SUPPLEMENT TO SECTION 4.7, TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

4.7.1 INTRODUCTION

The March 2006 Revised DEIR provided intersection analyses in four jurisdictions—Placer County, City of Roseville, Sutter County and Sacramento County. With the exception of Sacramento County, only the p.m. peak hour was analyzed, because a.m. peak hour was not typically analyzed in these jurisdictions. In response to requests received in comments on the March 2006 Revised Draft and Partially Recirculated Revised Draft EIRs, a.m. peak hour traffic impacts have been quantified for Placer County and Sutter County (the latter was also provided in the October 2006 Final EIR). The a.m. peak hour intersection calculations are included in this EIR as a Supplement to Appendix I of the Revised DEIR. No a.m. peak hour analysis has been prepared for the City of Roseville, because the City General Plan specifically refers to the p.m. peak hour.

PROPOSED PROJECT

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Placer County

Impact 4.7-3 beginning on page 4.7-39 of the March 2006 Revised DEIR is revised as shown. Note that only the a.m. peak hour tables are provided in this Supplement starting on page 4.7-13. No changes were made to the p.m. peak hour tables (Table 4.7-17 on page 4.7-41 of the March 2006 Revised DEIR).

4.7-3 Buildout of the Specific Plan area would increase peak hour traffic volumes on study area intersections in unincorporated Placer County.

The proposed Specific Plan provides typical cross-sections for the roadways within the Specific Plan area. Additional right-of-way is typically provided near major intersections on arterial and collector roadways to accommodate additional turn lanes.

A planning level signal warrant analysis was conducted for the conditions under Existing Plus Project conditions to define the locations where traffic signals should be assumed. This analysis indicates that the following intersections within the Specific Plan area should be signalized:

- Locust Road and Baseline Road
- Brewer Road and Baseline Road
- Palladay Road and Baseline Road
- 16th Street and Baseline Road
- 14th Street and Baseline Road
- 12th Street and Baseline Road
- 11th Street and Baseline Road
- Dyer Lane and Baseline Road

- Watt Avenue and A Street
- Watt Avenue and Town Center Drive
- Watt Avenue and Oak Street
- 16th Street and Dyer Lane
- Watt Avenue and Dyer Lane
- Watt Avenue and PFE Road

In addition to the above intersections, which would meet traffic signal warrants, the following intersections are proposed to be signalized in the Specific Plan:

- Dyer Lane and A Street (east and west)
- Dyer Lane and Palladay Road
- Dyer Lane and 11th Street
- Palladay Road and A Street
- 16th Street and A Street
- 14th Street and A Street
- 12th Street and A Street
- Dyer Lane and West Town Center Drive
- Dyer Lane and East Town Center Drive
- 18th Street and Dyer Lane
- Tanwood Avenue and Dyer Lane

These intersections were analyzed as stop-sign controlled intersections even though the Specific Plan calls for traffic signals, because traffic signals were not warranted under Existing Plus Project conditions.

Figure 4.7-4 shows the key study area intersections in unincorporated Placer County. Tables 4.7-17 and 4.7-17A presents the intersection Level of Service analysis at these intersections for the p.m. peak hour under Existing Plus Project conditions. The traffic volumes and existing lane geometry at each intersection in Table 4.7-17 are shown in Appendix I. This analysis indicates that development of the Specific Plan under existing conditions would cause impacts at the following intersections:

a. Level of Service at the intersection of Baseline Road and Fiddyment Road/Walerga Road would degrade from LOS "D" (observed LOS "F") to LOS "F" in both the a.m. and p.m. peak hour.

b. Level of Service at the intersection of Walerga Road and PFE Road would operate at LOS F and the V/C would increase by more than 5% in the a.m. peak hour, and degrade from LOS "E" to LOS "F" in the p.m. peak hour.

This is considered ***a significant impact.***

Mitigation Measure

Implementation of the following mitigation measures would reduce these impacts to a *less than significant level*:

4.7-3a *Implement Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a.*

4.7-3b *Consistent with Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a, the proposed project shall contribute its fair share toward the following improvements:*

i. Construct a second through lane on the southbound approach, a right turn lane to the eastbound approach and construct a second left turn lane on both the eastbound and westbound approaches to improve the intersection of Fiddyment Road and Baseline Road to LOS "C" (V/C 0.80) in the p.m. peak hour.

ii. Convert the southbound right turn lane into a free right turn lane, to improve the intersection of Fiddyment Road and Baseline Road to LOS "D" (V/C 0.87) in the a.m. peak hour.

iii. Construct a second through lane on both the northbound and southbound approaches, to improve the intersection of Walerga Road and PFE Road to LOS "B" (V/C 0.66) in the a.m. peak hour and LOS "D" (V/C 0.80) in the p.m. peak.

