FINAL

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

FOR THE

2012 BUTTE COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES STRATEGY

(SCH: 2012012034)

NOVEMBER 2012

Prepared for:

Butte County Association of Governments
2580 Sierra Sunrise Terrace, Suite 100
Chico, Ca 95928
(530)879-2468

Prepared by:

De Novo Planning Group
4630 Brand Way
Sacramento, CA 95819
(916) 580-9818

De Novo Planning Group

A Land Use Planning, Design, and Environmental Firm

FINAL
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

FOR THE

2012 BUTTE COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES STRATEGY

NOVEMBER 2012

Prepared for:

Butte County Association of Governments
2580 Sierra Sunrise Terrace, Suite 100
Chico, Ca 95928
(530)879-2468

Prepared by:

De Novo Planning Group
4630 Brand Way
Sacramento, CA 95819
(916) 580-9818

Chapter **Page Number**

Table **Page Number**

This page left intentionally blank.

INTRODUCTION

The Butte County Association of Governments (BCAG) has determined that the 2012 Butte County Metropolitan Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy (2012 MTP/SCS or proposed project) is a "Project" within the definition of CEQA. CEQA requires the preparation of an environmental impact report (EIR) prior to approving any project, which may have a significant impact on the environment. For the purposes of CEQA, the term "Project" refers to the whole of an action, which has the potential for resulting in a direct physical change or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment (CEQA Guidelines Section 15378[a]).

BCAG circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR for the proposed project and an Initial Study on January 17, 2012 to trustee and responsible agencies, the State Clearinghouse (SCH# 2012012034), and the public. A scoping meeting was held on Wednesday February 8th 4-6pm, Butte County Library in Oroville and on Thursday February 9th 4-6pm, Butte County Library in Chico. The NOP and Initial Study are presented in Appendix A of the Draft EIR.

Comments received in response to the Initial Study and Notice of Preparation were considered in preparing the analysis in the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR contains a description of the project, description of the environmental setting, identification of project impacts, and mitigation measures for impacts found to be significant, as well as an analysis of project alternatives, identification of significant irreversible environmental changes, growth-inducing impacts, and cumulative impacts. The Draft EIR identifies issues determined to have no impact or a less than significant impact, and provides detailed analysis of potentially significant and significant impacts.

BCAG published a public Notice of Availability (NOA) for the Draft EIR on September 27, 2012, inviting comment from the general public, agencies, organizations, and other interested parties. The NOA was filed with the State Clearinghouse (SCH # 2012012034) and the County Clerk, and was published in the Chico Enterprise Record, Paradise Post, Oroville Mercury Register, and Gridley Herald pursuant to the public noticing requirements of CEQA. The Draft EIR was available for public review from September 27 through November 13, 2012. The Draft EIR contains a description of the project, description of the environmental setting, identification of project impacts, and mitigation measures for impacts found to be significant, as well as an analysis of project alternatives, identification of significant irreversible environmental changes, growth-inducing impacts, and cumulative impacts. The Draft EIR identifies issues determined to have no impact or a less than significant impact, and provides detailed analysis of potentially significant and significant impacts.

This Final EIR was prepared to address comments received in response to the Draft EIR. BCAG has prepared a written response to the Draft EIR comments and made textual changes to the Draft EIR where warranted. The responses to the comments are provided in this Final EIR in Section 2.0, and all changes to the text of the EIR are provided in Section 3.0. Responses to comments received during the comment period do not involve any new significant impacts or “significant new information” that would require recirculation of the Draft EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project is the adoption and implementation of the 2012 Butte County Metropolitan Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy. Each is discussed below.

Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)

The MTP has been prepared to fulfill the state requirements of AB 402 (Government Code Title 7, Chapter 2.5, Sections 65080-65082) using specific guidance from the California Transportation Commission Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines. More specifically, the MTP is a twenty-three year, comprehensive transportation plan for all modes including: highways, local streets and roads, transit, bicycle, aviation, rail, and goods movement. BCAG is required to adopt and submit an updated MTP to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) and the Department of Transportation (Caltrans) every four years. In addition, the MTP is used to demonstrate Air Quality Conformity requirements applicable to Butte County, and it documents the BCAG Board's priorities for transportation funding to the region.

The secondary purpose of the MTP is to serve as a foundation for the development of the shorter "action" plans called the Regional Transportation Improvement Program, which satisfies California transportation planning requirements, and the federal counterpart referred to as the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) for all transportation projects that contain federal transportation dollars or require federal approval.

The MTP contains three primary elements: Policy Element, Action Element, and Financial Element.

The **Policy Element** presents guidance to decision-makers of the implications, impacts, opportunities, and foreclosed options that will result from implementation of the MTP. California law (Government Code Section 65080 (b)) states that each MTP shall include a Policy Element that:

1. Describes the transportation issues in the region;
2. Identifies and quantifies regional needs expressed within both short and long range planning horizons; and,
3. Maintains internal consistency with the Financial Element and fund estimates.

The **Action Element** identifies programs and actions to implement the MTP in accordance with the goals, objectives, and policies set forth in the Policy Element. It includes regionally significant multimodal projects that currently have funding in place or that are projected to have funding in the future (Fiscally Constrained), while it also identifies other improvement projects that are needed but do not have funding (Fiscally Unconstrained).

The **Financial Element** identifies the current and anticipated revenue sources and financing techniques available to fund the fiscally constrained transportation investments described in the Action Element. It also identifies potential funding shortfalls and sources for the unconstrained project list.

More detailed information on the Butte County MTP can be found at the BCAG website, (www.bcag.org).

Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS)

In September 2008 Governor Schwarzenegger signed Senate Bill 375 (SB 375), also known as the Sustainable Communities and Climate Change Act of 2008, as the mechanism to implement passenger vehicle greenhouse gas reductions outlined in Assembly Bill 32. Under SB 375, BCAG, as the region's MPO, has been designated by the state to prepare the area's SCS as an additional element of the 2012 MTP. The SCS will be the forecasted development pattern for the region, which, when integrated into the transportation network, and other transportation measures and policies, will meet the passenger vehicle greenhouse gas reduction target for the area.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The CEQA Guidelines require an EIR to describe a reasonable range of alternatives to the project or to the location of the project which would reduce or avoid significant impacts, and which could feasibly accomplish the basic objectives of the proposed project. Since the MTP/SCS is a countywide planning document, a discussion of alternative sites is not appropriate. The alternatives analyzed in this EIR include the following three alternatives in addition to the proposed MTP/SCS:

- No Project Alternative (2008 Regional Transportation Plan)
- Financially Unconstrained Alternative (Funded and Unfunded Projects)
- Transit Investment Alternative (Increase Funding of Public Transit Projects by Diverting BCAG-Controlled Funds)

Alternatives are described in detail in Chapter 5. Table ES-1 provides a comparison of the alternatives using a qualitative matrix that quantifies the impacts of each alternative relative to the other alternatives.

The Financially Constrained Alternative has the lowest overall impact (score of 16) and is deemed the environmentally superior alternative because it provides the greatest reduction of potential impacts in comparison to the other alternatives, while also achieving the project goals and objectives. The Transit Investment Alternative ranks second with a score of 18, the No Project Alternative ranks third with a score of 20, and the Financially Unconstrained Alternative ranks fourth with a score of 31.

COMMENTS RECEIVED

The Draft EIR addressed environmental impacts associated with the 2012 MTP/SCS that are known to BCAG, were raised during the Notice of Preparation (NOP) process, or raised during preparation of the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR discussed potentially significant impacts associated with aesthetics, agricultural resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions and climate change, land use and planning, noise, and transportation/circulation.

NOP Comments

The BCAG received two comment letters on the NOP. A copy of each letter is provided in Appendix B of the Draft EIR and the comments are summarized below.

Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC noted that CEQA requires the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report to assess the potential for the proposed project to have an adverse impact on historical and/or archaeological resources. The NAHC noted that the Sacred Lands File was searched for Butte County and Native American cultural resources were identified, but are exempted from public disclosure pursuant to the California Government Code Section 6254. The NAHC recommends consultation with Native American tribes in the plan area as a way to best avoid unanticipated discoveries of resources during construction. The NAHC presents the appropriate steps for consulting with the Native American tribes for federal projects and recommends confidentiality of historic and archeological resources that occur in the plan area. The NAHC also cites regulations for dealing with accidentally discovered archaeological resources or human remains during construction. Lastly, the NAHC reiterates the needs for effective consultation with the Native American tribes on individual projects in the plan area.

Central Valley Flood Protection Board (CVFPB). The CVFPB notes that the proposed project is within their jurisdiction and that they are required to enforce standards for construction, maintenance, and protection of flood control plans. The CVFPB provides a list of activities that require a permit from their agency. The list includes a broad range of actions that involve cutting into a levee, landscaping/planting that could interfere with flood control, and existing structures that predate permitting. The CVFPB cites CEQA Guidelines that require a discussion of cumulative impacts. The CVFPB reiterates that vegetation must not interfere with flood control. The CVFPB states that the EIR should include mitigation measures for channel and levee improvements and maintenance to prevent and/or reduce hydraulic impacts. Lastly, the CVFPB provides a link to the permit application on their website.

Draft EIR Comments

During the Draft EIR review process, BCAG received two (2) comment letters from the following agencies: Butte County Air Quality Management District, and OPR-State Clearinghouse. BCAG has prepared a response to the Draft EIR comments. The comments and responses to the comments are provided in this Final EIR in Section 2.0, and all changes to the text of the Draft EIR are provided in Section 3.0, Errata. Responses to comments received during the comment period do not involve any new significant impacts or "significant new information" that would require recirculation of the Draft EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5.

The Butte County Association of Governments (BCAG) is the federally designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and the state designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for Butte County, including the Cities of Biggs, Chico, Gridley, Oroville, and the Town of Paradise. As the MPO and RTPA, BCAG's transportation planning and programming efforts secure transportation funding for the region's highways, transit, streets and roads, pedestrian and other transportation system improvements throughout the region. BCAG will serve as CEQA lead agency for the environmental review of the 2012 MTP/SCS.

The 2012 Metropolitan Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy (2012 MTP/SCS) introduces a planning framework that is updated from the 2008 RTP, to reflect current priorities and practices at the regional, State, and federal levels. This framework provides guidance to policy makers as they make decisions impacting the region's transportation system. Over the planning horizon of this long-range plan, the goals, policies, and objectives will produce a more coordinated and comprehensive transportation system that effectively and efficiently utilizes the region's resources to the benefit of the citizens of Butte County. The goals, policies, and objectives reflect the desired outcomes of the 2012 MTP/SCS.

1.1 PURPOSE AND INTENDED USES OF THE EIR

CEQA REQUIREMENTS FOR A FINAL EIR

This Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the 2012 MTP/SCS has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and State CEQA Guidelines. State CEQA Guidelines Section 15132 requires that an FEIR consist of the following:

- the Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) or a revision of the draft;
- comments and recommendations received on the Draft EIR, either verbatim or in summary;
- a list of persons, organizations, and public agencies commenting on the Draft EIR;
- the responses of the lead agency to significant environmental concerns raised in the review and consultation process; and
- any other information added by the lead agency.

In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15132(a), the Draft EIR is incorporated by reference into this Final EIR.

