

**Addendum to the
2001 San Luis Obispo County Regional Transportation Plan
Environmental Impact Report**

State Clearinghouse
No. 2001021031

Prepared by
San Luis Obispo Council of Governments

April 6, 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
	Purpose of an Addendum to an EIR	1
	Organization of the Document.....	2
	Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigations	3
2.	INTRODUCTION	56
	Background	56
	Update to the 2001 Regional Transportation Plan	56
	Determination to Prepare Addendum to 2001 RTP EIR	58
3.	REVISIONS TO IMPACT ANALYSIS	58
	4.1 Transportation	59
	4.2 Land Use and Agriculture	59
	4.3 Air Quality	59
	4.4 Noise	59
	4.5 Aesthetics.....	60
	4.6 Water Resources	60
	4.7 Geology.....	60
	4.8 Biological Resources	60
	4.9 Cultural Resources	60
4.	ALTERNATIVES	60
5.	CEQA-REQUIRED CONCLUSIONS	60

Note:

In the *Revisions to Impact Analysis* chapter of this Addendum, the sections and figures are numbered as in the 2001 RTP EIR (e.g., Section 4.3.5 Air Quality)

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PURPOSE OF AN ADDENDUM TO AN EIR

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) permits a lead agency or responsible agency to prepare an Addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions triggering a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR have occurred. The Addendum to the EIR contains only minor changes and additions necessary to make the previous EIR adequate, and the changes made by the addendum do not raise important new issues about the significant effects on the environment.

The San Luis Obispo Council of Governments (SLOCOG) prepared and certified an EIR for the 2001 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) on December 5th 2001. This Addendum is being prepared because minor changes or additions are necessary to the 2001 RTP EIR to address the proposed Update (Vision 2025) to the 2001 RTP. However, changes made by this Addendum do not bring out any new issues or new significant regional adverse environmental impacts resulting from the proposed Update (Vision 2025) to the 2001 RTP.

The attached Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (Table ES-1), which remains unchanged from the 2001 RTP EIR, contains a review of the potential significant regional impacts of the RTP program, and the measures recommended to mitigate those impacts.

The proposed Update (Vision 2025) to the 2001 RTP largely consists of changes to the plan's format, update of financial information, preparation of a revised public transit element, and adding 5 new projects to the 2001 RTP;

- Tank Farm Road Safety and Operational Improvements (SLO Co.)
- Ramona Park Streetscape Improvements (Grover Beach)
- Main St. San Jacinto Intersection Imps. (Morro Bay)
- Main St./Radcliff Intersection Imps. (Morro Bay)
- Atascadero Transit Center (Atascadero)

ORGANIZATION OF THE DOCUMENT

This Addendum to the 2001 RTP EIR contains the following sections and contents:

SECTION	CONTENTS
1. Executive Summary	Briefly explains the purpose of an addendum, and outlines the organization of this document. Provides a Summary of Impacts and Mitigations. This Summary of Impacts and Mitigations remains unchanged from the 2001 RTP EIR.
2. Introduction	Introduces the Addendum to the 2001 RTP EIR, describes the Updates to the RTP, and briefly explains the decision not to prepare a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR.
3. Revisions to Impact Analysis	Highlights minor technical changes or additions to the 2001 RTP EIR analysis to account for the proposed Update to the RTP. The impact analysis set forth by the 2001 RTP EIR remains unchanged by this Addendum unless noted.
4. Alternatives	Reviews the alternatives analysis from the 2001 RTP EIR and its applicability to the proposed Update to the RTP. The Alternatives Analysis set forth by the 2001 RTP EIR remains unchanged by this Addendum.
5. CEQA-Required Findings	Assesses the impact of the RTP project in several subject areas specifically required by CEQA. The CEQA-Required Findings set forth by the 2001 RTP EIR remain unchanged by this Addendum.

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Table ES-1 identifies the summary of impacts and mitigations. **This Summary remains unchanged from the 2001 RTP EIR.** Impacts are organized by classes. Class A impacts are defined as significant, unavoidable adverse impacts which require a statement of overriding considerations to be issued pursuant to Section 15093 of the *State CEQA Guidelines* if the Project is approved. Class B impacts are significant adverse impacts that can be feasibly mitigated to less than significant levels and which require findings to be made under Section 15091 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*. Class C are considered less than significant impacts, and Class D are beneficial impacts.

Table ES-1. Summary of Potential Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

CLASS A IMPACTS		
LAND USE AND AGRICULTURE		
Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<p>LU-4. Some RTP projects could convert agricultural lands to transportation infrastructure. Although the actual level of impact from individual projects is not known at this time, the overall impact to agriculture is assumed to be Class A <i>significant and unavoidable</i>.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are available to mitigate the loss of agricultural lands, short of eliminating or realigning roadways that would traverse areas containing prime soils. However, the following measures would incrementally reduce impacts to agricultural lands and existing agricultural production:</p> <p>LU-4(a) When new roadway extensions are planned, Caltrans or the local jurisdiction in which the RTP project is located shall assure that project-specific environmental reviews consider alternative alignments that reduce or avoid impacts to agricultural lands.</p> <p>LU-4(b) Rural roadway alignments shall follow property lines to the extent feasible, to minimize impacts to the agricultural production value of any specific property. Farmers shall be compensated for the loss of agricultural production at the margins of lost property, based on the amount of land deeded as road right-of-way, as a function of the total amount of production on the property.</p> <p>Mitigation measure LU-1 (a), which calls for appropriate setbacks and fencing, would also minimize trespassing and vandalism impacts.</p>	<p>Although the above measures would reduce impacts to agriculture to the degree feasible, such impacts cannot be fully mitigated due to the potential conversion of agricultural lands. Impacts from individual projects will need to be addressed on a case-by-case basis; however, because impacts to individual agricultural properties cannot be assumed to be insignificant, agricultural impacts are considered potentially significant and unavoidable.</p>
NOISE		
Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<p>N-2. Various RTP projects could potentially expose sensitive receptors to noise in excess of</p>	<p>RTP Overall Goal 3B, "Encourage local jurisdictions and Caltrans to evaluate the noise levels and impacts of all major projects</p>	<p>Implementation of the recommended programmatic measures would reduce potential</p>

Table ES-1. Summary of Potential Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

<p>normally acceptable levels. Projects that increase use of existing roadways, rail lines, and other transportation facilities, or realign such facilities, could result in substantial increases in noise levels at adjacent receptors. This would be considered a Class A, <i>significant and unavoidable</i> impact.</p>	<p>adjacent to sensitive land uses at the project review stage and encourage local jurisdictions to adopt and enforce ordinances and land use standards that mitigate noise levels from highways, rail lines and local roads, including addition of wall insulation or sound proofing material, sound-berms, noise barriers, landscaping, and double glazed windows where appropriate” would reduce project impacts related to the exposure of sensitive receptors to severe noise levels. Additionally, Overall Policy 3c, “Encourage local jurisdictions and Caltrans to restrict street, road and highway improvements, where practical, within existing rights of way. Major widenings, such as additional lanes on Route 101, should be considered in the median strip, using retaining walls, cribwalls and nonstandard features (lanes, shoulders, medians, and ramps) where right-of-way is highly restricted (i.e. The Cuesta Grade, Monterey Street to Marsh Street in San Luis Obispo), etc.” would reduce project noise impacts on adjacent receptors. In addition, the following mitigation measures are required to reduce potential long-term noise impacts:</p> <p>N-2(a) If an RTP project is located adjacent to sensitive uses, Caltrans or the local jurisdiction in which the project is located shall ensure that a noise survey is conducted to determine alternate alignments which allow greater distance from, or greater buffering of, noise-sensitive areas. The noise survey shall be sufficient to indicate existing and projected noise levels, to determine the amount of attenuation needed to reduce potential noise impacts to such uses to an exterior noise level of 65 dBA or less. This shall be accomplished during the project’s individual environmental review.</p> <p>N-2(b) Various sound attenuation techniques shall be considered where new or expanded roadways or rail lines are found to expose receptors to noise exceeding normally acceptable levels. The preferred methods for mitigating noise impacts will be the use of appropriate setbacks and sound attenuating building design, including retrofit of existing structures with sound</p>	<p>impacts to a less than significant level. However, it should be noted that the construction of sound attenuation devices may create aesthetic impacts that may be undesirable and may affect the semi-rural character of much of the county. To mitigate this potential secondary impact to the degree feasible, the following measure is recommended:</p> <p>N-2(c) Long expanses of walls or fences should be interrupted with offsets and provided with accents to prevent monotony. Landscape pockets and pedestrian access through walls should be provided. Whenever possible, a combination of elements should be used, including solid fences, walls, and, landscaped berms.</p> <p>Implementation of soundwalls or other noise barriers along rail lines may be physically or economically infeasible in certain locations. Therefore, noise impacts associated with rail and roadway realignments or expansions would remain significant and unavoidable.</p>
--	--	---

Table ES-1. Summary of Potential Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

	<p>attenuating building materials where feasible. In instances where use of these techniques is not feasible, the use of sound barriers (earthen berms, sound walls, or some combination of the two) will be considered. Determination of appropriate noise attenuation measures will be assessed on a case-by-case basis during a project's individual environmental review pursuant to the regulations of the applicable agency.</p>	
AESTHETICS		
Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<p>AES-2. Development of some RTP roadway projects could contribute to the alteration of the county's rural (or semi-rural) areas to a somewhat more suburban or urban condition, through the addition of lighting, glare, and urban features. In addition, implementation of some airport, park and ride lot and sign projects could result in deterioration of the urban visual environment. This is considered Class A, significant and unavoidable impact.</p>	<p>Several RTP goals, objectives and policies would reduce project impacts related to aesthetics, as follows:</p> <p><i>Overall Policy 3c, "Encourage local jurisdictions and Caltrans to restrict street, road and highway improvements, where practical, within existing rights of way. Major widenings, such as additional lanes on Route 101, should be considered in the median strip, using retaining walls, cribwalls and nonstandard features (lanes, shoulders, medians, and ramps) where right-of-way is highly restricted (i.e. The Cuesta Grade, Monterey Street to Marsh Street in San Luis Obispo), etc."</i></p> <p><i>Overall Policy 3f - Encourage local jurisdictions and Caltrans to preserve high quality visual resources and minimize adverse impacts to land forms, geology and soils to the maximum extent possible when constructing new routes or expanding existing routes, and mitigate projects by proper design and planning including: avoiding construction on slopes in excess of 30%; centerline realignments and modified standards to minimize grading and preserve unique important features and vistas; landscape and revegetation plans using natural vegetation; and use of contour grading to blend cuts/fills with the adjacent topography.</i></p> <p><i>Overall Objective 9 - Maintain and enhance quality aesthetic experiences along transportation corridors and surrounding landscapes.</i></p> <p><i>Overall Policy 9a - Encourage and coordinate efforts to establish programs and standards for the management of the aesthetic resources as seen from highways and railways.</i></p>	<p>Implementation of the above mitigation measures would reduce project-specific impacts to the extent feasible. Nevertheless, the incremental alteration of the area's current rural or semi-rural character to a more suburban environment is considered a significant and unavoidable (Class B) impact.</p>

Table ES-1. Summary of Potential Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

	<p><i>Overall Policy 9c - Coordinate with Caltrans and local jurisdictions and other entities to encourage development of measures that provide a "sense of place" along transportation corridors through the use of distinctive signage, landscaping, building setbacks, walkways, and an appropriate mixture of land uses. Work with Caltrans, local jurisdictions, and transportation providers to develop transportation facilities and amenities that fit within the unique character of the community, providing landscaped medians and walkways along major multi-lane arterial highways, streets, and roadways.</i></p> <p><i>Overall Policy 9e - Coordinate with Federal, State, and local jurisdictions and Caltrans to establish scenic/vista points on State Highways and appropriate regional routes that provide information on the region and historic resources.</i></p> <p><i>Overall Policy 9g - Encourage the development of standards/land use arrangements which when constructed provide aesthetically pleasing, human scale, and "walkable" streetscapes.</i></p> <p>In addition, the following mitigation measures are recommended to reduce project impacts related to aesthetics:</p> <p>AES-2(a) Roadway extensions and widenings shall avoid the removal of existing mature trees to the extent possible. Any trees lost shall be replaced at a minimum 1:1 basis and incorporated into the landscaping design for the roadway. Tree replacement ratios shall be consistent with Caltrans or the local jurisdictions in which impacts could occur.</p> <p>AES-2(b) Roadway, park and ride lot, and aviation facility lighting shall be minimized and controlled to the extent possible, and shall not exceed the maximum height limits of Caltrans or the local jurisdiction in which the project would occur. In addition, lighting shall be designed so as not to spill over onto adjacent properties.</p> <p>AES-2(c) Bus shelters and other ancillary facilities constructed under the RTP shall be designed in</p>	
--	--	--

Table ES-1. Summary of Potential Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