As shown in Tables 4.7-17 and 4.7-17A, the above intersections operate at unacceptable Levels of Service under existing conditions, and the proposed project would increase congestion at these intersections. With the exception of "ii", the improvements described above are identified in the County's CIP, so they are planned to be constructed in the future, whether or not the project is developed. Therefore, the proposed project would be required to contribute its fair share to the above improvements, or to construct the improvements and be reimbursed for the costs beyond the project's fair share.

Sutter County

The text on pages 4.7-49 through 4.7-51 of the March 2006 Revised DEIR are revised as shown below. Table 4.7-23 on page 4.7-50 is not reproduced, because it has not changed.

4.7-8 Buildout of the Specific Plan area would increase peak hour traffic volumes on study area intersections in Sutter County.

Under Existing Plus Project conditions, no improvements were assumed for Sutter County intersections in the study area beyond existing conditions. Figure 4.7-8 shows the key study area intersections in Sutter County. Tables 4.7-23 and 4.7-23A presents the intersection Level of Service analysis at these intersections for the a.m. and p.m. peak hours under Existing Plus Project conditions. The traffic volumes and existing lane geometry at each intersection in Table 4.7-23 are shown in Appendix I. This analysis indicates that development of the Specific Plan under existing conditions would cause impacts at the following intersections:

a. Level of Service at the intersection of Riego Road and Natomas Road would degrade from LOS "C" to LOS "F" <u>in the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.</u>

b. Level of Service at the intersection of Pleasant Grove Boulevard (North) and Riego Road would degrade from LOS <u>"D" to LOS "F" in the a.m. peak hour and LOS</u> "C" to LOS "F" <u>in the p.m. peak hour.</u>

c. Level of Service at the intersection of Pleasant Grove Boulevard (North) and Riego Road would degrade from LOS "D" to LOS "F" <u>in the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.</u>

d. <u>Level of Service at the intersection of Highway 77/99 and Riego Road would operate at LOS "F" in the a.m. peak hour and would further degrade.</u>

This is considered a ***significant impact.***

<u>Mitigation Measure</u>

Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce this impact to a *less than significant level*. While implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce this impact to a less than significant level, the improvements lie outside the jurisdiction of Placer County. Sutter County can and should implement the suggested or similar mitigation measure but may choose not to. If the identified improvements are not made, the intersections would continue to operate at an unacceptable level. Therefore, this impact is considered *significant and unavoidable*

4.7-8a *Implement Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a.*

4.7-8b *Consistent with Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a, the proposed project shall contribute its fair share toward the following improvements in Sutter County:*

1. *Install a signal at the intersection of Riego Road and Natomas Road to provide <u>LOS "A" (V/C ratio 0.60) in the a.m. peak and</u> LOS "B" (V/C 0.61) <u>in the p.m. peak</u>.*

2. *Install a signal at the intersection of Riego Road and Pleasant Grove Road (North) to provide <u>LOS "C" (V/C ratio 0.70) in the a.m. peak and</u> LOS "B" (V/C 0.64) <u>in the p.m. peak</u>.*

3. *Install a signal at the intersection of Riego Road and Pleasant Grove Road (South) to provide <u>LOS "Cc" (V/C ratio 0.77) in the a.m. peak and</u> LOS "C" (V/C 0.74) <u>in the p.m. peak</u>.*

4. *At the intersection of Highway 99/77 and Riego Road, construct a third northbound and southbound through lanes (2,000 to 3,000 feet long) to provide LOS "D" (V/C ration of 46.5 seconds) in the a.m. peak.*

   Or

   Construct the Highway 77/99 interchange at Riego Road.

CUMULATIVE CONDITIONS

Placer County

Impact 4.7-13 on pages 4.7-25 through 4.7-31 of the July 2006 Partially Recirculated Revised DEIR are revised as shown below. Tables 4.7-29 and 4.7-30 are not reproduced because they have not changed.

4.7-13 Buildout of the Specific Plan under Cumulative Plus Project conditions would increase peak hour traffic volumes on study area intersections in unincorporated Placer County.

The proposed Specific Plan provides typical cross-sections for the roadways within the Specific Plan area. Additional right-of-way is typically provided near major intersections on arterial and collector roadways to accommodate additional turn lanes.

A planning level signal warrant analysis was conducted under the Cumulative Plus Project conditions to define the locations where traffic signals should be assumed. This analysis indicates the following intersections should be signalized by 2025:

- Locust Road and Baseline Road
- Brewer Road and Baseline Road
- Palladay Road and Baseline Road
- 16th Street and Baseline Road
- 14th Street and Baseline Road
- 12th Street and Baseline Road
- 11th Street and Baseline Road
- Dyer Lane and Baseline Road
- 9th Street and Baseline Road
- West Dyer Lane and A Street
- 12th Street and A Street
- Watt Avenue and A Street
- West Dyer Lane and Town Center Drive
- Watt Avenue and Town Center Drive
- East Dyer Lane and Town Center Drive
- Walerga Road and Town Center Drive
- Watt Avenue and Oak Street
- 18th Street and Dyer Lane

- 16th Street and Dyer Lane
- Tanwood Avenue and Dyer Lane
- Watt Avenue and Dyer Lane
- Cook Riolo Road and PFE Road

The intersections of Palladay Road with A Street, 16th Street with A Street, and 14th Street with A Street are analyzed as stop-sign controlled intersections even though the Specific Plan calls for traffic signals because traffic signals were not warranted under Cumulative Plus Project conditions.

Figure 4.7-4 shows the key study area intersections in unincorporated Placer County. Revised Table 4.7-29 presents the intersection Level of Service analysis at these intersections for the p.m. peak hour under Cumulative Plus Project conditions. Table 4.7-30A shows the Level of Service at intersections in the a.m. peak hour. The traffic volumes and lane geometry at each intersection in Revised Table 4.7-29 are shown in Appendix I. This analysis indicates that development of the Specific Plan under Cumulative Plus Project conditions would increase congestion at a number of locations throughout the study area. The following segments are projected to degrade from acceptable to unacceptable levels with the project and/or are new segments that would operate at unacceptable levels.

a. Level of Service at the intersection of Walerga Road and PFE Road would remain LOS "F" and would become worse.

b. Level of Service at the intersection of Dyer Lane and Baseline Road would degrade from LOS "D" to LOS "F" in both the a.m. and p.m. peak hour under the assumed geometry.

c. The new intersection of Watt Avenue and Dyer Lane would operate at LOS "F" conditions in both the a.m. and p.m. peak hour under the assumed geometry.

d. The new intersection of Walerga Road and East Town Center Drive would operate at LOS "F" in both the a.m. and p.m. peak hour conditions under the assumed geometry.

Because one or more intersections would degrade from acceptable to unacceptable levels, the increase in traffic congestion is considered ***a significant impact.***

Mitigation Measures

Implementation of the following measure would reduce the project contribution to cumulative traffic congestion by providing funding for improvements to the County transportation network. A combination of improvements would be needed to mitigate cumulative traffic impacts, and not all of these improvements are within the jurisdiction of Placer County (e.g., Placer Parkway). Furthermore, there may not be feasible improvements for some intersections. In addition, the best combination of improvements depends on the size, nature and timing of development and transportation improvements in Placer County, City of Roseville, Sacramento County and other jurisdiction. The County will continue to coordinate with these jurisdictions, but the specific set

of improvements that will ultimately be constructed cannot be identified at this time. For these reasons, this impact would remain ***significant and unavoidable.***

4.7-13a *Implement Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a.*

4.7-13b *Consistent with Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a, the proposed project shall contribute its fair share toward the following improvements:*

i. A third northbound and southbound through lane, a second eastbound and westbound through lane, a second northbound, an eastbound and westbound left turn lane and a free eastbound right turn lane to improve the intersection of Walerga Road and PFE Road to LOS "F" (V/C 1.19) in the p.m. peak hour.

ii. A third northbound and southbound through lane to improve the intersection of Walerga Road and Town Center Drive to LOS "B" (V/C ratio 0.61) in the a.m. peak hour and LOS "C" (V/C 0.73) in the p.m. peak hour

iii. Conversion of the northbound right turn lane into a free right turn lane to improve the intersection of Watt Avenue and Dyer Lane to LOS "E" (V/C 0.94) in the a.m. peak hour and LOS "F" (V/C 1.03) in the p.m. peak hour.

iv. Conversion of the northbound right turn lane into a free right turn lane to improve the intersection of East Dyer Lane and Baseline Road to LOS "E" (V/C 0.92) in the a.m. peak hour.

Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a requires that the proposed project contribute its fair share toward roadway improvements in Placer County by constructing the improvements (and being reimbursed for costs beyond the project share) or paying fees collected for improvements in Placer County. In order to evaluate the potential for such improvements to reduce traffic congestion in the study area, a Mitigated Transportation Network (shown in Figure 4.7-19) was identified and modeled. The Mitigated Transportation Network includes construction of Placer Parkway, widening of some existing or planned roadways and intersections and improvements to transit service. As Revised Table 4.7-30 shows, the Mitigated Transportation Network would reduce the number of intersections that would operate at unacceptable levels, and would reduce the severity of the impacts at other locations. In some cases, congestion at an intersection would increase.

As indicated below, four intersections would continue to operate at unacceptable levels under the Cumulative Plus Project with Mitigated Transportation Network scenario. However, with the exception of the intersection of Walerga Road and PFE Road, operations would improve as a result of the enhanced roadway network.

a. Level of Service at the intersection of Walerga Road and PFE Road would degrade from LOS "F" (V/C 1.42) to LOS "F" (V/C 1.63).

b. Level of Service at the intersection of Dyer Lane and Baseline Road would degrade from LOS "D" to LOS "F" in the a.m peak and LOS "D" to LOS "E" in the p.m. peak under the assumed geometry.

c. The new intersection of Walerga Road and Town Center Drive would operate at LOS "E" in the a.m. peak and LOS "F" conditions in the p.m. peak under the assumed geometry.

b. The new intersection of Watt Avenue and Dyer Lane would operate at LOS "F" conditions in both the a.m. and p.m. peaks under the assumed geometry.

Implementation of the improvements identified in Mitigation Measure 4.7-13b would improve operations at two of these intersections. These improvements would likely be necessary regardless of which combination of improvements is funded and/or constructed by the proposed project.

As discussed under Mitigation Measure 4.7-12, additional improvements, such as third left turn lanes and four through lanes, could be constructed at intersections that would operate at LOS "F" even with the Mitigated Transportation Network. In some cases this could improve LOS to "E". County staff does not recommend that these extraordinary improvements be included in the package of feasible mitigations, for the reasons discussed under Mitigation Measure 4.7-12.

An alternative would be to retain the flexibility to consider such super-intersections in the future. A condition could be set requiring the project to reserve future rights-of-way for the additional width that would be needed to accommodate additional lanes. Such right-of-way could be used for landscaping until such time, if ever, it is needed for pavement.

Sutter County

Impact 4.7-18 on pages 4.7-84 and 4.7-85 of the March 2006 Revised DEIR are revised as shown below. Table 4.7-38 is not reproduced because it would not change.

4.7-I8 Buildout of the Specific Plan under Cumulative Plus Project conditions would increase peak hour traffic volumes on study area intersections in Sutter County.

Figure 4.7-8 shows the key study area intersections in Sutter County. Tables 4.7-38 and 4.7-38A present~~s~~ the intersection Level of Service analysis at these intersections for the a.m. and p.m. peak hours under Cumulative Plus Project conditions.

There will be several new signals along Riego Road between Hwy 70/99 and Pleasant Grove Road (North) as part of the *South Sutter Specific Plan*. However, there are no details on how many signalized intersections there will be or the proposed lane geometry. Therefore a detailed intersection analysis was not conducted for intersections in that segment of Riego Road.

The traffic volumes and existing lane geometry at each intersection in Table 4.7-38 are shown in Appendix I. This analysis indicates that development of the Specific Plan under Cumulative Plus

Project conditions would increase congestion at the following study area intersections that already operate at unacceptable levels:

a. Level of Service at the intersection of Pleasant Grove Road (North) and Riego Road would degrade from LOS "D" to LOS "E" in the a.m. peak and LOS "E" to LOS "F" in the p.m. peak.

b. Level of Service at the intersection of Pleasant Grove Road (South) and Riego Road would degrade from LOS "D" to LOS "F" in the a.m. peak and LOS "E" to LOS "F" in the p.m. peak.

This is considered a ***significant impact.***

Mitigation Measure

Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce project contribution to increased congestion at Sutter County intersections to a *less than significant level*. Placer County can collect fees toward the improvements identified below, but cannot compel Sutter County to construct the improvements. If the identified improvements are not made, the intersection would continue to operate at an unacceptable level. Therefore, this impact is considered *significant and unavoidable.*

4.7-18a *Implement Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a.*

4.7-18b *Consistent with Mitigation Measure 4.7-2a, the proposed project shall contribute its fair share toward the following improvements in Sutter County:*

i. Construct a second left turn lane on the southbound approach, to improve the intersection of Pleasant Grove Road (North) and Riego Road to LOS "D" (VC ratio 0.83) in the a.m. peak LOS "D" conditions (V/C 0.87) in the p.m. peak.

ii. Construct a second left turn lane on the northbound and westbound approaches, to improve the intersection of Pleasant Grove Road (South) and Riego Road to LOS "C" (VC ratio 0.78) in the a.m. peak LOS "D" conditions (V/C 0.87) in the p.m. peak.

BLUEPRINT ALTERNATIVE

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Placer County

The bullets and the second full paragraph on page 6-2 of the July 2006 Partially Recirculated Revised DEIR are revised as shown:

a. Level of Service at the intersection of Baseline Road and Fiddyment Road/Walerga Road would degrade from LOS "D" to LOS "F" in both the a.m. and p.m. peak hour.

b. Level of Service at the intersection of Watt Avenue and PFE Road would degrade from LOS "C" to LOS "D" in the p.m. peak hour.

c. Level of Service at the intersection of Walerga Road and PFE Road would operate at LOS F and the V/C would increase by more than 5% in the a.m. peak hour, and degrade from LOS "E" to LOS "F" in the p.m. peak hour.

In comparison, the proposed Specific Plan would have impacts at Baseline Road/Fiddyment Road/Walerga Road and Walerga Road/PFE Road, but not the other intersection. The intersection of Watt Avenue with PFE Road would be mitigated by constructing a westbound right turn lane. The mitigated LOS at Baseline Road with Fiddyment Road/Walerga Road would be LOS "D" (V/C 0.84) in the a.m. peak hour and LOS "E" (V/C 0.95) in the p.m. peak hour, Watt Avenue with PFE Road would be LOS "B" (V/C 0.66) in the p.m. peak hour, Walerga Road with PFE Road would be LOS "D" (V/C 0.84) in the a.m. peak hour and LOS "E" (V/C 0.98) in the p.m. peak hour.

Sutter County

The second through fourth paragraphs on page 6-84 of the March 2006 Revised DEIR are revised as shown:

The Blueprint Alternative would increase peak hour traffic volumes on study area intersections in Sutter County (Impact 4.7-8). Under Existing Plus Project conditions, no improvements were assumed for Sutter County intersections in the study area beyond existing conditions. Figure 4.7-8 shows the key study area intersections in Sutter County. Tables 6-18 and 6-18A present~~s~~ the intersection Level of Service analysis at these intersections for the p.m. peak hour under Existing Plus Project conditions. The traffic volumes and lane geometry at each intersection in Table 6-18 are shown in Appendix I. This analysis indicates that development of the Blueprint Alternative under existing conditions would cause impacts at the following intersections:

a. Level of Service at the intersection of Riego Road and Natomas Road would degrade from LOS "C" to LOS "F" in both the a.m. and p.m. peaks.

b. Level of Service at the intersection of Pleasant Grove Boulevard (North) and Riego Road would degrade from LOS "D" to LOS "F" in the a.m. peak and LOS "C" to LOS "F" in the p.m. peak.

c. Level of Service at the intersection of Pleasant Grove Boulevard (South) and Riego Road would degrade from LOS "D" to LOS "F" in both the a.m. and p.m. peaks.

d. Level of Service at the intersection of Highway 77/99 and Riego Road would operate at LOS "F" in the a.m. peak and would further degrade.

The proposed Specific Plan would have significant impacts at the same intersections.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.7-8a and 4.7-8b would reduce this impact. The mitigated level of service of the intersection of Riego Road/Natomas Road would be LOS "C" (V/C 0.72) in the a.m peak and LOS "D" (V/C 0.87) in the p.m. peak, Riego Road/Pleasant Grove Road (North) would be LOS "D" (V/C 0.87) in the a.m peak and LOS "D" (V/C 0.87) in the p.m. peak, and Riego Road/Pleasant Grove Road (South) would be LOS "D" (V/C 0.87) in the a.m peak and LOS "E" (V/C 0.93) in the p.m. peak. The mitigated level of service at the intersection of Highway 77/99 and Riego Road would be LOS E (delay of 71.4 seconds) in the a.m. peak hour. As discussed on page 4.7-50, implementation of these mitigation measures is within the jurisdiction of the Sutter County. If the identified improvements are not made, the intersections would continue to operate at an unacceptable level. Therefore, this impact is considered *significant and unavoidable.*

CUMULATIVE CONDITIONS

Placer County

The text on pages 6-17 and 6-18 of the July 2006 Partially Recirculated Revised DEIR is revised as shown below:

Figure 4.7-4 shows the key study area intersections in unincorporated Placer County. Revised Table 6-24 presents the intersection Level of Service analysis at these intersections for the p.m. peak hour under Cumulative Plus Project conditions. The traffic volumes and lane geometry at each intersection in Revised Table 6-24 are shown in Appendix I. This analysis indicates that the Cumulative Plus Blueprint conditions would substantially increase congestion at the following intersections:

a. Level of Service at the intersection of Walerga Road and PFE Road would degrade from LOS "F" to LOS "F"

b. The new intersection of 12th Street and Baseline Road would operate at LOS "E".

c. The new intersection of 11th Street and Baseline Road would operate at LOS "E".

d. Level of Service at the intersection of East Dyer Lane (Westside Drive) and Baseline Road would degrade from LOS "D" to LOS "F" in both the a.m. and p.m. peak hour under the assumed geometry.

e. The new intersection of Walerga Road and East Town Center Drive would operate at LOS "F" in both the a.m. and p.m. peak hour conditions under the assumed geometry.

f. The new intersection of Watt Avenue and Dyer Lane would operate at LOS "F" conditions in both the a.m. and p.m. peak hour under the assumed geometry.

g. Level of Service at the intersection of Fiddyment Road (Walerga Road) and Baseline Road would operate at LOS "F" and the volume to capacity ratio would increase by five percent in the a.m. peak hour.

This is considered a significant impact. The proposed Specific Plan would also have significant impacts at intersections a., d., e., ~~and~~ f and g.

Mitigation Measures 4.7-13a and 4.7-13b would reduce the Blueprint Alternative's contribution to cumulative traffic impacts by providing funding for intersection improvements. However, because some of these improvements could be outside of Placer County's jurisdiction, the impact would remain ***significant and unavoidable.***

As discussed above, the Mitigated Transportation Network includes construction of Placer Parkway, widening of some existing or planned roadways and intersections and improvements to transit service. As Revised Table 6-25 shows, the Mitigated Transportation Network would reduce the number of intersections with significant impacts and would reduce the severity of the impacts at other locations. Mitigation Measure 4.7-13(b) would improve conditions at the intersections of Walerga Road/PFE Road to LOS "F" (V/C 1.03) in the p.m. peak hour, Walerga Road/Town Center Drive to LOS "B" (V/C 0.67) in the a.m. peak and LOS "C" (V/C 0.74) in the p.m. peak, East Dyer Lane with Baseline Road to LOS "E" (V/C 0.94) in the a.m. peak hour and Watt Avenue/Dyer Lane to LOS "E" (V/C 1.00) in the a.m. peak and LOS "F" (V/C 1.06) in the p.m. peak. Fiddyment/Baseline would operate at LOS "F" (V/C 1.26) in the a.m. peak hour. However, no mitigation has been identified to improve five intersections to a less than significant level. Therefore, the Blueprint Alternative's contribution to cumulative traffic conditions at Placer County intersections is considered ***significant and unavoidable.***

Further, regardless of which improvements are implemented under Mitigation Measure 4.7-14(a), feasible mitigation measures have not been found at the five intersections with significant impacts under the Cumulative Plus Blueprint Project with Mitigated Transportation Network scenario. Therefore, the Blueprint Alternative's contribution to this cumulative impact is ***significant and unavoidable.***

