

# 1 INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

---

## **CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)**

CEQA requires that discretionary decisions by public agencies be subject to environmental review. The purpose of an environmental impact report (EIR) is to identify the significant effects of the project on the environment, to identify alternatives to the project, and to indicate the manner in which those significant effects can be mitigated or avoided (Section 21002.1(a)). Each public agency is required to mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment of projects it approves or carries out whenever it is feasible.

This Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared by the County of Solano, California (lead agency) for the Lake Herman Quarry Expansion Project pursuant to CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines (California Administrative Code Section 15000 et seq.). Environmental effects of the Project that must be addressed include the significant effects of the Project, growth-inducing effects of the Project, and significant cumulative effects of past, present, and reasonably anticipated future projects.

## **BACKGROUND**

### **Relationship of Project to State Surface Mining and Reclamation Act**

Under the State of California's Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (SMARA; PRC §2100 et. seq.), all operators of surface mines in California must prepare and submit for approval by the lead agency a reclamation plan, along with financial assurances that sufficient funds will be available to accomplish reclamation (PRC §2770). Reclamation is defined in the statute as, "...the combined process of land treatment that minimizes water degradation, air pollution, damage to aquatic or wildlife habitat, flooding, erosion, and other adverse effects from surface mining operations, including adverse surface effects incidental to underground mines, so that mined lands are reclaimed to a usable condition which is readily adaptable for alternate land uses and create no danger to public health and safety. The process may extend to affected lands surrounding mined lands, and may require backfilling, grading, resoiling, revegetation, soil compaction, stabilization, or other measures" (PRC §2733).

The lead agency responsible for reclamation plan approval under SMARA is the jurisdiction with land use authority over the surface mining operation. For this project, the lead agency is Solano County. Substantial deviations from an approved reclamation plan may not be undertaken without the submission to and approval by the lead agency of amendments to the reclamation plan (PRC §2777). Under SMARA, each lead agency must adopt a surface mining ordinance which establishes procedures for the review and approval of reclamation plans and financial assurances, and for issuance of permits to conduct surface mining operations (PRC §2774). Solano County adopted a Surface Mining and Reclamation Ordinance codified as Chapter 29 in the County Code on August 1, 1978.

### **Need for the Project**

Aggregate is a critical resource required to meet current and future infrastructure needs for transportation improvements; flood protection, including sea-level rise; and public and private facilities. According to the California Geological Survey, the permitted aggregate available for the North San Francisco Bay is only 21 percent of the 50-year demand (CDC 2012). In September 2008 the Director of the California Department of Transportation sent a letter to all "Transportation Partners," stressing the need for increasing the aggregate supply, stating California was well below the reserve required to address expected infrastructure needs over the next 50 years, and that permitted reserves would be exhausted in 30 years at the current rate of production. The letter also identified the potential impacts, including social, economic, and environmental, of transporting aggregate farther than 35 miles each way (Caltrans 2008). The Lake Herman Quarry services five cities, and the surrounding area: Fairfield, Vallejo, Benicia, American Canyon and Cordelia. Approval of the Lake Herman Quarry Expansion Project would fulfill a part of this need.

## **Lake Herman Quarry History**

The Lake Herman Quarry is part of the Sulphur Springs Mountain mineral resource that has been designated by the State of California as a Mineral Resource of Regional Significance, pursuant to the State Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975.

The Lake Herman Quarry has been mined since the early 1870's. Commercial operations began in the early 1940's and continued on a small scale until the mid-1960's. Syar Industries, Inc. acquired the quarry in 1965 and installed a rock crusher with screens to manufacture specific rock sizes. Around 1968, an asphaltic concrete (asphalt paving material) batch plant was added to the operation, as well as additional screening capacity in the rock plant.

In 1979, Solano County approved a 35-year quarry Use Permit and Reclamation Plan for the site, as well as a Variance to the County Grading Ordinance so that Syar could construct slope gradients steeper than 2:1. The County permit references for these initial permits are U-78-09, RP-78-03, and V-78-01. These permits were issued following certification of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The EIR described existing and anticipated activities on the site including future equipment upgrades and the addition of a Portland Cement Concrete (ready-mix) batch plant.