	<p>accordance with the architectural review requirements of Caltrans or the local jurisdiction in which the project would occur. Bus shelters in rural areas shall incorporate earth tone colors and wood materials complementary of the natural surroundings.</p> <p>Mitigation measures AES-1 (a) through AES-1 (d) would also incrementally reduce potential impacts.</p>	
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES		
Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<p>B-2. Some RTP transportation projects could permanently alter natural habitat areas and/or affect sensitive species. Impacts of many individual projects can likely be mitigated to a less than significant level. However, because the feasibility of mitigation cannot be determined at this time, the cumulative effect of RTP implementation is considered Class A, <i>significant and unavoidable</i>.</p>	<p>The RTP contains several policies that would reduce project impacts related to biological resources, as follows:</p> <p><i>Overall Policy 3c - Encourage local jurisdictions and Caltrans to restrict street, road and highway improvements, where practical, within existing rights of way. Major widenings, such as additional lanes on Route 101, should be considered in the median strip, using retaining walls, cribwalls and nonstandard features (lanes, shoulders, medians, and ramps) where right-of-way is highly restricted (i.e. The Cuesta Grade, Monterey Street to Marsh Street in San Luis Obispo), etc.</i></p> <p><i>Overall Policy 3e, "Encourage local jurisdictions and Caltrans to: conduct project level environmental assessments addressing site specific impacts and recommended mitigation measures in sensitive environmental areas (riparian systems, streams, wetlands, sensitive habitat areas and restricted plant communities); identify vegetation for protection and integrate appropriate measures to reduce identified impacts including, buffer strips, reductions in grading, revegetation with native plant species, marking for protection all vegetation proposed to remain within improvement rights-of-way, and modified design standards, which can retain a corridor's natural feel," would reduce project impacts related to biological resources.</i></p> <p><i>Overall Policy 3i - Support the removal, prevention and eradication of invasive plant species along public right-of-ways.</i></p> <p>In addition, the following measure is recommended to reduce impacts on biological resources:</p> <p>B-2(a) Caltrans or the local jurisdiction in</p>	<p>Compliance with existing regulations, in combination with careful site planning and development of specific mitigation measures on a case-by-case basis, would likely reduce impacts to a less than significant level for many capital improvement projects. However, because the actual magnitude of impacts and feasibility of mitigation for individual projects cannot be determined at this time, the cumulative biological resource effect of RTP implementation is considered potentially significant and unavoidable.</p>

Table ES-1. Summary of Potential Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

	<p>which an RTP project with potentially significant long-term effects to biological resources is located shall assure that project-specific environmental reviews consider specific mitigation measures and/or alternative alignments that avoid or minimize impacts to biological resources.</p>	
CLASS B IMPACTS		
TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION		
Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<p>T-3. Although they would likely reduce regional traffic congestion, implementation of some RTP projects could result in localized traffic congestion that would be considered a Class B, <i>significant but mitigable</i>, impact.</p>	<p>T-3(a) The agencies that propose an aviation facility or park and ride lot project that is demonstrated to significantly impact local roadways shall design the project so that impacts are reduced to the extent feasible. This may involve a reduction in the size of the project, relocation of the project, or reconfiguration of project facilities. If physical changes to an impacting project are not feasible due to physical, economic, technological, or other constraints, the project proponent may be required to pay in lieu traffic mitigation fees such that roadways and/or intersections affected by the project maintain an acceptable level of service.</p> <p>T-3(b) The jurisdictions that propose an aviation facility or park and ride lot that is demonstrated to significantly impact local roadways shall incorporate into the design of the project facilities that encourage the use of alternative forms of transportation (e.g., provision of bike storage facilities, pedestrian facilities, etc.), as feasible. In addition, the facility shall provide additional carpool or vanpool incentives, as feasible.</p>	<p>Impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels with proposed mitigation.</p>
LAND USE AND AGRICULTURE		
Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<p>LU-1. Some RTP projects may create land use conflicts with existing sensitive land uses and/or residential development. This is considered a Class B, <i>significant but mitigable</i> impact.</p>	<p>Overall Policy 3c, "Encourage local jurisdictions and Caltrans to restrict street, road and highway improvements, where practical, within existing rights of way. Major widenings, such as additional lanes on Route 101, should be considered in the</p>	<p>Implementation of recommended mitigation measures would be expected to reduce land use conflicts to a less than significant level.</p>

Table ES-1. Summary of Potential Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

	<p>median strip, using retaining walls, cribwalls and nonstandard features (lanes, shoulders, medians, and ramps) where right-of-way is highly restricted (i.e. The Cuesta Grade, Monterey Street to Marsh Street in San Luis Obispo), etc.” would reduce project impacts related to land use compatibility. In addition, the following mitigation measures are recommended to reduce land use compatibility impacts.</p> <p>LU-1(a) Setbacks, fences, or other appropriate means shall be used to separate transportation facilities with the potential to generate land use conflicts from adjacent sensitive land uses. Roadways shall be designed to minimize potential impacts to pedestrians and bicyclists, particularly those living in adjacent residential areas, or attending nearby schools. Adequate striping, signs and signalization shall be installed to slow traffic where appropriate, and to reduce safety and noise impacts. The jurisdiction through which the impacting project traverses would be responsible for implementing this measure, which may in part be based on project-specific noise and safety studies required by the local agency.</p> <p>LU-1(b) Street lighting, where necessary, shall be minimized to the extent possible in areas adjacent to sensitive land uses. Street lights shall be shielded, and oriented away from residential development. No street light shall exceed the minimum height requirement as dictated by Caltrans or local ordinance, as applicable.</p>	
<p>LU-2. During construction, many RTP projects would result in temporarily lane closures or other access restrictions that would disrupt existing homes, businesses, and pedestrian, bicycle, and transit routes. This is considered a Class B, <i>significant but mitigable</i> impact.</p>	<p>LU-2(a) For all transportation projects that could result in temporary lane closures or access blockage during construction, a temporary access plan shall be implemented to ensure continued access to affected cyclists, pedestrians, businesses, and homes. Appropriate signs and safe access shall be guaranteed during project construction to</p>	<p>Implementation of recommended measures would mitigate impacts relating to temporary disturbance.</p>

Table ES-1. Summary of Potential Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

<p>LU-3. Some RTP projects could permanently displace or disrupt existing homes and businesses. This is considered a Class B, <i>significant but mitigable</i> impact.</p>	<p>ensure that businesses remain open.</p> <p>LU-3(a) Caltrans or the local jurisdiction in which an RTP project with the potential to displace residences or businesses (as indicated in Table 4.2-1) is located shall assure that project-specific environmental reviews consider alternative alignments that avoid or minimize impacts to nearby residences and businesses.</p> <p>LU-3(b) Where project-specific reviews identify displacement or relocation impacts that are unavoidable, Caltrans or the local jurisdiction in which the project is located shall ensure that appropriate local, state, and federal relocation programs are used to assist eligible persons to relocate. In addition, Caltrans or the local jurisdiction shall review and, if necessary, modify the construction schedules to ensure that adequate time is provided to allow affected businesses to find and relocate to other sites.</p>	<p>Implementation of recommended measures would mitigate impacts relating to long-term displacement.</p>
<p>AIR QUALITY</p>		
<p>Impact</p>	<p>Mitigation Measures</p>	<p>Residual Impact</p>
<p>AQ-1. Many of the capital improvement projects included in the RTP would involve construction activity that could generate temporary increases in local air pollution. Because of their temporary nature, such impacts are considered Class B, <i>significant but mitigable</i>.</p>	<p>Because all construction projects can produce nuisance dust emissions, dust mitigation measures are required for all construction activities. The following mitigation measures are recommended to minimize emissions and to reduce the amount of dust that drifts onto adjacent properties. These measures would apply to both tract grading and development of individual lots.</p> <p>AQ-1(a) Application of CBACT. All construction equipment be properly maintained and tuned according to manufacturer specifications. All off-road and portable diesel powered equipment, including but not limited to bulldozers, graders, cranes, loaders, scrapers, backhoes, generator sets, compressors, and auxiliary power units, shall be fueled exclusively with CARB motor vehicle diesel fuel. At least 20% of the diesel-fueled equipment used for project construction shall be 1996 or newer. The project applicant shall install catalytic soot filters on at least 20% of the pre-1996</p>	<p>With the recommended measures, construction-related air quality impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.</p>

Table ES-1. Summary of Potential Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

	<p>diesel-fueled equipment, targeting those projected to generate the greatest emissions. Where catalytic soot filters are determined to be unsuitable, the owner shall install and use an oxidation catalyst. Suitability is to be determined by an independent California Licensed Mechanical Engineer who will submit, for District approval, a Suitability Report identifying and explaining the particular constraints to using the preferred catalytic soot filter.</p> <p>AQ-1(b) Dust Control. The following measures shall be implemented to reduce PM10 emissions during project construction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce the amount of the disturbed area where possible. • Use water trucks or sprinkler systems in sufficient quantities to prevent airborne dust from leaving the site. Water shall be applied as soon as possible whenever wind speeds exceed 15 miles per hour. Reclaimed (nonpotable) water should be used whenever possible. • All dirt-stock-pile areas shall be sprayed daily as needed. • Permanent dust control measures shall be identified in the approved project revegetation and landscape plans and implemented as soon as possible following completion of any soil disturbing activities. • Exposed ground areas that are planned to be reworked at dates greater than one month after initial grading shall be sown with a fast-germinating native grass seed and watered until vegetation is established. • All disturbed soil areas not subject to revegetation shall be stabilized using approved chemical soil binders, jute netting, or 	
--	---	--

Table ES-1. Summary of Potential Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

	<p>other methods approved in advance by the APCD.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All roadways, driveways, sidewalks, etc., to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. In addition, building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used. • Vehicle speed for all construction vehicles shall not exceed 15 mph on any unpaved surface at the construction site. • All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil or other loose materials shall be covered or shall maintain at least two feet of freeboard (minimum vertical distance between top of load and top of trailer) in accordance with CVC Section 23114. • Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto streets, or wash off trucks and equipment leaving the site. • Sweep streets at the end of each day if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent paved roads. Water sweepers with reclaimed water shall be used where feasible. <p>AQ-1(c) Cover Stockpiled Soils. If importation, exportation, or stockpiling of fill material is involved, soil stockpiled for more than two days shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation. Trucks transporting material shall be tarped from the point of origin.</p> <p>AQ-1(d) Dust Control Monitor. The contractor or builder shall designate a person or persons to monitor the dust control program and to order increased watering as necessary to prevent transport of dust off-site. Their duties shall include holiday and weekend</p>	
--	---	--

Table ES-1. Summary of Potential Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

<p>AQ-5. Implementation of RTP transit station projects could result in stationary or semi-stationary emissions sources that exposes sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, such as diesel exhaust. This would be considered a Class B, <i>significant but mitigable</i>, impact.</p>	<p>periods when work may not be in progress.</p> <p>AQ-5(a) The agencies that proposes a transit station project that is demonstrated to significantly impact sensitive receptors shall design the project so that impacts are reduced to the extent feasible. This may involve a reduction in the size of the project, relocation of the project, or reconfiguration of project facilities so that stationary sources (e.g., idling buses) are not located adjacent to sensitive receptors. If physical changes to an impacting project are not feasible due to physical, economic, technological, or other constraints, the project proponent shall prohibit bus engine idling for periods greater than one minute and/or utilization of the facility by buses shall be sequenced such that multiple buses do not utilize the facility at the same time.</p>	<p>Impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels with proposed mitigation.</p>
<p>NOISE</p>		
<p>Impact</p> <p>N-1. Construction activity associated with road, bike, pedestrian, transit, rail and airport projects would create temporary noise level increases in discreet locations throughout the county over the life of the RTP. This is considered a Class B, <i>significant but mitigable</i> impact.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>N-1(a) Caltrans or the local jurisdiction in which a particular RTP project is located shall ensure that, where residences or other noise sensitive uses are located adjacent to construction sites, appropriate measures shall be implemented to ensure consistency with noise ordinance requirements relating to construction. Specific techniques may include, but are not limited to, restrictions on construction timing, use of sound blankets on construction equipment, and the use of temporary walls and noise barriers to block and deflect noise.</p> <p>N-1(b) If a particular project located adjacent to sensitive receptors requires pile driving, Caltrans or the local jurisdiction in which this project is located shall require the use of pile drilling techniques instead, where feasible, which would reduce the physical impact and associated noise generation from pile driving. This shall be accomplished through the placement of conditions on the</p>	<p>Residual Impact</p> <p>With implementation of local noise control requirements and proposed mitigation, impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels.</p>

Table ES-1. Summary of Potential Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

	project during its individual environmental review.	
AESTHETICS		
Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
AES-1. Some RTP roadway projects may affect public views along designated scenic corridors, and other highways considered to have high scenic qualities. This is considered a Class B, <i>significant but mitigable</i> impact.	<p>AES-1(a) Where a particular RTP improvement affects adjacent landforms, Caltrans or the local jurisdiction in which the project is located shall ensure that recontouring provides a smooth and gradual transition between modified landforms and existing grade. This requirement can be accomplished through the placement of conditions on the project by Caltrans or the local jurisdiction during individual environmental review.</p> <p>AES-1(b) Caltrans or the local jurisdiction in which a particular RTP project is located shall ensure that associated landscape materials enhance landform variation, provide erosion control and blend with the natural setting. This requirement can be accomplished through the placement of conditions on the project by Caltrans or the local jurisdiction during individual environmental review. To ensure compliance with approved landscape plans, the implementing agency shall provide a monetary performance security equal to the value of the landscaping/ irrigation installation.</p> <p>AES-1(c) Caltrans or the local jurisdiction or lead agency of a particular RTP project shall ensure that a project in a scenic view corridor will have the minimum possible impact, consistent with project goals, upon foliage, existing landscape architecture and natural scenic views. This requirement shall be accomplished through the placement of conditions on the project by the lead agency during the project specific environmental review and by ensuring that specific design considerations to achieve this mitigation are enacted at each stage of design by the lead agency, local jurisdictions and SLOCOG personnel.</p>	With proposed mitigation measures, impacts would be less than significant.

