
Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration

For the Amador County
2024 Regional Transportation Plan

Prepared by
Amador County Transportation Commission
117 Valley View Way
Sutter Creek, CA 95685



DRAFT
May 2, 2024

Introduction

Project Title: Amador County Regional Transportation Plan 2024 Update

Lead Agency Name and Address: Amador County Transportation Commission
117 Valley View Way Sutter Creek, CA 95685

Contact Person: John Gedney (209)267-2282

Project Location: Amador County, CA

Project Overview:

As the responsible agency for maintaining and implementing the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the Amador County Transportation Commission (ACTC) has prepared an updated draft RTP 2024 update (which is considered a “ Project” for the purposes of this study).

To ensure compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines, the Lead Agency (ACTC) is required to perform an Initial Study for the project. The purpose of the Initial Study for a project is to disclose significant environmental impacts and to identify mitigation measures to avoid or reduce significant environmental impacts.

This study addresses potential impacts at a program level, while project-level impacts would be evaluated at the time the project is. In response to the findings within the Initial Study, and pursuant to the CEQA guidelines, the ACTC has completed a Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Project Description:

As required by State law, the RTP is a program-level planning document to be updated and submitted to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) and Caltrans every five (5) years. However, the ACTC elected to adopt a 4-year schedule to better align with the 8-year Housing Element schedule that is required of local jurisdictions. The purpose of the RTP is to identify the region’s short-term and long-range (20-year) transportation needs and to establish policies, programs, and projects designed to meet those needs. Additionally, projects that are included in the RTP are prioritized for funding through the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), which are then submitted to the CTC for programming every two (2) years as part of the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).

Environmental Setting and Project Location:

Amador County is located approximately 35 miles southeast of Sacramento on the western slope of the Sierra Nevada mountain range. At approximately 593 square miles, Amador County is one of the smallest counties in the State of California.

The county's elevation ranges from a low of 250 feet in the county's western foothills to a high of more than 9,000 feet in mountainous peaks of the Sierra Nevada on the eastern boundary. The county is divided into two (2) physiographic divisions referred to as the "Foothills" and the "Upcountry" areas. The foothills contain most of the county's population which is concentrated within or around the county's five (5) incorporated cities: Jackson (County Seat), Sutter Creek, Plymouth, Lone, and Amador City. The foothills also include several small communities such as Camanche, Buena Vista, Martell, Fiddletown, and River Pines. The higher Upcountry elevation of the county is largely typified by forested landscape, deep canyons, and sweeping ridge tops. The Upcountry area contains small unincorporated communities such as: Pine Grove, Volcano, Pioneer, Buckhorn, and Kirkwood. Areas outside of rural-residential ownership are predominately comprised of public and private forest lands that are typically managed for timber production or watershed and recreational values. The Upcountry area also contains numerous resorts and high-use recreational destinations such as: Bear River Reservoir, Silver Lake, and Kirkwood Ski Resort.

Amador County contains 121 miles of State Highways (arterial), which include State Routes 16, 26, 49, 88, 104, and 124. In addition to approximately 474 miles of city/county local street/roads that interconnect with the State Route system. Of those 474 miles, 411 miles are county roads and 62 miles are city streets, of which approximately 189 miles are considered collectors.

Population:

According to the Department of Finance (DOF) estimates, Amador County has a population of 39,837 people. Between 2020 and 2023 there shows a 1.6% decline, and aside from a small increase in the short-term population projections, the county is expected to approximately 40,000, there shows a decline (lower than current population) into the later stage of the 20-year horizon.

Due to the decline in population and traffic volumes on the Amador County regional Roadways, transportation improvements have become more focused primarily on the preservation and rehabilitation of the county's local roadways.

Tribal Consultation:

The ACTC consulted all three (3) Federally recognized tribal governments within the region at various points of the planning process of the RTP update. In addition, the tribes were provided with an electronic version of the Draft RTP. No tribes have commented.

Agency Approvals:

The RTP is required to be adopted by the ACTC at a public hearing. After adoption for the ACTC board, the document must be submitted to the CTC and Caltrans.

Environmental Factors Potentially Impacted:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by the project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" are:

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

Determination:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will NOT be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project (mitigation measures) have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION was prepared.