A separate Use Permit (U-93-29) to operate a plant to recycle broken asphalt paving and concrete materials was approved by Solano County in 1994. An amended Use Permit (U-97-01) and Reclamation Plan (RP-97-01) were approved in 2001 to reflect a revised depth of mining down to an elevation of 200 feet above mean sea level (msl) and to add an overburden storage area across Lake Herman Road from the quarry. The amended Reclamation Plan also included an updated site plan showing the location of processing equipment, accessory asphalt and concrete batch plants, drainage and sediment control facilities, and other features of the operation. A Mitigated Negative Declaration was adopted for the project components included in the amended Use Permit and Reclamation Plan.

The material mined at the quarry is basalt. The basalt deposit and quarry site are important for several reasons: 1) they provide hard rock that exceeds State and local specifications for Portland Cement Concrete; 2) the geographic location is in an urbanizing market with close proximity to an extensive transportation network including highway, rail, inland waterways, and coastal access; and 3) it is an existing ongoing quarry operation with substantial remaining reserves. The Sulphur Springs Mountain deposit is one of the few remaining locations in the North San Francisco Bay Production-Consumption Region, as designated by the State Department of Conservation, with a large concentration of construction grade aggregate.

Current operations at the quarry are set to expire in 2014 per U-78-09, RP-78-03, and V-78-01. In April 2008 a Use Permit Application and Mining and Reclamation Plan was submitted to the County to expand and extend the existing quarry operations. The Project evaluated in this EIR encompasses the proposed expansion as well as the current permitted uses at the Lake Herman Quarry under the various use permits, including the asphalt plants, the Portland cement concrete plant, and the asphalt and concrete recycling plant.

## **PUBLIC AND AGENCY INVOLVEMENT**

On October 29, 2009, a Notice of Preparation of an EIR was mailed to interested individuals, organizations, and neighbors of Lake Herman Quarry. On October 29, 2009, the Notice of Preparation was distributed by the State Clearinghouse to the reviewing state agencies, triggering the start of a 30-day scoping period. On November 12, 2009, the County held a Scoping Meeting, at Solano Community College in Vallejo, to solicit input regarding the issues that should be addressed in the EIR. The scoping period ended December 4, 2009. Eight letters (via mail and email) were received during the scoping period, including three from State and Federal Agencies, one from city government, one from a regional government, one from a community based organization, and two from interested individuals (refer to Appendix C Notice of Preparation and Scoping Letters).

**Availability of the Draft EIR and Public Comment Period**

The Draft EIR will be circulated for a 45-day comment period, ending September 4<sup>th</sup>, 2013, to allow public agencies and interested individuals to review and comment on the document. Written comments on the Draft EIR will be accepted by the County until 5:00 p.m. on September 4<sup>th</sup>, 2013. Public agencies, interested organizations and individuals are encouraged to submit comments on the Draft EIR for consideration by the County. All written comment should be addressed to:

Karen Avery, Senior Planner  
Solano County Department of Resource Management  
675 Texas Street, Suite 5500  
Fairfield, Ca 94533

You may also submit your comments via fax: (707) 784-4805 or email: [kmavery@solanocounty.com](mailto:kmavery@solanocounty.com).

To facilitate understanding of the comments, please provide a separate sentence or paragraph for each comment, and note the page and chapter of the Draft EIR to which the comment is directed. This approach to commenting will help the County to provide a clear and meaningful response to each comment.

The Draft EIR and appendices are available for review at the Solano County Resource Management Department. The Draft EIR, including appendices, also is available in downloadable Adobe Acrobat format on the County’s website: <http://www.solanocounty.com/depts/rm/documents/eir>:

**AREAS OF CONTROVERSY AND KEY ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED**

The Scoping phase of the environmental review for the Project identified a number of key issues to be addressed in the EIR. These issues are listed below with references to the chapter and sections of the Draft EIR in which each issue is addressed.

**TABLE 1-1  
Key Issues to be Resolved in the EIR**

<b>Issues</b>	<b>Chapter/Section of EIR where Issue is Evaluated</b>
Alternatives	3 Alternatives Description 5 Alternatives Analysis
Air Quality, operational impacts	4.3 Air Quality
Biological impacts, special-status species	4.4 Biological Resources
Greenhouse gas emissions	4.7 Greenhouse Gases and Energy Use
Cultural resources	4.5 Cultural and Paleontological Resources
Hydrology, containing runoff on-site	4.9 Hydrology and Water Quality
Noise, existing and future	4.12 Noise and Vibration
Public health and safety	4.3 Air Quality 4.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials
Traffic, hazards on Lake Herman Road	4.14 Transportation
Visual impacts, expansion of the quarry	4.1 Aesthetics

**SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES**

The following table identifies, by environmental topic, the significant Project impacts and proposed mitigation measures. Additional information about the impacts and mitigation measures can be found in Chapter 4 of this EIR, as referenced for each topic. The numbering of the impacts corresponds to the numbering within each section in Chapter 4.