Table ES-1. Summary of Potential Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

	<p>AES-1(d) Potential noise impacts arising from increased traffic volumes associated with adjacent land development shall be preferentially mitigated through the use of setbacks and the acoustical design of adjacent structures. The use of sound walls, or any other architectural features that could block views from the scenic highways or other view corridors, shall be discouraged to the extent possible. Where use of sound walls is found to be necessary, walls shall incorporate offsets, accents, and landscaping to prevent monotony, as described in Mitigation Measure N-2(c).</p>	
WATER RESOURCES/FLOODING		
Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<p>W-1. Construction and maintenance of RTP projects could incrementally increase countywide water demand. Such impacts would be Class B, <i>significant but mitigable</i>, impacts.</p>	<p>W-1(a) Caltrans or the local jurisdiction in which a particular RTP project is located shall ensure that, where economically feasible, reclaimed and/or desalinated water is used for dust suppression during construction activities. This measure shall be noted on construction plans and shall be spot checked by Caltrans or the local jurisdiction.</p> <p>W-1(b) Caltrans or the local jurisdiction in which a particular RTP project is located shall ensure that low water use landscaping (i.e., drought tolerant plants and drip irrigation) is installed. This shall be accomplished through the placement of conditions on the project by Caltrans or the local jurisdiction during individual environmental review.</p> <p>W-1(c) Caltrans or the local jurisdiction in which a particular RTP project is located shall ensure that, if feasible, landscaping associated with improvements is maintained using reclaimed and/or desalinated water. This shall be accomplished through the placement of conditions on the project by Caltrans or the local jurisdiction during individual environmental review.</p>	<p>Implementation of the above measures would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.</p>

Table ES-1. Summary of Potential Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

	<p>W-1(d) Caltrans or the local jurisdiction in which a particular RTP project is located shall ensure that porous pavement materials are utilized, where feasible, to allow for groundwater percolation. Rural bicycle trails shall be left unpaved, where appropriate. This shall be accomplished through the placement of conditions on the project by Caltrans or the local jurisdiction during individual environmental review.</p>	
<p>W-2. Construction of, and vehicular operations on, RTP transportation facilities, park and ride lots, and rail stations could result in erosion and runoff, which could degrade surface and ground water quality. This impact is considered Class B, <i>significant but mitigable</i>.</p>	<p>W-2(a) Caltrans or the local jurisdiction in which a particular RTP project is located shall ensure that fertilizer/pesticide application plans for any new right-of-way landscaping are prepared to minimize deep percolation of chemicals. This shall be accomplished through the placement of conditions on the project by Caltrans or the local jurisdiction during individual environmental review.</p> <p>W-2(b) Caltrans or the local jurisdiction in which an RTP road widening or roadway extension project is located shall ensure that the improvement directs runoff into subsurface percolation basins and traps which would allow for the removal of urban pollutants, fertilizers, pesticides, and other chemicals. This shall be accomplished through the placement of conditions on the project by Caltrans or the local jurisdiction during individual environmental review.</p> <p>W-2(c) For roadway projects that would disturb at least five acres (one acre after March 2003), a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall be developed prior to the initiation of grading and implemented for all construction activity on the project site. The SWPPP shall include specific BMPs to control the discharge of material from the site and into the creeks and local storm drains. BMP methods may include, but would not be limited to, the use of temporary retention basins, straw bales, sand bagging, mulching, erosion</p>	<p>Implementation of the above measures would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.</p>

Table ES-1. Summary of Potential Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

	<p>control blankets and soil stabilizers.</p> <p>W-2(d) Caltrans or the local jurisdiction in which a particular RTP project is located shall ensure that adequate drainage infrastructure is in place to accommodate runoff from the project, prior to issuance of grading permits. If adequate drainage infrastructure is not available, the project proponent shall pay utility mitigation fees or otherwise provide improvements to the drainage facilities of the jurisdiction in which the project is located such that drainage facilities affected by the project in question maintain an acceptable level of service.</p>	
<p>W-3. Some RTP projects could be subject to high flood hazard. Impacts are considered Class B, <i>significant but mitigable</i>.</p>	<p>W-3(a) If a particular RTP roadway, bikeway or bridge project is located in an area with high flooding potential, Caltrans or the local jurisdiction in which the project is located shall coordinate with FEMA to ensure that the structure is elevated at least one foot above the 100 year flood zone elevation, that feasible bank stabilization and erosion control measures are implemented along creek crossings, or that other measures acceptable to FEMA are implemented. This requirement can be accomplished through the placement of conditions on the project by Caltrans or the local jurisdiction during individual environmental review.</p>	<p>Implementation of the above measure would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.</p>
<p>W-4. Some RTP projects may be located in areas subject to tsunami or seiche. This is considered a Class II, <i>significant but mitigable</i> impact.</p>	<p>W-4(a) In areas subject to tsunami effects, Caltrans or the local jurisdiction shall ensure that RTP projects involving the construction of new roadways or other structures are elevated above the 10-foot elevation by an appropriate margin. This requirement can be accomplished through the placement of conditions on the project by Caltrans or the local jurisdiction during environmental review for individual projects.</p>	<p>Implementation of the above measure would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.</p>

Table ES-1. Summary of Potential Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

GEOLOGIC RESOURCES		
Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<p>G-1. Some RTP projects may be located on potential unstable soils, in areas of high liquefaction or erosion potential, or in areas subject to landslides. This is considered a Class B, <i>significant but mitigable</i> impact.</p>	<p>RTP Overall Policy 3f, "Encourage local jurisdictions and Caltrans to preserve high quality visual resources and minimize adverse impacts to land forms, geology and soils to the maximum extent possible when constructing new routes or expanding existing routes, and mitigate projects by proper design and planning including: avoiding construction on slopes in excess of 30%; centerline realignments and modified standards to minimize grading and preserve unique important features and vistas; landscape and revegetation plans using natural vegetation; and use of contour grading to blend cuts/fills with the adjacent topography," would reduce impacts related to unstable soils. In addition, the following programmatic measures would reduce potential impacts to the extent feasible.</p>	<p>Implementation of the above measures would reduce potential impacts of projects located in areas with liquefaction potential, unstable slopes, expansive, collapsible, compressible, or erosive soils, and/or high groundwater to a less than significant level.</p>
	<p>G-1(a) If a particular RTP bridge or passenger station project is located in an area of moderate to high liquefaction potential, Caltrans or the local jurisdiction in which this project is located shall ensure that these structures are designed based upon appropriate geology, soils and earthquake engineering studies. Possible design measures include deep foundations, removal of liquefiable materials and dewatering. This requirement can be accomplished through the placement of conditions on the project by Caltrans or the local jurisdiction during individual environmental review.</p>	
	<p>G-1(b) If a particular RTP road widening or bridge project involves cut slopes over 20 feet in height or is located in areas of bedded or jointed bedrock, Caltrans or the local jurisdiction in which the project is located shall ensure that specific slope stabilization studies are conducted. Possible stabilization methods include buttresses, retaining walls and soldier piles. This requirement can be accomplished through the placement of conditions on the project by Caltrans or the local jurisdiction during individual environmental review.</p>	

Table ES-1. Summary of Potential Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

	<p>G-1(c) If a particular RTP bridge or passenger station project is located in an area of highly expansive, collapsible or compressible soils, Caltrans or the local jurisdiction in which the project is located shall ensure that a specific investigation and appropriate design factors are implemented. This requirement can be accomplished through the placement of conditions on the project by Caltrans or the local jurisdiction during individual environmental review.</p> <p>G-1(d) If a particular RTP roadway or fixed facility project involving deep foundations or underground areas is located in an area of high groundwater potential, Caltrans or the local jurisdiction in which the project is located shall ensure that appropriate construction techniques (such as de-watering, special water proofing, and deeper foundations) are included. This requirement can be accomplished through the placement of conditions on the project by Caltrans or the local jurisdiction during individual environmental review.</p> <p>G-1(e) If a particular RTP roadway or fixed facility project involving deep foundations or underground areas is located in an area of moderate or high erosion potential, Caltrans or the local jurisdiction in which the project is located shall ensure that a grading and erosion control plan that minimizes erosion and sedimentation shall be prepared and implemented by the project proponent, prior to issuance of Grading Permits. This requirement can be accomplished through the placement of conditions on the project by Caltrans or the local jurisdiction during individual environmental review. The grading and erosion control plan should include the following:</p> <p>a. Methods such as retention basins, drainage diversion structures, spot</p>	
--	---	--

Table ES-1. Summary of Potential Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

	<p>grading, silt fencing/coordinated sediment trapping, straw bales, and sand bags shall be used to minimize erosion on slopes and siltation into waterways during grading and construction activities.</p> <p>b. Graded areas shall be revegetated within four weeks of grading activities with deep-rooted, native, drought-tolerant species to minimize slope failure and erosion potential. Geotextile binding fabrics shall be used if necessary to hold slope soils until vegetation is established.</p> <p>c. Exposed areas shall be stabilized to prevent wind and water erosion, using methods approved by the Planning and Building Grading Division and APCD. These methods may include importing of topsoil is to be imported and spread on the ground surface in areas having soils that can be transported by the wind, and/or the mixing of the highly erosive sand with finer-grained materials (silt or clay) in sufficient quantities to prevent its ability to be transported by wind. The topsoil or silt/clay mixture is to be used to stabilize the existing soil to prevent its ability to be transported by wind. As a minimum, six inches of topsoil or silt/clay/sand mixture is to be used to stabilize the wind-erodable soils.</p> <p>d. Landscaped areas adjacent to structures shall be graded so that drainage is away from structures.</p> <p>e. Grading on slopes steeper than 5:1 shall be designed to minimize surface water runoff.</p> <p>f. Fills placed on slopes</p>	
--	---	--

Table ES-1. Summary of Potential Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

	<p>steeper than 5:1 shall be properly benched prior to placement of fill.</p> <p>g. Brow ditches and/or berms shall be constructed and maintained above all cut and fill slopes, respectively.</p> <p>h. Cut and fill benches shall be constructed at regular intervals.</p> <p>i. Excavation and grading shall be limited to the dry season of the year (typically April 15 to November 1, allowing for variations in weather) unless an approved erosion control plan is in place and all measures therein are in effect.</p>	
<p>G-2. Some RTP projects could be subject to seismic hazards, including fault rupture and groundshaking. This is considered a Class B, <i>significant but mitigable</i> impact.</p>	<p>RTP Overall Policy 3g, "Encourage Caltrans and local jurisdictions to ensure adequate geotechnical investigations, including, but not limited to earthquake ground shaking & fault rupture zones, tsunami/seiche effects, liquefaction, slope stability, expansive and collapsible soils, high groundwater, adequate elevation of roadway structures above flood levels, and avoidance, plugging and abandonment of any non-operational wells within the right-of-way," would reduce impacts related to geologic hazards. In addition, the following measures are recommended to mitigate potential impacts relating to seismic activity.</p> <p>G-2(a) Caltrans or the local jurisdiction in which a particular RTP bridge or passenger station project is located shall ensure that the structure is designed and constructed to the latest geotechnical standards. In most cases, this will necessitate site specific geologic and soils engineering investigations to exceed the code for high groundshaking zones. This can be accomplished through the placement of conditions on the project by Caltrans or the local jurisdiction during individual environmental review.</p> <p>G-2(b) Caltrans or the local jurisdiction in</p>	<p>Implementation of the above measures would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.</p>

Table ES-1. Summary of Potential Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