- I find the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signed: _____

John Gedney, Executive Director
Amador County Transportation Commission

Date: _____

Initial Study Checklist and Analysis

Checklist and Analysis:

The following Environmental Checklist and discussion of potential environmental effects were completed in accordance with Sections 15060 to 15065 of the CEQA Guidelines and the revised Initial Study checklist, to determine whether the Project may have significant environmental effect. The degree of impact for each discussion topic is based on the following definitions:

- **Potentially Significant Impact:** An impact which could be significant and for which no mitigation has been incorporated. Such an impact would require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report.
- **Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation:** An impact which requires mitigation to reduce the impact to a less than significant level. For such impacts, proposed mitigation measures are identified within the Initial Study.
- **Less Than Significant Impact:** An impact which is considered less than significant under the standards of CEQA.
- **No Impact:** An issue for which the Project would have no impact.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Aesthetics:

QUESTION	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project: a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
Would the project: b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
Would the project: c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?				X
Would the project: d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				X

DISCUSSION: Existing roadway rehabilitation projects contained in the RTP will not impact historic buildings, scenic vistas, or adversely impact day and nighttime views.

Agriculture and Forest Resources:

QUESTION	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project: a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X
Would the project: b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
Would the project: c) Conflict with existing zoning, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?				X
Would the project: d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X
Would the project: e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X

DISCUSSION: Existing roadway rehabilitation projects contained in the RTP will not impact agricultural or forest land.

Air Quality:

QUESTION	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project: a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X
Would the project: b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?			X	
Would the project: c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?		X		
Would the project: d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?			X	

Discussion: Amador County is currently in non-attainment of State and Federal Ozone standards as well as State PM 10 standards.

PM 10 is primarily caused by wood burning, wind-blown dust and agriculture. Ozone is primarily generated from the Sacramento valley drifting eastward into the Foothills.

During roadway construction activities, increased levels of PM 10 can be adequately mitigated through mitigation measures adopted by the implementing agencies in accordance with applicable guidance.

MITIGATION MEASURE AIR-1: The implementing agency will review individual RTP projects prior to implementation in accordance with applicable local, regional, state, or federal procedures.

Biological Resources:

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>
Would the project: a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, or NOAA Fisheries?			X	
Would the project: b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X	
Would the project: c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			X	
Would the project: d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?			X	
Would the project: e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			X	
Would the project: f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?			X	

Discussion: All of the proposed projects in the RTP are designed as ‘edge-line to edge-line’ roadway rehabilitation projects. As such, no disturbances to the environment beyond the existing roadway pavement is expected.

Cultural Resources:

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>
Would the project: a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?				X
Would the project: b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?				X
Would the project: c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?				X

Discussion: All of the proposed projects in the RTP are designed as ‘edge-line to edge-line’ roadway rehabilitation projects. As such, no disturbances to the environment beyond the existing roadway pavement is expected.

Energy:

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>
Would the project: a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy			X	

resources during project construction or operation?				
Would the project: b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?			X	

Discussion: The RTP’s goals and policies encourages the use of materials and systems that reduce waste and improve energy efficiency.

Geology and Soils:

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>
Would the project: a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent AlquistPriolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			X	
Would the project: a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
Would the project: a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X	
Would the project: a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: iv) Landslides?			X	

Would the project: b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
Would the project: c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?		X		
Would the project: d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?			X	
Would the project: e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?			X	
Would the project: f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X	

Discussion: The RTP proposes roadway rehabilitation projects that may have specific impacts on geology and soils that will be addressed on a project-by-project basis by implementing agencies. If any individual project has potential for impacts to geology and soils, the mitigation measures listed below will reduce impacts to a less than significant degree.

MITIGATION MEASURE GEO-1: Temporary erosion control measures (i.e. silt fences, staked straw bales/wattles, sediment basins and traps, geofabric, and sandbag dikes) to be implemented as appropriate.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions:

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>
Would the project: a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?		X		

Would the project: b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

Discussion: The RTP contains goals and policies to encourage programming of shovel-ready roadway rehabilitation projects. These projects will not induce additional vehicle traffic. However, during construction activities, project-level environmental analysis should implement measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

MITIGATION MEASURE GHG-1: Consistent with Appendix F of CEQA Guidelines, implementing agencies should identify and reduce energy consumption during construction through the following measures:

- Promote efforts to recycle materials
- Promote the use of alternative fuels or energy systems
- Minimize energy consumption, increase water conservation, and reduce solid waste

Hazards and Hazardous Materials:

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>
Would the project: a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				X
Would the project: b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				X
Would the project: c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
Would the project: d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a				X

significant hazard to the public or the environment?				
Would the project: e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?				X
Would the project: f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
Would the project: g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?				X

Discussion: The RTP projects will not create hazards nor produce hazardous materials.