**TABLE 1-2  
Impact and Mitigation Summary**

<b>Impact</b>	<b>Project Significance</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure</b>	<b>Post-mitigation Significance</b>
<b>Aesthetics</b>			
AES-1. Will the Project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista or substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, recreation use areas, and historic buildings within a scenic highway corridor?	Less than Significant	No mitigation is necessary	Less than Significant
AES-2. Will the Project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	Less than Significant	No mitigation is necessary	Less than Significant
AES-3. Will the Project create a new source of substantial light or glare, adversely affecting day or nighttime views of the area?	Less than Significant	No mitigation is necessary	Less than Significant
AES-C1. Will the Project's incremental effect to aesthetics be cumulatively considerable, based on evaluation criteria 1 through 3?	Less than Significant	No mitigation is necessary	Less than Significant
<b>Agricultural and Forest Resources</b>			
AF-1. Will the Project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resource Agency, to non-agricultural use?	No Impact	No mitigation is necessary	No Impact
AF-2. Will the Project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?	No Impact	No mitigation is necessary	No Impact
AF-3. Will the Project conflict with existing zoning for forest land or timberland, or result in loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	No Impact	No mitigation is necessary	No Impact
AF-4. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	No Impact	No mitigation is necessary	No Impact
AF-C1. Will the Project's incremental effect on agricultural or forest resources be cumulatively considerable based on evaluation criteria 1 thru 4?	No Impact	No mitigation is necessary	No Impact

Impact	Project Significance	Mitigation Measure	Post-mitigation Significance
<b>Air Quality</b>			
AQ-1. Will construction or operation of the Project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	No Impact	No mitigation is necessary	No Impact
AQ-2. Will construction or operation of the Project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	Significant	AQ-2a Basic Measures for Construction AQ-2b Fugitive Dust Reduction During Operation	Less than Significant
AQ-3. Will the Project expose sensitive receptors to substantial levels of toxic air contaminants?	Less than Significant	No mitigation is necessary	Less than Significant
AQ-4. Will the Project cause objectionable odors affecting a substantial number people?	Less than Significant	No mitigation is necessary	Less than Significant
AQ-C1. Will the Project plus cumulative projects create impacts to air quality and toxic air contaminants based on evaluation criteria 1 and 3?	Less than Significant	No mitigation is necessary	Less than Significant
AQ-C2. Will the Project plus cumulative projects cause objectionable odors affecting a substantial number people?	No Impact	No mitigation is necessary	No Impact
<b>Biology</b>			
BIO-1. Will the Project 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 or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	Significant	BIO-1a California Red-Legged Frog BIO-1b Callippe Silverspot Butterfly BIO-1c Birds and American Badger	Less than Significant
BIO-2. Will the Project 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 US Fish and Wildlife Service?	Significant	BIO-2a Riparian Vegetation BIO-2b Oak Woodlands BIO-2c Native Grasslands BIO-2d Non-Native Grasslands	Less than Significant
BIO-3. Will the Project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	Significant	BIO-3 Wetlands and Waters	Less than Significant
BIO-4. Will the Project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors?	Less than Significant	No mitigation is necessary	Less than Significant

<b>Impact</b>	<b>Project Significance</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure</b>	<b>Post-mitigation Significance</b>
BIO-5. Will the Project result in the loss of protected trees?	Significant	BIO-2b Oak Woodlands	Less than Significant
BIO-6. Will the Project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	No Impact	No mitigation is necessary	No Impact
BIO-C1. Will the Project's incremental effect on biological resources be cumulatively considerable, based on evaluation criteria 1 through 6?	Less than Significant	No mitigation is necessary	Less than Significant
<b>Cultural Resources</b>			
CR-1. Will the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archeological resource?	Significant	CR-1a Minimize Impacts to Significant Historic Structures and Equipment CR-1b Avoid or Minimize Impacts to Unknown Archaeological Resources	Less than Significant
CR-2. Will the Project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	Significant	CR-2 Treatment of Human Remains, Associated Grave Goods, or Items of Cultural Patrimony	Less than Significant
CR-3. Will the Project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	Significant	CR-3 Evaluation and Treatment of Paleontological Resources	Less than Significant
CR-C1: Will the Project's incremental effect on historical and archeological resources be cumulatively considerable, based on criteria 1 and 2?	Less than Significant	No mitigation is necessary	Less than Significant
CR-C2: Will the Project's incremental effect on paleontological resources be cumulatively considerable?	Less than Significant	No mitigation is necessary	Less than Significant
<b>Geology and Soils</b>			
GEO-1. Will the Project be subject to 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?	Less than Significant	No mitigation is necessary	Less than Significant
GEO-2. Will the Project expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking?	Significant	GEO-2a Geotechnical Study GEO-2b Slope Stability Inspections	Less than Significant