An EIR must disclose the expected environmental impacts, including impacts that cannot be avoided, growth-inducing effects, impacts found not to be significant, and significant cumulative impacts, as well as identify mitigation measures and alternatives to the proposed project that could reduce or avoid its adverse environmental impacts. CEQA requires government agencies to consider and, where feasible, minimize environmental impacts of proposed development, and an obligation to balance a variety of public objectives, including economic, environmental, and social factors.

PURPOSE AND USE

BCAG, as the lead agency, has prepared the Draft EIR and this Final EIR to disclose the expected environmental impacts, including impacts that cannot be avoided, growth-inducing effects, impacts found not to be significant, and significant cumulative impacts, as well as identify mitigation measures and alternatives to the proposed project that could reduce or avoid its adverse environmental impacts. CEQA requires government agencies to consider and, where feasible, minimize environmental impacts of proposed projects, and confers an obligation to balance a variety of public objectives, including economic, environmental, and social factors.

This document and the Draft EIR, as amended herein, constitute the Final EIR, which will be used as programmatic-level environmental document to evaluate subsequent planning and permitting actions associated with the 2012 MTP/SCS. Many subsequent actions will require subsequent and/or supplement analysis as the details of the action become clear from the development of detailed project planning, design, and engineering. Subsequent actions that may be associated with the 2012 MTP/SCS are identified in Chapter 2.0 of the Draft EIR.

1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

The review and certification process for the EIR has involved, or will involve, the following general procedural steps:

NOTICE OF PREPARATION AND INITIAL STUDY

The BCAG circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR for the proposed project and an Initial Study on January 17, 2012 to trustee and responsible agencies, the State Clearinghouse (SCH# 2012012034), and the public. A scoping meeting was held on Wednesday February 8th 4-6pm, Butte County Library in Oroville and on Thursday February 9th 4-6pm, Butte County Library in Chico. The NOP and Initial Study are presented in Appendix A.

NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY AND DRAFT EIR

BCAG published a public Notice of Availability (NOA) for the Draft EIR on September 27, 2012, inviting comment from the general public, agencies, organizations, and other interested parties. The NOA was filed with the State Clearinghouse (SCH # 2012012034) and the County Clerk, and was published in the Chico Enterprise Record, Paradise Post, Oroville Mercury Register, and Gridley Herald pursuant to the public noticing requirements of CEQA. The Draft EIR was available for public review from September 27 through November 13, 2012. The Draft EIR contains a description of the project, description of the environmental setting, identification of project impacts, and mitigation measures for impacts found to be significant, as well as an analysis of project alternatives, identification of significant irreversible environmental changes, growth-inducing impacts, and cumulative impacts. The Draft EIR identifies issues determined to have no impact or a less than significant impact, and provides detailed analysis of potentially significant and significant impacts.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS/FINAL EIR

BCAG received two (2) comment letters regarding the Draft EIR, both from a public agency. No additional oral or written comments were received. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15088, this Final EIR responds to the written comment received. The Final EIR also contains minor edits to the Draft EIR, which are included in Section 3.0, Errata. This document and the Draft EIR, as amended herein, constitute the Final EIR.

CERTIFICATION OF THE EIR/PROJECT CONSIDERATION

BCAG will independently review and consider the Final EIR. If BCAG finds that the Final EIR is "adequate and complete", the BCAG Board may certify the Final EIR in accordance with CEQA. The rule of adequacy generally holds that an EIR can be certified if:

1) The EIR shows a good faith effort at full disclosure of environmental information; and

2) The EIR provides sufficient analysis to allow decisions to be made regarding the proposed project in contemplation of environmental considerations.

Upon certification of the Final EIR, the BCAG Board may take action to approve, revise, or reject the project. A decision to approve the 2012 MTP/SCS, for which this EIR identifies significant environmental effects, must be accompanied by written findings in accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091 and 15093. A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, as described below, would also be adopted in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21081.6(a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15097 for mitigation measures that have been incorporated into or imposed upon the project to reduce or avoid significant effects on the environment. This Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program will be designed to ensure that these measures are carried out during project implementation, in a manner that is consistent with the EIR.

1.3 ORGANIZATION OF THE FINAL EIR

This Final EIR has been prepared consistent with Section 15132 of the State CEQA Guidelines, which identifies the content requirements for Final EIRs. This Final EIR is organized in the following manner:

CHAPTER 1.0 – INTRODUCTION

Chapter 1.0 briefly describes the purpose of the environmental evaluation, identifies the lead, agency, summarizes the process associated with preparation and certification of an EIR, and identifies the content requirements and organization of the Final EIR.

CHAPTER 2.0 – COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR AND RESPONSES

Chapter 2.0 provides a list of commentors, copies of written comments made on the Draft EIR (coded for reference), and responses to those written comments.

CHAPTER 3.0 - ERRATA

Chapter 3.0 consists of minor revisions to the Draft EIR in response to comments on the Draft EIR, as well as minor staff edits. The revisions to the Draft EIR do not change the intent or content of the analysis or mitigation.

CHAPTER 4.0 – FINAL MMRP

Chapter 4.0 consists of a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP). The MMRP is presented in a tabular format that presents the impacts, mitigation measure, and responsibility, timing, and verification of monitoring.

CHAPTER 5.0 – REPORT PREPARERS

Chapter 5.0 lists all authors and agencies that assisted in the preparation of the EIR, by name, title, and company or agency affiliation.

2.1 INTRODUCTION

BCAG received two (2) comment letters regarding the Draft EIR. Acting as lead agency, BCAG has prepared a response to the Draft EIR comments. Responses to comments received during the comment period do not involve any new significant impacts or "significant new information" that would require recirculation of the Draft EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5.

2.2 LIST OF COMMENTORS

Table 2-1 lists the comments on the Draft EIR that were submitted to the BCAG. The assigned comment letter number, letter date, letter author, and affiliation, if presented in the comment letter or if representing a public agency, are also listed.

TABLE 2-1 LIST OF COMMENTORS

RESPONSE LETTER/ NUMBER	INDIVIDUAL OR SIGNATORY	AFFILIATION	DATE
A	Armen Kamian	Butte County Air Quality Management District	11-2-2012
B	Scott Morgan	OPR-State Clearinghouse	11-13-2012

2.3 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

REQUIREMENTS FOR RESPONDING TO COMMENTS ON A DRAFT EIR

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088 requires that lead agencies evaluate and respond to all comments on the Draft EIR that regard an environmental issue. The written response must address the significant environmental issue raised and provide a detailed response, especially when specific comments or suggestions (e.g., additional mitigation measures) are not accepted. In addition, the written response must be a good faith and reasoned analysis. However, lead agencies need only to respond to significant environmental issues associated with the project and do not need to provide all the information requested by the commentor, as long as a good faith effort at full disclosure is made in the EIR (CEQA Guidelines Section 15204).

CEQA Guidelines Section 15204 recommends that commentors provide detailed comments that focus on the sufficiency of the Draft EIR in identifying and analyzing the possible environmental impacts of the project and ways to avoid or mitigate the significant effects of the project, and that commentors provide evidence supporting their comments. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064, an effect shall not be considered significant in the absence of substantial evidence.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088 also recommends that revisions to the Draft EIR be noted as a revision in the Draft EIR or as a separate section of the Final EIR. Chapter 3.0 of this Final EIR identifies all revisions to the Draft EIR.

RESPONSES TO COMMENT LETTERS

Written comments on the Draft EIR are reproduced on the following pages, along with responses to those comments. To assist in referencing comments and responses, the following coding system is used:

- Each letter is lettered (i.e., Letter A) and each comment within each letter is numbered (i.e., comment A-1, comment A-2).

Where changes to the Draft EIR text result from the response to comments, those changes are included in the response and identified with revision marks (<u>underline</u> for new text, ~~strike out~~ for deleted text).

RECEIVED NOV 05 2012

629 Entler Avenue, Suite 15
Chico, CA 95928

(530) 332-9400
(530) 332-9417 Fax

Butte County Air Quality Management District

W. James Wagoner
Air Pollution Control Officer

Robert McLaughlin
Asst. Air Pollution Control Officer

November 2, 2012

Jon Clark, Executive Director
Butte County Association of Governments
2580 Sierra Sunrise Terrace, Suite 100
Chico, CA 95928

Re: Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the 2012 Butte County MTP and SCS

Dear Mr. Clark:

Thank you for providing the Butte County Air Quality Management District (District) the opportunity to review the DEIR for the 2012 Butte County Metropolitan Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy. Our comments address the Air Quality Section in the DEIR.

Based on the information reviewed, the District considers the DEIR analysis to be comprehensive and consistent with the District's air quality goals.

The proposed project is able to voluntarily reduce air quality impacts to less than significant, and demonstrates intended reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. The District recommends that all projects utilize the District's CEQA Air Quality Handbook (Handbook) to reduce air quality impacts to a "less than significance level". Please note that the District is currently in the process of updating the Handbook. A-1

District comments to the DEIR are listed in the enclosed attachment.

The District appreciates the opportunity to comment on the proposed project. If you have any questions, please contact the District at 332-9400, extension 108.

Sincerely,

Armen Kamian

Armen Kamian
Associate Air Quality Planner

File No 3452.A-1

RECEIVED NOV 05 2012

Butte County Air Quality Management District (District) Comments
2012 Butte County MTP and SCS – Draft EIR

Following are District comments, suggestions or corrections on the Draft EIR document:

Page 3.3-3, Seasonal Pollution Variations: (suggestion)

- .....Elevated levels of particulate matter (primarily fine particulates of $PM_{2.5}$) and ground-level ozone..... (paragraph 2)
- Surface-based inversions that form during late fall and winter nights cause localized air pollution problems ($PM_{2.5}$ and carbon monoxide)..... (paragraph 4)

Page 3.3-5, Fine particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$) (suggestion)

- .....consists of fine particles.....

A-2

Page 3.3-5, ODORS (suggestion)

- Typically odors are regarded as a nuisance .....

Page 3.3-7, Table 3.3-1: ***FEDERAL AND STATE AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS*** (correction)

- Nitrogen Dioxide – Annual Federal Standard is 0.053 ppm
  1-hour Federal Standard is 0.100 ppm
- Sulfur Dioxide - 1-hour Federal Standard is 75 ppb
- PM2.5- Annual Federal Standard is 15 ug/m3
  24-hour Federal Standard is 35 ug/m3

Reference: www.arb.ca.gov/research/aaqs/caaqs/caaqs.htm
www.epa.gov/air/criteria.html

Page 3.3-8, Table 3.3-2: ***STATE AND NATIONAL ATTAINMENT STATUS*** (correction)

- PM10 – National Designation - Unclassified

Reference: www.arb.ca.gov/desig/adm/adm.htm

Page 3.3-10, Butte County Air Quality Monitoring (comment)
It should be noted that the Paradise –Fire Station #1 monitor was relocated to the Paradise Theater on Clark Road in September 2010. In May 2012, the Chico monitoring site was relocated from Manzanita Avenue to East Avenue, approximately ¼ mile to the NNE.

Page 3.3-14, Air Quality (comment)
It should be noted that the *Northern Sacramento Valley Planning Area DRAFT 2012 Triennial Air Quality Attainment Plan* is scheduled to be considered at the November 2012 Technical Advisory Committee of Sacramento Valley Basinwide Air Pollution Control Council meeting.

Page 3.3-14, BCAQMD Rules and Regulations (comment)
It should be noted that while some significant rules that may apply to the proposed project are listed in this document, this does not exclude or limit applicability of all BCAQMD Rules and Regulations.

