

# State Route 4 Transportation Management Systems Upgrade

Various locations in San Joaquin County  
10-SJ-Various State Routes-Various Post Miles  
Project Number 1018000007

## Initial Study with Proposed Negative Declaration

Volume 1 of 2



Prepared by the  
State of California Department of Transportation

July 2022



## General Information About This Document

### ***What's in this document:***

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) has prepared this Initial Study, which examines the potential environmental impacts of alternatives being considered for the proposed project in San Joaquin County in California. The document explains why the project is being proposed, the alternatives being considered for the project, the existing environment that could be affected by the project, potential impacts of each of the alternatives, and proposed avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures.

### ***What you should do:***

- Please read the document. Additional copies of the document and the related technical studies are available for review at the Caltrans district office at 1976 East Doctor Martin Luther King Junior Boulevard, Stockton, California 95205 and the Cesar Chavez Central Library at 605 North El Dorado Street, Stockton, California 95202-1907. The document is also available online at the following web address: <https://dot.ca.gov/caltrans-near-me/district-10>.
- Tell us what you think. If you have any comments regarding the proposed project, please send your written comments to Caltrans by the deadline. Submit comments via U.S. mail to: Jaycee Azevedo, District 10 Environmental Division, California Department of Transportation, 1976 East Doctor Martin Luther King Junior Boulevard, Stockton, California 95205. Submit comments via email to: [Jaycee.Azevedo@dot.ca.gov](mailto:Jaycee.Azevedo@dot.ca.gov).
- Submit comments by the deadline: November 25, 2022.

### ***What happens next:***

After comments are received from the public and the reviewing agencies, Caltrans may 1) give environmental approval to the proposed project, 2) do additional environmental studies, or 3) abandon the project. If the project is given environmental approval and funding is appropriated, Caltrans could design and construct all or part of the project.

Printing this document: To save paper, this document has been set up for two-sided printing (to print the front and back of a page). Blank pages occur where needed throughout the document to maintain proper layout of the chapters and appendices.

For individuals with sensory disabilities, this document can be made available in Braille, in large print, on audiocassette, or on computer disk. To obtain a copy in one of these alternate formats, please write to or call Caltrans, Attention: Jaycee Azevedo, District 10 Environmental Division, 1976 East Doctor Martin Luther King Junior Boulevard, Stockton, California 95205; 209-992-9824 (Voice), or use the California Relay Service 1-800-735-2929 (Teletype to Voice), 1-800-735-2922 (Voice to Teletype), 1-800-855-3000 (Spanish Teletype to Voice and Voice to Teletype), 1-800-854-7784 (Spanish and English Speech-to-Speech), or 711.

Update Transportation Management System elements at multiple locations across San Joaquin County on State Routes 4, 12, 26, 33, 88, 99 and 120, Interstate 5, and Interstate 205

**INITIAL STUDY  
with Proposed Negative Declaration**

Submitted Pursuant to: (State) Division 13, California Public Resources Code

THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
Department of Transportation  
and  
Responsible Agency: California Transportation Commission

For: James P. Henke C. Scott Guidi  
James P. Henke  
Environmental Office Chief, District 10  
California Department of Transportation  
CEQA Lead Agency

7/26/2022

Date

The following individual can be contacted for more information about this document:

Jaycee Azevedo, 1976 East Doctor Martin Luther King Junior Boulevard, Stockton, California 95205; email: jaycee.azevedo@dot.ca.gov; phone: 209-992-9824





**DRAFT**  
**Proposed Negative Declaration**

Pursuant to: Division 13, Public Resources Code

**State Clearinghouse Number:** pending

**District-County-Route-Post Mile:** 10-SJ-VAR-VAR

**EA/Project Number:** 10-1F960/1018000007

**Project Description**

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) proposes to improve the mobility of travelers on State Routes 4, 12, 26, 33, 88, 99 and 120, Interstate 5, and Interstate 205 by updating the Transportation Management System (TMS) elements at 37 locations across San Joaquin County that are obsolete or do not meet current Caltrans standards. The project would also install new fiber optic cable at eight locations, upgrade or install traffic monitoring stations in cabinets at nine locations, install weather information systems at six locations, install pull boxes at six locations, install a manhole at one location, upgrade motor vehicle pullouts at four locations, and replace or install closed-circuit television (CCTV) cameras at 25 locations.