	<p>which a particular RTP bridge or passenger station project is located shall ensure that these structures are placed in areas outside of fault rupture zones. If avoidance is not possible, detailed geologic and seismic studies must be conducted to locate active or potentially active fault traces. Structures shall then be placed outside of an appropriate setback distance. This requirement can be accomplished through the placement of conditions on the project by Caltrans or the local jurisdiction during individual environmental review.</p>	
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES		
Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<p>B-3. Some RTP projects would occur in areas subject to the requirements of Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP). Potential RTP project impacts on species and habitat protected under an HCP would be considered a Class B, <i>significant but mitigable</i>, impact.</p>	<p>RTP Policy 4.3, to “Ensure that transportation projects contribute to the protection of biological and scenic resources, open space and agricultural land” would reduce RTP impacts on biological resources. All RTP projects will be subject to local, state, and federal regulations pertaining to the protection of biological resources. In addition, the following measure is required to mitigate potential conflicts with HCPs:</p> <p>B-3(a) Caltrans or the local jurisdiction in which an RTP project with potentially significant conflicts with an HCP is located shall assure that project-specific environmental reviews consider specific mitigation measures and/or alternative alignments that avoid or minimize conflicts with applicable HCPs and the protected species and habitats thereof.</p>	<p>Following implementation of the above mitigation measure, RTP project impacts on HCP areas would be less than significant.</p>
CULTURAL RESOURCES		
Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<p>CR-1. Development under the RTP could disturb known and previously undiscovered cultural resources. Such impacts would be Class B, <i>significant but mitigable</i>.</p>	<p>In general, prior to commencement of any action, development or land use changes on lands subject to federal jurisdiction or for projects involving federal funding, a cultural resource survey and an environmental analysis must be prepared. Historic resources are also protected under the regulations of the National Historic Preservation Act and the Department of Transportation Act of 1966. County and city sponsored projects would be subject to local</p>	<p>Implementation of the above measures would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.</p>

Table ES-1. Summary of Potential Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

	<p>ordinance requirements, including General Plan provisions that protect for cultural resources. Overall Goal 3g, "Encourage Caltrans and local jurisdictions to conduct adequate cultural investigation and mitigation when appropriate, including: the preparation of an Area of Potential Effects Map; conducting Phase I and II studies, if necessary; utilizing a certified archeologist if monitoring is required; mitigating by project realignments; capping of the site, relocation, and prevention of vandalism," would reduce RTP impacts related to cultural resources. In addition, the following mitigation measures may be required to reduce potential impacts related to disturbance of cultural resources:</p> <p>CR-1(a) Caltrans or the local jurisdiction in which an RTP project involving substantial earth disturbance, the removal or disturbance of existing buildings, or construction of permanent above ground structures or roadways is located shall ensure that the following elements are included in the RTP project's individual environmental review:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A map defining the Area of Potential Effects (APE) shall be prepared for RTP improvements that involve substantial earth disturbance, the removal or disturbance of existing buildings, or construction of permanent above ground structures. This map will indicate the areas of primary and secondary disturbance associated with construction and operation of the facility and will help in determining whether known cultural resources are located within the impact zone. 2. A preliminary study of each project area, as defined in the APE, shall be completed to determine whether or not the project area has been studied under an earlier investigation, and to determine the impacts of the previous project. 3. If the results of the preliminary studies indicate 	
--	--	--

Table ES-1. Summary of Potential Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

	<p>additional studies are necessary; development of field studies and/or other documentary research shall be developed and completed (Phase I studies). Negative results would result in no additional studies for the project area.</p> <p>4. Based on positive results of the Phase I studies, an evaluation of identified resources shall be completed to determine the potential eligibility/significance of the resources (Phase II studies).</p> <p>5. Phase III mitigation studies shall be coordinated with the Office of Historic Preservation, as the research design will require review and approval from the OHP. In the case of prehistoric or Native American related resources, the Native American Heritage Commission and/or local representatives of the Native American population shall be contacted and permitted to respond to the testing/mitigation programs.</p> <p>CR-1(b) If development of an RTP project requires the presence of an archaeological monitor, Caltrans or the local jurisdiction shall ensure that a certified archaeologist/ paleontologist monitors the grading and/or other ground altering activities. The schedule and extent of the monitoring will depend on the grading schedule and/or extent of the ground alterations. This requirement can be accomplished through placement of conditions on the project by Caltrans or the local jurisdiction during individual environmental review.</p> <p>CR-1(c) Caltrans or the local jurisdiction shall ensure that materials recovered over the course of any given improvement are adequately cleaned, labeled, and curated at a recognized</p>	
--	--	--

Table ES-1. Summary of Potential Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

	<p>repository. This requirement can be accomplished through placement of conditions on the project by Caltrans or the local jurisdiction during individual environmental review.</p> <p>CR-1(d) Caltrans or the local jurisdiction shall ensure that mitigation for potential impacts to significant cultural resources includes one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Realignment of the project right-of-way (avoidance; the most preferable method); • Capping of the site and leaving it undisturbed; • Addressing structural remains with respect to NRHP guidelines (Phase III studies); • Relocating structures per NRHP guidelines; • Creation of interpretative facilities; and/or • Development of measures to prevent vandalism. <p>This can be accomplished through placement of conditions on the project by Caltrans or the local jurisdiction during individual environmental review.</p> <p>CR-1(e) A qualified archaeologist shall monitor all earth moving activities within native soil. In the event that archaeological and historic artifacts are encountered during project construction, all work in the vicinity of the find will be halted until such time as the find is evaluated by a qualified archaeologist and appropriate mitigation (if necessary) is implemented.</p> <p>In the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, the following steps will be taken:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. There shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until: 	
--	---	--

Table ES-1. Summary of Potential Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

	<p>A. The coroner of the county in which the remains are discovered must be contacted to determine that no investigation of the cause of death is required, and</p> <p>B. If the coroner determines the remains to be Native American:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours. 2. The Native American Heritage Commission shall identify the person or persons it believes to be most likely descended from the deceased Native American. 3. The most likely descendent may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public resources Code Section 5097.98, or <p>II. Where the following conditions occur, the landowner or his authorized representatives shall rebury the Native American human remains and</p>	
--	---	--

Table ES-1. Summary of Potential Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

	<p>associated grave goods with appropriate dignity on the property in a location nor subject to further subsurface disturbance.</p> <p>A. The Native American Heritage Commission is unable to identify a most likely descendent or the most likely descendent failed to make a recommendation within 24 hours after being notified by the commission.</p> <p>B. The descendent identified fails to make a recommendation; or</p> <p>C. The landowner or his authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the descendent, and the mediation by the Native American Heritage Commission fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner.</p>	
CLASS C IMPACTS		
TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION		
Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<p>T-2. RTP projects that increase roadway capacity could redistribute vehicle travel from other travel modes, times or routes. However, this effect would not be expected to increase traffic congestion beyond pre-project conditions. This is a Class C, <i>less than significant</i>, impact.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Traffic impacts would be less than significant.</p>
LAND USE AND AGRICULTURE		
Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<p>LU-5. The RTP includes policies that guide development under the plan. RTP policies are consistent with other regional and local transportation policies. Impacts would be Class C, <i>less than significant</i>.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>The project is considered consistent with applicable plans and policies adopted by local agencies within the county.</p>

Table ES-1. Summary of Potential Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

AIR QUALITY		
Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<p>AQ-2. Implementation of the 2001 RTP would reduce emissions of ozone precursors as compared to what would occur if no transportation projects were implemented by promoting a multi-modal transportation system and thereby reducing reliance on single occupancy vehicle use. The RTP would also implement the CAP Transportation Control Measures. This is considered a Class C, less than significant effect.</p>	<p>Several RTP goals, objectives and policies would reduce project impacts related to air quality, as follows:</p> <p><i>Overall Goal 3a - Encourage ridesharing, the use of public transit, bicycling, walking, telecommuting, and implementation of other transportation systems management actions to discourage use of the single occupant vehicle and reduce emissions and traffic congestion, and enhance mobility.</i></p> <p><i>Overall Policy 3c - Encourage local jurisdictions and Caltrans to restrict street, road and highway improvements, where practical, within existing rights of way. Major widenings, such as additional lanes on Route 101, should be considered in the median strip, using retaining walls, cribwalls and nonstandard features (lanes, shoulders, medians, and ramps) where right-of-way is highly restricted (i.e. The Cuesta Grade, Monterey Street to Marsh Street in San Luis Obispo), etc.</i></p> <p><i>Overall Policy 7a - Encourage local jurisdictions to make land use decisions that adequately address regional transportation issues and adopt improvement proposals that are consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan, and the Clean Air Plan.</i></p> <p><i>TSM/TDM Goal - Increase transportation system efficiency, improve mobility and overall accessibility, reduce travel demand and provide for improved air quality through the implementation of system management and demand management strategies and Intelligent Transportation System applications.</i></p> <p><i>Public Transportation Objective 4 - Consider transit as a significant part of a coordinated effort to reduce air pollution.</i></p> <p><i>Public Transportation Goal 4b - Work closely with APCD and jurisdictions to implement transportation-related components of the CAP.</i></p> <p><i>Public Transportation Goal 4c - Encourage alternative fuel conversion experimentation by private and public transportation providers, by making research findings available and publicly commending efforts to use cleaner fuels, and by assisting providers with funding source information.</i></p>	<p>The operational impacts of the RTP on the attainment of state and federal air quality standards can be classified as less than significant (Class C) and beneficial in both the short term and long term.</p>

Table ES-1. Summary of Potential Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

	No additional mitigation measures are required.	
AQ-3. The RTP is substantially consistent with the Air Pollution Control District (APCD) 1997 Clean Air Plan (CAP). Class C, <i>less than significant</i> , impacts related to RTP consistency with the CAP would result.	No mitigation measures are required.	Impacts would be considered less than significant.
AQ-4. Implementation of RTP roadway improvement, transit, and TSM/TDM projects would not result in localized traffic congestion that causes localized carbon monoxide (CO) emission hotspots. This would be considered a Class C, <i>less than significant</i> , impact.	No mitigation measures are required.	Impacts would be considered less than significant.
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES		
Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
B-1. Construction activity associated with some transportation projects may temporarily disturb wetland or riparian habitats and/or other biological resources. However, compliance with existing regulations pertaining to construction activities would be expected to reduce this impact to a level considered <i>less than significant</i> (Class C).	For all projects with potential construction-related impacts, the lead agency should investigate the applicability of various federal, state, and local permit requirements and obtain all required permits prior to construction. In accordance with agency requirements, in the event that wetland or other jurisdictional habitat loss is not avoidable, mitigation should be in-kind and on-site with no net destruction of habitat value. Additional mitigation beyond compliance with the requirements of existing regulations pertaining to biological resources is not required.	Compliance with existing construction regulations would reduce construction impacts to a level considered less than significant.
GROWTH INDUCEMENT		
Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
Economic Growth. Implementation of the RTP would create short-term economic growth in the county as a result of construction-related job opportunities. RTP implementation would also generate additional employment opportunities for roadway, vehicle, and landscape maintenance, and transportation facility clean-up. The potential employment increase may subsequently increase the demand for support services and utilities, which could generate secondary employment opportunities. This additional economic growth would likely raise the existing revenue base for San Luis Obispo County.	No mitigation measures are required.	Impacts would be less than significant.

Table ES-1. Summary of Potential Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

<p>Although such growth may incrementally increase economic activity in the county, significant physical effects are not expected to result from economic growth generated by the project.</p>		
<p>Population Growth. Implementation of the RTP would not entail a substantial change in land use anywhere in the county. Rather, the plan responds to land uses proposed in local general plans. The RTP does propose several new approaches to transportation planning, including the use of various intelligent transportation system and alternative fuel technologies. These new approaches may set new precedent for transportation planning in the county; however, such approaches would not be expected to result in significant adverse environmental impacts.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant.</p>
<p>Removal of Obstacles to Growth. As discussed in Section 4.2, <i>Land Use</i>, implementation of the RTP may remove impediments to growth in some limited fashion. While the transportation system improvements included in the RTP are expected to respond to growth anticipated in adopted local general plans, they may indirectly increase growth pressure by increasing transportation system capacity. In addition, the road extension projects planned in the less developed areas, may remove obstacles to growth by improving vehicular access. For example, the Prado Road Extension project in the City of San Luis Obispo and the Oak Park Boulevard-Price Canyon Road Arterial project in Pismo Beach would extend development into currently underdeveloped areas. Development induced as a result of removal of obstacles to growth could result in additional environmental impacts (e.g., additional noise and traffic), and may increase the use of slowly renewable and nonrenewable resources and energy to serve new development. For example,</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant.</p>

Table ES-1. Summary of Potential Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts

<p>induced development projects could affect regional groundwater supplies. However, the nature and magnitude of such impacts are speculative, and would be largely a function of local agency control, prevailing community attitudes, and future market conditions. The environmental impacts of any additional growth would depend upon the type, location, and magnitude of new development.</p>		
CLASS D IMPACTS		
TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION		
Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<p>T-1. RTP roadway, transit, and TSM/TDM projects would address potential traffic congestion on existing roadways, and would implement regional circulation improvement projects contemplated in the General Plans of local jurisdictions. This is a Class D, <i>beneficial</i> impact.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impacts would be beneficial.</p>

PROJECT-SPECIFIC IMPACT SUMMARY

The following table presents a list of contemplated 2001 RTP projects and the anticipated impacts for each project for each issue area. It should be noted that individualized impacts are not described for the issue areas of transportation and circulation or air quality, since these issue areas generally relate to cumulative issues and/or RTP policy guidance rather than individual projects. In addition, several impacts relate to many or all of the contemplated projects, and are therefore not listed in Table ES-2 for individual projects. The impacts that would relate to many or all of the contemplated RTP projects are briefly described in the paragraphs below.

Impacts Common to All or Many RTP Projects

Impact T-1: RTP roadway, transit, and TSM/TDM projects would address potential traffic congestion on existing roadways, and would implement regional circulation improvement projects contemplated in the General Plans of local jurisdictions. *Beneficial impact.*

Impact T-2: RTP projects that increase roadway capacity could redistribute vehicle travel from other travel modes, times or routes. However, this effect would not increase traffic volumes beyond pre-project conditions. *Less than significant impact.*

Impact LU-2: During construction, many RTP projects would result in temporarily lane closures or other access restrictions that could disrupt existing homes, businesses, and pedestrian, bicycle, and transit routes. *Significant But Mitigable Impact.*

Impact AQ-1: Many of the capital improvement projects included in the RTP would involve construction activity that could generate temporary increases in local air pollution. *Significant But Mitigable Impact.*

Impact AQ-2: Implementation of the 2001 RTP would reduce emissions of ozone precursors as compared to what would occur if no transportation projects were implemented by promoting a multi-modal transportation system and thereby reducing reliance on single occupancy vehicle use. The RTP would also implement the CAP Transportation Control Measures. *Beneficial Impact.*

Impact AQ-3: The proposed RTP is consistent with the Air Pollution Control District (APCD) 1997 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). *No Impact.*

Impact AQ-4: Implementation of RTP roadway improvement, transit, and TSM/TDM projects would not result in localized traffic congestion that causes localized carbon monoxide (CO) emission hotspots. *Less Than Significant Impact.*

Impact N-1: Construction activity associated with road, bike, pedestrian, transit, rail and airport projects would create temporary noise level increases in discreet locations throughout the county over the life of the RTP. *Significant But Mitigable Impact.*

Impact W-1: Construction and maintenance of RTP projects could incrementally increase countywide water demand. *Significant But Mitigable Impact.* Note that individual projects described in Table ES-2 that could result in impacts related to increases in countywide water demand would utilize water during project operations (e.g., for landscaping), as well as construction.

Impact W-2: Construction of, and vehicular operations on, RTP transportation facilities, park and ride lots, and rail stations could result in erosion and runoff, which could degrade surface and ground water quality. *Significant But Mitigable Impact.* Note that individual projects described in Table ES-2 that would result in impacts related to erosion and runoff would potentially degrade water quality due to vehicular operations, as well as during construction.

Impact W-4: Some RTP projects may be located in areas subject to tsunami or seiche. *Significant But Mitigable Impact.*

Impact G-1: Some RTP projects may be located on potential unstable soils, in areas of high liquefaction or erosion potential, or in areas subject to landslides. *Significant But Mitigable Impact.* Note that individual projects described in the table below that could result in impacts related to potential unstable soils would be located in areas, including non-coastal areas, known to contain unstable soils and/or could feature structures that would be susceptible to soils constraints.

Impact G-2: Some RTP projects could be subject to seismic hazards, including fault rupture and groundshaking. *Significant But Mitigable Impact.* Note that individual projects described in the

table below that would result in impacts related to seismic hazards involve structures or other facilities that would be susceptible to seismic hazards.

Impact CR-1: Development under the RTP could disturb known and previously undiscovered cultural resources. *Significant But Mitigable Impact*. Note that individual projects described in the table below that would result in impacts related to cultural resources contain features such as potentially historic bridges, and would potentially affect known as well as previously unidentified cultural resources.

Error! Main Document Only.

Table ES-2 Summary of 2001 RTP Project Impacts*

Project ID*	Project Title	Traffic	Land Use	Air Quality	Noise	Visual	Water Resources	Geology	Biological Resources	Cultural Resources
NORTH COAST SUBREGION										
CALTRANS PROJECTS										
839	Route 46 Beautification Enhancements									
838	Route 41 Beautification Enhancements									
417	Route 1 Intersection Channelizations					1				
722	CURE Project – Highway 1									
727	Pavement Rehab – Highway 46									
688	Route 1 – Bridge Replacement					1, 2	3	1, 2	1, 2	1
737	Route 1 Beautification Enhancements–Phase I									
414	Route 1 Left Turn Channelization					1				
728	Route 1 Pavement Rehab – North Coast									
732	Route 1 – Repair Slipout									
733	Route 1 Roadside Rehab – Morro Bay									
730	Route 41 – Repair Embankment									
731	Route 46 – Tieback Wall, Repair Embankment									
725	Route 1 – Replace Bridge at Santa Rosa Creek					1, 2	3	1, 2	1, 2	1
736	Route 1 Roadside Rehab Vista Points									
739	Route 1 Roadway Realignment		1		2	1, 2				
740	Various Protective Betterments – San Luis Obispo									
738	Route 1 Beautification Enhancements–Phase 2									
600	Changeable Message Signs					1				
253	Route 1 North – Class II Bike Lanes					1				
SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY PROJECTS										
415	Route 1 Climbing Lane				2	1, 2				
1665	Route 1 Passing Lanes				2	1, 2				
803	Route 1 Roadside Recreational Facilities	3	1		2	1		1, 2		

* The impact numbers presented in this table correspond to the numbers of the impacts in Section 4 of this EIR. For example, an entry of “1, 2” under “Geology” indicates that the project may result in Impacts G-1 and G-2, as described in Section 4.7, *Geologic Resources*, of this EIR.

Error! Main Document Only.

Table ES-2 Summary of 2001 RTP Project Impacts*

Project ID*	Project Title	Traffic	Land Use	Air Quality	Noise	Visual	Water Resources	Geology	Biological Resources	Cultural Resources
MORRO BAY PROJECTS										
184	Interchange Operations Analysis									
369	Quintana Road and Morro Bay Boulevard Roundabout									
601	Route 1/Route 41 Interchange Improvements					1				
291	North Main Street Rehabilitation									
404	Main Street Widening – Phase 1					2				
368	Relocate Embarcadero Street		3		2	2	3			
401	Intersection Improvements – Sight Distance									
402	Main Street Widening – Phase 2					2				
397	Morro Bay Boulevard Widening				2	2				
358	South Street Extension to Embarcadero		3		2	2	3			
91	Local Street Maintenance									
532	Short-term Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation									
615	Waterfront Boardwalk and Circulation Improvements – Phase I						3		1, 2	
221	Quintana Road Class II Bike Lanes – Phase 1									
161	Embarcadero Pedestrian Boardwalk Study									
507	Lateral Access Improvements									
882	Morro Creek Multi-Use Path						3		1, 2	
885	Morro Strand Multi-Use Path 2						3		1, 2	
798	Waterfront Boardwalk and Circulation Impacts – Phase 2						3		1, 2	
351	Beach Tract Class II Bicycle Improvements						3		1, 2	
206	High School Class I Bike Path									
894	South Quintana Road Bike Lane - Phase 2									
891	State Park Road Bike Route									
353	Downtown Class II Bikeway Improvements									
506	Morro Rock/Coleman Park Enhancements						3		1, 2	

Error! Main Document Only.

Table ES-2 Summary of 2001 RTP Project Impacts*

Project ID*	Project Title	Traffic	Land Use	Air Quality	Noise	Visual	Water Resources	Geology	Biological Resources	Cultural Resources
352	North Embarcadero Class II Bikeway						3		1, 2	
880	Quintana Road Class II Bikeway									
349	South Street Class I Bike Path									
267	Del Mar Park Class I Multi-Use Path									
893	Various Local Downtown Bike Improvements									
237	Gateway Improvements – Morro Bay						1, 2			
505	North Main Street Beautification						1, 2			
30	DAR Vehicle Replacement									
31	DAR Vehicle Replacement									
566	Phone System for Morro Bay DAR									
1924	Main St./San Jacinto Intersection Imps.									
1925	Main St./Radcliff Intersection Imps.									
1635	Morro Bay Park and Ride Lot									
LOS OSOS PROJECTS										
463	Los Osos Valley Road Rehabilitation									
616	Los Osos Valley Road Rehabilitation									
262	Widen Los Osos Valley Road Between 9 th Street and Pine Avenue		1		2	2				
282	Traffic Signals – Various Locations									
89	Doris Avenue Roadway Construction		1		2	2			1	
86	Los Olivos Street Drainage Improvements									
87	Santa Maria Avenue Roadway Construction									
263	11 th Street Widening		1			2				
482	7 th Street Widening		1			2				
481	9 th Street Widening		1			2				
261	Extend Ramona Avenue		1		2	2			1	
273	Third Street Improvements									
217	Santa Ysabel Traffic Calming									

Error! Main Document Only.

Table ES-2 Summary of 2001 RTP Project Impacts*

Project ID*	Project Title	Traffic	Land Use	Air Quality	Noise	Visual	Water Resources	Geology	Biological Resources	Cultural Resources
88	El Morro Avenue Bike and Pedestrian Path									
365	Various Bikeway Improvements									
588	Pedestrian Bridge and Restoration – Phase 2						3	1, 2	1, 2	
222	South Bay Boulevard Vista Overlook					2				
1634	Los Osos Park and Ride Lot									
1581	DAR Vehicle Replacement									
1582	DAR Vehicle Replacement									
1583	DAR Vehicle Replacement									
CAYUCOS PROJECTS										
257	Old Creek Road Storm Damage Repair									
587	Downtown Community Enhancements						1, 2			
287	Class I Bike Path Connector									
148	Class I Bike Path Overcrossing								1, 2	
806	North Ocean Avenue Class II Bike Lanes									
805	Pacific Drive Class II Bike Lanes									
804	Studio Drive Class III Bike Lanes									
383	Toro Creek Access Improvements		1		2	2		1, 2	1, 2	
384	Park and Ride Lot									
CAMBRIA PROJECTS										
379	Traffic Signal – Route 1/Cambria Drive									
380	Traffic Signal – Main/Pine Knolls Drive									
288	Route 1 Flood Control Improvements					1				
259	Bridge Replacements						3	1, 2	1, 2	1
316	Upgrade and Widen Burton Drive		1		2	2				1
371	School House Lane (Connection)		1		2	2				
83	Main Street Sidewalk									
61	Santa Rosa Creek Cross Town Trail						3		1, 2	
649	Main Street Bike Lane									

Error! Main Document Only.

Table ES-2 Summary of 2001 RTP Project Impacts*

Project ID*	Project Title	Traffic	Land Use	Air Quality	Noise	Visual	Water Resources	Geology	Biological Resources	Cultural Resources
242	Rehabilitate Bike Lanes									
244	Rehabilitate Pedestrian Path									
871	Main Street Bike Lanes									
1653	Windsor/Main Street Pedestrian Improvements									
1636	Cambria Park and Ride Lot									
SAN SIMEON PROJECTS										
247	Gateway and Pedestrian Access Improvements									
CENTRAL COUNTY SUBREGION										
CALTRANS PROJECTS										
449	Brizzolara Street Soundwall					2		1, 2		
340	Coastal Access MIS									
115	Project Cuesta Grade		1		2	1				
723	Route 1 – Construct Median Barrier					1				
721	Route 1 – Construct Median Barrier					1				
693	Route 1 – California Boulevard - Broad									
729	Route 101 Rehabilitate Pavement/San Luis Obispo									
734	Route 101 Roadside Rehabilitation from Los Osos Valley Road to San Luis Obispo Creek Bridge									
544	Route 101/Avila Road Interchange Improvements					1				
705	Route 227 Pavement Rehabilitation									
333	Route 101 – California Boulevard - Broad		1		2	1, 2			1	
545	Route 101 Northbound Auxiliary Lane from Prado Road to Madonna Road								1	
748	Route 101 Pavement Rehabilitation at Milepost 24 to 32.3									
546	Route 101 Southbound Auxiliary Lane from Broad Street to Marsh Street				2	1, 2			1	
547	Route 1/Los Osos Valley Road Interchange Improvements					1	3		1	

Error! Main Document Only.

Table ES-2 Summary of 2001 RTP Project Impacts*

Project ID*	Project Title	Traffic	Land Use	Air Quality	Noise	Visual	Water Resources	Geology	Biological Resources	Cultural Resources
735	Route 101 Roadside Rehabilitation, Los Osos Valley Road to San Luis Obispo Creek Bridge – Phase 2					1	1, 2			
332	Route 227 Widening		1, 4		2	2	3	1, 2	1, 2	
742	Various San Luis Obispo County Protective Betterments									
1605	Route 101 North County (Mile Post 21.1 to 24.3)		1		2	1, 2				
1606	Route 101 North County (Mile Post 24.3 to 30.3)		1		2	1, 2				
1607	Route 101 North County (Mile Post 30.3 to 32.3)		1		2	1, 2				
327	Route 101/Los Osos Valley Road Interchange								1	
328	Route 1/Cuesta College Interchange					1				
592	Route 101 San Luis Obispo Ramp Meters									
598	Changeable Message Signs									
473	Railroad Signal Upgrade									
913	Rail: San Luis Obispo-Santa Barbara Signal Upgrade									
CUESTA COLLEGE PROJECTS										
219	Historical Collection Facility									
SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY PROJECTS										
460	Buckley Road Rehabilitation									
411	City to Sea Pedestrian/Bike Trail						3		1, 2	
586	Cave Landing Trail						3		1, 2	
1889	Tank Farm Road Safety/Op. Improvements			1					1	
410	Railroad Bike Path, San Luis Obispo to Oceano									
SLOCOG PROJECTS										
159	Cuesta Grade Bicycle Connector						3			
833	Cal Poly-Cuesta Bikeway Connector									
908	Cal Poly-Cuesta Bikeway Connector 2									

Error! Main Document Only.

Table ES-2 Summary of 2001 RTP Project Impacts*

Project ID*	Project Title	Traffic	Land Use	Air Quality	Noise	Visual	Water Resources	Geology	Biological Resources	Cultural Resources
861	O'Conner Way Extension									
CITY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO PROJECTS										
630	ITS Automatic Voice Enunciator									
629	Fare Revenue Security									
627	800 Block Higuera Street									
571	Los Osos Valley Road/Route 101 Interchange Project Study Report (PSR)									
406	Calle Joaquin Realignment		1			2	3			
624	Johnson Avenue Rehabilitation									
694	Osos Street-Santa Barbara Street Rehabilitation									
331	Prado Road Interchange									
692	Prado Road Widening		1		2		3		1, 2	
448	South Higuera Street Rehabilitation									
90	Mid-Higuera Street Widening		1				1, 2			
405	Orcutt Road/UPRR Grade Crossing									
502	Prado Road East Connector		1		2	2	3		1, 2	
763	Santa Barbara Street Widening		1, 3			2				
528	Short-term Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation									
93	Smart Traffic Signals									
104	Traffic Signal Congestion Relief									
105	Traffic Signal Interconnect									
769	Santa Fe Road Realignment		4			2	3			
573	Traffic Signal Master Plan System									
892	Buckley Road Extension to South Higuera Street		1, 4		2	2				
1650	Marsh Street Bridge Replacement							1, 2		1
626	Los Osos Valley Road Medians						1, 2			
887	Medians on Broad Street						1, 2			
563	South Higuera Street Sidewalks						1, 2			

Error! Main Document Only.

Table ES-2 Summary of 2001 RTP Project Impacts*

Project ID*	Project Title	Traffic	Land Use	Air Quality	Noise	Visual	Water Resources	Geology	Biological Resources	Cultural Resources
757	City to Sea Pedestrian to Bike Trail – Phase 1						3		1, 2	
45	Railroad Bike Path Phase 2									
752	Railroad Bike Path Phase 3									
753	Railroad Bike Path Phase 4									
758	City to Sea Pedestrian/Bike Trail – Phase 2						3		1, 2	
756	Railroad Bike Path – Phase 4									
708	Pedestrian Improvements									
92	Montalban Pedestrian/Bike Bridge					2	3	1, 2	1, 2	
760	Sidewalk on Madonna Bridge at State Route 101									
761	Sidewalk on Madonna Road – Phase 2						3		1, 2	
79	Bike and Pedestrian Improvements									
94	Downtown Access Improvements									
102	Railroad Bike Path Study									
646	Prado Road Bike Lane Phase 2									
762	Safe Bike Route - Sinsheimer									
766	Lawrence Drive Pedestrian-Bike Bridge					2		1, 2		
644	Prado Road Bike Lane									
645	Prado Road Bike Lane									
759	Prefumo Creek Bike Path Connector									
754	Railroad Bike Path Phase 4					2		1, 2		
755	Railroad Bike Path Phase 6					2		1, 2		
647	Railroad Bike Path Phase 3					2		1, 2		
765	Garden Street Enhancement						1, 2			
562	Railroad Walk of History									
215	San Luis Obispo Freight Building									
764	Mission Plaza Expansion									
21	Bus Stop Improvements									
208	Downtown Interim Transfer Center			5						

Error! Main Document Only.

Table ES-2 Summary of 2001 RTP Project Impacts*

Project ID*	Project Title	Traffic	Land Use	Air Quality	Noise	Visual	Water Resources	Geology	Biological Resources	Cultural Resources
24	Transit Coach Replacement									
751	Fare Revenue Security System									
750	Smart Bus Stop System									
749	Transit Stop Voice Annunciator									
AVILA BEACH PROJECTS										
680	Route 101 Southbound Climbing/ Auxiliary Lane, Avila Beach					1, 2				
572	San Luis Bay Drive Bridge Replacement					2	3	1, 2	1, 2	1
574	City to Sea Pedestrian-Bike Trail Scoping									
552	Harford Pier Road Reconstruction									
166	Lighthouse Access Road					2				
1664	Pedestrian Promenade						3		1, 2	
1666	Bikeway to Front Street Park									
NORTH COUNTY SUBREGION										
CALTRANS PROJECTS										
686	Route 101 - Bridge Replacement						3	1, 2	1, 2	1
724	Route 101 – Construct Median Barrier									
685	Route 101 – Median Barrier									
501	Route 101 – North County Operational Improvements									
689	Route 101 – Various Rehabilitation Projects									
691	Route 101 – Bridge Rail Upgrades									
475	Route 41 West Pullouts					1				
476	Route 41/101 Interchange Reconstruction					1				
325	Route 46 East Operational Improvements					1, 2				
471	Route 46 East Widening – Phase 2		1, 4		2	1, 2	3		1, 2	
690	Route 46 - Various Rehabilitation Projects									
840	Route 101 Beautification, North County									
590	Route 101 – North County Operational					1, 2				

Error! Main Document Only.

Table ES-2 Summary of 2001 RTP Project Impacts*

Project ID*	Project Title	Traffic	Land Use	Air Quality	Noise	Visual	Water Resources	Geology	Biological Resources	Cultural Resources
	Improvements									
470	Route 46 East Widening – Phase 1		1, 4		2	1, 2	3		1, 2	
341	Route 46/101 Interchange Reconstruction					1				
743	San Luis Obispo County Protective Betterments									
687	Route 101 – Bridge Replacement									
702	Route 101 Bridge Rail Upgrades									
318	Route 41 East Widening – Phase 1		1		2	1, 2	3		1, 2	
324	Route 46 East Widening – Phase 3		1, 4		2	1, 2	3		1, 2	
329	Route 101 North County 6 Lane (Milepost 35.2 to 42.3)		1		2	1, 2	3		1, 2	
491	Route 101 North County 6 Lane (Milepost 42.3 to 58.0)		1		2	1, 2	3		1, 2	
319	Route 41 East Operational Improvements					1				
595	Route 101 – Santa Margarita/ Atascadero Ramp Meters									
599	Changeable Message Signs					2				
596	Route 101 – Paso Robles Ramp Meters									
497	Cuesta Grade/Route 58 Bikeway – Phase 1									
1625	Rail: Gilroy to San Luis Obispo Track Upgrades 1									
911	Rail: Amtrak Station Enhancements									
912	Rail: Cuesta Grade Second Mainline Track				2	2				
910	Rail: Gilroy to San Luis Obispo Track Upgrades 2									
920	Rail: Henry-Santa Margarita Realign		1		2	2				
915	Rail: McKay-Wellsona Curve Realign		1		2	2				
918	Rail: Templeton Siding Extension		1		2	2				
919	Rail: Templeton-Henry Curve Realign		1		2	2				
916	Rail: Wellsona Siding		1		2	2				
917	Rail: Wellsona to Paso Robles Realignments		1		2	2				

Error! Main Document Only.

Table ES-2 Summary of 2001 RTP Project Impacts*

Project ID*	Project Title	Traffic	Land Use	Air Quality	Noise	Visual	Water Resources	Geology	Biological Resources	Cultural Resources
SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY PROJECTS										
167	Route 101/Las Tablas Road Project Study Report (PSR)									
326	Route 101/Las Tablas Road Interchange Reconstruction									
636	Highway 46 West Operational Improvements					1				
677	Main Street Interchange Reconstruction									
500	Tassajara Creek Road Channelization									
674	Vineyard Drive Interchange Reconstruction									
343	Wellsona Road/101 Interchange Construction									
334	Atascadero/Templeton Road Roadway Connector		1, 4		2	2	3		1, 2	
635	Nacimiento Lake Drive Climbing Lane		1		2	2				
663	Install Traffic Signal									
662	Install Traffic Signal									
661	Ramada Drive Widening									
537	Templeton West Frontage Construction									
559	Cypress Mountain Drive Overlay									
499	Tassajara Creek Road – Route 58 Connector		1		2	2	3		1, 2	
1598	San Juan Creek Pedestrian Bridge					1, 2	3	1, 2	1, 2	
284	Templeton-Atascadero Bikeway Connector									
799	Route 58 Class II Bike Lanes									
668	Highway 46 West Bike Lanes					1				
671	Vineyard Drive Bike Lanes									
538	Main Street Bikeways									
539	Theater Drive Bikeways Construction									
642	Las Tablas Bike Lanes									
909	North River Road Bike Lanes									
800	Santa Margarita Ranch Multi-Use Trail									

Error! Main Document Only.

Table ES-2 Summary of 2001 RTP Project Impacts*

Project ID*	Project Title	Traffic	Land Use	Air Quality	Noise	Visual	Water Resources	Geology	Biological Resources	Cultural Resources
496	Cuesta Grade/Route 58 Bikeway – Phase 2									
216	San Miguel Mission Street Improvements									
556	Santa Margarita Streetscape Improvements – Phase 1									
900	Santa Margarita Streetscape Improvements – Phase 2									
SLOCOG PROJECTS										
673	State Route 46 East/Route 101 On-Ramp Improvements									
637	State Route 46 East/Route 101 On-Ramp Improvements 2									
504	Monterey Road Frontage Connector				2	2				
CITY OF ATASCADERO PROJECTS										
614	El Camino Real Traffic Signalization Project									
84	Route 101 – El Camino Real Corridor Study									
106	Route 101 – Traffic Way Project Study Report (PSR)									
317	Route 101 – Curbaril Avenue Interchange Reconstruction									
678	Route 101 – Traffic Way Interchange Reconstruction									
335	Route 101 – Santa Barbara Road Interchange Reconstruction									
338	Route 101 – Santa Rosa Avenue Interchange Reconstruction									
426	El Camino Real Rehabilitation									
85	El Camino Real Slurry Seal									
610	Santa Cruz Road Improvement Project									
428	Traffic Way/Buena Avenue Storm Drain									
508	Atascadero Interchange Intersection Signals									
248	Atascadero – Other Roadway Improvements									

Error! Main Document Only.

Table ES-2 Summary of 2001 RTP Project Impacts*

Project ID*	Project Title	Traffic	Land Use	Air Quality	Noise	Visual	Water Resources	Geology	Biological Resources	Cultural Resources
611	Santa Ysabel Avenue Rehabilitation									
531	Short-term Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation									
429	Traffic Way/Chico Road Storm Drain									
897	Lewis Avenue Bridge		1		2	2	3	1, 2	1, 2	
40	Santa Lucia Avenue/Graves Creek Bridge Replacement						3	1, 2	1, 2	1
613	Traffic Signal Preemption Project									
549	Atascadero Lake Walkway									
560	Curbaril Avenue Bike and Pedestrian Bridge					2		1, 2		
75	El Camino Real Bike Lanes, Phase III									
791	South El Camino Real Class II Bike Lanes									
36	Traffic Way Bike Lanes – Phase II									
793	North El Camino Real Class II Bike Lanes									
789	Portola Avenue Class III Bike Lanes									
787	Atascadero Railroad Multi-Use Path									
792	Route 41 West Class II Bike Lanes					2				
14	Route to School Enhancement									
609	El Camino Real Beautification and Pedestrian Improvements – Phase 1						1, 2			
898	El Camino Real Beautification and Pedestrian Improvements – Phase 2						1, 2			
899	El Camino Real Beautification and Pedestrian Improvements – Phase 3						1, 2			
1587	ATS Rolling Stock Procurement									
1588	ATS Rolling Stock Procurement									
1589	ATS Rolling Stock Procurement									
157	Bus Stop Amenities									
1932	Atascadero Transit Center			5						
285	Transit Vehicle Replacement									

Error! Main Document Only.