<b>Impact</b>	<b>Project Significance</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure</b>	<b>Post-mitigation Significance</b>
GEO-3. Will the Project expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects from landslides?	Significant	GEO-2b Slope Stability Inspections	Less than Significant
GEO-4. Will the Project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the Project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	Significant	GEO-2a Geotechnical Study GEO-2b Slope Stability Inspections	Less than Significant
GEO-5. Will the Project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1 of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risk to life or property?	Significant	GEO-2a Geotechnical Study	Less than Significant
GEO-C1: Will the Project's incremental effect on geology or soils be cumulatively considerable, based on criteria 1 through 5?	No Impact	No mitigation is necessary	No Impact
<b>Greenhouse Gases and Energy Use</b>			
GG-1: Will the Project generate GhG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	Less than Significant	No mitigation is necessary	Less than Significant
GG-2: Will the Project conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GhGs?	Significant	BIO-2b Oak Woodlands BIO-2c Native Grasslands BIO-2d Non-Native Grasslands	Less than Significant
GG-1C: Will the Project plus cumulative projects generate GhG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	Less than Significant	No mitigation is necessary	Less than Significant
GG-2C: Will the Project plus cumulative projects conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GhGs?	No Impact	No mitigation is necessary	No Impact
<b>Hazardous Materials</b>			
HAZ-1. Will the Project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	Less than Significant	No mitigation is necessary	Less than Significant
HAZ-2. Will the Project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	Less than Significant	No mitigation is necessary	Less than Significant

<b>Impact</b>	<b>Project Significance</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure</b>	<b>Post-mitigation Significance</b>
HAZ-3. Will the Project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65692.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	Less than Significant	No mitigation is necessary	Less than Significant
HAZ-4. Will the Project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	Less than Significant	No mitigation is necessary	Less than Significant
HAZ-5. Will the Project expose the workers to safety hazards associated with operation of heavy machinery, vehicles, or equipment; creation of accessible excavations; or handling of hazardous materials?	Less than Significant	No mitigation is necessary	Less than Significant
HAZ-6. Will the Project increase the potential exposure of the public to disease vectors (i.e., mosquitoes)?	Less than Significant	No mitigation is necessary	Less than Significant
HAZ-C1. Will the Project plus cumulative projects create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	Less than Significant	No mitigation is necessary	Less than Significant
HAZ-C2. Will the Project plus cumulative projects create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	Less than Significant	No mitigation is necessary	Less than Significant
HAZ-C3. Will the Project plus cumulative projects be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65692.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	No Impact	No mitigation is necessary	No Impact
HAZ-C4. Will the Project plus cumulative projects expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	Less than Significant	No mitigation is necessary	Less than Significant
HAZ-C5. Will the Project plus cumulative projects expose the workers to safety hazards associated with operation of heavy machinery, vehicles, or equipment; creation of accessible excavations (trenches, pits, or borings); or handling of hazardous materials?	No Impact	No mitigation is necessary	No Impact
HAZ-C6. Will the Project plus cumulative projects increase the potential exposure of the public to disease vectors (i.e., mosquitoes)?	Less than Significant	No mitigation is necessary	Less than Significant



Impact	Project Significance	Mitigation Measure	Post-mitigation Significance
<b>Hydrology and Water Quality</b>			
HWQ-1. Will the Project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, including through alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	Significant	HWQ-1 Update Industrial Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan	Less than Significant
HWQ-2. Will the Project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	Less than Significant	No mitigation is necessary	Less than Significant
HWQ-3. Will the Project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	Less than Significant	No mitigation is necessary	Less than Significant
HWQ-4. Will the Project create or contribute runoff water which would provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	Significant	HWQ-1 Update Industrial Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan	Less than Significant
HWQ-5. Will the Project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows, or expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	Significant	HWQ-5 Sulphur Creek Bridge Design	Less than Significant
HWQ-6. Will the Project substantially decrease surface-water contributions to Sulphur Springs Creek and Blue Rock Creek?	Less than Significant	No mitigation is necessary	Less than Significant
HWQ-C1. Will the Project's incremental effect on hydrology and groundwater be cumulatively considerable, based on evaluation criteria 1 through 6?	Less than Significant	No mitigation is necessary	Less than Significant
<b>Land Use</b>			
LU-1. Will the Project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environment effect or increase potential for conflict as a result of incompatible land uses?	Less than Significant	No mitigation is necessary	Less than Significant

<b>Impact</b>	<b>Project Significance</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure</b>	<b>Post-mitigation Significance</b>
LU-C1: Will the Project's incremental effect on land use and planning policies be cumulatively considerable?	No Impact	No mitigation is necessary	No Impact
<b>Mineral Resources</b>			
MR-1: Will the Project 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, or a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	No Impact	No mitigation is necessary	No Impact
MR-2: Will mineral extraction operations be managed and recovered in accordance with applicable requirements?	No Impact	No mitigation is necessary	No Impact
MR-C1: Will the Project's incremental effect on mineral resources be cumulatively considerable based on evaluation criteria 1 and 2?	No Impact	No mitigation is necessary	No Impact
<b>Noise</b>			
NO-1. Will Project operations generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	Less than Significant	No mitigation is necessary	Less than Significant
NO-2. Will Project construction activities result in generation of excessive ground-borne vibration levels?	Less than Significant	No mitigation is necessary	Less than Significant
NO-3. Will the Project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?	Less than Significant	No mitigation is necessary	Less than Significant
NO-4. Will the Project result in a temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?	Less than Significant	No mitigation is necessary	Less than Significant
NO-C1. Will the Project's incremental effect to noise be cumulatively considerable, based on evaluation criteria 1 through 3?	Less than Significant	No mitigation is necessary	Less than Significant
<b>Public Services, Recreation, and Utilities</b>			
PS-1. Would the Project be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project's solid waste disposal needs?	Less than Significant	No mitigation is necessary	Less than Significant
PS-2. Would the Project increase demand for electrical or gas facilities to such a degree that accepted service standards are not maintained?	Less than Significant	No mitigation is necessary	Less than Significant

<b>Impact</b>	<b>Project Significance</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure</b>	<b>Post-mitigation Significance</b>
PS-3: Would the Project conflict with any applicable recreational plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project (including, but not limited to the general plan, Tri-City and County Cooperative Plan, pedestrian plan, or bicycle plan)?	No Impact	No mitigation is necessary	No Impact
PS-C1: Will the Project's incremental effect on public services, utilities, or recreation be cumulatively considerable, based on evaluation criteria 1 through 3?	Less than Significant	No mitigation is necessary	Less than Significant
<b>Transportation</b>			
TR-1: Will the Project conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	Less than Significant	No mitigation is necessary	Less than Significant
TR-2: Will the Project conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	Less than Significant	No mitigation is necessary	Less than Significant
TR-3: Will the Project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	No Impact	No mitigation is necessary	No Impact
TR-4: Will the Project result in inadequate emergency access?	Significant (Short term), Beneficial (Long-term)	TR-4 Traffic Control Procedures	Less than Significant
TR-5: Will the Project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	Significant	TR-4 Traffic Control Procedures	Less than Significant
TR-C1: Will the Project's incremental effect on traffic be cumulatively considerable, based on criteria 1 and 2?	No Impact	No mitigation is necessary	No Impact
TR-C2: Will the Project's incremental effect on traffic be cumulatively considerable, based on criteria 3 through 4?	No Impact	No mitigation is necessary	No Impact

## REFERENCES

- California Department of Conservation (CDC). Revised 2007. *California's Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (SMARA; PRC §2100)*.
- CDC. 2012. *Map Sheet 52, Aggregate Sustainability in California*.
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2008. *Letter to Transportation Partners*. September 30.
- California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. 2012. *Public Resources Code, Sections 21000-21178 and California Code of Regulations, Sections 15000-15387*.
- Solano County. 2009. *Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report Syar Lake Herman Quarry Expansion and Surface Mining and Reclamation Permit*. November.