**Determination**

An Initial Study has been prepared by Caltrans District 10. On the basis of this study, it is determined that the proposed action will not have a significant effect upon the environment for the following reasons:

- Impacts to special-status fish species and Essential Fish Habitat would be minimized by limiting in-water activities to daylight hours between June 1 and October 31, and requiring vibratory pile driving instead of impact pile driving.
- Impacts to the giant garter snake and western pond turtle would be avoided and minimized through preconstruction surveys, and by limiting construction to a work window of May 1 to October 1.

---

James P. Henke  
Environmental Office Chief, District 10  
California Department of Transportation

---

Date



# Table of Contents

<b>Chapter 1</b>	Proposed Project .....	1
1.1	Introduction.....	1
1.2	Purpose and Need.....	1
1.2.1	Purpose.....	1
1.2.2	Need .....	1
1.3	Project Description.....	1
1.4	Project Alternatives.....	2
1.4.1	Build Alternative .....	2
1.4.2	No-Build (No-Action) Alternative .....	3
1.5	Standard Measures and Best Management Practices Included in All Build Alternatives.....	3
1.6	Discussion of the NEPA Categorical Exclusion .....	4
1.7	Permits and Approvals Needed .....	5
<b>Chapter 2</b>	CEQA Evaluation .....	7
2.1	CEQA Environmental Checklist .....	7
2.1.1	Aesthetics .....	7
2.1.2	Agriculture and Forest Resources.....	8
2.1.3	Air Quality .....	9
2.1.4	Biological Resources.....	10
2.1.5	Cultural Resources.....	14
2.1.6	Energy.....	15
2.1.7	Geology and Soils.....	15
2.1.8	Greenhouse Gas Emissions .....	16
2.1.9	Hazards and Hazardous Materials .....	18
2.1.10	Hydrology and Water Quality .....	19
2.1.11	Land Use and Planning.....	20
2.1.12	Mineral Resources.....	21
2.1.13	Noise.....	21
2.1.14	Population and Housing.....	22
2.1.15	Public Services .....	22
2.1.16	Recreation .....	23
2.1.17	Transportation.....	23
2.1.18	Tribal Cultural Resources .....	24
2.1.19	Utilities and Service Systems.....	25
2.1.20	Wildfire.....	25
2.1.21	Mandatory Findings of Significance .....	26
<b>Appendix A</b>	Title VI Policy Statement.....	28





# **Chapter 1**      Proposed Project

---

## **1.1 Introduction**

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Caltrans proposes to update Transportation Management System (TMS) elements at 37 locations across San Joaquin County. Figure 1-1 shows the project vicinity map.

## **1.2 Purpose and Need**

### **1.2.1 Purpose**

The purpose of the project is to improve the mobility of travelers on State Routes 4, 12, 26, 33, 88, 99 and 120, Interstate 5, and Interstate 205 by updating Transportation Management System elements at 37 locations across San Joaquin County.

### **1.2.2 Need**

The project is needed because Transportation Management System elements in the project area were identified as being obsolete or not meeting current Caltrans standards.

## **1.3 Project Description**

Caltrans proposes to update Transportation Management System elements at 37 locations across San Joaquin County that are obsolete or do not meet current Caltrans standards. The project would also install new fiber optic cable at eight locations, upgrade or install traffic monitoring stations in cabinets at nine locations, install weather information systems at six locations, install pull boxes at six locations, install a manhole at one location, upgrade motor vehicle pullouts at four locations, and replace or install closed-circuit television (CCTV) cameras at 25 locations.

Figure 1-1 Project Vicinity Map



## 1.4 Project Alternatives

The project has two alternatives—a Build Alternative and a No-Build Alternative—under consideration.

### 1.4.1 Build Alternative

The project area covers 37 locations along State Routes 4, 12, 26, 33, 88, 99 and 120, Interstate 5, and Interstate 205 in San Joaquin County. The Build Alternative would install new fiber optic cable at eight locations, upgrade or install traffic monitoring stations in cabinets at nine locations, install weather

information systems at six locations, install pull boxes at six locations, install a manhole at one location, upgrade motor vehicle pullouts at four locations, and replace or install closed-circuit television cameras at 25 locations.

This project contains a number of standardized project measures that are used on most, if not all, Caltrans projects and were not developed in response to any specific environmental impact resulting from the proposed project. These measures are listed later in this chapter under “Standard Measures and Best Management Practices Included in All Build Alternatives.”