Response to Letter A Armen Kamian, Butte County AQMD

Response A-1: The commentor states that BCAQMD considers the DEIR analysis to be comprehensive and consistent with the District's air quality goals. She states that the proposed project is able to voluntarily reduce air quality impacts to less than significant, and demonstrates intended reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. The commentor notes that the BCAQMD recommends that all projects utilize the District's CEQA Air Quality Handbook (Handbook), which is currently being updated, to reduce air quality impacts to a "less than significance level". This comment is noted. No response is necessary.

Response A-2: The commentor provides suggestions, corrections, and comments regarding specific text in the Draft EIR. Each of the commentor's comments have been accepted by BCAG and the appropriate revisions are provided in Section 3.0 Errata. No further response is necessary.

RECEIVED NOV 16 2012

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE *of* PLANNING AND RESEARCH
STATE CLEARINGHOUSE AND PLANNING UNIT

EDMUND G. BROWN JR.
GOVERNOR

KEN ALEX
DIRECTOR

November 14, 2012

Brian Lasagna
Butte County Association of Governments
2580 Sierra Sunrise Terrace, Suite 100
Chico, CA 95928

Subject: 2012 Butte County Metropolitan Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy EIR
SCH#: 2012012034

Dear Brian Lasagna:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Draft EIR to selected state agencies for review. The review period closed on November 13, 2012, and no state agencies submitted comments by that date. This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

B-1

Please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process. If you have a question about the above-named project, please refer to the ten-digit State Clearinghouse number when contacting this office.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan
Director, State Clearinghouse

1400 10th Street P.O. Box 3044 Sacramento, California 95812-3044
(916) 445-0613 FAX (916) 323-3018 www.opr.ca.gov

Document Details Report
State Clearinghouse Data Base

RECEIVED NOV 16 2012

SCH#	**2012012034**
Project Title	2012 Butte County Metropolitan Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy EIR
Lead Agency	Butte County Association of Governments
Type	**EIR** Draft EIR
Description	The proposed project is the adoption and implementation of the 2012 Butte County MTP and SCS. The MTP is a twenty year comprehensive transportation plan for all modes including: highways, local streets and roads, transit, bicycle, aviation, rail, and goods movement. The MTP is updated every four years. The SCS will be an additional element of the MTP that was not included in the previous update. The SCS is a mechanism toimplement passenger vehicle greenhouse gas reductions outlined in Assembly Bill 32.

Lead Agency Contact

Name	Brian Lasagna		
Agency	Butte County Association of Governments		
Phone	(530) 879-2468	***Fax***	
email			
Address	2580 Sierra Sunrise Terrace, Suite 100		
City	Chico	***State*** CA	***Zip*** 95928

Project Location

County	Butte			
City				
Region				
Lat / Long				
Cross Streets	County-wide			
Parcel No.				
Township		***Range***	***Section***	***Base***

Proximity to:

Highways	
Airports	
Railways	
Waterways	
Schools	
Land Use	Various

Project Issues	Aesthetic/Visual; Agricultural Land; Air Quality; Archaeologic-Historic; Biological Resources; Noise; Population/Housing Balance; Traffic/Circulation; Vegetation; Wetland/Riparian; Wildlife; Landuse; Growth Inducing
Reviewing Agencies	Resources Agency; Department of Conservation; Department of Fish and Game, Region 2; Office of Historic Preservation; Department of Parks and Recreation; Central Valley Flood Protection Board; Caltrans, District 3 N; Caltrans, Division of Transportation Planning; Air Resources Board, Transportation Projects; Regional Water Quality Control Bd., Region 5 (Redding); Native American Heritage Commission; Public Utilities Commission; Department of Water Resources

Date Received 09/27/2012 ***Start of Review*** 09/27/2012 ***End of Review*** 11/13/2012

Response to Letter B: Scott Morgan, OPR-State Clearinghouse

Response B-1: The commentor identifies that the state review period closed on November 13, 2012 and that no state agencies provided comment. The commentor further acknowledged that BCAG complied with the State Clearinghouse requirements for environmental review. This comment is noted. No response is necessary.

Revisions made to the Draft EIR are identified below. None of the revisions identify new significant environmental impacts, nor does any of the revisions result in substantive changes to the Draft EIR. The new information to the EIR is intended merely correct, clarify, amplify, and makes insignificant modifications. Mitigation measures have not been added or deleted.

3.1 REVISIONS TO THE DRAFT EIR

SECTION 2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This section was revised to include revised information to the EIR based on corrections noted by BCAG. The revisions include corrections to the 2020 GHG emissions, all of which are incorporated into the EIR. The changes to the EIR occur in Section 2.0 Project Description on page Page 2.0-9. The changes are identified with revision marks (<u>underline</u> for new text, ~~strike-out~~ for deleted text).

SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES STRATEGY (SCS)

In 2008, Senate Bill 375 (SB 375), also known as the Sustainable Communities and Climate Change Act of 2008, was passed as the mechanism to implement passenger vehicle greenhouse gas reductions outlined in Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32). Under SB 375, BCAG, as the region's Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), has been designated by the state to prepare the area's "Sustainable Communities Strategy" (SCS) as an additional component of the 2012 MTP. The SCS demonstrates the integration of land use, housing, and transportation for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from passenger vehicles. In addition, SB 375 amends CEQA to provide incentives for residential and residential mixed use projects that help to implement the 2012 MTP/SCS.

Regional Targets

In 2010, the California Air Resources Board approved passenger vehicle GHG emission targets for the Butte County region for the years 2020 and 2035. The targets established for the Butte County region allow for a 1% increase, per capita, in passenger vehicle GHG emissions for both time periods (compared with 2005).

The SCS shows that the Butte County region will meet these targets, shown in Table 2-1, by balancing housing and employment growth within the specified growth areas; protecting sensitive habitat and open space; and investing in a multi-modal transportation system that serves the population of Butte County. The determination that BCAG will meet the CARB GHG reduction target is based upon model results as discussed in Section 3.6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change. The models and methodology used in preparing the per capita GHG estimates is described in the SCS Appendix 6, which can be found at the BCAG website (www.bcag.org).

TABLE 2-1: MTP/SCS PER CAPITA CO2 FOR PASSENGER VEHICLES FROM 2005

TARGET YEAR	*ARB TARGET*	*BCAG MTP/SCS*
2020	1% increase	~~12~~2% decrease
2035	1% increase	2% decrease

SOURCE: BCAG, 2012

Land Use Scenarios

The SCS included the development of land use scenarios that are intended to achieve the reduction targets. These land use scenarios were developed through a cooperative effort between BCAG, each local jurisdiction, and LAFCO. This partnership included the exchange of planning assumptions, review and comments regarding the information to be considered, review of the various documents, and the development of the land use scenarios. Additional public and stakeholder participation, in the development of the SCS and forecasted development pattern, were implemented through the BCAG Public Participation Plan (PPP).

Ultimately, three distinctive land use scenarios were developed for the purpose of illustrating the travel effects of different development patterns on the regional transportation system and the associated greenhouse gas emissions resulting from these patterns. In addition, the scenarios

SECTION 3.3 AIR QUALITY

This section was revised to include new information to the EIR in response to comments provided by the Butte County Air Quality Management District. The revisions include suggestions, corrections, and comments, all of which are incorporated into the EIR. The changes to the EIR occur in Section 3.3 Air Quality on pages Page 3.3-3, 5, 7, 8, 10, and 14. The changes are identified with revision marks (underline for new text, ~~strike-out~~ for deleted text).

are usually present on clear cold nights during late fall and winter. In the morning, these ground based inversions are weakened and eventually eliminated by solar heating. As a result, they are strongest in the late night and early morning, when ground-level temperatures are coldest and solar radiation is low.

Seasonal Pollution Variations

Carbon monoxide, oxides of nitrogen, particulate matters, and lead particulate concentrations in the late fall and winter are highest when there is little interchange of air between the valley and the coast and when humidity is high following winter rains. This type of weather is associated with radiation fog, known as tule fog, when temperature inversions at ground level persist over the entire valley for several weeks and air movement is virtually absent.

Pollution potential in the Butte County area is relatively high due to the combination of air pollutant emissions sources, transport of pollutants into the area and meteorological conditions that are conducive to high levels of air pollution. Elevated levels of particulate matter (primarily ~~very small~~fine particulates or $PM_{2.5}$~~10~~) and ground-level ozone are of most concern to regional air quality officials.

Local carbon monoxide "hot spots" are important to a lesser extent. Ground-level ozone, the principal component of smog, is not directly emitted into the atmosphere but is formed by the reaction of reactive organic gases (ROG) and nitrogen oxides (NOx) (known as ozone precursor pollutants) in the presence of strong sunlight. Ozone levels are highest in Butte County during late spring through early fall, when weather conditions are conducive and emissions of the precursor pollutants are highest.

Surface-based inversions that form during late fall and winter nights cause localized air pollution problems (PM_{10} and carbon monoxide) near the emission sources because of poor dispersion conditions. Emission sources are primarily from automobiles. Conditions are exacerbated during drought-year winters.

CRITERIA POLLUTANTS

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) uses six "criteria pollutants" as indicators of air quality, and has established for each of them a maximum concentration above which adverse effects on human health may occur. These threshold concentrations are called National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Each criteria pollutant is described below.

Ozone (O3) is a photochemical oxidant and the major component of smog. While O3 in the upper atmosphere is beneficial to life by shielding the earth from harmful ultraviolet radiation from the sun, high concentrations of O3 at ground level are a major health and environmental concern. O3 is not emitted directly into the air but is formed through complex chemical reactions between precursor emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOC) and oxides of nitrogen (NOx) in the presence of sunlight. These reactions are stimulated by sunlight and temperature so that peak O3 levels occur typically during the warmer times of the year. Both VOCs and NOx are emitted by

aggravation of existing respiratory and cardiovascular disease, alterations in the body's defense systems against foreign materials, damage to lung tissue, carcinogenesis and premature death.

Respirable particulate matter (PM_{10}) consists of small particles, less than 10 microns in diameter, of dust, smoke, or droplets of liquid which penetrate the human respiratory system and cause irritation by themselves, or in combination with other gases. Particulate matter is caused primarily by dust from grading and excavation activities, from agricultural uses (as created by soil preparation activities, fertilizer and pesticide spraying, weed burning and animal husbandry), and from motor vehicles, particularly diesel-powered vehicles. PM_{10} causes a greater health risk than larger particles, since these fine particles can more easily penetrate the defenses of the human respiratory system.

Fine particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$) consists of ~~small~~ fine particles, which are less than 2.5 microns in size. Similar to PM_{10}, these particles are primarily the result of combustion in motor vehicles, particularly diesel engines, as well as from industrial sources and residential/agricultural activities such as burning. It is also formed through the reaction of other pollutants. As with PM_{10}, these particulates can increase the chance of respiratory disease, and cause lung damage and cancer. In 1997, the EPA created new Federal air quality standards for $PM_{2.5}$.

The major subgroups of the population that appear to be most sensitive to the effects of particulate matter include individuals with chronic obstructive pulmonary or cardiovascular disease or influenza, asthmatics, the elderly and children. Particulate matter also soils and damages materials, and is a major cause of visibility impairment.

Lead (Pb) exposure can occur through multiple pathways, including inhalation of air and ingestion of Pb in food, water, soil or dust. Excessive Pb exposure can cause seizures, mental retardation and/or behavioral disorders. Low doses of Pb can lead to central nervous system damage. Recent studies have also shown that Pb may be a factor in high blood pressure and subsequent heart disease.

ODORS

Typically odors are regarded as ~~an annoyance~~ a nuisance rather than a health hazard. However, manifestations of a person's reaction to foul odors can range from psychological (e.g., irritation, anger, or anxiety) to physiological (e.g., circulatory and respiratory effects, nausea, vomiting, and headache).

With respect to odors, the human nose is the sole sensing device. The ability to detect odors varies considerably among the population and overall is quite subjective. Some individuals have the ability to smell minute quantities of specific substances; others may not have the same sensitivity but may have sensitivities to odors of other substances. In addition, people may have different reactions to the same odor; in fact, an odor that is offensive to one person (e.g., from a fast-food restaurant) may be perfectly acceptable to another.

It is also important to note that an unfamiliar odor is more easily detected and is more likely to cause complaints than a familiar one. This is because of the phenomenon known as odor fatigue,

TABLE 3.3-1: FEDERAL AND STATE AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS

POLLUTANT	*AVERAGING TIME*	*FEDERAL PRIMARY STANDARD*	*STATE STANDARD*
Ozone	1-Hour 8-Hour	-- 0.075 ppm	0.09 ppm 0.070 ppm
Carbon Monoxide	8-Hour 1-Hour	9.0 ppm 35.0 ppm	9.0 ppm 20.0 ppm
Nitrogen Dioxide	Annual 1-Hour	0.53 ppm~~—~~ 0.~~53~~ 100 ppm	0.03 ppm 0.18 ppm
Sulfur Dioxide	Annual 24-Hour 1-Hour	0.03 ppm 0.14 ppm ~~—~~75 ppb	-- 0.04 ppm 0.25 ppm
PM10	Annual 24-Hour	-- 150 ug/m3	20 ug/m3 50 ug/m3
PM2.5	Annual 24-Hour	~~35~~ 15 ug/m3 ~~15~~ 35 ug/m3	12 ug/m3 --
Lead	30-Day Avg. 3-Month Avg.	-- 1.5 ug/m3	1.5 ug/m3 --

Notes: ppm = parts per million, ppb = parts per billion, ug/m3 = Micrograms per Cubic Meter

SOURCE: CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD, ~~2010~~2012 (WWW.ARB.CA.GOV/RESEARCH/AAQS/CAAQS/CAAQS/HTM) AND USEPA, 2012 (WWW.EPA.GOV/AIR/CRITERIA/HTML)

In 1997, new national standards for fine particulate matter diameter 2.5 microns or less ($PM_{2.5}$) were adopted for 24-hour and annual averaging periods. The current PM_{10} standards were to be retained, but the method and form for determining compliance with the standards were revised.

The State of California regularly reviews scientific literature regarding the health effects and exposure to PM and other pollutants. On May 3, 2002, CARB staff recommended lowering the level of the annual standard for PM_{10} and establishing a new annual standard for $PM_{2.5}$. The new standards became effective on July 5, 2003, with another revision on November 29, 2005.

In addition to the criteria pollutants discussed above, Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs) are another group of pollutants of concern. TACs are injurious in small quantities and are regulated despite the absence of criteria documents. The identification, regulation and monitoring of TACs is relatively recent compared to that for criteria pollutants. Unlike criteria pollutants, TACs are regulated on the basis of risk rather than specification of safe levels of contamination.

Existing air quality concerns within Butte County and the entire NSVPA are related to increases of regional criteria air pollutants (e.g., ozone and particulate matter), exposure to toxic air contaminants, odors, and increases in greenhouse gas emissions contributing to climate change. The primary source of ozone (smog) pollution is motor vehicles which account for 70 percent of the ozone in the region. Particulate matter is caused by dust, primarily dust generated from construction and grading activities, and smoke which is emitted from fireplaces, wood-burning stoves, and agricultural burning.

It should be noted that Butte County is subject to significant ozone transport from the Sacramento area. These factors, coupled with the region's climate and topography, have resulted in the air quality of the Butte County area becoming "moderately" polluted with ozone and particulate matter.

3.3 AIR QUALITY

Attainment Status

In accordance with the California Clean Air Act (CCAA), the CARB is required to designate areas of the state as attainment, nonattainment, or unclassified with respect to applicable standards. An "attainment" designation for an area signifies that pollutant concentrations did not violate the applicable standard in that area. A "nonattainment" designation indicates that a pollutant concentration violated the applicable standard at least once, excluding those occasions when a violation was caused by an exceptional event, as defined in the criteria.

Depending on the frequency and severity of pollutants exceeding applicable standards, the nonattainment designation can be further classified as serious nonattainment, severe nonattainment, or extreme nonattainment, with extreme nonattainment being the most severe of the classifications. An "unclassified" designation signifies that the data do not support either an attainment or nonattainment status. The CCAA divides districts into moderate, serious, and severe air pollution categories, with increasingly stringent control requirements mandated for each category.

The U.S. EPA designates areas for ozone (O3), carbon monoxide (CO), and nitrogen dioxide (NO2) as "does not meet the primary standards," "cannot be classified," or "better than national standards." For sulfur dioxide (SO2), areas are designated as "does not meet the primary standards," "does not meet the secondary standards," "cannot be classified," or "better than national standards." However, the CARB terminology of attainment, nonattainment, and unclassified is more frequently used.

Butte County has a state designation of Nonattainment for Ozone, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ and is either Unclassified or Attainment for all other criteria pollutants. The County has a national designation of Nonattainment for ozone and $PM_{2.5}$. The County is designated either attainment or unclassified for all other criteria pollutants. **Table 3.3-2** presents the state and nation attainment status for Butte County.

TABLE 3.3-2: STATE AND NATIONAL ATTAINMENT STATUS

CRITERIA POLLUTANTS	*STATE DESIGNATIONS*	*NATIONAL DESIGNATIONS*
Ozone	Nonattainment	Nonattainment
PM_{10}	Nonattainment	~~Attainment~~Unclassified
$PM_{2.5}$	Nonattainment	Nonattainment
Carbon Monoxide	Attainment	Unclassified/Attainment
Nitrogen Dioxide	Attainment	Unclassified/Attainment
Sulfur Dioxide	Attainment	Unclassified
Sulfates	Attainment	
Lead	Attainment	
Hydrogen Sulfide	Unclassified	
Visibility Reducing Particles	Unclassified	

SOURCES: CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD (2012) (WWW.ARB.CA.GOV/DESIG/ADM/ADM.HTM).

Sacramento Valley Air Basin Monitoring

The SVAB consists of 13 counties covering approximately 13,700 square miles. The SVAB stretches about 200 miles long in a north-south direction, and has a maximum width of about 150 miles,

3.3 AIR QUALITY

Butte County Air Quality Monitoring

There are four air quality monitoring sites in Butte County: Chico - Manzanita Avenue, Paradise – 4405 Airport Road, Paradise – Fire station #1, Gridley - Cowee Avenue. The Paradise - Fire Station #1 and Gridley - Cowee Avenue monitoring sites do not have air quality data on record with CARB for the most recent reportable years (2008-2010). The Paradise – 4405 Airport Road site has data for ozone and the Chico - Manzanita Avenue site has data for ozone and particulate matter. Data obtained from the monitoring sites between 2008 and 2010 is shown in **Tables 3.3-6 through 3.3-7**. It is important to note that the federal ozone 1-hour standard was revoked by the EPA and is no longer applicable for federal standards.

TABLE 3.3-6: AMBIENT AIR QUALITY MONITORING DATA (CHICO – MANZANITA AVENUE)

POLLUTANT	CAL. PRIMARY STANDARD	FED. PRIMARY STANDARD	YEAR	MAX CONCENTRATION	DAYS EXCEEDED STATE/FED STANDARD
Ozone (O3) (1-hour)	0.09 ppm for 1 hour	NA	2008 2009 2010	0.111 0.080 0.077	2 / (N/A) 0 / (N/A) 0 / (N/A)
Ozone (O3) (8-hour)	0.07 ppm for 8 hour	0.075 ppm for 8 hour	2008 2009 2010	0.097 0.073 0.071	14 / 6 2 / 0 1 / 0
Particulate Matter (PM10)	50 ug/m3 for 24 hours	150 ug/m3 for 24 hours	2008 2009 2010	143.5 48.2 38.3	37 / 0 0 / 0 0 / 0
Fine Particulate Matter (PM2.5)	12 µg/m3 (Annual standard)	35 ug/m3 for 24 hours	2008 2009 2010	107.6 35.1 31.9	18.2 / 16.8 13.0 / 10.0 10.9 / 8.0

NOTE: IT IS NOTED THAT THE CHICO MONITORING SITE WAS RELOCATED FROM MANZANITA AVENUE TO EAST AVENUE, APPROXIMATELY ¼ MILE TO THE NORTHEAST.

SOURCES: CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD (ADAM) AIR POLLUTION SUMMARIES, 2012.

TABLE 3.3-7: AMBIENT AIR QUALITY MONITORING DATA (PARADISE – 4405 AIRPORT ROAD)

POLLUTANT	CAL. PRIMARY STANDARD	FED. PRIMARY STANDARD	YEAR	MAX CONCENTRATION	DAYS EXCEEDED STATE/FED STANDARD
Ozone (O3) (1-hour)	0.09 ppm for 1 hour	NA	2008 2009 2010	0.129 0.099 0.085	3 / (N/A) 1 / (N/A) 0 / (N/A)
Ozone (O3) (8-hour)	0.07 ppm for 8 hour	0.075 ppm for 8 hour	2008 2009 2010	0.108 0.088 0.078	23 / 16 35 / 13 14 / 4

NOTE: IT IS NOTED THAT THE PARADISE-FIRE STATION #1 MONITOR WAS RELOCATED TO THE PARADISE THEATER ON CLARK ROAD IN SEPTEMBER 2010.

SOURCES: CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD (ADAM) AIR POLLUTION SUMMARIES, 2012.

Notes:

ppm = parts per million.

Ug/m3 = microns per cubic meter.

NA= not applicable

* = There was insufficient (or no) data available to determine the value

3.3 AIR QUALITY

Air quality management districts and air pollution control districts within the Northern Sacramento Valley Planning Area work together to create a triennial attainment plan. The most recent plan, *Northern Sacramento Valley Planning Area 2009 Triennial Air Quality Attainment Plan*, identifies those portions of the NSVPA designated as "nonattainment" for the State ambient air quality standards and discusses the health effects related to the various air pollutants. The Plan identifies the air pollution problems which are to be cooperatively addressed on as many fronts as possible in order to make the region a healthier place to live now and in the future. Like the 1994, 1997, 2000, 2003, and 2006 Plans, the 2009 Plan focuses on the adoption and implementation of control measures for stationary sources, area wide sources, and indirect sources, and addresses public education and information programs. The 2009 Plan also addresses the effect that pollutant transport has on the ability of the NSVPA to meet and attain the State standards. It is noted that the Northern Sacramento Valley Planning Area Draft 2012 Triennial Air Quality Attainment Plan is scheduled to be considered at the November 2012 Technical Advisory Committee of Sacramento Valley Basinwide Air Pollution Control Council meeting.

