



**TRINITY COUNTY  
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN  
*ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION***

---

*August 2011*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Project Overview and Determination .....</b>	<b>1</b>
Project Title.....	1
Lead Agency Name and Address.....	1
Contact Person and Phone Number.....	1
Project Sponsor's Name and Address .....	1
Project Location and Setting.....	1
Project Description.....	3
Purpose of the Plan .....	4
Financial Element .....	7
Transportation/Land Use Integration .....	7
Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required (e.g., permits, etc.) .....	8
Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:.....	9
Determination: .....	9
<b>Evaluation of Environmental Impacts.....</b>	<b>10</b>
Environmental Checklist .....	10
I. AESTHETICS .....	10
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES .....	11
III. AIR QUALITY .....	13
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.....	18
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES .....	20
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS .....	21
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS .....	24
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY .....	26
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING .....	28
X. MINERAL RESOURCES .....	29
XI. NOISE .....	29
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING.....	31
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES .....	32
XIV. RECREATION .....	33
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC .....	34
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS .....	41
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.....	42
<b>References.....</b>	<b>43</b>



**LIST OF TABLES**

Table 1 Trinity County Total Population.....	4
Table 2 Trinity County Inter-County Commute Patterns.....	5
Table 3 VMT on State Highways in Trinity County .....	18
Table 4 2009 and 2040 Forecasted VMT on Trinity County Roadways (Including State Highways) .....	19
Table 5 Existing Level of Service on County and Caltrans Roadways.....	39
Table 6 2040 Level of Service on County and Caltrans Roadways.....	40



## PROJECT OVERVIEW AND DETERMINATION

### PROJECT TITLE

Trinity County 2010 Regional Transportation Plan Update

### LEAD AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS

Trinity County Transportation Commission (TCTC)  
PO Box 2490  
31301 Highway 3  
Weaverville, CA 96093

### CONTACT PERSON AND PHONE NUMBER

Jan Smith, Program Manager  
PO Box 2490  
31301 Highway 3  
Weaverville, CA 96093  
(530) 623-1365

### PROJECT SPONSOR'S NAME AND ADDRESS

Trinity County Transportation Commission (TCTC)  
PO Box 2490  
31301 Highway 3  
Weaverville, CA 96093  
(530) 623-1365

### PROJECT LOCATION AND SETTING

The project area consists of the entire County of Trinity. Trinity County is located in the northwestern portion of California. The geography of the County is defined by the Trinity Alps, South Fork Mountain and other ridges of the Klamath Mountains and Coastal Range, carved by the deep canyons and valleys of the Trinity, Van Duzen, and Eel Rivers. There is an extensive wild and scenic river system, and the terrain is rugged and forested, with the highest points at around 9,000 feet. According to the 2000 Census, the county has a total area of 3,208 square miles of which, 3,179 square miles is land and 29 square miles is water. There are no incorporated cities or towns in Trinity County. Trinity County's Census Designated Places (CDPs) include Hayfork, Lewiston, and Weaverville. Smaller communities include Big Bar, Burnt Ranch, Douglas City, Junction City, Salyer, Trinity Center, Hyampom, Mad River, Ruth and Coffee Creek. Trinity County is bounded by five counties:

1. Mendocino County on the south
2. Humboldt County on the west
3. Siskiyou County on the north
4. Shasta County on the east
5. Tehama County on the southeast

The county seat and largest town is Weaverville, with approximately 3,500 people. The major highways in the County include State Route 3, State Route 36, and State Route 299. Four national protected areas are found in Trinity County:

- Mendocino National Forest (78,643 acres)
- Shasta-Trinity National Forest (933,674 acres)
- Six Rivers National Forest (229,601 acres)
- Whiskeytown National Recreation Area (222,134 acres)

### Population

The U.S. Census Bureau reported Trinity County's population to be 13,063 in 1990 and 13,022 in 2000. In January 2008 the population increased slightly to 13,935 and in January 2009, the population is reported at 13,959 (reported by the California Department of Finance (DOF)). The 2010 U.S. Census Report revealed a total county population of 13,786. This represents a 5.5 percent increase over 1990 or slightly less than 0.28 percent annual growth since 1990. The distribution of population for 1990, 2000, 2008, 2009, and 2010 is shown in **Table 1.1**.

Population in Year					Percent Change 1990 - 2010	Annual % Change
1990	2000	2008	2009	2010		
13,063	13,022	13,935	13,959	13,786	5.5%	0.28%
Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, State of California, Department of Finance, Table E-4 City/County Population Estimates; DOF Research Unit; Trinity County 2008-09 Economic and Demographic Profile, Center for Economic Development, California State University, Chico						

### Travel Patterns

The regional movement of people within Trinity County can be classified into three broad categories: commute, recreational, and tourism. The County commute traffic consists mostly of automobile traffic from the smaller communities and rural areas to Weaverville. **Table 1.2** provides the inter-county commute patterns identified in the 2000 Census for Journey-to-Work data.

**TABLE 2  
TRINITY COUNTY INTER-COUNTY COMMUTE PATTERNS**

<b>County/Location</b>	<b>County of Employment for Trinity County Residents</b>	<b>County of Residence for Trinity County Workers</b>
Humboldt	7.7%	2.0%
Mendocino	0%	0%
Shasta	4.3%	3.7%
Siskiyou	0.2%	0.7%
Tehama	0.2%	0.4%
Trinity	83.3%	91.0%
Other locations (within California)	3.8%	1.2%
Other locations (outside of California)	0.5%	0.9%

Source: U.S. Census 2000; Trinity County 2005 RTP

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Trinity County Transportation Commission (TCTC) is the designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for Trinity County. The Trinity County Transportation Commission (TCTC) is established by Section 29535 of the Government Code and organized per Chapter 3, Title 21 of the California Administrative Code. Section 29535 of the Government Code establishes a local transportation commission that is designated as a Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) responsible for area wide transportation planning in Trinity County. These responsibilities include:

- Administration and Management
- Transportation Planning and Regional Coordination
- Transit Alternatives and Improved Air Quality
- Claimant Funding and Oversight
- Grant Applications and Management

The RTP serves as the planning blueprint to guide transportation investments in the County involving local, state, and federal funding over the next twenty years. The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) was last updated by the TCTC in 2005. The horizon year for this RTP update is 2030. All RTP projects are assigned the following Tier designation to reflect its anticipated construction and funding time frame.

*Tier 1* projects represent projects that are fully fundable from anticipated revenue sources and are already programmed in the 0-5 Year (2010/11 – 2014/15) time frame.

*Tier 2* projects represent projects that are short-term and would be fundable from anticipated revenue sources and are planned for programming from 2015/16 – 2024/25 of the RTP.

*Tier 3* projects represent projects that are longer-term (2025/26 – 2029/30) and should have full funding during the life of the RTP (by 2030) given current revenue assumptions and projections.

The overall focus of the 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

(2030). The coordination focus brings the County, local communities, governmental agencies, Indian Tribal Governments, 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, goods, railroad, and aviation.

A key issue for Trinity County is the deteriorating condition of the region's local streets and roads and the shortfall of funding needed to provide the level of maintenance necessary to prevent further deterioration during the life of this plan.

*Local Street and Roads Maintenance Needs:* In 2007-08, the League of Cities in conjunction with Caltrans conducted a comprehensive statewide study of California's local street and road system. The study's objective was to fully assess the condition of the local system to determine (1) what are the pavement conditions of local streets and roads? (2) what will it cost to bring pavements to a "Best Management Practices (BMP) or most cost-effective condition? (3) what are the needs for the essential components to a functioning system? and (4) is there a funding shortfall?

The study surveyed all 58 California counties and 478 cities. The response rate was 93 percent and because the majority of the data came from recognized pavement management systems, the accuracy of the data was considered very high. The results showed that California's local streets and roads are in critical condition. On a scale of zero (failed) to 100 (excellent) the statewide average pavement conditions index (PCI) is 68 which is considered "at risk category." Without additional funding, the PCI is projected to decrease to 58 within 10 years.

The funding need for local streets and roads within Trinity County based on the study findings is approximately **\$366 million** over 10 years.

## PURPOSE OF THE PLAN

As defined by the 2010 RTP Guidelines, the purpose of the regional transportation plan is to accomplish the following objectives:

1. Provide an assessment of the current modes of transportation and the potential of new travel options within the region
2. Predict the future needs for travel and goods movement
3. Identify and document specific actions necessary to address the region's mobility and accessibility needs
4. Identify guidance and documentation of public policy decisions by local, regional, state and federal officials regarding transportation expenditures and financing
5. 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)
6. Help identify project purpose and needs
7. Provide estimates of emissions impacts for demonstrating conformity with the air quality standards identified in the State Implementation Plan (SIP)
8. Promote consistency between the California Transportation Plan, the regional transportation plan 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

9. 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 TCTC has prepared this 2010 RTP update based on these objectives consistent with the 2010 RTP Guidelines (adopted April 7, 2010).

### **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 Trinity County each table of projects by mode is located in Appendix 4A through 4G of the 2010 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 Trinity 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 Trinity County experiences large volumes of truck and recreational traffic on many of its roadways, and the mountainous geography of the County, 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 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 Trinity County 2010 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 Trinity County, Caltrans, or the smaller communities in the County to undertake construction of specific improvement projects identified in the RTP without further environmental review and consideration.

#### ***Noteworthy Changes to Project Lists: 2005 vs. 2010 RTP***

New projects have been added to the lists of short, medium and long-range projects proposed in the 2010 RTP. Projects have been suggested by Caltrans and Transportation Commission staff and by members of the Board of Supervisors/ Transportation Commission, or requested by the public. Some long-range or Unconstrained projects included in the previous 2005 RTP have been deleted and not carried forward due to lack of support or loss of the proposed funding source.

The Highway Bridge Program (HBP) of replacing or rehabilitating bridges will continue with prioritized projects based on the Caltrans bi-annual bridge inspections. Safety projects under the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) are competitively awarded based on accident records. Programs such as the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and Transportation Enhancement (TE) provide the opportunity for Regional Transportation Planning Agencies to develop eligible projects based on transportation needs identified by the traffic studies in this, and previous, RTPs, or desires expressed by the community.

A summary of the more noteworthy new projects that have been proposed in this RTP follows:

- Traffic Signal on Highway 299 in Weaverville at Washington Street; mid-term
- Traffic Signal or Roundabout at Forest Avenue/ Garden Gulch Street; long-term
- Traffic Calming on Highway 299 at Big Flat; mid-term
- Two-way Center Street in Weaverville from Court Street to Highway 3; long-term
- Local Road rehabilitation on residential streets in Trinity Center and Lewiston
- Turnouts and/or passing lanes on Highway 3, Covington Mill to Trinity Center
- Class I bicycle/pedestrian path on Highway 3, Trinity Center to Wyntoon Resort
- Curve realignment and/or passing lanes on Highway 3 at Hayfork Summit
- Cooperative projects with adjacent Counties to rehabilitate East Side/Trinity Mountain Road (Shasta County) and Peak Road (Humboldt County)
- Realign Fountain Ranch Road away from the Trinity River
- Lighted heliport at Weaverville Lonnie Pool Airport

Projects that have not been carried forward from the 2005 RTP include paving and chip seal projects in the Trinity Pines area. These projects were initiated with grants from the North State Unified Air Quality

Management District to reduce emissions from unpaved roads. However, this grant program has been discontinued, so these projects have been dropped from the project lists. If a similar funding source becomes available, the County can again pursue these projects.

## FINANCIAL ELEMENT

Fiscal constraint is one of the foundational concepts of the 2010 RTP. As such, the financial plan is a key component of the document. Given the nature of the current economy, fiscal constraint is exceptionally important. As part of the 2010 RTP effort the TCTC took a strict posture on this issue. Needs will always exceed available funding; however, it is smart planning to maximize benefit of each available dollar and to prioritize projects based on the funding availability, not strictly need. To this degree, project lists reflect fiscal constraint meaning that the projected revenues from all sources cover the total project costs for Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 projects.

## TRANSPORTATION/LAND USE INTEGRATION

Transportation System Goal 1 in the Trinity County General Plan Circulation Element is to *“Provide for the long-range development of the county’s roadway system that is consistent with adopted land use patterns, ensure the safe and efficient movement of the people and goods, minimizes impacts on the attractiveness of the community, meets environmental and circulation objectives, and implements funding strategies for construction, improvement, and maintenance of existing and new roadways.”* These desired outcomes are consistent with the County’s overall mission to serve the public with integrity in an effective and efficient manner in order to create and sustain a safe, healthy, and productive environment. These transportation/land use principles are reinforced in the General Plan Circulation Element through the following objectives and policies:

**Objective 1.1** – Establish consistency and/or linkages between transportation programs and land use plans

Policy 1.1.A – Update the Trinity County General Plan, Regional Transportation Plan, and/or Community Plans to provide consistency with the findings and/or recommendation of traffic studies, as appropriate.

Policy 1.1.B – Consider the Trinity County General Plan, Regional Transportation Plan, and/or Community Plans when assessing potential transportation projects.

**Objective 1.2** – Determine and, as appropriate, address the probable land use impacts of transportation projects prior to approving or funding the projects.

Policy 1.2.A – Location, design and development of transportation projects shall be consistent with the adopted land use policies of the county.

Policy 1.2.B – Identify potential impacts and/or conflicts between potential growth-inducing transportation projects and the adopted land-use policies of the county.

Policy 1.2.C – Require mitigation for transportation projects with potentially significant impacts to existing or planned land uses in the county.

The RTP promotes the transportation/land use integration and recognizes that future development in Trinity County should occur in areas that will be easiest to develop without high public costs, have the least negative environmental effect, and that will not displace or endanger the county's critical natural resources and agricultural and forest activities. This approach is consistent with the California Wildlife Plan (2006), results in lower cost for improvements and increased operational efficiency of the transportation system because the system will be sized appropriately to reflect more compact growth in near proximity to existing or planned services. The advantages of compact growth extend to higher levels of mobility, connectivity, and accessibility for the elderly and disabled, and to helping manage the growth in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and its subsequent direct relationship to trip length and air quality.

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

Trinity 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 vary among projects and may include, but are not necessarily limited to: Caltrans District 2, 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.

**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.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Responsible Agency Staff Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Title:

## 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 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 Trinity Alps, scenic water resources (Trinity Lake, Trinity River, New River, Main trunk of the El River, North Fork of the El River, Mad River, Lewiston Lake, Ruth Reservoir and Ewing Reservoir) and other scenic resources (forest highways) 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 in any of these areas. The proposed project includes a variety of roadway improvement projects, which consist primarily of roadway rehabilitation efforts and roadway safety improvements, 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. There is one proposed new road included in the 2010 update (East Connector) that underwent a full EIR and was officially adopted on March 4, 2003. The report is available at the Trinity County Planning and Public Works department., The "East Connector" project was developed and designed to help alleviate existing and projected future traffic and circulation problems in the Weaverville Basin. The project includes bicycle and pedestrian facilities, including Class I and II lanes along the East Connector and a proposed new bike/pedestrian path along Levee Road, in line with existing planning goals and objectives for the project area. Therefore, project traffic and transportation impacts would be largely beneficial.

The RTP also identifies roadway and multimodal transportation improvement funding priorities that will be implemented over the next 20 years. Implementation of the RTP 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

A review of 2010 labor force data for Trinity County from the EDD shows that 99 percent of the workforce is in non-farm related industries with the vast majority of those employed in retail and services. Only one-percent is considered farm/agriculture/mining. There are a few vineyards but employment is relatively small. Of the total wage and salary positions, 88 percent are related to the service industry. In addition, 52 percent work in government agencies (including forest service jobs) and 48 percent are employed by

private firms. This data suggests that major conversions of farmland and sensitive agriculture resources to accommodate job growth is not a major focus of the work force nor employment trends.

**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**

Under State Law, local and regional air pollution control districts have the primary responsibility for controlling air pollutant emissions from all sources other than vehicular emissions. Control of vehicular air pollution is the responsibility of the California Air Resources Board (CARB). In California, State standards are more stringent than Federal standards. The three primary pollutants prevalent within the County are listed below:

- *Ozone (O<sub>3</sub>)* – smog formed through a chemical reaction of volatile organic compounds, nitrogen oxides and sunlight;
- *Carbon Monoxide (CO)* – a colorless, odorless gas that is considered toxic because of its tendency to reduce the carrying capacity of oxygen in the blood; and,
- *Suspended Particulate Matter less than 10 microns (PM<sub>10</sub>)* – solid or liquid matter that can penetrate into the lungs and affect sensitive population groups such as children, the elderly, and people with respiratory diseases.

These pollutants are all emitted by motor vehicles. Motor vehicles also release fugitive PM10 dust that is re-entrained from road surfaces. Fugitive PM10 dust release is substantially higher on unpaved roads compared to paved roads.

Air quality is a significant consideration in planning for and evaluating the transportation system. The CARB divides the State into air basins and adopts standards of quality for each air basin. Trinity County is part of the North Coast Air Basin, with air quality managed by the North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District (NCUAQMD).

The NCUAQMD has a monitoring station located in Trinity County on the roof of the Courthouse in Weaverville. The only pollutant monitored at this site is Particulate Matter 10 (particulate matter ten microns in diameter or less) or PM10. Airborne Particulate Matter is caused by a combination of sources including fine fugitive dust, combustion from automobiles and heating, road salt, conifer pollen, and others. Constituents that comprise suspended particulates include organic, sulfate, and nitrate aerosols which are formed in the air from emitted hydrocarbons, and chloride, sulfur oxides, and oxides of nitrogen. The 24-hour Federal PM10 Standard is 150 µg/m<sup>3</sup>, while the State Standard is 50 µg/m<sup>3</sup>. The low population density, limited number of industrial and agricultural installations, and minimal problems with traffic congestion all contribute to Trinity County's generally good air quality. In 2003 (the most recent year for which data is available), Trinity County was in attainment with the Federal PM10 standard, but was in non-attainment (in Weaverville) for the State PM10 standard. Specifically, Trinity County slightly exceeded the State PM10 Standard only one day in 2003 (on 11/18/03) by 3.9 µg/m<sup>3</sup>. This is generally not of great concern as the measures are within reason, and given that nearly all counties in California are in non-attainment for State PM10. In Trinity County, the primary sources of pollutants contributing to the non-attainment designation for PM10 are wood stoves, wind-blown dust from dirt roads and agriculture, and open burning such as backyard burns, prescribed burning and wildfire.

An air quality conformity determination is not required for adoption of this RTP, as Trinity County is not within a designated Federal non-attainment or maintenance area for air quality and is therefore exempt. However, since the County, and other areas in the North Coast District exceed the State PM10 standard, The North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District has established a PM10 Attainment Plan, which includes Transportation Control Measures (TCMs) and land use measures affecting motor vehicles. Some of the project alternatives proposed in this RTP would lead to reduced traffic congestion, resulting in slightly lower emissions. In addition, some projects to surface unpaved roads are in compliance with the PM10 Attainment Plan being implemented by the NCUAQMD. Therefore, this RTP is consistent with the District's PM10 Attainment Plan.

**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.

### ***Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emissions***

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 back to 1990 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 Trinity County. These recommendations are also part of the 2010 RTP Guidelines.

- Emphasize transportation investments in areas where desired land uses as indicated in a 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, forest and resource lands.
- Consider transportation projects that increase connectivity, emphasize non-auto modes 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 and objectives are established for Trinity County to lessen dependence on the automobile and to promote mode shifting to other forms of transportation.

- Goal 2: Provide affordable, reliable, and efficient public transportation options that are consistent with demand and available resources.
  - support public transit determined to be “reasonable to meet”
  - maximize county-wide transit service and inter-county connections
- Goal 3: Promote non-auto modes by developing a safe and convenient system of bicycle and pedestrian facilities to connect activity centers and communities
  - increase the total mileage of safe bike routes, lanes and trails
  - increase the total mileage of safe pedestrian walkways and sidewalks
  - provide safe equestrian facilities
- Goal 5: Support and promote economic development through the efficient movement of freight to, and through Trinity County
  - Encourage use of county airports by commercial freight delivery services
  - Develop aviation related freight delivery services at airports as funding allows

In recent years, Trinity County has experienced relative slow growth (less than 1.0 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 2010 RTP guidelines, the County is not required to run a network travel demand model to estimate VMT. However, the County is committed to implementing policies and

strategies that reduce reliance on the automobile and contribute to the reduction of GHG. The effectiveness of efforts by the RTPA to provide transportation alternatives and to implement Transportation Demand Management (TDM) and Transportation System Management (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. In the past, the County has relied on Caltrans to provide VMT estimates through their count program on state highways. The results of this approach are summarized below.

#### Caltrans Annual VMT Report

Caltrans reports VMT by County on an annual basis. Their summary report "Vehicle Miles of Travel on State Highway System" for Trinity 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 2008. This reduction is attributed to a reduction in resource employment, higher fuel costs, and the State's declining economy.

**Table 1.3** displays historical annual and average daily vehicle miles of travel (VMT) on state highways in Trinity County.

<b>TABLE 3 VMT ON STATE HIGHWAYS IN TRINITY COUNTY</b>		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Annual VMT (in millions)</b>	<b>Average Daily VMT<sup>1</sup></b>
1995	112.8	309,041
1996	113.3	310,411
1997	119.2	326,575
1998	119.6	327,671
1999	126	345,205
2000	111	304,110
2001	111	304,110
2002	111	304,110
2003	115	315,068
2004	121.3	332,329
2005	120.7	330,685
2006	120.3	329,589
2007	120.4	329,863
2008	119.4	327,123

Notes: <sup>1</sup> Average Daily VMT equals annual VMT divided by 365 days per year.  
Source: Caltrans Traffic and Vehicle Data Systems Unit

#### Trinity County Travel Demand Model (TDM)

Although not required by the RTP Guidelines, Trinity County developed a TDM in 2004 to assist the county in refining its forecasting of traffic levels and patterns on its transportation system. This proactive approach will position the County to report progress in complying with any future CARB targets established for the County in AB 32 or SB 375.

A travel demand model (TDM) is a computer based tool that estimates traffic levels and patterns for a specific geographic area. TDM's are compiled using a computer program consisting of input files that summarize the area's land uses, street network, travel characteristics, and other key factors. Using this data, the model performs a series of calculations to determine the amount of trips generated by land uses, where each trip begins and ends, and the route taken by the trip. The model's output includes estimates of traffic on major roadways.

The Trinity County TDM is viewed as a valuable tool for the preparation of the Trinity County 2010 Regional Transportation Plan and other long-range transportation planning studies including compliance with GHG legislation such as AB 32 and SB 375 if such compliance is mandated for Trinity County. The model can be used to estimate the average daily and peak hour traffic volumes on major roadways in the future under certain growth assumptions. Using these traffic projections, transportation improvements can be identified to accommodate traffic growth, as well as forecasting future VMT and GHS emissions from the transportation sector.

**Table 1.4** displays 2009 and future year 2040 daily VMT estimates on state facilities and county roadways produced by the Trinity County Travel Demand Model (Fehr & Peers 2010). The VMT estimates are displayed for each 5 mile per hour speed increment. With this type of information, emission levels for GHG can be estimated once targets are established. Note that the travel demand model results do show an increase in Daily VMT for Trinity County.

<b>TABLE 4</b>		
<b>2009 AND 2040 FORECASED VMT ON TRINITY COUNTY ROADWAYS (INCLUDING STATE HIGHWAYS)</b>		
<b>Speed Increment</b>	<b>2009 Daily VMT</b>	<b>2040 Daily VMT</b>
20-25 mph	19,443	26,147
26-30 mph	11,502	12,856
31-35 mph	26,212	35,609
36-40 mph	6,286	7,117
41-45 mph	4,368	5,869
46-50 mph	3,401	4,281
51-55 mph	360,623	477,085
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>431,836</b>	<b>568,964</b>
Source: Fehr & Peers, 2010		

#### 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	

Trinity County extends from high elevations (+10,000 feet) in the Trinity Alps to lower elevations in the Weaverville basin near Weaverville and Trinity Center near Lewiston. As a result of the changes in elevation, Trinity County includes a 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. Trinity County contains a variety of vegetation associations, which support a diverse array of plant and animal species.

- Balsan Fir, White Fir, California Fir, and Red Firs
- Vine Maple, Mountain Maple, and Big Leaf Maple
- Needlegrass
- Western STIPA

- Western Banebarry
- Buckeye

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 the Trinity Alps. The migratory deer spend summers at high elevations in the Trinity Alps and migrate to lower elevations in the winter.

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 Trinity County include the Trinity River, North Fork of the Trinity, New River, South Fork of the Trinity, Main trunk of the Eel River, Trinity Lake, Lewiston Lake, Ruth Reservoir and Ewing Reservoir. High elevation streams in the national forests are occupied by species adapted to the cool, swift-moving, highly oxygenated waters. Such species include rainbow trout, brook trout, brown trout, black bass, small mouth bass, catfish, kokanee salmon, and coho salmon. Foothill and meadow streams generally flow in winter, but are intermittent in the summer.

#### ***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:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 (RTP) 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 and reconstruction 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.

As mentioned under Aesthetics, there is one proposed new road included in the 2010 update (East Connector) that underwent a full EIR and was officially adopted on March 4, 2003. The report is available at the Trinity County Planning and Public Works Department., The "East Connector" project was developed and designed to help alleviate existing and projected future traffic and circulation problems in the Weaverville Basin. The project includes bicycle and pedestrian facilities, including Class I and II lanes along the East Connector and a proposed new bike/pedestrian path along Levee Road, in line with existing planning goals and objectives for the project area. Therefore, project traffic and transportation impacts would be largely beneficial.

## 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	

Trinity County is located in the northwestern portion of California (**Figure 1**). The geography of the County is defined by the Trinity Alps, South Fork Mountain and other ridges of the Klamath Mountains and Coastal Range, carved by the deep canyons and valleys of the Trinity, Van Duzen, and Eel Rivers. There is an extensive wild and scenic river system, and the terrain is rugged and forested, with the highest points at around 9,000 – 10,000 feet. According to the 2000 Census, the county has a total area of 3,208 square miles of which, 3,179 square miles is land and 29 square miles is water.

### **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 Trinity 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 Trinity 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 liquefaction.

*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 rehabilitation and reconstruction, and would occur within the existing right of way of the County's roadway system. 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, 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. Trinity 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 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:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				X
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through 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 Trinity County that is registered with the Department of Toxic Substances Control. The site consists of the Jensen Lumber Company and is located approximately 80 miles west of Redding on SR 3. The site is located in the community of Hyampom. Previous cleanup status was recorded as certified in 1989. 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 4F 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, runway widening, taxiway construction, hangar construction and the implementation of other ancillary improvements such as lighting and wind detectors, 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 Trinity 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 Siskiyou 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 rehabilitation and reconstruction 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:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?				X
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X

### 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 was reviewed during preparation of the RTP, and the RTP is consistent with this document. No housing would be removed as part of the proposed project. As mentioned under Aesthetics, there is one proposed new road included in the 2010 update (East Connector) that underwent a full EIR and was officially adopted on March 4, 2003. The report is available at the Trinity County Planning and Public Works Department. The "East Connector" project was developed and designed to help alleviate existing and projected future traffic and circulation problems in the Weaverville Basin. The project includes bicycle and pedestrian facilities, including Class I and II lanes along the East Connector and a proposed new bike/pedestrian path along Levee Road, in line with existing planning goals and objectives for the project area. The project does not divide any communities within the plan area. Therefore, project traffic and transportation impacts would be largely beneficial.

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. 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:**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 7 mines identified on the AB 3098 list in Trinity County. The list below identifies the active mines located in the county.

#### AB 3098 List – Active Mines in Trinity County

Mine ID	Mine Name	Mine Operator
91-53-0002	Dinsmore Bar	Mercer-Fraser Company, INC.
91-53-0007	La Grange Mine	Eagle Rock, INC.
91-53-0014	Blue Rock Quarry	Ladd & Associates, INC.
91-53-0015	Smith Pit Phase 2	Concrete Aggregate Products
91-53-0021	Blue Rock Quarry – 2	Ladd & Associates, INC.
91-53-0024	Oswald Mine	Master Petroleum
91-53-0025	Ruth Mine	Trinity County, Department of Trans.
91-54-0002	Lee Gill Granite	Mitchell Brown General Engineering, INC.

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:**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or			X	

applicable standards of other agencies?				
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above 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 Trinity 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 East Connector has an approved EIR (2003) that accounted for all potential impacts from the facility. The remaining 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 include runway expansion and widening that is consistent with approved airport land use plans. These improvements will not impact existing height restrictions and/or noise contours around the airport and there are no new sensitive receptors or residential areas near the improvements. 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 SR 299 and SR 3. 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:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 and reconstruction of the existing transportation network in Trinity County. As mentioned under Aesthetics, there is one proposed new road included in the 2010 update (East Connector) that underwent a full EIR and was officially adopted on March 4, 2003. The report is available at the Trinity County Planning and Public Works Department., The “East Connector” project was developed and designed to help alleviate existing and projected future traffic and circulation problems in the Weaverville Basin. The project includes bicycle and pedestrian facilities, including Class I and II lanes along the East Connector and a proposed new bike/pedestrian path along Levee Road, in line with existing planning goals and objectives for the project area. Therefore, project traffic and transportation impacts would be largely beneficial to existing residents and users. 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 Trinity 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 Trinity 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	

### **Traffic Volumes and LOS**

Roadway operations are measured in terms of Level of Service (LOS). Level of Service is a qualitative measure describing operational conditions within a traffic stream, based on service measures such as speed and travel time, freedom to maneuver, traffic interruptions, comfort, and convenience. LOS is defined for each type of facility that has analysis procedures available in the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) 2000. Letters designate each LOS from A to F, with LOS A representing the best operating conditions and LOS F representing the worst. Safety is addressed through other measures.

- **Level of Service A** represents free flow. Individual users are virtually unaffected by the presence of others in the traffic stream. Freedom to select desired speeds and to maneuver within the traffic stream is extremely high. The general level of comfort and convenience provided to the motorist, passenger, or pedestrian is excellent.
- **Level of Service B** is in the range of stable flow, but the presence of other users in the traffic stream begins to be noticeable. Freedom to select desired speeds is relatively unaffected, but there is a slight decline in the freedom to maneuver within the traffic stream from LOS A. The

level of comfort and convenience provided is somewhat less than at LOS A, because the presence of others in the traffic stream begins to affect individual behavior.

- **Level of Service C** is in the range of stable flow, but marks the beginning of the range of flow in which the operation of individual users becomes significantly affected by interactions with others in the traffic stream. The selection of speed is now affected by the presence of others, and maneuvering within the traffic stream requires substantial vigilance on the part of the user. The general level of comfort and convenience declines noticeably at this level.
- **Level of Service D** represents high-density, but stable, flow. Speed and freedom to maneuver are severely restricted, and the driver or pedestrian experiences a generally poor level of comfort and convenience. Small increases in traffic flow will generally cause operational problems at this level.
- **Level of Service E** represents operating conditions at or near the capacity level. All speeds are reduced to a low, but relatively uniform value. Freedom to maneuver within the traffic stream is extremely difficult, and it is generally accomplished by forcing a vehicle or pedestrian to "give way" to accommodate such maneuvers. Comfort and convenience levels are extremely poor, and driver or pedestrian frustration is generally high. Operations at this level are usually unstable, because small increases in flow or minor perturbations within the traffic stream will cause breakdowns.
- **Level of Service F** is used to define forced or breakdown flow. This condition exists wherever the amount of traffic approaching a point exceeds the amount which can traverse the point. Queues form behind such locations. Operations within the queue are characterized by stop-and-go waves, and they are extremely unstable. Vehicles may progress at reasonable speeds for several hundred feet or more, then be required to stop in a cyclic fashion. Level of Service F is used to describe the operating conditions within the queue, as well as the point of the breakdown. It should be noted, however, that in many cases operating conditions of vehicles or pedestrians discharged from the queue may be quite good. Nevertheless, it is the point at which arrival flow exceeds discharge flow which causes the queue to form, and Level of Service F is an appropriate designation for such points.

### **Roadway Segment Level of Service**

LOS for rural highways is largely determined by roadway geometry factors, such as grades, vertical and horizontal curves, and the presence of passing opportunities. In mountainous topography and particularly through canyons, roadway LOS can be relatively low, even absent substantial traffic volumes. Roadway LOS can also be impacted in developed areas by pedestrian, bicycle and parking activity.

Caltrans District 2 provided an estimate of 2009 level of service on state facilities within Trinity County. In addition, **Table 5** provides additional level of service information, based on average annual daily traffic, for Caltrans and County roadways based on the Analysis Methodology described above.

The following are Caltrans District 2 estimates of LOS on primary roadway segments during peak traffic conditions:

#### *State Route 3*

- SR 36 to Mile Post 15.0 – LOS B
- Mile Post 15.0 to Rush Creek Road – LOS C
- Rush Creek Road to Mile Post 67.7 – LOS B
- Mile Post 67.7 to Mile Post 79.5 – LOS A
- Mile Post 79.5 to Scott Summit – LOS B

*State Route 36*

Trinity/Humboldt County Line to Junction of SR 3 – LOS B  
SR 3 to the Trinity/Shasta County Line – LOS B

*State Route 299*

The Caltrans District 1 & 2 Boundary to Limestone Point – LOS B  
Lime Point to Oregon Mountain – LOS B  
Oregon Mountain to Memorial Drive – LOS B  
Memorial Drive to Industrial Park Way – LOS D  
Industrial Park Way to Douglas City – LOS B  
Douglas City to Buckhorn Summit – LOS B

Note that general LOS information for Downtown Weaverville was not provided by Caltrans District 2 because more detailed intersection analysis is provided in the following sections, which provides a better representation of traffic conditions in this area of SR 299 given the close intersection spacing and higher vehicle volumes.

**TABLE 5  
EXISTING LEVEL OF SERVICE ON COUNTY AND CALTRANS ROADWAYS**

Trinity County Facilities			Caltrans Facilities		
Route and Location	Existing Volume <sup>1</sup>	LOS	Route and Location	Existing Volume <sup>1</sup>	LOS
Mill St: South of SR 299	699	A	SR 3: Junction of SR 36, north	210	A
Oregon St: SR 299 to Miner St.	2,727	C	SR 3: Morgan Hill Rd., south	670	A
Oregon St: Miner Street to Odd Fellow Ave.	1,171	B	SR 3: Morgan Hill Rd., north	660	A
Washington St: North of SR 299	3,179	C	SR 3: Hayfork	2,050	C
Washington St: South of SR 3	3,216	C	SR 3: Douglas City, South Jct.	1,450	B
Washington St: South of SR 299	867	A	SR 3: Weaverville, North Jct.	4,000	C
S. Miner St: South of Forest Ave.	2,050	C	SR 3: Rush Creek Rd., south	1,300	B
S. Miner St: North of Oregon St.	2,045	C	SR 3: Rush Creek Rd., north	590	A
Bremer St: South of SR 299	526	A	SR 3: Trinity Center Maintenance Station	660	A
Martin Rd: East of SR 299	1,853	B	SR 3: Siskiyou County Line	190	A
Rush Creek Rd: South of SR 3	685	A	SR 36: Lower Mad River Rd., west	680	A
Airport Rd: East of SR 3	645	A	SR 36: Lower Mad River Rd., east	340	A
Mary Ave: South of Airport Rd.	593	A	SR 36: Forest Glen Maintenance Station	330	A
Trinity Dam Blvd: North of SR 299	903	A	SR 36: Jct. of Route 3, north	400	A
Brady Rd: North of SR 3	620	A	SR 299: East Limits Salyer, west	3,400	C
Morgan Hill Rd: East of SR 3	787	A	SR 299: East Limits Salyer, east	3,150	C
Hyampom Rd: West of SR 3	1,114	B	SR 299: Burnt Ranch Rd., west	3,150	C
Oak Ave: South of SR 3	1,704	B	SR 299: Del Loma, east	1,600	A
Mulligan St (East): North of SR 3	200	A	SR 299: Weaverville, West City Limits	2,950	C
Mulligan St (West): North of SR 3	516	A	SR 299: Weaverville, Washington St., east	11,600	D
Glen Rd: West of Nugget Ln.	1,502	B	SR 299: Martin/Nugget Roads, west	7,100	D
Center St: East of SR 299	504	A	SR 299: Martin/Nugget Roads, east	6,400	C
Center St: South of SR 3	827	A	SR 299: East Jct. SR 3, west	4,350	C
Weaver St: East of SR 299	850	A	SR 299: East Jct. SR 3, east	3,850	C
Masonic Ln: South of SR 299	769	A	SR 299: Lewiston Rd., east	3,400	C
Mountain View St: South of SR 299	738	A	SR 299: Trinity Dam Rd., east	3,750	C
N. Miner St: South of SR 299	184	A			
Mad River Rd: South of SR 36	388	A			
Van Duzen Rd: South of SR 36	581	A			

Notes: <sup>1</sup> Annual Average Daily Traffic volumes. Level of service results may differ by one level of service during the peak month. Shading indicates deficient operations.

Source: Caltrans Traffic and Vehicle Data Systems Unit, 2008; Fehr & Peers, 2010

2040 Conditions

**Table 6** provides 2040 level of service information for County and Caltrans roadways based on the forecasted traffic volumes from the Trinity County Travel Demand Model (Fehr & Peers, 2010) using a 0.28% per year population growth.

TABLE 6 2040 LEVEL OF SERVICE ON COUNTY AND CALTRANS ROADWAYS					
Trinity County Facilities			Caltrans Facilities		
Route and Location	2040 Volume <sup>1</sup>	LOS	Route and Location	2040 Volume <sup>1</sup>	LOS
Mill St.: South of SR 299	700	A	SR 3: Hayfork	2,200	C
Oregon St.: SR 299 to Miner St.	3,170	C	SR 3: Douglas City, South Jct.	1,570	B
Oregon St.: Miner Street to Odd Fellow Ave.	1,700	B	SR 3: Weaverville, North Jct.	4,590	C
Washington St.: North of SR 299	1,480	B	SR 3: Rush Creek Rd., south	1,540	B
Washington St.: South of SR 3	1,550	B	SR 3: Trinity Center Maintenance Station	800	A
Washington St.: South of SR 299	960	B	SR 3: Siskiyou County Line	260	A
S. Miner St.: South of Forest Ave.	2,340	C	SR 36: Lower Mad River Rd., west	930	B
S. Miner St.: North of Oregon St.	2,270	C	SR 36: Forest Glen Maintenance Station	520	A
Bremer St.: South of SR 299	540	A	SR 36: Jct. of Route 3, north	480	A
Martin Rd.: East of SR 299	1,560	B	SR 299: East Limits Salyer, west	4,400	C
Rush Creek Rd.: South of SR 3	800	A	SR 299: Burnt Ranch Rd., west	4,130	C
Airport Rd.: East of SR 3	760	A	SR 299: Del Loma, east	2,570	B
Mary Ave.: South of Airport Rd.	670	A	SR 299: Weaverville, West City Limits	4,910	C
Trinity Dam Blvd.: North of SR 299	960	B	SR 299: Weaverville, Washington St., east	10,980	D
Brady Rd.: North of SR 3	780	A	SR 299: Martin/Nugget Roads, west	8,440	D
Morgan Hill Rd.: East of SR 3	860	A	SR 299: Martin/Nugget Roads, east	7,870	D
Hyampom Rd.: West of SR 3	1,120	B	SR 299: East Jct. SR 3, west	5,420	C
Oak Ave.: South of SR 3	1,840	B	SR 299: East Jct. SR 3, east	4,950	C
Mulligan St. (East): North of SR 3	210	A	SR 299: Lewiston Rd., east	4,230	C
Mulligan St. (West): North of SR 3	500	A	SR 299: Trinity Dam Blvd., east	5,450	C
Glen Rd.: West of Nugget Ln.	1,510	B			
Center St.: East of SR 299	490	A			
Center St.: South of SR 3	830	A			
Weaver St.: East of SR 299	840	A			
Masonic Ln.: South of SR 299	770	A			
Mountain View St.: South of SR 299	890	A			
N. Miner St.: South of SR 299	190	A			
Mad River Rd.: South of SR 36	420	A			

Trinity County Facilities			Caltrans Facilities		
Route and Location	2040 Volume <sup>1</sup>	LOS	Route and Location	2040 Volume <sup>1</sup>	LOS
Van Duzen Rd.: South of SR 36	590	A			
East Connector: SR 299 to Pioneer Ln.	2,690	C			
East Connector: Pioneer Ln. to Browns Ranch Rd.	2,550	C			
East Connector: Browns Ranch Rd. to SR 3	1,780	B			

Notes: <sup>1</sup> Annual Average Daily Traffic volumes. Level of service results may differ by one level of service during the peak month. The information assumes that the East Connector is in place.  
Shading indicates deficient operations.  
Source: Caltrans Traffic and Vehicle Data Systems Unit, 2008; Fehr & Peers, 2010

In 2040, SR 299 in Weaverville will continue to operate below Caltrans Standards, and the deficiency will extend east of Martin Road. The level of service analysis presented in **Table 6** assumes construction of the East Connector. The East Connector project has been approved and is assumed to be in place in 2040. Note that without the East Connector, SR 299 in Weaverville would operate at LOS E in 2040 and Washington Street would operate at LOS D.

**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 the road network, transit, and bicycle/pedestrian facilities will improve conditions. With the improvements, the roadways that operate below the level of service policy will improve to within the policy. 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 roadways 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 improvements proposed to aviation facilities including runway expansion and widening in the County would not result in an increase in flights or a change in flight patterns, but mainly improve flight safety for existing aircraft operations. The RTP and the projects included within were developed after careful review of the General Plans of the County. The RTP is consistent with the circulation elements of the General Plans, and would not result in conflicts or inconsistencies with the above referenced plans. This is considered a less than significant impact and no mitigation is required.

## XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

### Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 statues 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. California Important Farmlands 2006 Map (California Department of Conservation, June 2008)
2. Inventory of California Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990 to 2004. (Staff Final Report), (California Energy Commission, 2006)
3. A Manual of California Vegetation (Sawyer, John and Todd Keeler-Wolf 1995)
4. Terrestrial vegetation of California (Barbour and Major 1988)
5. Jepson Manual: Higher Plants of California (Hickman, James C. 1993)
6. Cal EPA Department of Toxic Substances Control, May 2008, Cleanup Sites and Hazardous Waste Permitted Facilities
7. California Department of Conservation, Mine Reclamation AB 3098 List (July 2009)
8. 2010 Draft Trinity County RTP (Fehr and Peers, September 2010)
9. Trinity County Transit Development Plan – Draft Final Report February 2009 (Nelson/Nygaard)
10. Trinity County Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services Transportation Plan – Final Plan October 2008 (Nelson/Nygaard)
11. Trinity County Bikeways Master Plan – April 2004 (Alta Planning & Design)
12. Trinity County 2005 Regional Transportation Plan Final Report – October 2005 (LSC)
13. 2010 Regional Transportation Improvement Program – February 2010
14. Trinity County Economic & Demographic Profile – 2008 (Center for Economic Development at Chico State)
15. Airport Layout Plan & Report – Hayfork – September 2008 (Coffman Associates, Inc)
16. Weaverville Airport Master Plan/New Site Feasibility Study – 2008 (Coffman Associates, Inc)
17. Trinity County General Plan Circulation Element – May 1, 2002 (LSC)
18. Negative Declaration – Initial Study and Environmental Checklist for the Trinity County General Plan Circulation Element Update – November 2001 – LSC
19. State Route 299 Transportation Concept Report – September 2009 (Caltrans District 2)
20. Trinity County General Plan Noise Element – October 21, 2003 (Brown-Buntin Associates, Inc.)
21. Trinity Center Airport Layout Plan Report – July 2008 (Coffman Associates, Inc.)
22. Ruth Airport Layout Plan and Report – July 2008 (Coffman Associates, Inc.)
23. Weaverville Basin Traffic Circulation Study Final Report – October 1998 (LSC)
24. Trinity County General Plan Safety Element – March 2002 (Trinity County Planning Department)
25. Weaverville Community Plan – September 1990 (adopted as part of Trinity County General Plan)
26. California Aviation System Plan (2006)
27. Shasta-Trinity National Forest Motorized Travel Management Plan – Record of Decision (March 2010).
28. Water Quality and Habitat Protection Manual for County Road Maintenance – Chapter 3 (Maintaining the Roads – 2002)