#### **1.4.2 No-Build (No-Action) Alternative**

The No-Build Alternative would leave the Transportation Management System elements in their current condition. These elements are obsolete or do not meet current Caltrans standards. Therefore, the No-Build Alternative would not meet the purpose and need of the project.

### **1.5 Standard Measures and Best Management Practices Included in All Build Alternatives**

The following Best Management Practices are anticipated to be implemented on the project, where applicable. The final list of Best Management Practices will be submitted by the contractor and approved for inclusion in the construction contract by Caltrans later in the project design phase as part of the preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan or Water Pollution Control Plan.

- SS-1 Scheduling
- SS-2 Preservation of Existing Vegetation
- SS-4 Hydroseeding
- SS-5 Soil Binders
- SS-6 Straw Mulch
- SS-7 Temporary Cover and Rolled Erosion Control Products
- NS-1 Water Conservation Practices
- NS-6 Illegal Connection and Illicit Discharge Detection and Reporting
- NS-8 Vehicle and Equipment Cleaning
- NS-9 Vehicle and Equipment Fueling
- NS-10 Vehicle and Equipment Maintenance
- NS-13 Material and Equipment Use Over Water
- WM-1 Material Delivery and Storage

- WM-2 Material Use
- WM-3 Stockpile Management
- WM-4 Spill Prevention and Control
- WM-5 Solid Waste Management
- WM-6 Hazardous Waste Management
- WM-7 Contaminated Soil Management
- WM-9 Sanitary and Septic Waste Management
- WM-10 Liquid Waste Management

The following measures from the 2018 Caltrans Standard Specifications will also be implemented in the project, where applicable:

- Section 4-1.13 (Scope of Work—Cleanup)
- Section 7-1.02K(6)(j)(iii) (Earth Material Containing Lead)
- Section 10-5 (Dust Control)
- Section 13 (Water Pollution Control)
- Section 14-6.03A (Species Protection)
- Section 14-6.10 (Exclusionary Devices)
- Section 14-6.03B (Bird Protection)
- Section 14-8 (Noise Control)
- Section 14-9.02 (Air Pollution Control)
- Section 14-11.03 (Hazardous Waste Management)
- Section 20-1.03C(3) (Weed Control)

## **1.6 Discussion of the NEPA Categorical Exclusion**

This document contains information regarding compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and other state laws and regulations. Separate environmental documentation, supporting a Categorical Exclusion determination, has been prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act. When needed for clarity, or as required by CEQA, this document may contain references to federal laws and/or regulations (CEQA, for example, requires consideration of adverse effects on species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species by the U.S. National Marine Fisheries Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service—that is, species protected by the Federal Endangered Species Act).

## 1.7 Permits and Approvals Needed

The following permits, licenses, agreements, and certifications are required for project construction:

Agency	Permit/Approval	Status
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Endangered Species Act Section 7: Letter of Concurrence	Letter of Concurrence was received on April 1, 2022.
National Marine Fisheries Service	Endangered Species Act Section 7: Letter of Concurrence	Letter of Concurrence was received on March 22, 2022.
Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board	Clean Water Act Section 401: Water Quality Certification	The permit would be obtained during the design phase of the project.
Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board	Clean Water Act Section 402: National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit	The permit would be obtained during the design phase of the project.
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 Section 10: Nationwide Permit 57	The permit would be obtained during the design phase of the project.
California Department of Fish and Wildlife	California Fish and Game Code Section 1602: Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement	The permit would be obtained during the design phase of the project.



# Chapter 2 CEQA Evaluation

---

## 2.1 CEQA Environmental Checklist

This checklist identifies physical, biological, social, and economic factors that might be affected by the project. Potential impact determinations include Significant and Unavoidable Impact, Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated, Less Than Significant Impact, and No Impact. In many cases, background studies performed in connection with a project will indicate that there are no impacts to a particular resource. A “No Impact” answer reflects this determination. The questions in this checklist are intended to encourage the thoughtful assessment of impacts and do not represent thresholds of significance.

Project features, which can include both design elements of the project and standardized measures that are applied to all or most Caltrans projects such as Best Management Practices and measures included in the Standard Plans and Specifications or as Standard Special Provisions, are considered to be an integral part of the project and have been considered prior to any significance determinations documented below.