Hydrology and Water Quality:

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>
Would the project: a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?			X	
Would the project: b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?				X
Would the project: c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would: (i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;		X		

(ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;			X	
(iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or			X	
(iv) impede or redirect flood flows?			X	
Would the project: d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?		X		
Would the project: e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?				X

Discussion: The RTP lists several bridge rehabilitation projects have been programmed during previous cycles. All of these projects have undergone detailed environmental analysis at the project-level. Appropriate mitigation measures for each project have been identified and adopted to bring impacts to a less than significant level.

Roadway rehabilitation projects proposed for funding through this RTP cycle are limited to existing edge-line to edge-line pavement extents. As such, construction related activity may impact existing hydrology and water quality systems. Projects advanced for funding will undergo specific analysis of appropriate hydrologic mitigation practices prior to and during project implementation.

MITIGATION MEASURE HYD-1: During project development, implementing agencies will take steps to identify and reduce potential impacts to hydrology and water quality systems due to construction activities.

Land Use and Planning:

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>
Would the project: a) Physically divide an established community?			X	
Would the project: b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any			X	

land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				
---	--	--	--	--

Discussion: Over its 20-year horizon, the RTP plans for rehabilitation of existing roadways and will not impact established communities.

Mineral Resources:

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>
Would the project: a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
Would the project: b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X

Discussion: The RTP does not contain projects that would impact existing mineral resources in the County.

Noise:

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>
Would the project result in: a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?		X		
Would the project result in: b) Generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?		X		
Would the project result in: c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			X	

Discussion: Construction of roadway rehabilitation projects will likely produce potential noise impacts. Specific environmental analysis will be conducted as individual projects are advanced. Typical project-level mitigation measures limit work times to daytime hours, install temporary sound barriers, phase ground disturbing activities, apply noise reduction techniques, etc.

MITIGATION MEASURE NOISE: The implementing agencies shall take steps to identify and reduce the effects of construction on the roadway system throughout the construction period.

Population and Housing:

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>
Would the project: a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				X
Would the project: b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

Discussion: “No Impact” determinations in this section are based on the scope, description, and location of the proposed projects. Potential impacts to Population and Housing are not anticipated because the projects do not involve activities that would encourage population growth or displace housing or people.

Public Services:

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Fire protection?				X

Police protection?				X
Schools?				X
Parks?				X
Other Public Facilities?				X

Discussion: “No Impact” determinations in this section are based on the scope, description, and location of the proposed projects. Improvements to roadway pavement condition will actually have beneficial Impacts to Public Service providers.

Recreation:

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X

Discussion: “No Impact” determinations in this section are based on the scope, description, and location of the proposed projects.

Transportation/Traffic:

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>
Would the project: a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?				X
Would the project: b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?			X	
Would the project: c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
Would the project: d) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X

Discussion: The RTP is a long-range programmatic planning document for Amador County that contains goals and policies to efficiently deliver construction-ready roadway rehabilitation projects in the County and its incorporated cities. No induced travel will be generated through implementation of the Plan. All proposed projects will be screened on an individual basis.

Tribal Cultural Resources:

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>
Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred				X

place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is: a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or				
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.			X	

Discussion: ACTC continues to include tribal governments in the transportation planning process through regularly-scheduled meetings as well as ad-hoc discussions of specific issues. In addition, all three (3) Federally recognized tribes in Amador County were contacted during the RTP update process. Adoption of the RTP will not have a significant impact on tribal resources.

Utilities and Service Systems:

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>
Would the project: a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
Would the project: b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and			X	

reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?				
Would the project: c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			X	
Would the project: d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?			X	
Would the project: e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			x	

Discussion: The 2024 RTP is focused on rehabilitation of existing roadways that may have existing utilities and service systems in need of repair. These utility and service system repairs would be performed concurrently with roadway repair and evaluated on an individual basis at the time the specific project is advanced for development.

Wildfire:

QUESTION	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
f located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project: a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project: b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project				X

occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?				
If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project: c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?				X
If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project: d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, postfire slope instability, or drainage changes?				X

Discussion: Projects in the RTP will improve emergency evacuation efforts by repairing roadways and improving traffic circulation.

Mandatory Findings of Significance:

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?			X	
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?			X	
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X	

Discussion: The RTP is a long-range planning document that includes policies to help guide implementation of transportation improvements for the Amador region. Categorical environmental concerns are highlighted. Specific environmental impacts are studied in greater detail throughout the individual project development process.

Preparers:

Report Author: Amador County Transportation Commission

Attachment 1- Comments and Responses: