4.11 TRANSPORTATION

1. INTRODUCTION

This section assesses the effects of the proposed CCAP Update on the transportation system, including roadway, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian components, in the CCAP Update area (Figure 3-4). Government agencies and the public were provided an opportunity to comment on the Project in response to a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR and an Initial Study (published in May 2017) that provided a preliminary summary of potential impacts that could result from the Project. No comments regarding transportation and circulation were received.

As described in Chapter 1.0 Project Description, this document is a program-level EIR that evaluates the changes proposed to the CCRMP and the OCMP, and as such considers and evaluates broad area-wide and potential cumulative impacts associated with potential project-related effects on the transportation system. This section also identifies laws, policies and ordinances that address and mitigate potential impacts associated with in-channel streambed and bank alteration projects and off-channel mining activities. Per County policy, new off-channel mining projects that may occur within the proposed new OCMP areas would be subject to project-level CEQA review to evaluate potential effects to the transportation system within the specific project area.

To provide a context for the impact analysis, this section begins with a description of the environmental setting. The setting qualitatively describes the existing physical and operational conditions for the transportation system components. Following the setting is the regulatory framework influencing the transportation system and providing the basis for impact significance thresholds used in the impact analysis. The section concludes with the impact analysis findings and recommended mitigation measures, as necessary.

2. SETTING

Numerous modes of transportation are available and used in the Yolo County and in the CCAP area, including on-road vehicles (automobiles and trucks), public transit (including buses and rail), bicycle travel, and walking. However, automobiles are the primary mode of travel for most people (approximately 80 percent of all working County residents travel from home to work by automobile).[1] Aggregate transport occurs via truck (typically heavy duty multi-axle trucks) on the highway and roadway system. As part of the County land development approval process aggregate operators and haulers are restricted to specified haul roads until the point at which they access the federal or State highway system. The majority of regional travel occurs on Interstate 5 (I-5), Interstate 505 (I-505) and State Route 16 (SR 16), as described below.

a. Physical Environment

Transportation within the local environment includes travel on the roadway system, the transit system, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The following summarizes the current status of each facility within the study area.

(1) Existing Roadway System

The discussion of the roadway system within the CCAP Update area is based on the characterization of the roadways included in the 1996 CCRMP and OCMP EIRs, as updated to identify current conditions.

[1] Yolo County. 2009. 2030 Countywide General Plan Environmental Impact Report, April, page 207.

With the exception of I-5, I-505 and SR 16, all study roadways in the CCAP area are two-lane County Roads (Figure 3-4). Roads numbered between 80 and 100 have north-south directionality and roads numbered between 10 and 40 have east-west directionality. In addition, a number of smaller roads are located between the primary County Roads. These smaller roadways are designated with an "A" or a "B" suffix following the County Road number. Each of the study roadways that serve Project-related travel is described below. Pavement conditions are based on the following guidelines: Good pavement is defined as a generally smooth pavement surface with limited cracking. Fair pavement is defined as slightly rough pavement surface with some cracking. Poor pavement is defined as noticeably rough with considerable cracking and some potholes.

Interstate 5 (I-5) is a four-lane freeway that serves north-south travel throughout the entire State of California. Within the study area, it serves the eastern portion of the study area and maintains interchange access at Road 14, Road 98 and several streets within Woodland.

Interstate 505 (I-505) is a four-lane, north-south freeway that connects with Interstate 80 (I-80) near Vacaville and I-5 near Dunnigan. Within the CCAP Update area, interchanges exist at SR 16, Road 14 and Road 19.

State Route 16 (SR 16) is a two-lane, east-west highway that serves the western rural area of Yolo County and the communities of Rumsey, Guinda, Brooks, Capay, Esparto, Madison, Monument Hills, and the City of Woodland. SR 16 also provides connection to the Cache Creek Resort Casino located near the town of Brooks. North of Rumsey, SR 16 passes though the Cache Creek Regional Park area and is one of the routes used by trucks to access Colusa and Lake Counties. SR 16 extends east as a two-lane conventional highway from the Colusa County line to the Woodland city limits, then north to the connection at I-5. SR 16 parallels the southern boundary of the study area.

With build-out of the 2030 Countywide General Plan and associated increases in regional traffic, traffic volumes are anticipated to increase on SR 16. Caltrans has identified the need to improve portions of SR 16 between the Cache Creek Casino and I-5 as identified and evaluated in the *State Route 16 Safety Improvement Project (SIP) Initial Study Mitigated Negative Declaration* (June 2015).[2] This document contains an analysis of the three locations within the SIP that Caltrans Traffic Safety has identified as having collision rates that are higher than the statewide average for a similar facility. To relieve congestion, increase safety and reduce collisions, in July of 2018, Caltrans began work on a one-mile segment between Brooks and Capay and a 3.5-mile stretch between Esparto and the I-505 junction within the CCAP Update area. The project will widen shoulders, straighten curves, add two-left-turn lanes and construct a roundabout at the intersection of SR 16 and Road 89.[3]

The SR 16 SIP project does not add additional vehicular capacity and is not expected to appreciably affect traffic volumes as the project does not contain design elements, such as additional travel lanes, which would provide additional highway capacity. However, vehicles are expected to experience fewer delays since drivers turning left at County Roads would no longer block traffic due to the wider lanes and shoulders and the addition of left-turn lanes included in the SR 16 improvement project. The posted 55 miles per hour (mph) speed limit on SR 16 would not be changed by the proposed SIP project.

Road 14 is a two-lane, east-west rural road located north of the CCAP Update area. It extends east from Road 85 to I-505 then transitions into Road 13 before crossing I-5. This route provides

[2] State of California Department of Transportation. 2015. *State Route 16 Safety Improvement Project Initial Study with Mitigated Negative Declaration*. June.

[3] http://www.dot.ca.gov/d3/projects/subprojects/0C470/index.html accessed on October 18, 2018.

direct access to both I-505 and I-5 via interchanges. Passing is permitted along the majority of Road 14 however there are no paved shoulders in most locations. This entire segment of Road 14 received a surface treatment in 2018, which improved the pavement condition to good. A one-mile section of Road 14 directly west of I-505 contains several sharp turns and contains an advisory speed of 25 mph through the corridor.

Road 19 is a two-lane, east-west road extending between Road 87 on the west and Road 94B on the east. The pavement quality is generally poor and in general does not have paved shoulders. The interchange at Road 19 and 1-505 features northbound and southbound diagonal on- and off-ramps and a long, fairly steep incline over the interstate for eastbound through vehicles. A sharp horizontal curve is located west of the 1-505 interchange with a 30-mph speed advisory.

Road 20 is a two-lane road that begins just west of Road 96 and extends east to Road 98 where it becomes Kentucky Avenue. Many portions of the road were reconstructed in 1996 and maintenance has continued since then keeping the pavement in good condition. The paved shoulders are narrow along the majority of the roadway and passing is permitted.

Road 85 is a two-lane road that extends north from the town of Capay beyond Road 14, on the western edge of the CCAP Update area. The bridge for Road 85 across Cache Creek was replaced in the late 1990s. The entire segment was given a mix of surface treatments in 2018 resulting in good pavement condition. North of Road 16A, the road has narrow lanes and no paved shoulders whereas south of Road 16A, lanes are slightly wider. Passing is permitted along the majority of this roadway.

Road 87 is a two-lane road that begins at SR 16 in Esparto and heads north beyond Road 14. Passing is permitted along the majority of the roadway south of Road 19 and along portions of the roadway north of Road 19. The pavement along the majority of Road 87 is in poor condition.

Road 89 is a two-lane, north-south road from Road 19 south to Winters (State Route 128) that runs parallel to 1-505 approximately one mile to the west. Road 89 discontinues across Cache Creek. The pavement condition between Cache Creek and SR 16 is poor and has numerous cracks and potholes. The travel lanes and shoulders are narrow and passing is permitted along this segment.

Road 96 is a two-lane, north-south road that begins at Road 24 and terminates just beyond Road 20. This road has narrow paved shoulders and passing is permitted along the entire route. The speed limit is 50 mph and the pavement is in fair condition.

Road 98 is a two-lane, north-south road that forms the western boundary of the City of Woodland and the eastern boundary of the study area. Road 98 begins at I-80 where it forms the I-80/Pedrick Road interchange. It continues north through the western portion of the City of Davis, to the City of Woodland where it forms the SR 16/Road 98/Main Street intersection. For the purposes of this study, the concurrent 3-mile section of road north of this intersection, known both as SR 16 and Road 98, will be referred to as Road 98.

The pavement condition for Road 98 varies as does the geometry of the road section. In 2014 reconstruction was completed that improved the corridor from Road 29 north to the City of Woodland providing two 12-foot travel lanes, 8-foot paved shoulders, and 4-foot graded shoulders. Improvements also included turn lanes at major intersections to allow for safe deceleration. Road 98 north of SR 16 and south of Road 27, has paved shoulders that are narrow and the pavement condition ranges from poor to fair.

(2) Substandard Roadway Conditions

The Countywide 2030 General Plan identified the following roadways within the CCAP Update area as needing spot improvements for portions of the identified segments including but not limited to intersection control and lane configuration improvements, passing lanes and/or wider travel lanes and shoulders:

- State Route 16 between County Road 78 and County Road 85B
- State Route 16 between Interstate 505 and County Road 98

The SR 16 SIP project will address portions of these substandard segments.

Table CI-14 in the Circulation Element of the 2030 Countywide General Plan identifies that following roadway and targeted trucking corridors in the vicinity of or within the CCAP Update area as those with the "highest priority for improvements:"

- County Road 14 from County Road 85 to County Road 13
- County Road 19 from County Road 90A to County Road 94B
- County Road 85 from County Road 14 to State Route 16
- County Road 85B from State Route 16 to County Road 23
- County Road 89 from State Route 16 to Winters City Limit
- County Road 98 from State Route 16/Main Street to Solano County Line

(3) Public Transit System

The Yolo County Transportation District (YCTD) operates Yolobus, which serves the residents of Yolo County and provides regional, intercity, and local fixed-route services throughout the County. For the fixed-route service, 10 routes are local (within Yolo County), and eight routes provide commuter route service to Sacramento County and Solano County. As of December 2017, the only available transit route that runs between Woodland and Cache Creek Casino Resort on SR 16 is Route 215 Cache Creek Shuttle that provides 17 round trips on a daily basis.[5]

The YCTD also provides paratransit services through Yolobus Special, which provides local city, intercity, and rural County service. These services provide on-demand, door-to-door transportation primarily for elderly and disabled passengers. The paratransit service is in addition to the approximate 3/4-mile route deviations that can be requested on some of the local fixed-routes. Paratransit ridership during the fiscal year 2003–2004 was approximately 14,400.

(4) Bicycle and Pedestrian System

Bicycle and pedestrian travel within the CCAP area is limited due to the lack of facilities and the rural nature of the area. In general, the bicycle and pedestrian transportation system in Yolo County is composed of local and regional bikeways, trails and sidewalks in cities and more urban communities.

[4] Yolo County. 2009. 2030 Countywide General Plan. November 10. Page CI-36.
[5] http://www.yolobus.com/media/YolobusSystemOverviewMap03-13.pdf. Referenced on October 23, 2018.

Bikeways are classified into the following three types:

- Class I - off-street bike paths.
- Class II - on-street bike lanes marked by pavement striping.
- Class III - on-street bike routes that share the road with motorized vehicles.

The County of Yolo Bicycle Transportation Plan (BTP) was updated by the Yolo County Transportation Advisory Committee and adopted by the Board of Supervisors in March 2013.[6] According to the Yolo County BTP, five major bikeways exist within the unincorporated area and are all located outside of the CCAP Update area. The BTP does identify a proposed Class III bikeway along SR 16 from Woodland northwest to the County border and potential Class II bikeway projects on the following County Roads adjacent to or within the CCAP Update area:

- Road 24 from Woodland to County Road 90
- Road 89 from Winters to Madison
- Road 99 and 18
- Road 99 West from Road 18 to the northern County line

Few pedestrian facilities exist within CCAP Update area unless they are included within the developed communities including Woodland, Madison, Esparto, and Capay. The County has developed a Parks and Open Space Master Plan (adopted in September 2006) that includes descriptions and resources within the unincorporated parts of the County.

As envisioned in the CCAP, the County is drafting various components of a CCAP Parkway Plan. This effort will include an Open Space Inventory and Baselines Improvements document (Baseline Inventory) of properties and trails that will be dedicated to the County as a result of the program, a Master Plan and Parkway Vision document (Master Plan) that describes possible additional improvements and trail connections that could supplement the baseline dedications as funding becomes available, and a financial feasibility analysis of the program. These documents are available at this link: https://www.yolocounty.org/general-government/general-government-departments/county-administrator/county-administrator-divisions/natural-resources/cache-creek-area-plan-ccap/cache-creek-parkway-plan. As described in the Baseline Inventory, the County has or will be taking possession of several open space properties and trails along lower Cache Creek.

b. Regulatory Environment

(1) Federal, State, and Regional

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) owns and operates the State highway system, consisting of freeways and State routes within California. Caltrans maintains Corridor System Management Plans (CSMP) that describe existing and projected future conditions on all State routes and freeways, and proposes performance strategies and improvements.

[6] Yolo County Transportation Advisory Committee. 2013. *County of Yolo Bicycle Transportation Plan*. March.

Sacramento Area Council of Governments. SACOG is responsible for regional transportation planning in Yolo County. The 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) was published in February 2016,[7] and is a federally mandated long-range fiscally constrained transportation plan for the six-County area that includes El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba counties. The 2016 MTP/SCS allocates $12.6 billion to preserve, maintain, and rehabilitate the region's roads, highways, bridges, trails, sidewalks, and other bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Transit also benefits from road maintenance projects in that many road rehabilitation projects include complete street designs that make the road safer for, and more inclusive of, transit and bikeways. The MTIP and its amendments are subject to air quality conformity analysis under federal regulations, which limits the use of federal funds for regionally significant, capacity-increasing roadway projects. SACOG adopted the Final 2017-20 MTIP, Amendment #1 to the 2016 MTP/SCS, and Air Quality Conformity Analysis on September 15, 2016. The documents received federal approval on December 16, 2016. The 2017-20 MTIP is the current programming document.

(2) Local

Countywide Transportation Capital Improvement Plan. The Yolo County Transportation District (YCTD) has prepared the Countywide Transportation Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) that is a 20-year plan that identifies and quantifies the existing priority expenditures for transportation projects set by each of the five jurisdictions of the County, the two transit districts, Caltrans and the Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District. The CIP has identified the following projects on the CIP list that are within or in the vicinity of the CCAP Update area[8]:

- CR 89 (CR 26 to SR 16) road reconstruction
- CR 87 (Cache Creek to SR 16) road reconstruction
- CR 87 (CR 19 to CR 14) road reconstruction
- CR 85 (SR 16 to CR14) road reconstruction
- CR 14 (I-5 to I-505) road reconstruction

2030 Countywide General Plan. The CCRMP is a component of the CCAP, which is an adopted part of the 2030 Countywide General Plan that contains the following goals, policies, and actions related to the transportation system that are relevant to the CCAP Update:

Policy CI-1.10 Coordinate with appropriate entities to maintain the following as primary routes for emergency evacuation from Yolo County (edited):

- Interstate 5 – North towards Redding and east into Sacramento
- Interstate 505 – South to the junction of E/WB Interstate 80
- State Route 16 – West from Woodland into the Capay Valley and then north into Colusa County
- County Road 98 – South from Woodland into Solano County.

Policy CI-1.12 CMP Consistency – 1) Coordinate with YCTD on the update to the Yolo County CMP to ensure consistency with the LOS policies established in the Yolo County Circulation Element; 2) Monitor roadways identified in the

[7] SACOG. 2016. *Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy*. February.
[8] Yolo County Transportation District. 2018. *Draft Countywide Transportation Capital Improvement Plan*. January 31.

Yolo County CMP and prepare a deficiency plan as outlined in the CMP, when the CMP LOS thresholds are exceeded. The deficiency plan shall focus on modifications to the transportation system that reduce vehicle travel by accommodating more travel by walking, bicycling, and transit modes consistent with the Draft General Plan; 3) Coordinate with cities to consider opting out of the CMP pursuant to Section 65088.3 of the Government Code. (DEIR MM CI-4)

Policy CI-3.1 Maintain Level of Service (LOS) C or better for roadways and intersections in the unincorporated county. In no case shall land use be approved that would either result in worse than LOS C conditions, or require additional improvements to maintain the required level of service, except as specified below. The intent of this policy is to consider level of service as a limit on the planned capacity of the County's roadways.

A. Interstate 5 (County Road 6 to Interstate 505) – LOS D is acceptable to the County, assuming that one additional auxiliary lane is constructed in each direction through this segment. The County will secure a fair share towards these improvements from planned development. LOS D is anticipated by Caltrans according to the Interstate 5 Transportation Concept Report 1996 to 2016 (Caltrans, April 1997).

B. Interstate 5 (Interstate 505 to Woodland City Limit) – LOS D is acceptable to the County. LOS D is anticipated by Caltrans according to the Interstate 5 Transportation Concept Report 1996 to 2016 (Caltrans, April 1997).

C. Interstate 5 (Woodland City Limit to Sacramento County Line) – LOS F is acceptable to the County. The County will secure a fair share towards intersection improvements from all feasible sources including planned development at the Elkhorn site. LOS C is anticipated by Caltrans according to the State Route 99 and Interstate 5 Corridor System Management Plan (Caltrans, May 2009).

D. Interstate 80 (Davis City Limit to West Sacramento City Limit) – LOS F is acceptable to the County. LOS F is anticipated by Caltrans according to the Interstate 80 and Capital City Freeway Corridor System Management Plan (Caltrans, May 2009).

E. State Route 16 (County Road 78 to County Road 85B) – LOS D is acceptable.

F. State Route 16 (County Road 85B to County Road 21A) – LOS E is acceptable.

G. State Route 16 (County Road 21A to Interstate 505) – LOS D is acceptable, assuming that this segment is widened to four lanes with intersection improvements appropriate for an arterial roadway. The County will secure a fair share towards these improvements from planned development. Caltrans and the Rumsey Band of Wintun Indians shall be encouraged to provide funding for the project.

H. State Route 16 (Interstate 505 to County Road 98) – LOS D is acceptable, assuming that passing lanes and appropriate intersection improvements are constructed. The County will secure a fair share towards these improvements from all feasible sources. Caltrans and the Rumsey Band of Wintun Indians shall be encouraged to establish a funding mechanism to pay the remainder.

I. State Route 113 (Sutter County Line to County Road 102) – LOS F is acceptable to the County. The County will secure a fair share towards these improvements from planned development. LOS F is anticipated by Caltrans according to the State Route 113 Transportation Concept Report 1991-2019 (Caltrans, May 2000).

J. State Route 113 (County Road 102 to Woodland City Limits) – LOS D is acceptable.

K. State Route 128 (Interstate 505 to Napa County Line) – LOS D is acceptable.

L. Old River Road (Interstate 5 to West Sacramento City limits) – LOS D is acceptable.

M. South River Road (West Sacramento City Limit to the Freeport Bridge) – LOS D is acceptable.

N. County Road 6 (County Road 99W to the Tehama Colusa Canal) – LOS D is acceptable, assuming this segment is widened to four lanes. The County will secure a fair share towards these improvements from all feasible sources.

O. County Road 24 (County Road 95 to County Road 98 – LOS D is acceptable. (DEIR MM CI-2)

P. County Road 27 (County Road 98 to State Route 113 – LOS D is acceptable. (DEIR MM CI-2)

Q. County Road 31 (County Road 95 to County Road 98) – LOS D is acceptable. (DEIR MM CI-2)

R. County Road 32A (County Road 105 to Interstate 80) – LOS D is acceptable.

S. County Road 98 (County Road 29 to County Road 27) – LOS D is acceptable. (DEIR MM CI-2)

T. County Road 99W (County Road 2 to County Road 8) – LOS D is acceptable, assuming that this segment is widened to four lanes. The County will secure a fair share towards these improvements from all feasible sources. (DEIR MM CI-2)

U. County Road 102 (County Road 13 to County Road 17) – LOS D is acceptable, assuming that passing lanes and appropriate intersection improvements are constructed. The County will secure a fair share towards these improvements from all feasible sources. (DEIR MM CI-2)

V. County Road 102 (County Road 17 to the Woodland City Limit) - LOS E is acceptable, assuming that passing lanes and appropriate intersection improvements are constructed. The County will secure a fair share towards these improvements from all feasible sources. (DEIR MM CI-2)

W. County Road 102 (Woodland City Limit to Davis City Limit) – LOS D is acceptable assuming that passing lanes and appropriate intersection improvements are constructed. The County will secure a fair share towards these improvements from all feasible sources.

X. Additional exceptions to this policy may be allowed by the Board of Supervisors on a case-by-case basis, where reducing the level of service

would result in a clear public benefit. Such circumstances may include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Preserving agriculture or open space land;

2. Enhancing the agricultural economy;

3. Preserving scenic roadways/highways;

4. Preserving the rural character of the county;

5. Avoiding adverse impacts to alternative transportation modes;

6. Avoiding growth inducement; or

7. Preserving downtown community environments.

8. Where right-of-way constraints would make the improvements infeasible. (DEIR MM CI-2)

Policy CI-3.2 Identify specific level of service policies within Specific Plans and Community Area Plans based on the following conditions:

A. Development shall occur consistent with applicable Land Use and Community Character Element policies.

B. Development shall provide transit, bike and pedestrian facilities and amenities consistent with the applicable Circulation Element policies.

C. New development shall utilize a grid pattern for all roadways.

D. Level of service shall not be allowed to worsen beyond LOS E within the proposed Dunnigan Specific Plan except where specified in Policy CI-3.1.

E. Level of service shall not be allowed to worsen beyond LOS E within the proposed Knights Landing Specific Plan except where specified in Policy CI-3.1.

F. Level of service shall not be allowed to worsen beyond LOS E within the proposed Madison Specific Plan except where specified in Policy CI-3.1.

G. Level of service shall not be allowed to worsen beyond LOS E within the Esparto Community Plan except where specified in Policy CI-3.1.

H. Level of service shall not be allowed to worsen beyond LOS D within all other Community Plans and Specific Plans except where specified in Policy CI-3.1.

I. Level of service shall not be allowed to worsen beyond LOS E within the Covell Specific Plan except where specified in Policy CI-3.1.

J. Where roadways improvements are not needed due to the adoption of a lower level of service as described in Policy CI-3.1, developers shall be required to construct equivalent circulation and safety improvements for other modes of travel.

K. Roadways shall be designed to reduce VMT.

Policy CI-3.3 CEQA review for subsequent projects will analyze project traffic and circulation impacts using both the Yolo County General Plan policies and Caltrans policies (based on the CSMPs, TCCRs, or other guidelines) as applicable.

A. Consider the following objectives, following consultation with Caltrans, when making decisions to expand or modify the State highway system in Yolo County:

1. Minimize impacts to the environment.

2. Minimize increases in greenhouse gases and air pollutants.

3. Minimize increases in VMT.

4. Minimize long-distance commute trips.

5. Fully utilize existing capacity while maintaining stable flows and speeds.

6. Provide facilities for all users including pedestrians, bicyclists, carpool users and transit riders.

B. Consider the following objectives when making decisions to expand the County road system in Yolo County:

1. Minimize impacts to the environment.

2. Promote designs that result in a decrease of greenhouse gases and air pollutants.

3. Promote designs that decrease Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and long-distance commute trips.

4. Fully utilize existing capacity in accordance with adopted Levels of Service.

5. Provide facilities for all users including pedestrians, bicyclists, carpool users and transit riders, where appropriate.

Policy CI-3.9 To the greatest feasible extent, require new development to construct safety improvements consistent with current design standards on existing roadways that are anticipated to accommodate additional traffic from planned development.

Policy CI-3.10 Upgrade the existing County road system to be consistent with current County design standards (such as horizontal curvature, site distance, etc.) as transportation funding allows. Roadways that require design improvements to accommodate projected future traffic, as identified in Table CI-1, shall have the highest priority to be upgraded. Safety shall be a key factor in prioritizing specific projects.

These roadways also represent targeted trucking corridors for agricultural (“farm-to-market”) transport and other goods movement. By attracting truck trips to these corridors, other roadways throughout the County are more available for movement of agricultural equipment and farm workers thus supporting more efficient and safe agricultural operations countywide.

Exceptions to design standards may be allowed where circumstances warrant special treatment of the roadway including, but not limited to, the following:

A. Extraordinary construction costs due to terrain, roadside development, or unusual right-of-way needs.

B. Environmental constraints that may otherwise preclude road improvement to the adopted standards.

C. Exceptions to the level of service policy specified in Policy CI-3.1.

Policy CI-3.11 Require new development to finance and construct all off-site circulation improvements necessary to mitigate a project's transportation impacts (including public transit, pedestrian and bicycle mobility, safety and level of service-related impacts, and impacts to the State Highway System). For mitigation to be considered feasible, it must be consistent with the policies of the General Plan.

Policy CI-3.18 Ensure adequate access for emergency vehicles.

Policy CI-7.2 Encourage movement of goods by truck on freeways and other appropriate designated routes.

Action CI-A9 Continue to implement and enforce design standards for industrial and highway commercial roadways to accommodate heavier loads associated with truck operations and larger turning radii to facilitate truck movements. (Policy CI-7.2) Responsibility: Planning and Public Works Department Timeframe: 2010/2011; Ongoing

Action CI-A16 Require new development to enter into an agreement with the County that establishes circulation improvements to be constructed and/or fair share costs to be the responsibility of the project applicant. (Policy CI-3.10, Policy CI-3.12, Policy CI-3.14) Responsibility: Planning and Public Works Department Timeframe: Ongoing

(5) Other Relevant Local Documents and Requirements

Transportation Impact Study Guidelines[9] - Yolo County has developed Transportation impact study (TIS) guidelines to assist applicants with assessing potential traffic impacts of proposed projects. These guidelines have been developed to provide a consistent technical approach to transportation impact analysis for projects within Yolo County's jurisdiction. The Circulation Element of the 2030 Countywide General Plan specifically identified the development and adoption of transportation impact study guidelines that consider all modes of travel and establish clear guidance for analysis and significance criteria (Circulation Element Action CI-A2).

For projects that are consistent with the General Plan, the impact analysis is generally limited to an evaluation of the project access points and connectivity to the existing adjacent bicycle, pedestrian, vehicle, and transit facilities Unless explicitly waived by the County, a TIS is required when any one of the following conditions is met.

- The project has the potential to create a significant environmental impact under CEQA (check Table 7 on page 31 for a list of significance thresholds for all modes).
- The proposed project has the potential to generate 100 new passenger vehicle trips per day or an equivalent number of truck trips (20 medium duty trucks or 5 heavy duty trucks).
- The project requires a permit application, which is subject to discretionary approval.

[9] Yolo County, 2010. Transportation Impact Study Guidelines, February. Available at: https://www.yolocounty.org/home/showdocument?id=11513

- The project will substantially alter physical or operational conditions on a County roadway, bikeway, sidewalk, or other transportation facility.

Applicants are required to verify LOS thresholds for study area intersections and roadways. The General Plan also states that LOS exceptions may be allowed on a case-by-case basis, where reducing the level of service threshold would result in clear public benefit. Further, individual Specific Plans and Community Area Plans have specific LOS thresholds. Applicants with a project within one of these plan areas should confirm applicable LOS thresholds with the County.

CCAP Plans and Regulations

In-Channel Ordinance

The in-channel ordinance includes regulations for managing unpaved in-channel haul roads (Section 10-3.401. Access Roads), but does not include any regulations that directly address on-road vehicle use and circulation.

Mining Ordinance

The Mining Ordinance addresses requirements in regards access roads, County road improvements/maintenance, setbacks from roads, and CEQA review for new proposed mining operations within the CCAP area, as follows (existing [not updated] ordinances shown below):

Section 10-4.402. Access roads. (no change proposed by CCAP Update)

> The first one-hundred (100) feet of access road intersecting a County-maintained road shall be surfaced in a manner approved by the Public Works Department, with an approach constructed to County standards. Traffic control and warning signs shall be installed as required by the Public Works Department.

Section 10-4.407. County road improvements. (changed to Section 10-4.408 in CCAP Update)

> Each operator shall pay its fair share toward improvements required to maintain Level of Service (LOS) "C" operations on County roads of LOS “D" operations on State Highways within the OCMP planning area. Fair share mitigation shall also be required to improve existing operational deficiencies of the transportation system. Specific locations shall be identified through the project-specific environmental review process for each operator's long-term mining permit application. Each operator shall participate in a funding program operated by the County which is designed to ensure that all improvements are made in a timely manner and that a reimbursement mechanism is in place to ensure repayment of any costs contributed in excess of fair share amounts. The program shall be initiated upon the approval of the long-term mining permits and shall be updated biennially by the County to ensure any new or modified impacts or funding sources are being addressed. Each operator shall have the option to complete the work at their expense without triggering the competitive bid process, as long as they comply with the applicable legal requirements of the County. If the operator declines the option, the County shall utilize the competitive bid process.

Section 10-4.409. County road maintenance.

The operator shall agree to assume joint pavement maintenance responsibility with the County (or shared with another producer using the same roadway) for all County roads along a designated haul route from the access point of the surface mining operation to an appropriate State Highway. The operator shall agree to submit an evaluation of the structural integrity of the identified roadways on or before December 1 of each year in which mining operations are permitted. The report shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer and/or County staff with expertise in the area of roadway pavement and shall be subject to the approval of the Public Works Department. Based on the results of this annual evaluation, the Public Works Department shall identify the improvements required to maintain safe and efficient traffic operations on the road for the upcoming year. The County agrees to implement maintenance improvements similar to other County roads (i.e. fill cracks and chip seal). The operator agrees to implement the improvements beyond the typical County improvements in a timeframe set forth by the Public Works Department. The operator does not assume the liability for the roadway, except for cases where the· operator has not fulfilled its maintenance obligations. If a subsequent mining operation utilizes a road previously required to be improved pursuant to this subsection, then the subsequent operator shall be responsible for compliance with the agreements and requirements of the previous operator.

Section 10-4.429. Setbacks [excerpt]

All off-channel surface mining operations shall comply with the following setbacks:

(a) New processing plants and material stockpiles shall be located a minimum of one-thousand (1,000) feet from public rights-of-way, public recreation areas, and/or off-site residences, unless alternate measures to reduce potential noise, dust, and aesthetic impacts are developed and implemented;

(b) Soil stockpiles shall be located a minimum of five-hundred (500) feet from public rights-of-way, public recreation areas, and off-site residences, unless alternate measures to reduce potential dust and aesthetic impacts are developed and implemented;

(c) Off-channel excavations shall maintain a minimum one-thousand (1,000) foot setback from public rights-of-way and adjacent property lines of off-site residences, unless a landscaped buffer is provided or site-specific characteristics reduce potential aesthetic impacts. Where landscaped buffers are proposed, the setback for off-channel excavations may be reduced to a minimum of fifty (50) feet from either the property line or the adjoining right-of-way, whichever is greater. Where mining occurs within one-thousand (1,000) feet of a public right-of-way, operators shall phase mining such that no more than fifty (50) acres of the area that lies within one-thousand (1,000) feet of the right-of-way would be actively disturbed at any time, except where operations are adequately screened from public view. Where adequate screening exists in the form of mature vegetation and/or constructed berms that effectively block public views, the area of active disturbance within one-thousand (1,000) feet of the right-of-way shall not exceed the area that is screened by more than fifty (50) acres at any one time. Actively disturbed areas are defined as those

on which mining operations of any kind, or the implementation of reclamation such as grading, seeding, or installation of plant material are taking place.

(h) No mining activities shall occur within two-thousand (2,000) feet of the community boundaries of Capay, Esparto, Madison, Woodland, and/or Yolo. This setback may be reduced by up to five-hundred (500) feet when existing mature vegetation, proposed landscape buffers of a sufficient height and density to create a visual buffer (consisting of native species and fence-row habitat appropriate to the area), or other site-specific characteristics reduce potential incompatibilities between urban land uses and mining. Commercial mining shall not take place east of County Road 96.

Section 10-4.502. Applications: Contents. [excerpt]

Except as provided for in Section 10-4.503 of this article, all documentation for the surface mining permit shall be submitted to the Director at one time. Ten (10) complete copies of the application shall be provided to the County. An executive summary and a table of contents shall be submitted with each application. Applications for proposed surface mining permit shall include, but shall not be limited to, the following:

(b) Site-specific technical reports, performed by qualified professionals in the appropriate area of expertise, shall provide specific proposals for inclusion in the surface mining permit to address the following potential environmental impacts:

(4) A traffic analysis to evaluate the impacts of proposed haul routes on the Levels of Service for County roads and State highways. The analysis shall evaluate specific designated truck routes and shall include an evaluation of existing road conditions for those routes to be used. The analysis shall also specify the projected number of average truck trips per year, average truck trips per day, estimated maximum truck trips on peak days, estimated number of peak days per year, and estimated months in which peak days will occur. The analysis shall include appropriate measures to reduce any significant adverse impacts to traffic flow and/or safety.

Section 10-4.505. Applications: Review.

The Director shall notify the Department in writing of any application for a surface mining permit within thirty (30) days of its being filed. The application shall also be circulated to all other agencies of jurisdiction for their review and comments in accordance with CEQA, or other applicable regulatory requirements. In addition, a notice of the filing of a reclamation plan shall be mailed to any other person with an interest in the application, who has deposited a self-addressed, stamped envelope with the Agency for the purpose of receiving a notice of the filing.

3. IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

a. Significance Criteria

The following significance criteria are based on the changes to CEQA, including Appendix G, that were adopted by the California Natural Resources Agency on December 28, 2018. [10] The following criteria are for the topic of transportation and have changed substantially relative to the previously adopted CEQA criteria that were identified in the NOP/Initial Study released in May 2017.

a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?

   The following excerpts from the Yolo County Transportation Impact Study (TIS) Guidelines[11] provide further clarification of this criterion. An impact would occur if:

   > A roadway segment or intersection operates acceptably according to Policy CI-3.1 and CI-3.2 (see Figure 1 on pages 18 and 19 above) under a no project scenario and the addition of project trips causes overall traffic operations on the facility to operate unacceptably.
   >
   > A roadway segment or intersection operates unacceptably according to Policy CI-3.1 and CI-3.2 (see Figure 1 on pages 18 and 19 above) under a no project scenario and the project adds 10 or more peak hour trips.

b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

   The following excerpts from the Yolo County TIS Guidelines provide further clarification of this criterion. An impact would occur if:

   > A project fails to provide safe accommodation of forecast truck traffic or temporary construction-related truck traffic.
   >
   > The project adds 100 daily passenger vehicle trips (or equivalent – see Section 2 Vehicle and Truck Trip Equivalencies) to an existing roadway that does not meet current County design standards (e.g., structural section, horizontal and vertical curves, lane and shoulder width, etc.)

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

For purposes of continuity, the thresholds above reflect both the prior thresholds and the new updated thresholds. The NOP/Initial Study released in May 2017 identified two additional criteria from the then current adopted CEQA criteria that were deferred to this EIR for further impact evaluation. These criteria are listed below and addressed in Impact TR-1.

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

[10] http://resources.ca.gov/ceqa/ accessed January 9, 2019.
[11] Yolo County, 2010. Transportation Impact Study (TIS) Guidelines, February

level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

b. Impacts Found Less than Significant in Initial Study

In the Initial Study, the conclusion was reached that implementation of the proposed CCAP Update would not result in significant impact for several of the significance criteria. These are summarized below.

Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks.

The CCAP Update would not result in a change in air traffic patterns as none of the updates are related to air travel. The nearest airport to the CCAP area is the Watts-Woodland Airport (a portion of which is located within the southeastern portion of the CCAP area). The CCAP Update would not result in a change in air traffic patterns as none of the updates are related to air travel. Therefore, this impact is less than significant

Result in inadequate emergency access.

The CCAP Update would not result in inadequate emergency access as, per the discussion above, the Project itself does not propose the creation of new public roadways or hazardous physical conditions that could impede emergency access. Policy CI-1.10 in the 2030 Countywide General Plan identifies I-505, SR 16 and Road 98 within or near the CCAP Update area as primary routes for emergency evacuation and requires the coordination of appropriate entities to maintain those routes for that purpose. Implementation of the CCAP Update would have a less-than-significant impact on the performance and provision of emergency access routes within the County. Moreover the aggregate industry often plays an integral role during emergency situations involving flood flows and/or emergency recovery by supplying equipment and material necessary for repair and reconstruction.

Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

The Yolo County Transportation District administers Yolobus, which provides limited daily service throughout Yolo County. Two routes, Cache Creek and Dunnigan, run on SR-16 in the vicinity of the CCAP area. According to the Yolo County Bicycle Transportation Plan, there are no existing bicycle facilities on any of the study area roadway segments. Pedestrian facilities in the vicinity of the CCAP area are limited, typically consisting of roadway shoulders. The CCAP Update does not propose changes in transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. This is a less-than-significant impact.

c. Approach

The proposed CCAP Update is comprised of a series of specific text changes to eight policy and regulatory County plans and ordinances that govern the County's activities along Lower Cache Creek. The proposed text changes that have the greatest potential to result in impacts related to transportation are identified in Table 4.11-2, located at the end of this section, and are discussed in the impact analysis below.

In order to evaluate potential impacts to transportation and county roadways, it was necessary to estimate the potential increase in vehicle trips (including haul trucks) that are expected to occur under the CCAP Update. Based on County experience with managing the CCAP program over the last 20 years, reasonable project scenarios were developed for in-channel and off-

channel projects under the CCAP Update. The types of vehicle trips that would be needed for In-channel activities were identified for a relatively large bar-skimming flood mitigation project; it was assumed that transportation of material from in-channel operations to a processing facility would occur off-road (on temporary dirt roads). Sale and distribution of the aggregate material was assumed to occur by haul truck on County roads. For off-channel activities, the primary source of new vehicle trips (i.e., truck trips) that could occur under the CCAP Update would be related to establishing new off-channel mining operations. To calculate truck trips associated with the potential new off-channel operations, total tonnage expected to be permitted was divided by typical haul truck capacity.

d. Potentially Significant Impacts

Impact TR-1: The CCAP Update could conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle lanes and pedestrian paths (LTS).

This criterion from the updated CEQA Guidelines Appendix G is as follows:

> Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle lanes and pedestrian paths

This criterion is similar to the previous Appendix G criteria considered in the 2017 Initial Study prepared for this Project (the Initial Study found these impacts to be potentially significant and indicated they would be further evaluated in the EIR):

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

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

The following discussion addresses all three of these criteria as applicable to proposed revisions to both in-channel and off-channel plans and regulations.

The applicable plan is the 2030 Countywide General Plan. The current CCAP is an adopted part of the 2030 Countywide General Plan. The analysis of transportation and circulation impacts (including cumulative conditions) that was completed for the 2030 Countywide General Plan EIR included traffic and truck trips associated with the CCAP. The 1996 CCAP and 2030 Countywide General Plan CEQA analyses evaluated potential impacts to “levels of service” (LOS) that could occur under CCAP implementation and general plan build-out. This analysis focuses on whether the proposed CCAP Update would create a conflict with the General Plan, or other applicable ordinances or policies of the County.

The applicable congestion management plan (CMP) is the Yolo County Congestion Management Program[12] (last revised in 1996). Per General Plan Policy CI-1.12 of the County General Plan, the County is committed to coordinating with the Yolo County Transportation

[12] Yolo County, revised March 1996. Congestion Management Program, 51 pages

District (YCTD) to update the CMP to ensure consistency with the County General plan policies. However, the CMP has not been updated by the YCTD since the mid-1990's. Pursuant to Policy CI-1.12, it is the County's position is that the County General Plan supersedes the older CMP and therefore consistency with the General Plan is the standard to which the project is held.

With the California Natural Resources Agency's certification and adoption of the changes to the CEQA Guidelines (as discussed above), automobile delay, as measured by "level of service" and other similar metrics, should generally no longer constitute a significant adverse impact to the transportation and circulation system under CEQA. (Pub. Resources Code, section 21099, subdivision (b)(3). While project effects on LOS are no longer considered a potential significant impact under CEQA, the Yolo County 2030 Countywide General Plan does include Policy CI-3.1 which requires that certain levels of service not be exceeded on County roadways. Under Policy CI-3.1, in no case shall proposed new projects be approved that would either result in worse than LOS C conditions, or require additional improvements to maintain the required level of service, except as specified in Policy CI-3.1. Therefore, to be consistent with the General Plan, a project must demonstrate that it will not degrade the LOS below levels specified in Policy CI-3.1.

As shown in table 4.11-1, the CCAP Update could result in an increase in vehicle trips (including heavy duty trucks) on the County roadway network.

Table 4.11-1: Vehicle Trips

	Permitted under the original CCAP (1996)			**CCAP Update (Proposed Net New Amount)**		
Factors	Off-Channel (1996)	In-Channel (1996)	**Total**	Off-Channel	In-Channel	Total
Production, millions of tons/year	6,744,141	200,000	**6,944,141**	1,200,000[a]	1,243,440	4,643,440
Truck trips, round trips/year	269,766	8,000[b]	**277,788**	48,000	0[b]	48,000

Source: Baseline Environmental Consulting, 2019 (data based on Table 3-1 from Project Description)
Notes:
a/ Includes proposed potential new mining site of one of the SGRO parcels (also includes the 20% annual maximum exceedance); proposed Shifler operation would add no new truck trips as it is assumed to replace Teichert Schwarzgruber and Teichert Esparto tonnage.

b/ No new truck trips (other than those already approved under existing mining operations would occur due to the requirements of Mitigation Measure TR-3 (see below)

The CCAP requires per Mining Ordinance Section 10-4.502 that applications for proposed new off-channel mining facilities include a traffic analysis to evaluate the impacts of proposed haul routes on the levels of service for County roads and State highways. This traffic analysis must evaluate specific designated truck routes and include an evaluation of existing road conditions for those routes to be used. If it is determined that LOS conditions would be adversely affected, then Mining Ordinance Section 10-4.407.8 (changed to Section 10-4.408 and further proposed for amendment in CCAP Update, as reflected herein, and shown in Table 4.11-2 located at the end of this section) would apply and the operator would be required to pay its fair share toward improvements required to maintain a structural capacity (traffic index) sufficient for project-related traffic and to maintain operations on County roads and State highways within the OCMP planning area consistent with applicable general plan policies related to LOS. Fair share funding

is also required to improve existing operational and structural deficiencies in the transportation system. Implementation of the applicable existing CCAP ordinances discussed above ensures ongoing consistency with the General Plan.

As a part of the CCAP Update modifications to Section 10-4.419 (Haul Roads) are also proposed (Table 4.11-2, at the end of this section) to clarify that operators may only haul on an approved haul route, unless making a local delivery. The CCAP Update would not conflict with plans, ordinances or policies addressing the circulation system; does not propose changes in the transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities and would therefore have a less-than-significant impact related to policy conflicts.(LTS)

Impact TR-2: The Project would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b) (S).

CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3 was added December 28, 2018 to address the determination of significance for transportation impacts. Pursuant to Subsection (c) this threshold becomes effective July 1, 2020 and may affect future projects implemented pursuant to the CCAP. Like other jurisdictions throughout the state the County must review and potentially amend its General Plan and Transportation Impact Study Guidelines to ensure consistency with this new requirement. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 subsection (b) identifies four criteria for analyzing the transportation impacts of a project, each of which is discussed below:

Section 15064.3(b)(1) Land Use Projects – The proposed Project is a set of proposed updates to various plans, policies, and regulations being implemented by the County as part of the CCAP. As such it does not clearly fall within this category of “land use projects” but the projects regulated under the CCAP Update would generally be considered “land use projects”. This section describes that projects with specified proximity to “major” or “high quality” transit should be presumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact. The unincorporated area of Yolo County does not have transit service that meets these criteria and therefore this presumption would not apply to projects regulated under the proposed CCAP Update. This section also describes that projects which would decrease VMT in the Project area as compared to existing conditions should also be presumed to have a less than significant effect. The CCRMP projects that would be regulated under the CCAP Update fall within this criterion (as described below) subject to Mitigation Measure TR-3 and potential transportation impacts would be less than significant. Mitigation Measure TR-3 ensures that there would be no expansion of operations or employees for the purposes of processing the in-channel extractions. The OCMP projects that would be regulated under the CCAP Update would likely not fall within this criterion (as described below), and may result in increased VMT. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-2 provides appropriate assurance this potential effect will be addressed at a project-level with subsequent environmental impact review.

Section 15064.3(b)(2) Transportation Projects -- The proposed Project is a set of proposed updates to various plans, policies, and regulations being implemented by the County as part of the CCAP. As such it does not fall within this category of “transportation projects” and this section does not apply.

Section 15064.3(b)(3) Qualitative Analysis – This section explains that there may be conditions under which a qualitative rather than quantitative analysis is of VMT is appropriate. This will be applicable to analysis of impacts of future off-channel mining undertaken pursuant to Mitigation Measure TR-2. This would not apply to in-channel activities pursuant to Mitigation Measure TR-3.

Section 15064.3(b)(4) Methodology – This section explains that the County has discretion to choose the most appropriate methodology to evaluate VMT subject to other applicable standards such as CEQA Guidelines Section 15151. Future project will be subject to the County's direction in this regard.

In support of this new CEQA Guideline, the Governor's Office of Planning and Research has issued a *Technical Advisory On Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA* (December 2018). The Technical Advisory outlines recommended procedures and methods for evaluating transportation impacts for residential, office, and retail projects. However, it does not offer guidance for a programmatic project like the subject CCAP Update which modifies a regional aggregate mining program. Residential, office, and retail land uses, which are the focus of the Technical Advisory, are governed by the County General Plan (2009) with which the CCAP is consistent and supportive.

The Technical Advisory notes by way of background (page 2) that there are three primary ways of reducing GHG emissions for the transportation sector: increasing vehicle efficiency, reducing fuel carbon content, and reducing the amount of vehicle travel. Local jurisdictions are not able to influence or control the first two, but through careful land use planning local governments can ensure reductions in vehicle travel. The Advisory highlights the relationship between reduction of VMT and reduction of GHG emissions, which is a key component of SB 743.

Minimization of aggregate truck trips is a fundamental consideration in implementation of the CCAP. By ensuring a local source of aggregate, Yolo has maximized the opportunity to reduce mining truck traffic in the County. Operators as well have a strong incentive to maximize efficiency because transportation costs add significantly to the price of aggregate thus affecting marketability. The CCAP, including the proposed Update, is consistent with the goal of reduction of aggregate truck trips and does not hinder or conflict with efforts to achieve regional and statewide GHG reductions. The CCAP including the Update is also consistent with State policy and regulations regarding aggregate resources including ensuring availability of important mineral resources, minimizing environmental impacts from mining, and ensuring reclamation of mined lands to a usable condition.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(a) states, "For the purposes of this section, 'vehicle miles traveled' refers to the amount and distance of automobile travel attributable to a project." Here, the term "automobile" refers to on-road passenger vehicles, specifically cars and light trucks. The Technical Advisory goes on to suggest that heavy-duty truck VMT could be included for modeling convenience and ease of calculation. Mitigation Measure TR-2 below identifies this as a new requirement for project-level EIRs on future mining applications.

In support of state policy, and the recommendations of the Technical Advisory, the CCAP ensures a local source of aggregate for local construction projects that would otherwise be transported from greater distances, and thereby reduces the distance trucks must travel to deliver product to regional sites. It also establishes stringent local regulations governing the extraction of that aggregate, which exceed the rigor of the otherwise applicable requirements of the State Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA) and result in net public benefits in addition to the availability of the mined aggregate resources. Overall the CCAP provides a "travel efficient" program for aggregate resources serving the region while recognizing that unlike most urban land uses which fundamentally can be located anywhere, resource-based land uses are limited to locations where the resource exists.

Proposed Revisions to In-Channel Plans and Regulations

Truck traffic and vehicle trips associated with in-channel projects and activities would generate VMT. Implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-3 below would ensure that substantially no new trips other than those already approved under existing mining operations would occur.

Proposed Revisions to Off-Channel Plans and Regulations

Truck traffic and vehicle trips associated with off-channel projects and activities would generate VMT. Implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-2 below would ensure appropriate project-level analysis and mitigation.

> **Mitigation Measure TR-2**: Modify Section 10-4.502(b)(4) of the Mining Ordinance as follows:
>
> (4) A transportation impact ~~traffic~~ analysis to evaluate the impacts of the proposed operation on haul routes and other impacted county roads (if any) pursuant to Secs. 10-4.408 and 10-4.409 of the Mining Ordinance, and the County General Plan. ~~on the Levels of Service for County roads and State highways.~~ The analysis shall evaluate operations, safety, and truck and vehicle VMT (as required to ensure compliance with the CCAP and County General Plan). ~~specific designated truck routes and~~ The analysis shall satisfy the requirements of the County's Transportation Impact Study Guidelines and shall include an evaluation of existing road conditions for those routes to be used, as well as any other information necessary to demonstrate compliance with applicable county and State standards. The analysis shall also specify the projected number of average truck trips per year, average truck trips per day, estimated maximum truck trips on peak days, estimated number of peak days per year, and estimated months in which peak days will occur. The analysis shall identify mitigation measures such as capital improvements and maintenance to be undertaken by the applicant ~~include appropriate measures~~ to reduce direct and indirect ~~any~~ significant adverse impacts to traffic flow and/or safety to acceptable levels consistent with applicable LOS, VMT, pavement condition, and other thresholds in the Yolo County General Plan and County Transportation Impact Study Guidelines;

This mitigation measure would ensure that truck and vehicular trips associated with off-channel mining operations truck traffic on the County roadway network would be disclosed, analyzed, and mitigated consistent with state and local requirements. Because a framework to minimize transportation and traffic impacts to acceptable levels and ensure consistency with state and local thresholds is integrated into the CCAP as a requirement of future projects, this will ensure that future projects will be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, this potential impact would be less than significant after mitigation. (LTS)

Impact TR-3: The CCAP Update could substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) (S)

The CCAP and CCAP Update guide and regulate in-channel restoration activities and off-channel mining operations. The CCAP Update could result in an annual increase in future truck trips (related to the increase in allowed tonnage removed from in-channel and new off-channel mining operations and facilities) and would extend the time horizon for the CCAP program. As shown on Table 4.11-1, over the entire CCAP area the projected annual increase in future truck trips over the number of permitted 1996 CCAP truck trips is approximately 48,000 additional round trips (Table 4.11-1) per year. This is a conservative estimate/assumption (i.e., the actual yearly roundtrips will likely be lower) as it assumes that aggregate tonnage removal and mining

associated with all areas of the CCAP program are experienced immediately and all at once which is not likely to happen, and maximized, including:

- The maximum amount of aggregate material associated with in-channel restoration and stabilization projects is removed in a given year. As described in Section 3.0 of this Draft EIR (see subsection In-Channel CCRMP Projects), future in-channel projects would be limited to the removal and processing of an average annual tonnage of 690,800 tons and an occasional maximum annual tonnage of 1,381,600 from the Cache Creek channel; and

- All existing approved off-channel mining operations[13] are mining, processing, and distributing their maximum annual permit allotments;

- The addition of new area (1,188 acres) to the OCMP planning area and rezoning this land SGRO would allow future mining that was not evaluated in the original OCMP and OCMP EIR. This would be in addition to 1,001 acres of land currently zoned SGRO for future mining. This analysis assumes one new mining operation is established and is operating and full capacity (assumed to be 1.2 million tons per year); and

- The tonnage associated with a new mining permit application (i.e., Teichert Shifler) which was recently received by the County (and is currently under review).

Proposed Revisions to In-Channel Plans and Regulations

As described in Chapter 3.0 Project Description, CCAP Update in-channel projects are limited to those that: maintain flood flow capacity; protect existing structures, infrastructure, and/or farmland; minimize bank erosion; implement the Channel Form Template; enhance creek stability; establish riparian vegetation; and/or result in recreation and open space uses consistent with the Parkway Plan. Per the revision to the CCRMP noted above in Table 4.11-2, located at the end of this section, the CCAP Update Project generally allows for the removal and processing of a maximum allowable tonnage (690,800 tons, and occasionally up to 1,381,600 tons) in one year from the Cache Creek channel, an increase from the 210,000 tons currently permitted.

The most likely entity to implement an in-channel restoration or stabilization project is one of the existing aggregate operators. In which case, the in-channel site would be accessed from the existing mining/processing facility via non-public haul roads and the removed raw aggregate material would be transported via these non-public roads to the existing processing plant. Consistent with In-Channel Ordinance Section 10-3.413 (see Table 4.11-2, located at the end of this section), the material would be processed and distributed to end users in a manner similar to the aggregate material excavated at an existing permitted off-channel mining operation (i.e., only at an approved off-channel plant facility, and no new plant facilities shall be established for the purposes of processing in-channel materials).

Consistent with In-Channel Ordinance Section 10-3.409(d) (as modified by the CCAP Update, see Table 4.11-2, located at the end of this section), the material that is processed and distributed to end users would be excluded from the tonnage allocation assigned to each off-channel operator. This material must be processed in an existing aggregate processing facility[14] Therefore, unless constrained or limited in some way, an operator could produce their full

[13] CEMEX, Granite Capay, Granite Esparto, Granite Woodland, Teichert Woodland, and Syar.

[14] Per Sec.10-3.413. Processing Prohibition of the In-Channel Ordinance, processing of in-channel excavated material shall occur only at approved off-channel plant facilities. No new plant facilities shall be established for the purposes of processing in-channel materials.

annual tonnage allocation from the off-channel mine and remove, process, and distribute additional material from within the channel. The combined off-channel and in-channel production could result in a substantial increase in truck traffic on the roadway network that was not evaluated in the project-level CEQA analysis and transportation study for that particular facility. This increase in truck traffic could exacerbate roadway deterioration conditions and may conflict with General Plan Policy CI-3.1 regarding maintenance of LOS. This is a potentially significant impact and requires mitigation. The following mitigation measure shall be implemented to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

> **Mitigation Measure TR-3a:** The text of Section 10.3.409 of the In-Channel Ordinance shall be amended to include the following:
>
> (f) Unless a subsequent environmental impact assessment is completed or a determination is made that a subsequent environmental impact assessment is not necessary, the combined volume of aggregate material removed from in-channel and off-channel sources that is transported on the County roadway network in any given year shall not exceed the annual allocation assigned to the applicable off-channel operator (as specified in their approved mining permit).

This mitigation measure would ensure that truck traffic on the County roadway network would not exceed the level that has already been reviewed under CEQA and approved by the County. Therefore, this potential impact would be less than significant after mitigation. (LTS)

Proposed Revisions to Off-Channel Plans and Regulations

The projected increase in future CCAP Update annual truck trips related to potential new off-channel mining operations is conservatively projected to be up to 48,000 new truck trips per year. These additional truck trips could exacerbate hazardous conditions on existing roadways that do not meet current design standards and could result in roadway safety concerns. Additionally, due to the addition of proposed future mining sites, current mining truck traffic patterns on local county roads may change slightly as a result of the proposed CCAP Update.

There are existing substandard sections of roadways in the CCAP Update area. Policies, plans and programs have been identified in various approved County documents as described below, to address some of those sections. Policy CI-3.10 in the 2030 Countywide General Plan addresses these conditions by specifying the need to upgrade the existing County road system, with an emphasis on trucking corridors, to be consistent with current County design standards as transportation funding allows. Policy CI-3.9 requires that to the greatest feasible extent, new development is required to construct safety improvements consistent with current design standards on existing roadways that are anticipated to accommodate additional traffic from planned development.

In addition, the Mining Ordinance (Secs. 10-4.402, 10-4.408, and 10-4.409, shown on Table 4.11-2, located at the end of this section) includes requirements that operators address potential roadway hazards and assume roadway maintenance responsibilities.

> Section 10-4.402. Access Roads. Requires operators to satisfactorily surface (e.g. pave) their onsite access roads within 100 feet of any intersection with a County maintained road, construct their intersection approach to County standards, and install traffic control and warning signage.
>
> Section 10-4.408. County Road Improvements. Requires operators to pay for road improvements necessary to support their operation consistent with County and CCAP standards including operations, maintenance, and structural capacity. Operators are

required to ufund these improvements, with the opportunity for reimbursement from other uses for amounts in excess of fair share. The County is to update the program every other year to ensure that new or changing impacts are addressed and to account for new funding sources if any.

Section 10-4.409. County Road Maintenance. Requires the operator to assume joint pavement maintenance responsibility for all roads along their designated haul route, from the point of access onto a County road to a State Highway.

Enforcement of these existing regulations will ensure that aggregate operators fully mitigate for impacts to County roads. The County has experienced complaints from residents in prior years related to truck traffic traveling on CR 13/14 as a short cut between between I-505 and I-5. This appears to be primarily a matter of compliance and enforcement as the CCAP, including the proposed Update, provides the regulations necessary to ensure full mitigation for impacts to County roadways. Mitigation Measure TR-3b below is recommended to clarify Section 10-4.419 related to designated haul routes:

Mitigation Measure TR-3b: Make the following modifications to identified sections of the County Mining and Reclamation Ordinances:

Section 10-4.212/10-5.212. Haul road.

"Haul road" or “route” shall mean: 1) a road along which material is transported from the area of excavation to the processing plant or stock pile area of the surface mining operation; and/or 2) the designated route aggregate trucks are authorized to take pursuant to Section 10-4.419.

Section 10-4.419. Haul route roads.

~~An operator may only haul on~~Trucks accessing a mining site to pick up a load, or leaving a mining site to deliver a load, are restricted to the approved/designated haul routes identified in the operator’s permit which applies to the route taken from the mining site access/driveway to a state /federal highway. If a truck subsequently exists the state/federal highway while within Yolo County, this too may only occur on an approved/designate haul route. This applies to all truck trips serving the mining site, unless making a local delivery. Those portions of designated truck haul routes that include County-maintained roads shall be posted as such, in accordance with the Public Works Department, to facilitate law enforcement and public safety. Private truck haul routes or conveyors shall be used to transport material within the mining site, in order to reduce impacts to public roads.

Compliance with these requirements and mitigation, will ensure that existing and future off-channel mining projects would not create new hazardous physical conditions (e.g., the deterioration of roadway pavement that could cause unsafe driving conditions). The CCAP Update area and environs are in a rural area of Yolo County characterized by agriculture and mining uses, both of which require truck trips. Mining and agriculture are considered compatible uses such that the proximity of these uses to one another would not create or exacerbate hazardous conditions on local roadways. Additionally, Mining Ordinance Section 10-4.429(h) requires a 2,000-foot setback for mining operations from local communities which would also serve to reduce hazards associated with incompatible uses.

While the policies and regulations listed above will reduce potential adverse effects related to increases in hazardous roadway conditions, there could be some site specific design, safety, or incompatible use issues associated with individual mining projects. As required by State law and Mining Ordinance Section 10-4.505, new proposed mining operations that could be located in the "Future Proposed Mining" areas shown on Figure 3-4 would be subject to project-level CEQA review.

In conjunction with implementation of the 2030 Countywide General Plan policies, and the existing CCAP ordinances identified above, the potential effects on the transportation system of an increase in truck trips associated ingress and egress from facilities, and truck haul routes would be assessed based on site specific transportation system characteristics and conditions. Requirements for fair share contributions to roadway improvements, design requirements for egress/ingress or improved safety or other measures are already a required component of the CCAP, are incorporated into existing mining permits, and would be incorporated into any future approved mining operations as conditions of approval as appropriate. Implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-3b and the requirements of existing policies and regulations, will ensure that impacts associated with a potential substantial increase in hazardous conditions resulting from implementation of the CCAP Update are less than significant. (LTS)

Table 4.11-2: Proposed CCAP Updates Related to Transportation

TRANSPORTATION	
	CCAP DOCUMENT CHANGE
Changes to Horizon Year of Plans	
CCRMP (page 14)) and OCMP (page 17)	Horizon Year The horizon year for this plan is 2068. Similar to the use of this term in other long-range planning efforts, this reflects how far into the future the plan guidance extends. It also defines the period for consideration of cumulative effects for purposes of environmental impact analysis.
Change in the Amount of Material that Can Be Removed from the Channel in a Given Year	
CCRMP (page 34)	Based on the analysis conducted for the 2017 Technical Studies, between 1996 and 2011, an average of approximately 690,800 tons per year of sediment was actually deposited in the CCRMP area, of which 156,400 tons is estimated to be sand and gravel and 534,400 is estimated to be fines. This estimate of deposition was calculated by comparing topographic maps of Cache Creek in 1996 and 2011. It differs significantly from the original estimate in that it appears much more fine sediment is depositing in Lower Cache Creek than originally predicted. ~~in-stream excavation of sand and gravel has averaged some two million tons, however, which has resulted in a cumulative deficit of nearly 80 million tons since mining intensified in the 1950s. At the natural rate of replacement it would take over 500 year to replenish the material removed~~. ~~In addition, gravel bar skimming disturbs the formation or armor materials and removes riparian vegetation that allow the channel to readjust, thus increasing the potential for erosion.~~ While it is unclear whether the current rate of deposition will continue into the future, it appears likely that at least some portions of Cache Creek are recovering faster than expected in 1996. Based on this information, the cap for in-channel extraction for maintenance purposes should be increased from 210,000 tons annually on average to 690,800 tons annually on average to reflect actual conditions. In addition, in recognition that the creek may in reality deposit no tonnage in a given year or double the tonnage in another (depending on flow conditions) the cap shall be based on the annual average deposition since the last prior year that extraction occurred, not to exceed 690,800 tons annually.
Increase in Potential Off-Channel Mining Area	
OCMP (page 15)	**Planning Area for OCMP and CCRMP~~The Cache Creek Resources Management Plan~~** The planning area for the OCMP is defined as the area contained within the Mineral Resource Zones (28,130 acres), minus the planning~~in-channel~~ area regulated under the CCRMP (2,266 acres), or a total of 25,864 acres (see Figure 4). Within the OCMP planning area, 1,900 acres are currently approved for excavation which is a subset of the 2,464-acre total for all approved mine sites (area zoned Sand and Gravel Overlay or SGO), 1,001 acres are zoned currently to allow for future mining (Sand and Gravel Reserve Overlay or SGRO), and another 1,188 acres are proposed to be rezoned for future mining, as described below. The planning area for the CCRMP is equal to the active in-channel area of the creek system, as defined by the delineated~~present~~ channel bank

	line or the 100-year flood elevation, ~~described in the Westside Tributaries Study prepared by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers,~~ whichever is wider ~~(see Figure 3)~~ modified as described in the CCRMP . The in-channel area encompasses 5,109~~around 4,956~~ acres, including 2,266~~1,600~~ acres within the CCRMP~~present channel~~ boundary, plus several thousand acres located in the floodplain north of the City of Woodland (see Figure 3). ~~Subtracting this acreage from the 28,130 acres included in the State MRZs, leaves a total of approximately 23,174 acres within the planning area of the Off-Channel Mining Plan. As described in the following section, however, only 2,887 acres of the plan area are proposed to be rezoned to allow for off-channel mining over the next fifty years, or about 12 percent of the OCMP planning area.~~
Off-Channel Surface Mining Ordinance (page 9)	**Sec. 10-4.40~~7.~~8 County road improvements.** It is the intent of this program that each operator shall pay for any road improvements determined to be necessary to support their operation consistent with County and CCAP standards, and for ongoing operations and maintenance. Each operator shall pay its fair share toward improvements required to maintain a structural capacity (traffic index) sufficient for the project traffic and to maintain ~~Level of Service (LOS) "C"~~ operations on County roads ~~of LOS "D" operations~~ and on State Highways within the OCMP planning area consistent with applicable General Plan policies related to LOS and VMT. Fair share mitigation shall also be required to improve existing operational as well as structural deficiencies of the transportation system. Specific locations shall be identified through the project-specific environmental review process for each operator's long-term mining permit application. Each operator shall participate in a funding program operated by the County which is designed to ensure that all improvements are made in a timely manner and that a reimbursement mechanism is in place to ensure repayment of any costs contributed in excess of fair share amounts. The program shall be initiated upon the approval of the long-term mining permits and shall be updated biennially by the County to ensure any new or modified impacts or funding sources are being addressed. Each operator shall have the option to complete the work at their expense without triggering the competitive bid process, as long as they comply with the applicable legal requirements of the County. If the operator declines the option, the County shall utilize the competitive bid process.
Off-Channel Surface Mining Ordinance (page 9)	**Sec. 10-4.409. County road maintenance.** The operator shall agree to assume joint pavement maintenance responsibility with the County (or shared with another producer using the same roadway) for all County roads along a designated haul route from the access point of the surface mining operation to an appropriate State Highway. The County will provide maintenance of the county-maintained roadside drainage ditches, traffic signs, and striping. By May 15 of each year, the operator shall submit to the County an annual evaluation report documenting the structural integrity of the pavement structural section and the PCI of the roads maintained by the operator. The annual report shall be signed and sealed by a civil engineer licensed in the State of California. The report shall contain a proposed action plan for pavement maintenance and pavement improvements to maintain safe and efficient traffic operation on the roads, and a PCI of 70 or

	more, unless otherwise agreed by the County, as defined by American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Method D6433 (Standard Practice for Roads and Parking Lots Pavement Condition Index Survey), for each upcoming year. Within 30 days, the County will review the report and recommend revisions if necessary. Following acceptance of the report by the County, the operator shall secure a County encroachment permit specific to the action plan (at no cost to the operator) and complete the proposed pavement maintenance and improvement activities prior to the submittal of the annual report. Striping may be provided by the County if County striping equipment and material are available. Otherwise striping will be provided by the operator. Once the work is completed, the operator will resubmit the annual evaluation report by November 1st each year, and include the scope and dates that work was completed. ~~The operator shall agree to submit an evaluation of the structural integrity of the identified roadways on or before December 1 of each year in which mining operations are permitted. The report shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer and/or County staff with expertise in the area of roadway pavement and shall be subject to the approval of the Public Works Department. Based on the results of this annual evaluation, the Public Works Department shall identify the improvements required to maintain safe and efficient traffic operations on the road for the upcoming year. The County agrees to implement maintenance improvements similar to other County roads (i.e. fill cracks and chip seal). The operator agrees to implement the improvements beyond the typical County improvements in a timeframe set forth by the Public Works Department.~~ If minor emergency asphalt repairs (work requiring a single pick-up truck with asphalt patching material) are identified within the maintenance areas of the hauling routes after the Applicant's yearly maintenance has been completed, county crews will perform the minor asphalt repair maintenance once in a sixty (60) consecutive day period. The types of asphalt pavement failures requiring repairs include, but are not limited to, cracking, pot holes, depressions, rutting, shoving, upheaval, and raveling and any other pavement damage or failures requiring immediate repair by the county. If major emergency roadway repairs associated with the permitted activities (work requiring more than a single pick-up truck with asphalt patching material, or minor asphalt repairs occurring in less than the sixty (60) consecutive day period) are identified after the Applicant's yearly maintenance has been completed, the Applicant shall obtain a County encroachment permit (at no cost to Applicant) and complete the major roadway repairs. If major roadway repairs that are the Applicant's fair share obligation are not completed by the Applicant in a timely manner as determined by the County, and the County must make repairs when the public's safety is considered at risk by the County Engineer, then the Applicant will be billed for the County's major roadway repair work on a time and materials basis. The operator does not assume the liability for the roadway, except for cases where the operator has not fulfilled its maintenance obligations. If a subsequent mining operation utilizes a road previously

	required to be improved pursuant to this subsection, then the subsequent operator shall be responsible for compliance with the agreements and requirements of the previous operator.
Off-Channel Surface Mining Ordinance (page 17)	**Section 10-4.419. Haul roads.** An operator may only haul on the approved haul routes identified in their permit, and must remain on State Routes thereafter within Yolo County, unless making a local delivery. Those portions of designated truck haul routes that include County-maintained roads shall be posted as such, in accordance with the Public Works Department, to facilitate law enforcement and public safety. Private truck haul routes or conveyors shall be used to transport material within the mining site, in order to reduce impacts to public roads.
Off-Channel Surface Mining Ordinance (page 21)	**Sec. 10-4.429. Setbacks.** All off-channel surface mining operations shall comply with the following setbacks: (a) New processing plants and material stockpiles shall be located a minimum of one-thousand (1,000) feet from public rights-of-way, public recreation areas, and/or off-site residences, unless alternate measures to reduce potential noise, dust, and aesthetic impacts are developed and implemented; (b) Soil stockpiles shall be located a minimum of five-hundred (500) feet from public rights-of-way, public recreation areas, and off-site residences, unless alternate measures to reduce potential dust and aesthetic impacts are developed and implemented; (c) Off-channel excavations shall maintain a minimum one-thousand (1,000) foot setback from public rights-of-way and adjacent property lines of off-site residences, unless a landscaped buffer is provided or site-specific characteristics reduce potential aesthetic impacts. Where landscaped buffers are proposed, the setback for off-channel excavations may be reduced to a minimum of fifty (50) feet from either the property line or the adjoining right-of-way, whichever is greater. Where mining occurs within one-thousand (1,000) feet of a public right-of-way, operators shall phase mining such that no more than fifty (50) acres of the area that lies within one-thousand (1,000) feet of the right-of-way would be actively disturbed at any time, except where operations are adequately screened from public view. Where adequate screening exists in the form of mature vegetation and/or constructed berms that effectively block public views, the area of active disturbance within one-thousand (1,000) feet of the right-of-way shall not exceed the area that is screened by more than fifty (50) acres at any one time. Actively disturbed areas are defined as those on which mining operations of any kind, or the implementation of reclamation such as grading, seeding, or installation of plant material are taking place. (d) Off-channel excavations shall provide a minimum 50-foot setback from the neighboring property line to allow for access around the pit during mining and after reclamation for maintenance, safety, and other purposes. (ed) Proposed off-channel excavations located within the streamway influence zoneboundary shall be set back a minimum of seven-hundred (700) feet from the existing channel bank, unless it is demonstrated that a smaller distance will not adversely affect channel stability. Under no circumstances should off-channel

	excavations be located within 200 feet of the existing channel bank. ~~The evaluation~~Evaluations of proposed off-channel excavations within 700 feet of the ~~potential for adverse effects of~~channel bank ~~erosion or failure of the land separating pits located less than seven hundred (700) feet from the active channel~~ shall ~~address~~demonstrate, at a minimum, the following: (1) The two-hundred (200) foot setback area ~~shall~~does not include portions of the ~~former historic~~historically active ~~floodplain or~~channel. (2)The two-hundred (200) foot setback area does not include formerly mined lands separated from the active channel by levees or unmined areas less than two-hundred (200) feet wide (measured perpendicular to the active channel). (2) Identification of the former historic positions of the Cache Creek channels as delineated in the CCRMP Technical Studies, and determination if the proposed project is located within the limits of the historic channel. (3) ~~Description of current~~Acceptable channel hydraulic conditions (based on existing or site-specific hydraulic models) for the Cache Creek channel adjacent to the site and extending not less than one-thousand (1,000) feet upstream and downstream of the site. ~~(4) Determination~~Acceptable level of ~~the~~ erosion potential of the ~~stream~~channel bank adjacent to the site ~~made~~based on ~~the basis of~~predicted stream flow velocity and ~~estimated~~ shear stress on bank materials during ~~100~~a 100-year ~~flood flows~~flow and ~~historic~~historical patterns of erosion. ~~(5) Analytical~~Acceptable level of stability of the slopes separating the mining area from the creek channel based on an analytical slope stability analysis in conformance with Sections 10-4.426 and 10-5.517 of this title~~. The analysis of the slopes separating the mining area from the creek channel shall include~~ that includes evaluation of stability conditions during 100-year ~~flood~~peak flows in the channel. (6) ~~Future proposed~~Appropriate bank stabilization designs, if ~~recommended, shall not conflict~~needed, consistent with channel design recommendations of the Cache Creek Resource Management Plan ~~unless~~or approved by the Technical Advisory Committee. (7) The condition of flood protection structures and the integrity of the land within the approved setback zone separating the mining areas and the channel shall be inspected annually by a Registered Civil Engineer and reported to the Director. The annual report shall include recommendations for remedial action for identified erosion problems (see also Reclamation Ordinance Section 10-5.506) Approval of any off-channel mining project located within seven-hundred (700) feet of the existing channel bank shall be contingent upon an enforceable agreement which requires the project operator to participate in the completion of identified channel improvement projects along the frontage of their property, consistent with the CCRMP and CCIP, including implementation of the Channel Form Template. The agreement shall require that the operator provide a bond or other financial instrument for maintenance during the mining and reclamation period of any bank stabilization features required of the mining project. The agreement

	shall also require that a deed restriction be placed on the underlying property which requires maintenance of the streambank protection by future owners of the property. Maintenance of the bank stabilization features following completion of reclamation shall be the responsibility of the property owner. (f) Off-channel excavations shall be set back a minimum of twenty-five (25) feet from riparian vegetation; and (g) Recreational facilities shall be located a minimum of one-hundred and fifty (150) feet from private dwellings, with a landscaped buffer provided to reduce noise and maintain privacy, unless the dwelling is proposed to be an integral component of the recreational facility. (h) No mining activities shall occur within two-thousand (2,000) feet of the community boundaries of Capay, Esparto, Madison, Woodland, and/or Yolo. This setback may be reduced by up to five-hundred (500) feet when existing mature vegetation, proposed landscape buffers of a sufficient height and density to create a visual buffer (consisting of native species and fence-row habitat appropriate to the area), or other site-specific characteristics reduce potential incompatibilities between urban land uses and mining. Commercial mining shall not take place east of County Road 96.
Off-Channel Surface Mining Ordinance (page 25)	**Section 10-4.502 Applications: Contents.** Except as provided for in Section 10-4.503 of this article, all documentation for the surface mining permit shall be submitted to the Director at one time. Ten (10) complete paper copies of the application, and one electronic version, shall be provided to the County. An executive summary and a table of contents shall be submitted with each application. Applications for proposed surface mining permit shall include, but shall not be limited to, the following: (b) Site-specific technical reports, performed by qualified professionals in the appropriate area of expertise, shall provide specific proposals for inclusion in the surface mining permit to address the following potential environmental impacts: (4) A traffic analysis to evaluate the impacts of proposed haul routes on the Levels of Service for County roads and State highways. The analysis shall evaluate specific designated truck routes and shall include an evaluation of existing road conditions for those routes to be used. The analysis shall also specify the projected number of average truck trips per year, average truck trips per day, estimated maximum truck trips on peak days, estimated number of peak days per year, and estimated months in which peak days will occur. The analysis shall include appropriate measures to reduce any significant adverse impacts to traffic flow and/or safety;
Soil on Reclaimed Land	
Reclamation Ordinance (page 17)	**Sec. 10-5.532. Use of overburden and fine sediments in reclamation.** Sediment fines associated with processed in-channel aggregate deposits (excavated as a result of maintenance activities performed in compliance with the CCIP) ~~shall not~~may be used in the backfill or reclamation of off-channel permanent lakes where it can be demonstrated that no detrimental sediment toxicity exists (including unacceptable levels of mercury), and where fines will not reduce the porosity of the permanent lake in an adverse way. Fines that result from the processing of in-channel sand and gravel

	shall not be used for in-channel reshaping or habitat restoration efforts or as soil amendments in agricultural fields. Overburden and processing fines shall be used whenever possible to support reclamation activities around reclaimed wet pits. These materials may be used in reclamation activities without testing for agricultural chemicals. If topsoil (A-horizon soil), formerly in agricultural production, is proposed for use within the drainage area of a wet pit, the soils must be sampled prior to placement and analyzed for pesticides and herbicides (EPA 8140 and 8150). Samples shall be collected and analyzed in accordance with EPA Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste Physical/Chemical Methods, SW-846, Third Edition (as updated). Topsoil that contains pesticides or herbicides above the Maximum Contaminant Levels for primary drinking water (California Code of Regulations) shall not be placed in areas that drain to the wet pits. Land reclaimed to a subsequent use that includes planting of vegetation (e.g., agriculture, habitat) shall be provided an adequate soil profile (i.e., depth and texture of soil) to ensure successful reclamation. Proposed soil profiles associated with specific proposed reclamations plans shall be subject to expert review and evaluation during the CEQA process for that project. If the project is not subject to additional CEQA review, at the discretion of the County, the proposed reclamation plan for the project may be peer reviewed by an appropriate expert/professional, and recommendations, if any, shall be incorporated into the project as conditions of approval.