“No Impact” determinations in each section are based on the scope, description, and location of the project as well as the appropriate technical report (bound separately in Volume 2), and no further discussion is included in this document.

### 2.1.1 Aesthetics

Considering the information in the Scenic Resources Evaluation dated June 20, 2022, and the Visual Impact Assessment dated June 21, 2022, the following significance determinations have been made:

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099:

Question—Would the project:	CEQA Significance Determinations for Aesthetics
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	No Impact
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	No Impact

Question—Would the project:	CEQA Significance Determinations for Aesthetics
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<b>No Impact</b>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<b>No Impact</b>

### 2.1.2 Agriculture and Forest Resources

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

Considering the information in the Community Impact Memorandum dated June 30, 2022, the following significance determinations have been made:

Question—Would the project:	CEQA Significance Determinations for Agriculture and Forest Resources
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<b>No Impact</b>



<b>Question—Would the project:</b>	<b>CEQA Significance Determinations for Agriculture and Forest Resources</b>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<b>No Impact</b>
c) Conflict with existing zoning, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?	<b>No Impact</b>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<b>No Impact</b>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<b>No Impact</b>

### 2.1.3 Air Quality

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

Considering the information in the Air Quality Memorandum dated June 27, 2022, the following significance determinations have been made:

<b>Question—Would the project:</b>	<b>CEQA Significance Determinations for Air Quality</b>
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<b>No Impact</b>
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	<b>No Impact</b>
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<b>No Impact</b>

Question—Would the project:	CEQA Significance Determinations for Air Quality
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<b>No Impact</b>

### 2.1.4 Biological Resources

Considering the information in the Natural Environment Study dated February 26, 2022, the following significance determinations have been made:

Question—Would the project:	CEQA Significance Determinations for Biological Resources
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, or National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries?	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<b>No Impact</b>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<b>No Impact</b>

Question—Would the project:	CEQA Significance Determinations for Biological Resources
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<b>No Impact</b>

**Affected Environment**

Natural communities and habitat-based surveys for special-status species were conducted from November 22 to November 23, 2021. Aquatic resources were also delineated at the Smith Canal on October 6, 2021 in accordance with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers regulatory guidance.

Most of the proposed construction activities would be limited to the existing Caltrans right-of-way within existing paved roadways, disturbed road shoulders, on existing structures, and within graveled/graded pullouts and staging areas. The exception is Location 1 at the Smith Canal, which may require in-water access (via a barge or other suitable water platform) to install soffit hangers on the underside of the bridge to attach new conduit.

The project area is largely urban and includes natural communities of special concern, as well as unnatural ruderal, landscaped, and developed areas. Most of the work would occur in developed areas, except for the natural communities of special concern at Location 1 in the Smith Canal and Location 5 in the Stockton Diverting Canal.

The banks of the Smith Canal are sparsely vegetated with native and nonnative plants and trees, including Himalayan blackberry, ripgut brome, wild oats, and ornamental trees. However, 60 percent of the banks consist of bare ground. The Stockton Diverting Canal is also sparsely vegetated with similar native and nonnative plants and trees, with a large proportion of bare or disturbed area. The riparian habitat surrounding the canals is a sensitive natural community.

Both canals are designated as critical habitat for the California Central Valley steelhead, North American green sturgeon, and delta smelt. Also, the Smith Canal is considered Essential Fish Habitat for the Chinook salmon. The Ordinary High-Water Mark Delineation Report prepared for the project determined that the Smith Canal qualifies as potential non-wetland Waters of the United States and non-wetland waters of the State.

The Stockton Diverting Canal and Smith Canal could serve as potential habitat for the giant garter snake and western pond turtle, while the bridges over both the canals could support night-roosting bats or structures-nesting migratory birds. Also, there are trees and grasslands in the larger project

vicinity that could serve as potential nesting and foraging locations for the Swainson's hawk, white-tailed kite, non-special-status birds, or other raptors.

### ***Environmental Consequences***

The project would not affect special-status plant species because most of the project area does not contain suitable habitat. The areas around the Smith Canal and Stockton Diverting Canal do contain riparian habitat with potential for special-status plants, but work would not be conducted on the canal banks.

While no in-water work is proposed at the Stockton Diverting Canal, some special-status species could potentially be affected by the work at the Smith Canal. The Smith Canal and Stockton Diverting Canal contain low potential habitat for the giant garter snake and western pond turtle. However, the only component of the project that could potentially impact the giant garter snake or western pond turtle is the installation of the conduit on the underside of the Smith Canal Bridge. However, the bridges over the Stockton Diverting Canal and Smith Canal could host structures-nesting migratory birds or roosting bats, which could be disturbed by the installation of conduits.