BCAQMD RULES AND REGULATIONS

The BCAQMD has adopted numerous rules and regulations to implement its air quality plans. Following, are significant rules that will apply to the proposed project. It should be noted that this list does not exclude or limit the applicability of all BCAQMD Rules and Regulations; rather it is intended to provide a list of some significant rules that apply to the proposed project.

RULE 200 - NUISANCE

No person shall discharge from any non-vehicular source such quantities of air contaminants or other material which cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public or which endanger the comfort, repose, health or safety of any such persons or the public or which cause or have a natural tendency to cause injury or damage to business or property

RULE 201 - VISIBLE EMISSIONS

No person shall discharge into the atmosphere from any single non-vehicular source of emission whatsoever any air contaminant, other than uncombined water vapor, for a period or periods aggregating more than three (3) minutes in any one hour which is:

1.1 As dark or darker in shade as that designated as No. 2 on the Ringelmann Chart as published by the U.S. Bureau of Mines; or,

2.2 Of such opacity as to obscure an observers view to a degree equal to or greater than does smoke described in Section 1 of this Rule.

RULE 202 - PARTICULATE MATTER CONCENTRATION

A person shall not discharge into the atmosphere from any source particulate matter in excess of 0.3 grains per cubic foot of gas at standard conditions.

SECTION 3.6 GREENHOUSE GASES AND CLIMATE CHANGE

This section was revised to include revised information to the EIR based on corrections noted by BCAG. The revisions include corrections to the 2020 GHG emissions, all of which are incorporated into the EIR. The changes to the EIR occur in Section 3.6 Greenhouse Gas and Climate Change on pages Page 3.6-15 and 16. The changes are identified with revision marks (<u>underline</u> for new text, ~~strike out~~ for deleted text).

amount of average weekday vehicle miles of travel (VMT) occurring as a result of the scenario. In general, the more dispersed the land use pattern, the greater the average vehicle trip length will be, resulting in greater VMT. In turn, the more compact the land use patterns, the shorter the average trip length will be, resulting in less VMT but greater congestion. The VMT results of the balanced scenario model runs are included in **Table 3.6-1**. This VMT summary excludes through trips that originate outside of Butte County and includes only those trips made by passenger vehicles.

TABLE 3.6-1: SUMMARY OF VMT PER CAPITA BY ANALYSIS YEAR

2012 MTP/SCS	*2005*	*2020*	*2035*
VMT	3,668,000	~~3,950,000~~4,397,000	5,681,000
Population	214,582	257,266	332,459
VMT per Capita	17.09	~~15.35~~17.09	17.09
Percent Change	--	~~-10.18~~0.01%	-0.03%

SOURCE: BCAG, 2012.

Total VMT increases from 3,668,000 in 2005 to ~~3,950,000~~4,397,000 in 2020 and 5,681,000 in 2035. The VMT analysis in Table 3.6-1 shows VMT per capita decreases by ~~10.18~~.01% in 2020~~ even with an increase in total VMT~~. This analysis shows that VMT per capita decreases by 0.03% in 2035 for the balanced scenario when compared to 2005 VMT per capita.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions: In addition to measuring the amount of travel occurring as a result of each scenario, BCAG measured the levels of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions using the California Emissions Factor (EMFAC) model. The purpose of the GHG measurement is to determine how well each land use scenario performs in relation to achieving the GHG targets established for the MTP/SCS as a result of SB 375. As directed by the California Air Resources Board (ARB), the 2035 GHG emission estimates are presented as pounds (lbs.) of Carbon Dioxide (CO_2) per capita. **Table 3.6-2** reflects the amount of CO_2 emissions resulting from each scenario.

TABLE 3.6-2: SUMMARY OF CO_2 PER CAPITA BY ANALYSIS YEAR

2012 MTP/SCS	*2005*	*2020*	*2035*
CO_2 lbs. per day	3,540,000	~~3,740,000~~4,160,000	5,380,000
Population	214,582	257,266	332,459
CO_2 lbs. per Capita	16.50	~~14.54~~16.17	16.18
Percent Change	--	~~-11.88~~1.98%	-1.91%

SOURCE: BCAG, 2012.

Table 3.6-2 shows CO_2 per capita decreases by ~~11.88~~1.98% in 2020 and by 1.91% in 2035 for the balanced scenario when compared to 2005 CO_2 per capita.

Consistency with Targets: The GHG emissions presented above illustrate that the Butte County region will meet the per capita CO_2 emissions reduction targets issued by CARB under SB 375 by balancing housing and employment growth within the specified growth areas; protecting sensitive habitat and open space; and investing in a multi-modal transportation system that serves the population of Butte County. The differential between the reduction targets and the GHG emissions

is approximately ~~13 percent lower in 2020, and approximately~~ 3 percent lower in 2020 and 2035. Table 3.6-3 presents a comparison of the GHG reduction targets to the forecasted GHG emissions.

TABLE 3.6-3: COMPARISON OF YEAR 2020/2035 TARGETS TO GHG FORECASTS

TARGET YEAR	*ARB TARGET*	*BCAG MTP/SCS*
2020	1% increase	~~11.88~~1.98% decrease
2035	1% increase	1.91% decrease

SOURCE: BCAG, 2012

The MTP/SCS GHG targets require no greater than a 1% increase in per capita CO_2 emissions in 2020 and 2035 when compared to 2005 levels. The GHG emissions forecast demonstrate that the MTP/SCS meet the GHG targets for the region in 2020 and 2035. Implementation of the proposed project would have a **less than significant** impact relative to this environmental topic.

Impact 3.6.2: Consistency with AB 32 and SB 375 (less than significant)

CARB established regional on-road GHG per capita emissions reduction targets from light-duty trucks and passenger vehicles pursuant to AB 32 and SB 375. BCAG developed three growth scenarios and a coordinated list of transportation improvements to the regional network in an effort to provide a long-term strategy for the achievement of the reduction targets established by CARB. The regional travel demand model was used to estimate travel for the MTP/SCS for each scenario.

For the BCAG region, the targets set by CARB are one percent above 2005 emissions levels by 2020 and one percent above 2005 levels by 2035. The 2005 GHG per capita emissions were modeled for the plan area to be 15.6 pounds per day. With the MTP/SCS, the 2020 GHG per capita emissions were modeled for Butte County to be ~~14.54~~16.17 pounds per day, a reduction of ~~11.88~~1.98 percent from 2005. The 2035 emissions levels were modeled to be 16.18 pounds per day, a 1.91 percent reduction from 2005. As demonstrated, the MTP/SCS achieves the AB 32 and SB 375 GHG emissions reduction targets. Implementation of the MTP/SCS would have **less than significant** impact relative to this topic.

Impact 3.6.3: Construction Related Impacts from GHG Emissions (less than significant)

Construction projects would have potentially significant impact on GHG emissions if the individual projects in the MTP/SCS are implemented in a manner that is not consistent with the GHG emissions reduction goals set forth in AB 32. Construction related GHG emissions are correlated to construction energy consumption, which includes operation of equipment, and travel to and from the worksite.

Growth through the MTP/SCS planning horizon of 2035 requires the development of new housing, commercial, industrial, and public uses, as well as the construction of new, and the expansion of existing, transportation facilities. The new development would require new infrastructure such as water, wastewater treatment, and storm water management to be constructed to accommodate this growth. The MTP/SCS provides a balanced growth scenario that embodies elements of

SECTION 4.0 OTHER CEQA-REQUIRED TOPICS

This section was revised to include revised information to the EIR based on corrections noted by BCAG. The revisions include corrections to the 2020 GHG emissions, all of which are incorporated into the EIR. The changes to the EIR occur in Section 4.0 Other CEQA-Required Topics on pages Page 4.0-4 and 5. The changes are identified with revision marks (<u>underline</u> for new text, ~~strike out~~ for deleted text).

4.0 OTHER CEQA-REQUIRED TOPICS

Transportation Conformity Rule. Implementation of the 2012 Butte County MTP and SCS would result in a **less than cumulatively considerable** impact.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Impact 4.4: Cumulative Loss of Biological Resources Including Habitats and Special Status Species (Less than Cumulatively Considerable)

The cumulative setting for biological resources includes the entirety of Butte County. Cumulative development anticipated in Butte County, including growth projected by adopted general plans and those being updated, will result in the permanent loss of habitat for special-status species, corridor fragmentation, direct and indirect impacts to special-status species, and reduction and degradation of sensitive habitat. Compliance with the Butte Regional Conservation Plan (BRCP) would reduce the project-level and cumulative biological impacts associated with the 2012 Butte County MTP and SCS to a less than significant level. Implementation of the 2012 Butte County MTP and SCS would result in a **less than cumulatively considerable** impact.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Impact 4.5: Cumulative Impacts on Known and Undiscovered Cultural Resources (Considerable Contribution and Significant and Unavoidable)

The cumulative setting for cultural resources includes the entirety of Butte County. Cumulative development anticipated in Butte County, including growth projected by adopted general plans and those being updated, may result in the discovery and removal of cultural resources, including archaeological, paleontological, historical, and Native American resources and human remains. Mitigation measures provided in Chapter 3.5 would require the proposed project to survey for potential resources and to evaluate any resources discovered during construction activities. However, adherence to these regulations and implementation of mitigation may not prevent a future cumulative loss of these important resources. Because site-specific surveys have yet to be conducted for the individual projects, it is not known whether recognized cultural resources would be disturbed. Furthermore, the potential exists for the discovery of previously unknown resource sites during the construction of individual projects. In combination with the future scenario, any disturbance or destruction of known and unknown cultural resources would be significant cumulative impact. Therefore, this is considered a **cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable** impact.

GREENHOUSE GASES AND CLIMATE CHANGE

Impact 4.6: Greenhouse Gas Emissions May Contribute to Climate Change (Less than Cumulatively Considerable)

The GHG targets established for Butte County by CARB require no greater than a 1% increase in per capita CO^2 emissions in 2020 and 2035 when compared to 2005 levels. BCAG measured vehicle miles traveled and the levels of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions for the MTP/SCS using the regions travel demand model and the California Emissions Factor (EMFAC) model. The VMT analysis shows VMT per capita decreases by ~~10.18~~0.01% in 2020 even with an increase in total VMT. This analysis shows that VMT per capita decreases by 0.03% in 2035 for the balanced

scenario when compared to 2005 VMT per capita. Similar to the results of the VMT analysis, the GHG emissions analysis showed CO^2 per capita decreases by ~~11.88~~1.98% in 2020 and by 1.91% in 2035 for the balanced scenario when compared to 2005 CO^2 per capita.

These GHG emissions demonstrate that the Butte County region will meet the greenhouse gas reduction targets by balancing housing and employment growth within the specified growth areas; protecting sensitive habitat and open space; and investing in a multi-modal transportation system that serves the population of Butte County. The differential between the reduction targets and the GHG emissions is approximately ~~13 percent lower in 2020, and approximately~~ 3 percent lower in 2020 and 2035. The MTP/SCS is consistent with AB 32 and SB 375, as well as local plans designed to reduce GHGs. Implementation of the MTP/SCS would result in a **less than cumulatively considerable** impact.

LAND USE AND PLANNING/POPULATION AND HOUSING

Impact 4.7: Cumulative Impact on Communities and Local Land Uses (Less than Considerable Contribution)

The cumulative setting for land use and planning impacts includes Butte County, its incorporated communities, and the jurisdictions bordering Butte County. Cumulative land use and planning impacts, such as the potential for conflicts with adjacent land uses and consistency with adopted plans and regulations, are typically site- and project-specific. Construction of MTP projects may require removal of homes and result in the displacement of people and housing. Additionally, the SCS provides incentives for redevelopment, which may require the removal of homes and result in the temporary displacement of people and housing during the construction of a redevelopment project. The effects of the displacement of people and housing units are mitigated through laws that require relocation of residents that must be displaced, even if it is just temporarily. Additionally, there is adequate replacement housing within the current housing stock in Butte County.

The programmatic nature of the MTP/SCS requires consideration of the overall planning and land use setting under cumulative conditions. As cumulative development occurs, there is the potential for development to occur that is not consistent with adopted plans and regulations and the potential for land use conflicts to occur between communities or jurisdictions. Under cumulative conditions, the majority of MTP/SCS projects would involve work within an existing right-of-way or extension of an existing right-of-way to widen or lengthen existing facilities. These uses would generally be compatible with adjacent uses as the MTP/SCS projects are the continuation/extension of existing uses and would not add new land use conflicts.

The MTP/SCS considers the adopted and planned land uses in Butte County and its incorporated communities. Projects included in the MTP/SCS are intended to primarily address safety and operational deficiencies and will also assist in improving linkages between existing communities. Growth under the MTP/SCS would be consistent with growth envisioned by local agencies and the proposed project is not anticipated to result in growth at greater levels than already anticipated. As projects are designed and engineered they will be reviewed and evaluated for consistency with

This document is the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the 2012 Butte County Metropolitan Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy (2012 MTP/SCS or proposed project). This MMRP has been prepared pursuant to Section 21081.6 of the California Public Resources Code, which requires public agencies to "adopt a reporting and monitoring program for the changes made to the project or conditions of project approval, adopted in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment." An MMRP is required for the proposed project because the EIR has identified significant adverse impacts, and measures have been identified to mitigate those impacts.

The numbering of the individual mitigation measures follows the numbering sequence as found in the Draft EIR.

4.1 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

The MMRP, as outlined in the following table, describes mitigation timing, monitoring responsibilities, and compliance verification responsibility for all mitigation measures identified in the EIR. Agencies considering approval of subsequent activities under the 2012 MTP/SCS would utilize this EIR as the basis in determining potential environmental effects and the appropriate level of environmental review of a subsequent activity.

The agencies responsible for implementing the mitigation measures (implementing agency) will be the lead agency for the individual MTP/SCS project. The implementing agency for individual projects will vary by individual project, but will involve one of the following: Caltrans District 3, Butte County, and the cities of Biggs, Chico, Gridley, Oroville, and the town of Paradise. The implementing agency will be responsible to monitor mitigation measures that are required to be implemented during the operation of the project.

The MMRP is presented in tabular form on the following pages. The components of the MMRP are described briefly below:

- **Mitigation Measures**: The mitigation measures are taken from the EIR in the same order that they appear in the EIR.
- **Mitigation Timing**: Identifies at which stage of the project mitigation must be completed.
- **Monitoring Responsibility**: Identifies the agency that is responsible for mitigation monitoring.
- **Compliance Verification**: This is a space that is available for the monitor to date and initial when the monitoring took place.

This page left intentionally blank.

TABLE 4.0-1: MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

IMPACT	*MITIGATION MEASURE*	*MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY*	*TIMING*	*VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)*
Aesthetics				
Impact 3.1-1: Substantial Adverse Effects on Scenic Vistas and Resources or Substantial Degradation of Visual Character	***Mitigation Measure 3.1.1:*** *The implementing agency shall implement the following measures in the design of a project:* • *Design transportation systems in a manner where the surrounding landscape dominates.* • *Design transportation systems to be compatible with the surrounding environment (e.g., colors and materials of construction material).* • *Design transportation systems such that landscape vegetation blends in and complements the natural landscape.* • *Design transportation systems such that trees are maintained intact, or if removal is necessary, incorporate new trees into the design.* • *Design grades to blend with the adjacent landforms and topography.* ***Mitigation Measure 3.1.2:*** *Prior to the design approval of a project, the implementing agency shall assess whether the project would remove any significant visual resources in the project area, which may include trees, rock outcroppings, and historical buildings, and shall also assess whether the project would significantly obstruct views of scenic resources including historic buildings, trees, rocks, or scenic water features, and shall also identify whether the improvement would significantly obstruct views of scenic resources, such as views of the Sutter Buttes, Coastal Range, Sierra Nevada Range, and scenic water features.* *If it is determined that a project would remove significant visual resources, the implementing agency shall consider alternative designs that seek to avoid and/or minimize impacts from removal of significant visual resources to the extent feasible. Project-specific design measures may include revisions to the plans to retain trees, rocks, and historic buildings, or replanting of trees, and/or the relocation of scenic features.* *If it is determined that the a project would significantly obstruct scenic views, the*	Implementing Agency	Prior to Design Approval	

IMPACT	*MITIGATION MEASURE*	*MONITORING RESPONSIBILITY*	*TIMING*	*VERIFICATION (DATE/INITIALS)*
Aesthetics				
	implementing agency shall consider alternative designs that seek to avoid and/or minimize obstruction of scenic views to the extent feasible. Project-specific design measures may include reduction in height of improvements or width of improvements to reduce obstruction of views, or relocation of improvements to reduce obstruction of views.			
Impact 3.1-2: Creation of New Sources of Light and Glare	***Mitigation Measure 3.1.3:*** *Projects shall be designed to meet minimum safety and security standards and to avoid spillover lighting to sensitive uses. Design measures shall include the following:* • *Luminaries will be cutoff-type fixtures that cast low-angle illumination to minimize incidental spillover of light onto adjacent private properties and undeveloped open space. Fixtures that project light upward or horizontally will not be used.* • *Luminaries will be directed away from habitat and open space areas adjacent to the project site.* • *Luminaries will provide good color rendering and natural light qualities. Low-pressure sodium and high-pressure sodium fixtures that are not color corrected will not be used. Intensity will be approximately 10 lux for roadway intersections.* • *Luminary mountings will be downcast and the height of the poles minimized to reduce potential for back scatter into the nighttime sky and incidental spillover of light onto adjacent private properties and undeveloped open space. Light poles will be 20 feet high or shorter. Luminary mountings will have non-glare finishes.* *Exterior lighting features shall be directed downward and shielded in order to confine light to the boundaries of the subject project. Where more intense lighting is necessary for safety purposes, the design shall include landscaping to block light from sensitive land uses, such as residences.*	Implementing Agency	Prior to Design Approval	

Impact	*Mitigation Measure*	*Monitoring Responsibility*	*Timing*	*Verification (Date/Initials)*
Agricultural Resources				
Impact 3.2-1: Conversion of Farmlands, including Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide Importance, to Non-Agricultural Uses	***Mitigation Measure 3.2.1****: Prior to the design approval of a project, the implementing agency shall assess the project area for agricultural constraints. For federally funded projects, the implementing agency shall complete a form AD-1006 to determine the Farmland Conversion Impact Rating in compliance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act. The AD-1006 shall be submitted to the NRCS for approval. For non-federally funded projects, the implementing agency shall assess the project for the presence of important farmlands (prime farmland, unique farmland, farmland of statewide importance), and if present, perform a Land Assessment and Site Evaluation (LESA).* *If significant agricultural resources are identified within the limits of the project, the implementing agency shall consider alternative designs that seek to avoid and/or minimize impacts to the agricultural resources. Design measures may include, but are not limited to, reducing the footprint to avoid farmlands. If the project cannot be designed without complete avoidance of farmlands, the implementing agency shall compensate for unavoidable conversion impacts at an appropriate ratio and in accordance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act and local and regional standards, which may include enrolling offsite agricultural lands under a Williamson Act contract or other conservation easement, or paying mitigation fees.*	Implementing Agency	Prior to Design Approval	
Impact 3.2-3: Conflict with Existing Zoning of Forest or Timber Production or Result in the Loss or Conversion of Forest Land	***Mitigation Measure 3.2.2****: Prior to the design approval of a project, the implementing agency shall assess the project area for forest lands and forest resources as defined by Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), Section 4526, and Government Code Section 51104(g).* *If protected forest lands or timber resources are identified within the limits of the project, the implementing agency shall consider alternative designs that seek to avoid and/or minimize impacts to the forest lands or timber resources. Design measures may include, but are not limited to, reducing the footprint to avoid forest lands or timber resources, or avoiding significant stands of trees.*	Implementing Agency	Prior to Design Approval	

Impact	*Mitigation Measure*	*Monitoring Responsibility*	*Timing*	*Verification (Date/Initials)*
Air Quality				
Impact 3.3-2: Short-term - Conflict with, or Obstruct, the Applicable Air Quality Plan, Cause a Violation of Air Quality Standards, Contribute Substantially to an Existing Air Quality Violation, or Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Net Increase of a Criteria Pollutant in a Non-Attainment Area	***Mitigation Measure 3.3-1:*** *The implementing agency shall review each individual project in accordance with Butte County Air Quality Management District's Guidelines for Assessing Air Quality Impacts for Projects Subject to CEQA Review. Each project shall include emission calculations and mitigation for construction impacts, including the incorporation of best available control measures outlined in Table 1 of Rule 205 Fugitive Dust Emission.*	Implementing Agency	Prior to Design Approval	
Impact 3.3-3: Occasional Localized Carbon Monoxide Concentrations from Traffic Conditions at Some Individual Locations	***Mitigation Measure 3.3-2:*** *The implementing agency shall screen individual projects at the time of design for localized CO hotspot concentrations and if necessary incorporate project-specific measures into the project design to reduce or alleviate CO hotspot concentrations.*	Implementing Agency	Prior to Design Approval	
Impact 3.3-5: Contribute Substantially to, or Result in a Cumulatively Considerable Net Increase of Mobile Source Air Toxics	***Mitigation Measure 3.3-3****: As air toxics research continues, BCAG should utilize the tools and techniques that are developed for assessing health outcomes as a result of lifetime MSAT exposure. The potential health risks posed by MSAT exposure should continue to be factored into project-level decision-making in the context of environmental review.*	BCAG, and Implementing Agency	On-going, and Prior to Design Approval	
Impact 3.3-6: Potential to release asbestos from earth movement or structural asbestos from demolition/renovation of existing structures	***Mitigation Measure 3.3-4****: Prior to construction of individual projects, the implementing agency should assess the site for the presence of asbestos including asbestos from structures such as road base, bridges, and other structures. In the event that asbestos is present, the implementing agency should comply with applicable state and local regulations regarding asbestos, including ARB's asbestos airborne toxic control measure (ATCM) (Title 17, CCR § 93105 and 93106), to ensure that exposure to construction workers and the public is reduced to an acceptable level. This may include the preparation of an Asbestos Hazard Dust Mitigation Plan to be implemented during construction activities.*	Implementing Agency	Prior to construction	

Impact	*Mitigation Measure*	*Monitoring Responsibility*	*Timing*	*Verification (Date/Initials)*
Biological Resources				
Impact 3.4-1: Direct or Indirect Effects on Candidate, Sensitive, or Special-Status Species including their Habitat or Movement Corridors	***Mitigation Measure 3.4-1****: Prior to final design approval of individual projects, the implementing agency shall have a qualified biologist conduct a field reconnaissance of the environmental limits of the project in an effort to identify any biological constraints for the project, including special status plants, animals, and their habitats, as well as protected natural communities including wetland and terrestrial communities. If the biologist identifies protected biological resources within the limits of the project, the implementing agency shall first, prepare alternative designs that seek to avoid and/or minimize impacts to the biological resources. If the project cannot be designed without complete avoidance, the implementing agency shall coordinate with the appropriate regulatory agency (i.e. USFWS, NMFS, CDFG, ACOE) to obtain regulatory permits and implement project-specific mitigation prior to any construction activities.* *For projects that are located within the BRCP plan area, and are constructed after adoption of the BRCP, the implementing agency shall coordinate with the BRCP administrator to verify whether construction within the study area would require a permit. The permit process will require a field reconnaissance of the project study area by an approved biologist in an effort to identify any biological constraints, including covered species or habitat. If the biologist identifies covered species or habitat within the limits of the study limits the implementing agency shall implement all minimization measures and pay the appropriate mitigation fees or provide land in lieu of fees as established by the BRCP.*	Implementing Agency	Prior to Design Approval	
Impact 3.4-2: Adverse Effects on Riparian Habitat or Other Sensitive Natural Community Identified in Local or Regional Plans, Policies, Regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, or on Federally Protected Wetlands as Defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act through Direct Removal, Filling, Hydrological Interruption, or Other Means	***Mitigation Measure 3.4.2.*** *Prior to approval of individual projects, the implementing agency shall retain a qualified biologist to perform an assessment of the project area to identify wetlands, riparian, and other sensitive aquatic environments. If wetlands are present the qualified biologist shall perform a wetland delineation following the 1987 Army Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual. The wetland delineation shall be submitted to the USACE for verification.* ***Mitigation Measure 3.4.3.*** *If wetlands, riparian, or other sensitive aquatic environments are found within the project limits, the implementing agency shall design or modify the project to avoid direct and indirect impacts on these habitats, if feasible. Additionally, the implementing agency shall minimize the loss of*	Implementing Agency	Prior to Design Approval	

Impact	*Mitigation Measure*	*Monitoring Responsibility*	*Timing*	*Verification (Date/Initials)*
Biological Resources				
	riparian vegetation by trimming rather than removal where feasible. *Prior to construction, the implementing agency shall install orange construction barrier fencing to identify environmentally sensitive areas around the wetland (20' from edge), riparian area (100' from edge), and other aquatic habitats (250' from edge of vernal pool). The location of the fencing shall be marked in the field with stakes and flagging and shown on the construction drawings. The fencing will be installed before construction activities are initiated and will be maintained throughout the construction period. The following paragraph will be included in the construction specifications:* *The Contractor's attention is directed to the areas designated as "environmentally sensitive areas." These areas are protected, and no entry by the Contractor for any purpose will be allowed unless specifically authorized in writing by the BCAG. The Contractor will take measures to ensure that Contractor's forces do not enter or disturb these areas, including giving written notice to employees and subcontractors.* *Temporary fences around the environmentally sensitive areas will be installed as the first order of work. Temporary fences will be furnished, constructed, maintained, and removed as shown on the plans, as specified in the special provisions, and as directed by the project engineer. The fencing will be commercial-quality woven polypropylene, orange in color, and at least 4 feet high (Tensor Polygrid or equivalent). The fencing will be tightly strung on posts with a maximum 10-foot spacing.* *Immediately upon completion of construction activities the contractor shall stabilize exposed soil/slopes. On highly erodible soils/slopes, use a nonvegetative material that binds the soil initially and breaks down within a few years. If more aggressive erosion control treatments are needed, geotextile mats, excelsior blankets, or other soil stabilization products will be used. All stabilization efforts should include habitat restoration efforts.* ***Mitigation Measure 3.4.4:** If wetlands or riparian habitat are disturbed as part of an individual project, the implementing agency shall compensate for the disturbance to ensure no net loss of habitat functions and values. Compensation ratios shall be based on site-specific information and determined through*			

Impact	*Mitigation Measure*	*Monitoring Responsibility*	*Timing*	*Verification (Date/Initials)*
Biological Resources				
	coordination with state, federal, and local agencies as part of the permitting process for the project. Unless determined otherwise by the regulatory/permitting agency, the compensation shall be at a minimum ratio of 3 acres restored, created, and/or preserved for every 1 acre disturbed. Compensation may comprise onsite restoration/creation, off-site restoration, preservation, or mitigation credits (or a combination of these elements). The implementing agency shall develop and implement a restoration and monitoring plan that describes how the habitat shall be created and monitored over a minimum period of time.			
Impact 3.4-3: Interference with the Movement of 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	***Mitigation Measure 3.4-5****: Prior to design approval of individual projects that contain movement habitat, the implementing agency shall incorporate economically viable design measures, as applicable and necessary, to allow wildlife or fish to move through the transportation corridor, both during construction activities and post construction. Such measures may include appropriately spaced breaks in a center barrier, or other measures that are designed to allow wildlife to move through the transportation corridor. If the project cannot be designed with these design measures (i.e. due to traffic safety, etc.) the implementing agency shall coordinate with the appropriate regulatory agency (i.e. USFWS, NMFS, CDFG) to obtain regulatory permits and implement alternative project-specific mitigation prior to any construction activities.*	Implementing Agency	Prior to Design Approval	
Impact 3.4-4: Potential Introduction or Spread of Noxious Weeds	***Mitigation Measure 3.4.6:*** *Prior to approval of individual projects, the implementing agency shall retain a qualified biologist determine whether noxious weeds are an issue for the project. If the biologist determines that noxious weeds are an issue, the implementing agency shall review the noxious weed list from the County Agricultural Commission, California Department of Food and Agriculture, and the California Exotic Pest Plant Council to identify target weed species for a field survey. Noxious weed infestations shall be mapped and documented. The implementing agency shall incorporate the following measures into project plans and specifications:* • *Certified, weed-free, imported erosion-control materials (or rice straw in upland areas) will be used.* • *The project sponsor will coordinate with the county agricultural commissioner and land management agencies to ensure that the*	Implementing Agency	Prior to Design Approval	

Impact	*Mitigation Measure*	*Monitoring Responsibility*	*Timing*	*Verification (Date/Initials)*
Biological Resources				
	appropriate BMPs are implemented. • *Construction supervisors and managers will be educated about noxious weed identification and the importance of controlling and preventing their spread.* • *Equipment will be cleaned at designated wash stations after leaving noxious weed infestation areas.*			
Impact 3.4-5: Conflicts with an Adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, Recovery Plan, or Local Policies or Ordinances Protecting Biological Resources	***Mitigation Measure 3.4.7:*** *Prior to design approval of individual projects, the implementing agency shall coordinate with BCAG to determine the appropriate coverage, permits, compensatory mitigation or fees, and project specific avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures.*	Implementing Agency	Prior to Design Approval	

Impact	*Mitigation Measure*	*Monitoring Responsibility*	*Timing*	*Verification (Date/Initials)*
Cultural Resources				
Impact 3.5-1: Damage to or the Destruction of Archaeological Resources	***Mitigation Measure 3.5-1****: During environmental review of individual projects, the implementing agencies shall:* • Consult with the Native American Heritage Commission to determine whether known sacred sites are in the project area, and identify the Native American(s) to contact to obtain information about the project area. • Conduct a records search at the Central California Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System to determine whether the project area has been previously surveyed and whether resources were identified. In the event the records indicate that no previous survey has been conducted, the Central California Information Center will make a recommendation on whether a survey is warranted based on the archaeological sensitivity of the project area. If recommended, a qualified archaeologist shall be retained to conduct archaeological surveys. The significance of any resources that are determined to be in the project area shall be assessed according to the applicable local, state, and federal significance criteria. Implementing agencies shall devise treatment measures to ameliorate "substantial adverse changes" to significant archaeological resources, in consultation with qualified archaeologists and other concerned parties. Such treatment measures may include avoidance through project redesign, data recovery excavation, and public interpretation of the resource. Implementing agencies and the contractors performing the improvements shall adhere to the following requirements: • *If a project is located in an area rich with cultural materials, the implementing agency shall retain a qualified archaeologist to monitor any subsurface operations, including but not limited to grading, excavation, trenching, or removal of existing features of the subject property.* • *If, during the course of construction cultural resources (i.e., prehistoric*	Implementing Agency	Prior to Design Approval and during construction	

Impact	*Mitigation Measure*	*Monitoring Responsibility*	*Timing*	*Verification (Date/Initials)*
Cultural Resources				
	sites, historic sites, and isolated artifacts and features) are discovered work shall be halted immediately within 50 meters (165 feet) of the discovery, the implementing agency shall be notified, and a qualified archaeologist that meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in prehistoric or historical archaeology shall be retained to determine the significance of the discovery. • *The implementing agency shall consider mitigation recommendations presented by a professional archaeologist that meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in prehistoric or historical archaeology for any unanticipated discoveries and shall carry out the measures deemed feasible and appropriate. Such measures may include avoidance, preservation in place, excavation, documentation, curation, data recovery, or other appropriate measures. The project proponent shall be required to implement any mitigation necessary for the protection of cultural resources.*			
Impact 3.5-2: Inadvertent Discovery of Human Remains	**Mitigation Measure 3.5-2**: Implement Stop-Work and Consultation Procedures Mandated by Public Resources Code 5097. In the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains during construction or excavation activities, the implementing agency shall cease further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until the following steps are taken: • *The Butte County Coroner has been informed and has determined that no investigation of the cause of death is required.* • *If the remains are of Native American origin, either of the following steps will be taken:* o The coroner will contact the Native American Heritage Commission in order to ascertain the proper descendants from the deceased individual. The coroner will make a recommendation to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods, which may include obtaining a qualified archaeologist or team of archaeologists to properly excavate the human remains.	Implementing Agency	Prior to Design Approval and during construction	

Impact	*Mitigation Measure*	*Monitoring Responsibility*	*Timing*	*Verification (Date/Initials)*
Cultural Resources				
	○ The implementing agency or its authorized representative will retain a Native American monitor, and an archaeologist, if recommended by the Native American monitor, and rebury the Native American human remains and any associated grave goods, with appropriate dignity, on the property and in a location that is not subject to further subsurface disturbance when any of the following conditions occurs: ▪ *The Native American Heritage Commission is unable to identify a descendent.* ▪ *The descendant identified fails to make a recommendation.* ▪ *The implementing agency or its authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the descendant, and the mediation by the Native American Heritage Commission fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner.*			
Impact 3.5-3: Damage to or the Destruction of Paleontological Resources	**Mitigation Measure 3.5-3**: During environmental review of individual projects, the implementing agencies shall retain a qualified paleontologist to identify, survey, and evaluate paleontological resources where potential impacts are considered high. All construction activities shall avoid known paleontological resources, if feasible, especially if the resources in a particular lithologic unit formation have been determined to be unique or likely to contain paleontological resources. If avoidance is not feasible, paleontological resources should be excavated by a qualified paleontologist and given to a local agency, State University, or other applicable institution, where they could be curated and displayed for public education purposes.	Implementing Agency	Prior to Design Approval	
Impact 3.5-4: Damage to or the Destruction of Historical Resources	**Mitigation Measure 3.5-4**: During environmental review of individual projects, the implementing agencies shall retain a qualified architectural historian to inventory and evaluate architectural resources located in project area using criteria for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources. In addition, the resources would be recorded by the architectural historian on appropriate California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 forms, photographed, and mapped. The DPR forms shall be produced and forwarded to the Central California Information Center. If federal funding or approval is required, then the implementing agency shall comply with Section 106 of the National Historic	Implementing Agency	Prior to Design Approval	

Impact	*Mitigation Measure*	*Monitoring Responsibility*	*Timing*	*Verification (Date/Initials)*
Cultural Resources				
	Preservation Act. If architectural resources are deemed as potentially eligible for the California Register of Historic Resources or the National Register of Historic Places, the implementing shall consider avoidance through project redesign as feasible. If avoidance is not feasible, the implementing agencies shall ensure that the historic resource is formally documented through the use of large-format photography, measured drawings, written architectural descriptions, and historical narratives. The documentation shall be entered into the Library of Congress, and archived in the California Historical Resources Information System. In the event of building relocation, the implementing agency shall ensure that any alterations to significant buildings or structures conform to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings.			

Impact	*Mitigation Measure*	*Monitoring Responsibility*	*Timing*	*Verification (Date/Initials)*
Land Use and Planning				
Impact 3.7-2: MTP - Physical Division of an Established Community	***Mitigation Measure 3.7.1****: Prior to approval of MTP projects, the implementing agency shall consult with local planning staff to ensure that the project will not physically divide the community. The consultation should include a more detailed project-level analysis of land uses adjacent to proposed improvements to identify specific impacts. The analysis should consider new road widths and specific project locations in relation to existing roads. If it is determined that a project could physically divide a community, the implementing agency shall redesign the project to avoid the impact, if feasible. The measures could include realignment of the improvements to avoid the affected community. Where avoidance is not feasible, the implementing agency shall incorporate minimization measures to reduce the impact. The measures could include: alignment modifications, right-of-way reductions, provisions for bicycle, pedestrian, and vehicle facilities, and enhanced landscaping and architecture.*	Implementing Agency	Prior to Design Approval	

Impact	*Mitigation Measure*	*Monitoring Responsibility*	*Timing*	*Verification (Date/Initials)*
Noise				
Impact 3.8-1: Exposure of Noise-Sensitive Land Uses to Short-Term Construction Noise	***Mitigation Measure 3.8-1****: Subsequent projects under the MTP/SCS shall be designed and implemented to reduce adverse construction noise and vibration impacts to sensitive receptors, as feasible. Measures to reduce noise and vibration effects may include, but are not limited to:* • *Limit noise-generating construction activities, excluding those that would result in a safety concern to workers or the public, to the least noise-sensitive daytime hours, which is generally 6am to 9pm.* • *Construction of temporary sound barriers to shield noise-sensitive land uses.* • *Location of noise-generating stationary equipment (e.g., power generators, compressors, etc.) at the furthest practical distance from nearby noise-sensitive land uses.* • *Phase demolition, earth-moving and ground-impacting operations so as not to occur in the same time period.* • *Use of equipment noise-reduction devices (e.g., mufflers, intake silencers, and engine shrouds) in accordance with manufacturers' recommendations.* • *Substituting noise/vibration-generating equipment with equipment or procedures that would generate lower levels of noise/vibration. For instance, in comparison to impact piles, drilled piles or the use of a sonic or vibratory pile driver are preferred alternatives where geological conditions would permit their use.* • *Other specific measures as they are deemed appropriate by the implementing agency to maintain consistency with adopted policies and regulations regarding noise.* • *Comply with all local noise control and noise rules, regulations, and ordinances.*	Implementing Agency	Prior to Design Approval	

Impact	*Mitigation Measure*	*Monitoring Responsibility*	*Timing*	*Verification (Date/Initials)*
Noise				
Impact 3.8-2: Exposure of Noise-Sensitive Land Uses to Increases in Traffic Noise	***Mitigation Measures 3.8-2****: Prior to approval of MTP projects, the implementing agency shall perform a project-level noise evaluation. For projects adjacent to noise-sensitive uses, implementing agencies shall consider the following measures:* • *Construct vegetative earth berms with mature trees and landscaping to attenuate roadway noise on adjacent residences or other sensitive use, and /or sound walls or other similar sound-attenuating buffers, as appropriate.* • *Properly zone, buffer, and restrict development to ensure that future development is compatible with transportation facilities.* • *Design projects to maximize the distance between noise-sensitive land uses and new roadway lanes, roadways, rail lines, transit centers, park-and-ride lots, and other new noise generating facilities.* • *Improve the acoustical insulation of residential units where setbacks and sound barriers do not sufficiently reduce noise.* • *Establish speed limits and limits on hours of operation of rail and transit systems.*	Implementing Agency	Prior to Design Approval	

Impact	*Mitigation Measure*	*Monitoring Responsibility*	*Timing*	*Verification (Date/Initials)*
Hazards and Hazardous Materials				
Impact 4.5.1: Potential to create a significant hazard through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or be located on a hazardous site.	***Mitigation Measure 4.5.1:*** *Implement site-specific analysis for hazardous materials, remediation, and clean-up. Implementing agencies shall investigate potential for projects to be located at or near areas that are reasonably expected to contain hazardous materials, DTSC sites, areas containing ADL or naturally occurring asbestos, or at any structure that may contain asbestos. Site-specific evaluation should include an assessment of historical use of the area and soil sampling should be conducted as necessary. If a project site is found to be contaminated, clean up measures in accordance with the appropriate regulatory agency procedures will be implemented. Additionally, appropriate remediation measures will be employed to ensure worker safety during construction. All measures will be submitted to the DTSC for review and approval prior to project construction.*	Implementing Agency	Prior to Design Approval	
Impact 4.5.4: Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.	***Mitigation Measure 4.5.2****: The implementing agencies shall assess the necessity of a Transportation Management Plan (TMP) on a project-by-project basis. If the individual project will result in road closures, traffic detours, or congestion on main thoroughfares or roads that provide primary access to populated areas, a TMP shall be prepared prior to the initiation of project construction. The TMP will be provided to all emergency service providers in the construction area and will notify them of anticipated dates and hours of construction, as well as any anticipated limits on access. Notice will be provided at least 5 days before construction begins.*	Implementing Agency	Prior to Design Approval	

Impact	*Mitigation Measure*	*Monitoring Responsibility*	*Timing*	*Verification (Date/Initials)*
Hydrology and Water Quality				
Impact 4.5.6: Violate any water quality or waste discharge requirements or depletion of groundwater supplies or recharge.	***Mitigation Measure 4.5.3****: Prior to construction, the implementing agency shall:* • *Design new bridges or bridge replacement in accordance with the Butte County Flood Mitigation Plan, which includes provisions for adequate clearance, proper design, and debris walls, where needed, to reduce damage caused by tree logs and excessive debris accumulation.* • *Develop and implement a spill prevention and control program to minimize the potential for, and effects from, spills of hazardous, toxic, or petroleum substances during all construction activities.* • *Comply with NPDES and Waste Discharge Requirements when dewatering is required.* ***Mitigation Measure 4.5.4:*** *After construction, the implementing agency shall:* • *Implement source and treatment control measures that minimize the volume and rate of stormwater runoff discharge from the project site. General site design control measures incorporated into the project design can include:* o *conserving natural areas;* o *protecting slopes and channels;* o *minimizing impervious areas;* o *storm drain identification, and appropriate messaging and signing; and* o *minimizing effective imperviousness through the use of turf buffers and/or grass-lined channels, if feasible.* • *Implement treatment control measures, if possible and when feasible, to remove pollutants from stormwater runoff prior to discharge to the storm drain system or receiving water. Treatment control measures may*	Implementing Agency	Prior to Design Approval and during construction	

Impact	*Mitigation Measure*	*Monitoring Responsibility*	*Timing*	*Verification (Date/Initials)*
Hydrology and Water Quality				
	include, but not be limited to, the following: o *Vegetated buffer strip* o *Vegetated swale* o *Extended detention basin* o *Wet pond* o *Constructed wetland* o *Detention basin/sand filter* o *Porous pavement detention* o *Porous landscape detention* o *Infiltration basin* o *Infiltration trench* o *Media filter* o *Retention/irrigation* o *Proprietary control device* *Selection and implementation of these measures would be based on a project-by-project basis depending on project size and stormwater treatment needs.*			
Impact 4.5.7: Alter the existing drainage pattern in a manner which would result in substantial erosion, siltation, flooding, or polluted runoff	***Mitigation Measure 4.5.5:*** *Implementing agencies shall conduct project-level drainage studies. This study shall address the following topics:* • *A calculation of pre-development runoff conditions and post-development runoff scenarios using appropriate engineering methods. This analysis will evaluate potential changes to runoff through specific design criteria, and account for increased surface runoff.* • *An assessment of existing drainage facilities within the project area, and an inventory of necessary upgrades, replacements, redesigns, and/or rehabilitation, including the sizing of on-site stormwater detention features and pump stations.* • *A description of the proposed maintenance program for the onsite drainage system.*	Implementing Agency	Prior to Design Approval	

Impact	*Mitigation Measure*	*Monitoring Responsibility*	*Timing*	*Verification (Date/Initials)*
Hydrology and Water Quality				
	• *Standards for drainage systems to be installed on a project/parcel-specific basis.* • *Proposed design measures to ensure structures are not located within 100-year floodplain areas.* *Drainage systems will be designed in accordance with applicable flood control design criteria. As a performance standard, measures to be implemented from those studies will provide for no net increase in peak stormwater discharge relative to current conditions, ensure that 100-year flooding and its potential impacts are maintained at or below current levels, and that people and structures are not exposed to additional flood risk.* ***Mitigation Measure 4.5.6:*** *Avoid restriction of flood flows. Proposed projects requiring federal approval or funding will comply with Executive Order 11988 for floodplain management. Projects will avoid incompatible floodplain development designs, they will restore and preserve the natural and beneficial floodplain values, and they will maintain consistency with the standards and criteria of the National Flood Insurance Program. In addition, a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) will be prepared and submitted to FEMA where unavoidable construction would occur within 100-year floodplains. The LOMR will include revised local base flood elevations for projects constructed within flood prone areas. Potential impacts due to flooding as a result of MTP projects are assumed to be alleviated through the FEMA LOMR approval process.* ***Mitigation Measure 4.5.7:*** *Avoid project dewatering. Project designs that require continual de-watering activities for the life of the projects will be avoided if possible. Due to the potential for flooding and destabilizing conditions, project implementing agencies should choose project designs that do not require continual dewatering, if suitable project alternatives exist. Project alternatives may include construction of overpasses, as opposed to below-grade underpasses, which would avoid interception with groundwater.*			

.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank.

BUTTE COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

Jon Clark ..... Executive Director

Andy Newsom ..... Deputy Director

Chris Devine ..... Planning Manager

Ivan Garcia ..... Programming Manager

Brian Lasagna ..... Senior Planner

DE NOVO PLANNING GROUP

Steve McMurtry ..... Principal Planner/Project Manager

Ben Ritchie ..... Principal Planner

Beth Thompson ..... Principal Planner

Fehr & Peers Associates – Transportation Consultant

Ron Milam, AICP, PTP ..... Principal

Dave Robinson, P.E. ..... Senior Associate

Kwasi Donkor ..... Senior Transportation Engineer

This page left intentionally blank.