Table ES-2 Summary of 2001 RTP Project Impacts*

Project ID*	Project Title	Traffic	Land Use	Air Quality	Noise	Visual	Water Resources	Geology	Biological Resources	Cultural Resources
CITY OF PASO ROBLES PROJECTS										
186	Route 46 East Corridor Study									
567	Route 46 East Corridor Economic Study									
308	16 th Street Southbound On-Ramp Construction									
250	24 th Street Railroad Overcrossing Reconstruction							1, 2		1
272	Airport Road Widening		1, 4		2	2	3		1, 2	1
928	Airport Road Realignment/Extension		1, 4		2	2	3		1, 2	1
309	Route 46 East/Airport Road Interchange Construction					1				
389	13 th Street Bridge Widening		1		2	2	3	1, 2	1, 2	1
330	4 th Street Railroad Undercrossing and On-Ramp Improvements									
276	Golden Hill Road Widening – Phase 2		1		2	2				
418	Creston Road Widening		1		2	2				
271	Dry Creek Road Widening		1		2	2				
387	Charolais Road Bridge		1		2	2	3	1, 2	1, 2	
323	Route 46 East/Golden Hill Road Interchange Construction		3							
421	Spring Street Widening – Phase 2		1		2	2				
420	Spring Street Widening – Phase 1		1		2	2				
73	Union Road Widening		1		2	2				
568	4 th Street Railroad Undercrossing Project Study Report (PSR)									
835	Pavement Rehabilitation									
617	Buena Vista Drive Widening		1		2	2				
836	Pavement Rehabilitation									
837	Pavement Rehabilitation									
536	Pine Street Pedestrian Improvements						1, 2			
534	River Road Bike Path						3		1, 2	

Error! Main Document Only.

Table ES-2 Summary of 2001 RTP Project Impacts*

Project ID*	Project Title	Traffic	Land Use	Air Quality	Noise	Visual	Water Resources	Geology	Biological Resources	Cultural Resources
535	North River Road Bike Path						3		1, 2	
651	1 st Street Bike lanes									
191	South River Road Bike Path						3		1, 2	
70	Vine Street Bikeway									
640	24 th Street Bike Lanes									
569	Bikeway/Multi-Use Trail Master Plan									
652	Rolling Hills Road Bike Lane									
841	Park and Ride Lots									
828	Purchase Five Small- to Medium-Duty Buses									
831	Purchase Small- to Medium-Duty Buses									
832	Purchase Six Small- to Medium-Duty Buses									
585	Paso Robles Aviation Improvements	3	1		2			1, 2		
1630	Paso Robles Aviation Improvements	3	1		2			1, 2		
1631	Paso Robles Aviation Improvements	3	1		2			1, 2		
TEMPLETON PROJECTS										
685	Route 101 Median Barrier									
676	Las Tablas Road/Main Street Auxiliary Lane									
675	Vineyard Drive/Las Tablas Road Auxiliary Lane								1	
167	Route 101/Las Tablas Project Study Report (PSR)									
326	Route 101/Las Tablas Road Interchange Reconstruction									
677	Main Street Interchange Reconstruction								1	
674	Vineyard Drive Interchange Reconstruction								1	
663	Install Traffic Signal									
662	Install Traffic Signal									
661	Ramada Drive Widening		1		2	2				
537	Templeton West Frontage Construction		1		2	2	3		1, 2	
671	Vineyard Drive Bike Lanes									

Error! Main Document Only.

Table ES-2 Summary of 2001 RTP Project Impacts*

Project ID*	Project Title	Traffic	Land Use	Air Quality	Noise	Visual	Water Resources	Geology	Biological Resources	Cultural Resources
538	Main Street Bikeways									
539	Theater Drive Bikeway Construction									
642	Las Tablas Road Bike Lanes									
SANTA MARGARITA/GARDEN FARMS PROJECTS										
499	Tassajara Creek Road – Route 58 Connector									
500	Tassajara Creek Road Channelization									
800	Santa Margarita Ranch Multi-Use Trail									
799	Route 58 Class II Bike Lanes									
496	Cuesta Grade/Route 58 Bikeway Phase 2									
556	Santa Margarita Streetscape Improvements – Phase 1									
900	Santa Margarita Streetscape Improvements – Phase 2									
SOUTH COUNTY SUBREGION										
CALTRANS PROJECTS										
713	Route 1 Curve Realignment (Willow Road)					1				
697	Route 101 Median Barrier – Nipomo					1				
698	Route 101 Median Barrier – Pismo Beach					1				
719	Route 101 Median Irrigation/Planting					1	1			
718	Route 101 Median Irrigation/Planting						1			
716	Route 101 Operational Improvements – South County									
321	Route 101 Southbound Auxiliary Lane, Halcyon Road – Grand Avenue					1, 2				
680	Route 101 Southbound Climbing/ Auxiliary Lane, Avila Beach					1, 2				
714	Route 166 Curve Realignment									
715	Route 166 Curve Realignment (2)									
717	Route 166 Curve Realignment (3)		1		2	2				
699	Route 155 Guard Rail Upgrades									

Error! Main Document Only.

Table ES-2 Summary of 2001 RTP Project Impacts*

Project ID*	Project Title	Traffic	Land Use	Air Quality	Noise	Visual	Water Resources	Geology	Biological Resources	Cultural Resources
700	Route 166 Horizontal Curve Realignment									
322	Route 166 Operational Improvements									
703	Route 33 Pavement Rehabilitation									
336	Replace Santa Maria River Bridge					2	3	1, 2	1, 2	1
720	Route 101 Beautification – South County									
709	Route 101 Rehabilitation – South County									
701	Route 166 Bridge Upgrade/Paint									
711	Route 166 Pavement Rehabilitation									
741	Various Protective Betterments									
1603	Route 101 South County 6 Lane Widening (Mile Post 0.8-11.8)		1		2	1, 2				
1604	Route 101 South County 6 Lane Widening (Mile Post 11.8-21.1)		1		2	1, 2				
597	Changeable Message Signs					2				
594	Route 101 Five Cities Ramp Meters									
593	Route 101 Nipomo Ramp Meters									
768	Grover Beach Rail Siding Extension									
813	Grover Depot Voice Enunciation									
921	Rail: Hadley-Callender Curve Realign				2	2				
SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY PROJECTS										
679	Halcyon Road/Route 1 Upgrade Phase 1 Realignment					1, 2	3		1, 2	
347	Route 1 Halcyon Upgrade – Phase 2					1, 2	3		1, 2	
822	Route 1 Bike Lanes – Willow Road Segment					1				
458	Huasna Road Rehabilitation									
454	Los Berros Road Rehabilitation									
395	Improve Routes of Regional Significance									
515	Los Berros Road Widening/Bike Lanes					2				
511	El Campo Road Bike Lanes					2				

Error! Main Document Only.

Table ES-2 Summary of 2001 RTP Project Impacts*

Project ID*	Project Title	Traffic	Land Use	Air Quality	Noise	Visual	Water Resources	Geology	Biological Resources	Cultural Resources
819	Los Berros Road Bike Lanes, Valley to El Campo.									
824	North Frontage Road Construction		1		2	2				
817	Pomeroy Curve Realignment									
821	Aden Road Widening		1		2	2				
390	Class I and II Bike Lanes									
388	Route 1 Class II Bike Lanes					1				
SCAT PROJECTS										
633	SCAT Replacement Bus Procurement									
901	SCAT Trolley Rehabilitation									
1662	Grover Beach Multi-Modal Transit Center			5						
SLOCOG PROJECTS										
541	Route 101 northbound Auxiliary Lane, Brisco Road – Oak Park Boulevard					1, 2				
540	Route 101 northbound Auxiliary Lane, Grand Avenue – Brisco Road					1, 2				
543	Route 101 northbound Auxiliary Lane, South Junction 1-North Pismo					1, 2				
681	El Campo Road Southbound Acceleration and Deceleration Lanes					1				
542	Route 101 northbound Auxiliary Lane, Oak Park Boulevard - 4 th Street					1, 2				
682	Route 101 Southbound Shell Beach Off-Ramp		1			1				
902	Los Berros Road Park and Ride	1	1			2				
190	South County Park and Ride Lot Upgrade	1	1			2				
CITY OF ARROYO GRANDE PROJECTS										
666	Highway 101 Interchange Opticom Devices									
311	Reconstruct Route 101/Brisco Road Interchange					1				
683	Route 101 Ramp Realignment Grand Avenue – Fair Oaks Avenue		1		2	1, 2				
320	Route 101 – El Campo Road, Construct Interchange					1, 2				

Error! Main Document Only.

Table ES-2 Summary of 2001 RTP Project Impacts*

Project ID*	Project Title	Traffic	Land Use	Air Quality	Noise	Visual	Water Resources	Geology	Biological Resources	Cultural Resources
359	Route 227 (East Branch Street) Improvement									
164	Grand Avenue Rehabilitation/ Reconstruction – Phase 2									
425	Grand Avenue Rehabilitation/ reconstruction – Phase 3									
665	El Camino Real Widening/Retaining Wall		1			2				
286	Branch Mill Road Rehabilitation									
419	Bridge Street Bridge Deck Rehabilitation									
529	Long-term Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation									
96	Pavement Management Projects									
669	Rodeo Drive Traffic Calming									
424	Talley Ho Road Rehabilitation/ Reconstruction									
360	Old Town Pedestrian and Landscaping Improvements						1			
554	Scenic Creek Walkway Phase 3						1, 2, 3		1, 2	
218	Scenic Creekside Walk – Phase 2						1, 2, 3		1, 2	
903	Scenic Creekside Walkway – Phase 4						1, 2, 3		1, 2	
664	Bikeway Project 1, Phases 2 and 3									
863	Fair Oaks Avenue to Farroll Road Bike Connector									
868	Corbett Canyon Road Bike Lane									
867	Corbett Canyon Road Bike Route									
864	Urban Halcyon Road Bike Route									
564	Montego Street Sidewalks – Phase 2									
670	Spruce Street Sidewalks									
CITY OF GROVER BEACH PROJECTS										
74	Downtown Traffic Improvements									
744	South Oak Park Boulevard Right-of-Way Acquisition and Widening		1, 3		2	2				
295	The Pike Rehabilitation									

Error! Main Document Only.

Table ES-2 Summary of 2001 RTP Project Impacts*

Project ID*	Project Title	Traffic	Land Use	Air Quality	Noise	Visual	Water Resources	Geology	Biological Resources	Cultural Resources
385	Upgrade Grand Avenue Traffic Signals									
290	Widen North Oak Park Boulevard		1		2	2				
386	Widen South 4 th Street		1		2	2				
527	Short-term Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation									
653	Various Road Maintenance 2000 RTIP									
413	Long-Term Improvement, Local Streets									
154	Beach Pedestrian Boardwalk								1, 2	
827	Pismo Marsh Pedestrian Trail						3		1, 2	
855	4 th Street Bike Lanes, Grand Avenue to Ocean View									
862	Oak Park Boulevard Bike Lanes									
858	El Camino Real Bike Route									
1662	Grover Multi-Modal Transit Center									
768	Grover Beach Rail Siding Extension									
813	Grover Depot Voice Enunciation									
1896	Ramona Park Streetscape Improvements			5						
CITY OF PISMO BEACH PROJECTS										
480	Price Street/James Way Extension		1		2	2			1, 2	
1595	Ocean Drive and Seacliff Drive Bluff Protection									
924	4 th Street Widening		1		2	2	3		1, 2	
355	Downtown Street Improvements									
99	Shell Beach Road Slope Protection									
398	Inland Arterial Road Extensions		1, 4		2	2				
370	Oak Park Boulevard-Price Canyon Road Arterial		1, 4		2	2			1, 2	
82	Local Street/Road Maintenance									
1596	Taft and Miscellaneous Shell Beach Street Rehabilitation									
659	Various Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation 2000/2001									

Error! Main Document Only.

Table ES-2 Summary of 2001 RTP Project Impacts*

Project ID*	Project Title	Traffic	Land Use	Air Quality	Noise	Visual	Water Resources	Geology	Biological Resources	Cultural Resources
922	Cypress Street Bluff Stabilization									
366	Downtown Parking Expansion									
530	Long-term Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation									
213	Beach Boardwalk – Phase 3						3		1, 2	
356	Beach Stairway Replacement						3		1, 2	
60	Pedestrian Promenade – Phase 2						3		1, 2	
555	Pismo Beach Pedestrian Promenade –Phase 4						3		1, 2	
925	Shell Beach Road Corridor Enhancement									
1654	Pismo-U.S. 101 Bike/Pedestrian Overpass					1, 2		1, 2		
847	Hinds Avenue Class II Bike Link									
857	Five Cities Drive Bike Lanes									
367	Pismo Creek Pedestrian Bridge					2	3	1, 2	1, 2	
400	Bike and Pedestrian Path Expansion									
354	Cypress Street Bridge Rehabilitation					2				1
923	Bello Street Historic Bridge					2	3	1, 2	1, 2	1
658	Intersection ITS Improvements									
926	Downtown Pismo Streetscape									
904	Pismo Beach Park and Ride Lots									
NIPOMO PROJECTS										
815	Hill Street/Route 101 Southbound On-Ramp Relocation					2				
684	Route 101/Willow Road Interchange									
403	Southland Street/Route 101 Southbound On-Ramp									
517	Orchard Avenue Widening/Bike Lanes (1)		1		2	2				
344	Willow Road Extension		1, 4		2	2				
521	South Frontage Road Widening/Bike Lanes		1			2				
518	Orchard Avenue Widening/Bike Lanes (2)		1		2	2				
814	Orchard Avenue/Joshua Street/Hutton Road Bike									

Error! Main Document Only.

Table ES-2 Summary of 2001 RTP Project Impacts*

Project ID*	Project Title	Traffic	Land Use	Air Quality	Noise	Visual	Water Resources	Geology	Biological Resources	Cultural Resources
	Lanes									
520	Pomeroy Road Widening and Bike Lanes		1			2				
523	Traffic Signals (11) and Turn Pockets									
818	West Tefft Street Widening		1		2	2				
825	Hill Street Widening (Nipomo)		1		2	2				
816	Mary Avenue Construction (Nipomo)		1		2	2				
826	Sandydale Drive Paving									
516	Nipomo Regional Park Bike/Pedestrian Path									
519	Pacific Coast Railroad Bike/Pedestrian Path									
514	Juniper Street Bike Lanes									
550	Olde Town Nipomo Enhancements		1		2					
OCEANO PROJECTS										
823	Halcyon Road Shoulders/Bike Lanes									
852	Cienega Street Bike Lanes (Elm to Halcyon)									
850	Front Street Class II Bike Lanes									
558	Oceano Elementary Pedestrian Enhancements									
76	13 th Street - Oceano Bike Lanes									
1599	Downtown Oceano Pedestrian Enhancement									
77	17 th Street - Oceano Bike Lanes									
95	Paso Robles Street - Oceano Bike Lanes									
1627	Oceano Aviation Improvements	3	1		2	2		1, 2		
1629	Oceano Aviation Improvements	3	1		2	2		1, 2		
1633	Oceano Aviation Improvements	3	1		2	2		1, 2		

Error! Main Document Only.

2. INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is the major policy document of the San Luis Obispo Council of Governments (SLOCOG) and is required under Federal planning regulations. It is a planning document that outlines future transportation investment strategies for the San Luis Obispo County Region over the next twenty years, given a reasonable estimate of future transportation revenues. The last update of the RTP was adopted by the Board on December 5, 2001.

The full CEQA evaluation of the 2001 Regional Transportation Plan is contained in the *Final EIR on the 2001 RTP (available at www.slocog.org)*.

The purpose of this Addendum to the Environmental Impact Report (Addendum to the EIR) is to make minor changes and additions to the previously certified EIR for the 2001 Regional Transportation Plan (2001 RTP EIR) to address the proposed Update (Vision 2025) to the 2001 Regional Transportation Plan.

UPDATE TO THE 2001 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

SLOCOG staff is preparing the Update (Vision 2025) to the 2001 Regional Transportation Plan for the Board’s consideration and approval. The Update consists of the following administrative updates:

1. The RTP is presented in an almost entirely different format. The reason for this is for improved readability and ease of use, as well as to comply with State RTP Guidelines. The plan’s policies are largely unchanged, but are presented in a very different manner. They have been condensed into the goals, policy objectives and action policies in the body of the RTP, while the bulk of the policies have been moved to Appendix A of the RTP. The following Policy and “Core Value” have been added to the RTP.

Policy	Conserve and protect natural and sensitive resources.
Core Value	Minimize adverse impacts to the environment.

2. The Update adds the following new projects to the RTP:

Project Name	Location	Short Description
Tank Farm Rd. Safety Op. Improvements	San Luis Obispo County	Just west of Broad, Widen roadway to accommodate left-turn channelization
Ramona Park Streetscape Improvements	Grover Beach	Develop phased Improvement to enhance pedestrian experience
Main/San Yacinto Intersection Imps.	Morro Bay	Construct intersection mods. to improve operations and capacity.
Main/Radcliff Intersection Improvements	Morro Bay	Construct intersection mods. to improve operations and capacity.
Atascadero Transit Center	Atascadero	Construct transit center in Downtown Atascadero

This Addendum addresses the changes and additions to the RTP, as follows:

Error! Main Document Only.
Administrative Changes

Change of the RTP format

The changes to the format of the RTP is an administrative change that will have no impacts to the physical environment. Therefore, SLOCOG finds that it would not result in regional impacts which are different from those disclosed in the 2001 RTP EIR.

Additions to the RTP

Policy – Conserve and protect natural and sensitive resources.

This policy change will have no impacts to the physical environment. Therefore, SLOCOG finds that it would not result in regional impacts, which are different from those disclosed in the 2001 RTP EIR.

Core Value – Minimize adverse impacts to the environment.

This policy change will have no impacts to the physical environment. Therefore, SLOCOG finds that it would not result in regional impacts, which are different from those disclosed in the 2001 RTP EIR.

Tank Farm Rd. Safety Op. Improvements

This project will improve an existing safety condition on Tank Farm Road due to the lack of left-turn channelization at the intersection with Santa Fe Road. Although there will be project level impacts, they will be mitigated to a less than significant level. Thus, SLOCOG finds that the addition of the project as part of the Update (Vision 2025) to the 2001 RTP would not result in regional impacts which are different from those disclosed in the 2001 RTP EIR.

Ramona Park Streetscape Improvements

This project will construct multi-modal improvements in the vicinity of Ramona Park. Improvements will include sidewalks, bikelanes, bulbouts, and a new transit center. The project is entirely within an urbanized, disturbed area. The transit center is an existing use. The improvements consist of street, sidewalk, and shelter improvements. Although there will be project level impacts, they will be less than significant. Thus, SLOCOG finds that the addition of the project as part of the Update (Vision 2025) to the 2001 RTP would not result in regional impacts which are different from those disclosed in the 2001 RTP EIR.

Main/San Yacinto Intersection Improvements

This project will improve the operations of the intersection by realigning the horizontal geometrics of the intersection. The project is entirely within an urbanized, disturbed area. Although there will be project level impacts, they will be less than significant. Thus, SLOCOG finds that the addition of the project as part of the Update (Vision 2025) to the 2001 RTP would not result in regional impacts which are different from those disclosed in the 2001 RTP EIR.

Main/Radcliff Intersection Improvements

This project will improve the operations of the intersection by realigning the horizontal

Error! Main Document Only.

geometrics of the intersection. Although there will be project level impacts, they will be less than significant. Thus, SLOCOG finds that the addition of the project as part of the Update (Vision 2025) to the 2001 RTP would not result in regional impacts which are different from those disclosed in the 2001 RTP EIR.

Atascadero Transit Center

This project will construct a transit center in downtown Atascadero. The project is entirely within an urbanized, disturbed area. Although there will be project level impacts, they will be mitigated to a less than less than significant level. Thus, SLOCOG finds that the addition of the project as part of the Update (Vision 2025) to the 2001 RTP would not result in regional impacts which are different from those disclosed in the 2001 RTP EIR.

DETERMINATION TO PREPARE ADDENDUM TO 2001 RTP EIR

Section 15162 of the Guidelines to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that a certified EIR be updated when substantial changes are proposed in a project. SLOCOG has determined that the 2001 RTP EIR, which was certified on December 5, 2001 requires some necessary changes and additions to address the Update (Vision 2025) to the 2001 RTP but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a Subsequent EIR or Supplemental EIR have occurred.

Section 15164 of the Guidelines permits a lead agency to prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 have occurred. Because the RTP is a regional document and the addition of the five new projects as part of the Update (Vision 2025) to the RTP is small, only minor changes to the impact areas in the 2001 RTP EIR are required to adequately address changes. The environmental effects of these new projects will not enlarge the magnitude of the RTP's environmental impacts.

Based on these factors, SLOCOG has determined that an Addendum to the EIR is the appropriate CEQA document for the proposed Update (Vision 2025) to the 2001 RTP. The Addendum to the EIR contains only minor changes and additions necessary to make the previous EIR adequate, and the changes made by the addendum do not raise important new issues about the significant effects to the environment. An addendum need not be circulated for public review but can be included in or attached to the final EIR. Interested readers may find copies of the 2001 RTP EIR (including this document) in the San Luis Obispo City/County, South County, and Paso Robles Libraries, as well as the SLOCOG office (1150 Osos St. Suite 202, San Luis Obispo and at www.slocog.org).

In accordance with CEQA, therefore, the purpose of this document is to make minor changes or additions in the 2001 RTP EIR to address the proposed Update (Vision 2025) of the 2001 Regional Transportation Plan. In general, the environmental assessment for the overall 2001 RTP program remains unchanged for the amended RTP program

3. REVISIONS TO IMPACT ANALYSIS

The significant impacts and required mitigation identified in the 2001 RTP EIR have not changed. Only minor changes or additions to the impact areas are necessary to address the

Error! Main Document Only.

proposed Update (Vision 2025) to the 2001 RTP.

Sections and Tables in this Addendum to the EIR are numbered as in the 2001 RTP EIR so that the reader can easily cross-reference sections to the 2001 RTP EIR

The revisions to the impact analysis for each section are as follows:

4.1 Transportation

The Transportation Section set forth in the 2001 RTP EIR remains accurate and is unchanged by this Addendum. None of the additional 5 projects will have any significant transportation impacts and will result in transportation improvements.

4.2 Land Use and Agriculture

The Land Use and Agricultural Section set forth in the 2001 RTP EIR remains accurate and is unchanged by this Addendum. None of the additional 5 projects will have any significant impacts to land use or agriculture.

4.3 Air Quality

The Air Quality Section set forth in the 2001 RTP EIR remains accurate and is unchanged by this Addendum, except for revisions to Table 4.3-5 as described below.

Table 4.3-5 RTP Projects That May Result in Air Quality Impacts

Project	Lead Agency	Location	Impact	Description of Impact
Tank Farm Rd. Safety Op. Improvements	County of San Luis Obispo	Tank Farm Road, west of Broad St.	AQ-1	Project could result in short-term construction emissions that could generate temporary increase in local air pollution
Atascadero Transit Center	City of Atascadero	Downtown Atascadero	AQ-5	Project could result in stationary emission sources that expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.
Ramona Park Streetscape Imp.	City of Grover Beach	Downtown Grover Beach	AQ-5	Project could result in stationary emission sources that expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

4.4 Noise

The Noise Section set forth in the 2001 RTP EIR remains accurate and is unchanged by this Addendum. None of the additional 5 projects will have any significant noise impacts.

Error! Main Document Only.

4.5 Aesthetics

The Aesthetics Section set forth in the 2001 RTP EIR remains accurate and is unchanged by this Addendum. None of the additional 5 projects will have any significant aesthetics impacts.

4.6 Water Resources

The Water Resources Section set forth in the 2001 RTP EIR remains accurate and is unchanged by this Addendum. None of the additional 5 projects will have any significant water related impacts.

4.7 Geological Resources

The Geological Resources Section set forth in the 2001 RTP EIR remains accurate and is unchanged by this Addendum. None of the additional 5 projects will have any significant geologic impacts.

4.8 Biological Resources

The Biological Resources Section set forth in the 2001 RTP EIR remains accurate and is unchanged by this Addendum, except for revisions to Table 4.8-1 as described below.

Table 4.8-1 RTP Projects That May Result in Biological Resources Impacts

Project	Lead Agency	Location	Impact	Description of Impact
Tank Farm Rd. Safety Op. Improvements	County of San Luis Obispo	Tank Farm Road	B-1	Possible temporary impacts to riparian vegetation associated with construction activities.

4.9 Cultural Resources

The Cultural Resources Section set forth in the 2001 RTP EIR remains accurate and is unchanged by this Addendum. None of the additional 5 projects will have any significant cultural impacts.

4. ALTERNATIVES

Chapter 6 of the 2001 RTP EIR has been reviewed and is still found to be applicable. There are no changes pertaining to this chapter in this Addendum to the EIR.

5. CEQA-REQUIRED CONCLUSIONS

The 2001 RTP EIR assesses the impact of the RTP in several subject areas specifically required by CEQA. These include:

Error! Main Document Only.

- Cumulative Impacts
- Growth-Inducing Impacts
- Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes
- Short-term use of the environment vs. Long-Term Environmental Productivity.

These sections have been reviewed and is still found to be applicable. There are no changes pertaining to these section areas in this Addendum to the EIR.