The immediate project area does not support suitable nest trees or foraging grasslands for Swainson's hawk, white-tailed kite, non-special-status birds, or other raptors. However, there are larger trees and more suitable foraging areas in the project vicinity, farther from the work locations. These nesting and foraging areas may be indirectly affected by construction-generated noise.

The California Central Valley steelhead, North American green sturgeon, delta smelt, and Chinook salmon have the potential to occur in the Smith Canal and Stockton Diverting Canal based on their known presence in the nearby San Joaquin River. The San Joaquin River is Essential Fish Habitat for the Chinook salmon. The National Marine Fisheries Service also designates the Smith Canal and Stockton Diverting Canal as critical habitat for the California Central Valley steelhead and North American green sturgeon. Also, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service designates these two canals as critical habitat for the delta smelt.

Construction activities associated with conduit installation at the Smith Canal are not anticipated to affect non-wetland waters because all work conducted on the underside of the bridge would be done on a water platform. To protect water quality and prevent materials from inadvertently falling into adjacent aquatic resources, Caltrans would implement standard construction Best Management Practices and prepare and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan and Water Pollution Control Program. With implementation of these measures, no impacts on non-wetland waters are anticipated.

Also, no long-term or permanent adverse effects on Essential Fish Habitat, critical habitat, or protected species would be anticipated. The project could result in temporary sedimentation and turbidity (murky water), hazardous

materials and contaminants, and in-water disturbance of fish and wildlife species in the Smith Canal. However, the project would implement avoidance and minimization measures for these species that would also avoid and minimize impacts on protected waters and habitat.

***Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures***

The project would include agency consultation and permitting to ensure compliance with environmental regulations. A Letter of Concurrence was obtained from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on April 1, 2022, and another was obtained from the National Marine Fisheries Service on March 22, 2022. A Preliminary Jurisdictional Determination was also obtained from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers on April 27, 2022.

Clean Water Act Sections 401 and 402 permits would be obtained from the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board. A Rivers and Harbors Action Section 10 Nationwide Permit 57 would be obtained from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. And, a California Fish and Game Code Section 1602 Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement would be obtained from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All permits and agency approvals would be finalized before the end of the design phase of the project.

As part of the project, the project proponent or its contractor would implement the following avoidance and minimization measures. Prior to the start of work, a qualified biologist(s) would conduct an environmental awareness training program for all construction personnel. To protect water quality, construction Best Management Practices for vehicle fueling, vehicle maintenance, and dust control would be developed for the project and implemented throughout the course of construction. Construction materials and equipment would be stored in designated staging areas.

To avoid impacts to the giant garter snake or western pond turtle near the Smith Canal, construction would be limited from May 1 to October 1 so individuals could voluntarily move out of harm's way. A qualified biologist would also conduct preconstruction surveys no more than 24 hours prior to construction, and resurvey the area if there is a lapse in construction lasting two or more weeks. If species are detected during surveys, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and California Department of Fish and Wildlife would be notified to determine if additional protective measures are required. Construction equipment and materials stored within 200 feet of Smith Canal would be visually inspected at the start of each workday to detect wildlife.

To avoid or minimize impacts to nesting migratory birds and raptors, a qualified wildlife biologist would perform preconstruction surveys if work would occur between February 1 and September 30. If an active nest is discovered, a no-disturbance buffer would be established until the end of the breeding season, or until a qualified wildlife biologist determines that the young have fledged and moved out of the construction area. The extent of the buffers

would be determined by the biologist in coordination with any applicable agencies, as determined by species.

To avoid impacts to structure-nesting migratory birds and structure-roosting bats, Caltrans would hire a qualified wildlife biologist to inspect the bridge structure above the Smith Canal and Stockton Diverting Canal. Inactive nests or roosts would be removed, and prior to any construction that would occur between February 15 and August 31, the portion of the bridge where work would be performed would be covered with a suitable exclusion material to prevent nesting or roosting. The materials and methods would comply with the 2018 Caltrans Standard Specifications Section 14-6.10, and installation of the exclusion material would be monitored by the qualified biologist. If appropriate steps are taken to prevent birds from constructing new nests as described above, work would be able to proceed at any time of the year.

To avoid or minimize impacts to special-status fish species or Essential Fish Habitat, all in-water activities would be conducted between June 1 and October 31. In-water work would also be limited to daylight hours to allow for an extended quiet period for feeding and passage during nighttime hours. Installation of the anchor spuds for a barge would use a vibratory hammer instead of an impact pile driver to reduce temporary construction noise impacts. The contractor would monitor turbidity levels in the Smith Canal during in-water construction activities, using standard water quality monitoring techniques. Caltrans or its contractors would adjust work as necessary to reduce turbidity below a 20 percent threshold. Finally, Caltrans would minimize the potential spread of aquatic invasive species associated with in-water construction activities. This would involve coordination with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife's Invasive Species Program, training construction personnel and supervisors about controlling aquatic invasive species, and inspection and cleaning of all submerged surfaces before in-water work if feasible.

Caltrans would also be responsible for avoiding and minimizing the introduction or spread of invasive plant species. Appropriate Best Management Practices would be included in the construction specifications, including proper soil retention or disposal, using a weed-free source for project materials, and preventing invasive plant contamination during the transport or stockpiling of project materials.

### **2.1.5 Cultural Resources**

Considering the information in the Historic Property Survey Report, Archaeological Survey Report, and Architectural History Memorandum dated February 22, 2022, the following significance determinations have been made:

Question—Would the project:	CEQA Significance Determinations for Cultural Resources
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<b>No Impact</b>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<b>No Impact</b>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	<b>No Impact</b>

### 2.1.6 Energy

Considering the information in the Community Impact Memorandum dated June 30, 2022, and the Climate Change Study dated July 12, 2022, the following significance determinations have been made:

Question—Would the project:	CEQA Significance Determinations for Energy
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project construction or operation?	<b>No Impact</b>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<b>No Impact</b>

### 2.1.7 Geology and Soils

Considering the information in the Geotechnical Memorandum dated June 24, 2022, the following significance determinations have been made:

Question—Would the project:	CEQA Significance Determinations for Geology and Soils
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:  i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<b>No Impact</b>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<b>No Impact</b>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<b>No Impact</b>
iv) Landslides?	<b>No Impact</b>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<b>No Impact</b>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in onsite or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<b>No Impact</b>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<b>No Impact</b>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<b>No Impact</b>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<b>No Impact</b>

### 2.1.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Considering the information in the Climate Change Study dated July 12, 2022, the following significance determinations have been made:



Question—Would the project:	CEQA Significance Determinations for Greenhouse Gas Emissions
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<b>No Impact</b>

***Affected Environment***

The project includes multiple locations along State Routes 4, 12, 26, 33, 88, 99 and 120, Interstate 5, and Interstate 205 in San Joaquin County, including both higher density urban environments and lower density agricultural settings. The project area includes the cities of Lodi, Stockton, Manteca, Lathrop, and Tracy, as well as some of the surrounding area zoned for agricultural use. The San Joaquin Council of Governments (also known by the acronym SJCOG) guides transportation development in the project area. The San Joaquin County Regional Transportation Plan and the San Joaquin County General Plan address greenhouse gases in the project area.

***Environmental Consequences***

Because the project would not increase the number of travel lanes, no increase in vehicle miles traveled or operational greenhouse gas emissions would occur as result of project implementation. Operational emissions may decrease in the project area because the improved Transportation Management Systems would give the public faster and more accurate information for travel decisions. The project would also improve the efficiency and safety of government response to traffic congestion, accidents, and other issues on the traveled way.

The project would result in a temporary increase in greenhouse gas emissions during construction. Construction emissions for the project were calculated using the Department of Transportation’s Construction Emissions Tool (CALCET v1.1). Project construction is expected to generate approximately 310 tons of carbon dioxide during the 215 working days of the project.

***Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures***

The following measures will also be implemented in the project to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and potential climate change impacts from the project. Caltrans or its contractors will limit truck and diesel-equipment idling to 5 minutes, schedule truck trips outside of peak morning and evening commute hours, maximize use of recycled materials, encourage improved fuel efficiency from construction equipment, and provide environmental and greenhouse gas reduction training to construction personnel. With these

minimization measures to reduce construction greenhouse gas emissions, the project would not conflict with the greenhouse gas reduction goals of the General Plan or Regional Transportation Plan.

**2.1.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

Considering the information in the Initial Site Assessment dated April 1, 2022, the following significance determinations have been made:

<b>Question—Would the project:</b>	<b>CEQA Significance Determinations for Hazards and Hazardous Materials</b>
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<b>No Impact</b>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<b>No Impact</b>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<b>No Impact</b>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<b>No Impact</b>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<b>No Impact</b>
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<b>No Impact</b>

**Affected Environment**

Caltrans departmental records and multiple databases from the State Water Resources Control Board and Department of Toxic Substances Control were reviewed as part of the hazardous materials analysis. The project would install Transportation Management System elements within the Caltrans right-of-way, but would not involve any open remediation sites, excess soils, striping removal, pavement marking removal, or treated wood waste. The Caltrans District 10 Preliminary Assessment of Areas More Likely to Contain Naturally Occurring Asbestos also indicates that the project footprint is unlikely to include ultramafic rock outcroppings containing asbestos.

**Environmental Consequences**

The project involves work on three bridges that may contain asbestos-containing materials, painted surfaces that may contain lead, and unpaved areas that may contain aerially deposited lead. However, there is insufficient data to determine the presence of asbestos-containing materials on the structures.

**Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures**

To identify potential sources of asbestos, a project-specific survey for asbestos-containing materials would be conducted before construction activities. A survey for lead-based paint would also be performed before construction.

Caltrans Standard Special Provision 7-1.02K(6)(j)(iii) for Earth Materials Containing Lead will be added to the construction contract, and a lead compliance plan will be prepared by a Certified Industrial Hygienist.

**2.1.10 Hydrology and Water Quality**

Considering the information in the Water Quality Memorandum dated July 15, 2021, the following significance determinations have been made:

Question—Would the project:	CEQA Significance Determinations for Hydrology and Water Quality
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface water or groundwater quality?	<b>No Impact</b>

Question—Would the project:	CEQA Significance Determinations for Hydrology and Water Quality
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<b>No Impact</b>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:  (i) result in substantial erosion or siltation onsite or offsite;	<b>No Impact</b>
(ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding onsite or offsite;	<b>No Impact</b>
(iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	<b>No Impact</b>
(iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	<b>No Impact</b>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<b>No Impact</b>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<b>No Impact</b>

### 2.1.11 Land Use and Planning

Considering the information in the Community Impact Memorandum dated June 30, 2022, the following significance determinations have been made:

Question—Would the project:	CEQA Significance Determinations for Land Use and Planning
a) Physically divide an established community?	<b>No Impact</b>

Question—Would the project:	CEQA Significance Determinations for Land Use and Planning
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<b>No Impact</b>

### 2.1.12 Mineral Resources

Considering the information in the Geotechnical Memorandum dated June 24, 2022, the following significance determinations have been made:

Question—Would the project:	CEQA Significance Determinations for Mineral Resources
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<b>No Impact</b>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<b>No Impact</b>

### 2.1.13 Noise

Considering the information in the Noise Memorandum dated October 29, 2021, the following significance determinations have been made:

Question—Would the project result in:	CEQA Significance Determinations for Noise
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<b>No Impact</b>
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<b>No Impact</b>

Question—Would the project result in:	CEQA Significance Determinations for Noise
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<b>No Impact</b>

### 2.1.14 Population and Housing

Considering the information in the Community Impact Memorandum dated June 30, 2022, the following significance determinations have been made:

Question—Would the project:	CEQA Significance Determinations for Population and Housing
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<b>No Impact</b>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<b>No Impact</b>

### 2.1.15 Public Services

Considering the information in the Community Impact Memorandum dated June 30, 2022, the following significance determinations have been made:

<b>Question:</b>	<b>CEQA Significance Determinations for Public Services</b>
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:  Fire protection?	<b>No Impact</b>
Police protection?	<b>No Impact</b>
Schools?	<b>No Impact</b>
Parks?	<b>No Impact</b>
Other public facilities?	<b>No Impact</b>

### 2.1.16 Recreation

Considering the information in the Community Impact Memorandum dated June 30, 2022, the following significance determinations have been made:

<b>Question—Would the project:</b>	<b>CEQA Significance Determinations for Recreation</b>
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<b>No Impact</b>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<b>No Impact</b>

### 2.1.17 Transportation

Considering the information in the Community Impact Memorandum dated June 30, 2022, the following significance determinations have been made:

Question—Would the project:	CEQA Significance Determinations for Transportation
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<b>No Impact</b>
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<b>No Impact</b>
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<b>No Impact</b>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<b>No Impact</b>

### 2.1.18 Tribal Cultural Resources

Considering the information in the Historic Property Survey Report and the Archaeological Survey Report dated February 22, 2022, the following significance determinations have been made:

Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

Question:	CEQA Significance Determinations for Tribal Cultural Resources
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or	<b>No Impact</b>
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<b>No Impact</b>



**2.1.19 Utilities and Service Systems**

Considering the information in the Community Impact Memorandum dated June 30, 2022, the following significance determinations have been made:

Question—Would the project:	CEQA Significance Determinations for Utilities and Service Systems
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<b>No Impact</b>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	<b>No Impact</b>
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?	<b>No Impact</b>
d) Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<b>No Impact</b>
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<b>No Impact</b>

**2.1.20 Wildfire**

Considering the information in the Climate Change Study dated July 12, 2022, the following significance determinations have been made:

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones:

Question—Would the project:	CEQA Significance Determinations for Wildfire
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<b>No Impact</b>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<b>No Impact</b>
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<b>No Impact</b>
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<b>No Impact</b>

**2.1.21 Mandatory Findings of Significance**

Question:	CEQA Significance Determinations for Mandatory Findings of Significance
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<b>No Impact</b>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Question:</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>CEQA Significance Determinations for Mandatory Findings of Significance</b></p>
<p>b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>No Impact</b></p>
<p>c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>No Impact</b></p>

# Appendix A Title VI Policy Statement

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR  
P.O. BOX 942873, MS-49  
SACRAMENTO, CA 94273-0001  
PHONE (916) 654-6130  
FAX (916) 653-5776  
TTY 711  
[www.dot.ca.gov](http://www.dot.ca.gov)



Making Conservation  
a California Way of Life.

September 2021

### NON-DISCRIMINATION POLICY STATEMENT

The California Department of Transportation, under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, ensures *"No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance."*

Caltrans will make every effort to ensure nondiscrimination in all of its services, programs and activities, whether they are federally funded or not, and that services and benefits are fairly distributed to all people, regardless of race, color, or national origin. In addition, Caltrans will facilitate meaningful participation in the transportation planning process in a nondiscriminatory manner.

Related federal statutes, remedies, and state law further those protections to include sex, disability, religion, sexual orientation, and age.

For information or guidance on how to file a complaint, or obtain more information regarding Title VI, please contact the Title VI Branch Manager at (916) 324-8379 or visit the following web page:  
<https://dot.ca.gov/programs/civil-rights/title-vi>.

To obtain this information in an alternate format such as Braille or in a language other than English, please contact the California Department of Transportation, Office of Civil Rights, at 1823 14<sup>th</sup> Street, MS-79, Sacramento, CA 95811; PO Box 942874, MS-79, Sacramento, CA 94274-0001; (916) 324-8379 (TTY 711); or at [Title.VI@dot.ca.gov](mailto:Title.VI@dot.ca.gov).

A blue ink signature of Toks Omishakin, consisting of stylized cursive letters.

Toks Omishakin  
Director

*"Provide a safe and reliable transportation network that serves all people and respects the environment."*

## **List of Technical Studies Bound Separately (Volume 2)**

Air Quality Report

Noise Study Report

Water Quality Report

Community Impact Memorandum

Natural Environment Study

Geotechnical Memorandum

Historical Property Survey Report

- Architectural History Memorandum
- Archaeological Survey Report

Hazardous Waste Reports

- Initial Site Assessment

Scenic Resource Evaluation/Visual Assessment

Climate Change Study

To obtain a copy of one or more of these technical studies/reports or the Initial Study, please send your request to:

Jaycee Azevedo  
District 10 Environmental Division  
California Department of Transportation  
1976 East Doctor Martin Luther King Junior Boulevard, Stockton, California 95205

Or send your request via email to: [Jaycee.Azevedo@dot.ca.gov](mailto:Jaycee.Azevedo@dot.ca.gov)  
Or call: 209-992-9824

Please provide the following information in your request:

Project title: State Route 4 Transportation Management Systems Upgrade  
General location information: Various State Routes in San Joaquin County  
District number-county code-route-post mile: 10-SJ-VAR-VAR  
EA/Project ID number: EA 06-1F960/Project ID 1018000007