Mitigation Measures 4.7-13(b) through (d) would improve conditions at the intersections of Walerga Road/PFE Road LOS "F" (V/C 1.00), and Walerga Road/Town Center Drive LOS "C" (V/C 0.75), and Watt Avenue/Dyer Street LOS "F" (V/C 1.06). However, no mitigation has been identified to improve all of the intersections to acceptable levels. Therefore, the Blueprint Alternative's contribution to cumulative traffic conditions at Placer County intersections is considered *significant and unavoidable.*

Sutter County

The fourth through sixth paragraphs on page 6-110 of the March 2006 Revised DEIR are revised as shown:

The Blueprint Alternative would substantially increase traffic congestion at the following intersection.

a. Level of Service at the intersection of Pleasant Grove Road (North) and Riego Road would degrade from LOS "E" to LOS "F" during the p.m. peak hour.

b. Level of Service at the intersection of Pleasant Grove Road (South) and Riego Road would degrade from LOS "D" to LOS "F" in the a.m. peak.

No other Sutter County intersections would experience significant impacts. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.7-18a and 4.7-18b would reduce this impact. The mitigated LOS at the intersection of Pleasant Grove Road (North) with Riego Road would be LOS "D" (V/C 0.86) and Pleasant Grove Road (South) with Riego Road would be LOS "D" (V/C 0.85).

Table 4.7-17A
A.M. Peak Hour Levels of Service at Study Intersections – Unincorporated Placer County
Existing Plus Project Conditions

Intersection			Existing Conditions			Existing Plus Project Conditions		
			Level of Service	LOS Criteria		Level of Service	LOS Criteria	
North-South Roadway		East-West Roadway		Signalized Intersection (V/C Ratio)	Unsignalized Intersection (Delay)[1]		Signalized Intersection (V/C Ratio)	Unsignalized Intersection (Delay)[1]
1	Locust Road	Baseline Road	E	43.0		A	0.26	
2	Brewer Road	Baseline Road	C	0.5		A	0.33	
3	Watt Avenue	Baseline Road	B	0.65		A	0.50	
4	Fiddyment Rd	Baseline Road	D (F)[2]	0.88 (>1)[2]		**F**	**1.20**	
5	Watt Avenue	PFE Road	B		14.8	B	0.63	
6	Walerga Road	PFE Road	F	1.01		**F**	**1.13**	
7	Cook Riolo Rd	PFE Road	A	9.7		B		12.4
8	Palladay Road	Baseline Road				A	0.36	
9	16th Street	Baseline Road				A	0.38	
10	14th Street	Baseline Road				A	0.48	
11	12th Street	Baseline Road				A	0.52	
12	11th Street	Baseline Road				A	0.45	
13	Dyer Lane (E)	Baseline Road				A	0.51	
14	9th Street	Baseline Road				A		0.4
15	Watt Avenue	A Street				A	0.38	
16	Dyer Lane	A Street				A		8.4
17	Palladay Road	A Street				B		10.9
18	16th Street	A Street				B		10.1
19	14th Street	A Street				B		10.7
20	12th Street	A Street				A		3.4
21	W Dyer Lane	Town Center				A		5.9
22	Watt Ave	Town Center				A	0.44	
23	E Dyer Lane	Town Center				A		4.7
24	Walerga Road	Town Center				A	0.53	
25	Watt Avenue	Oak Street				B	0.66	
26	18th Street	Dyer Lane				A		6.4
27	16th Street	Dyer Lane				A	0.50	
28	Tanwood Ave	Dyer Lane				A		6.1
29	Watt Avenue	Dyer Lane				B	0.67	

Table 4.7-17A
A.M. Peak Hour Levels of Service at Study Intersections – Unincorporated Placer County
Existing Plus Project Conditions

Intersection		Existing Conditions			Existing Plus Project Conditions		
		Level of Service	LOS Criteria		Level of Service	LOS Criteria	
North-South Roadway	East-West Roadway		Signalized Intersection (V/C Ratio)	Unsignalized Intersection (Delay)[1]		Signalized Intersection (V/C Ratio)	Unsignalized Intersection (Delay)[1]

Notes: "Blank" = Intersection does not exist under this scenario. Intersection numbers refer to Figure 4.7-4. Significant impacts are highlighted in bold letters.
[1] Average delay for all movements at intersection, including uncontrolled movements. Delay on some stop-signed controlled left-turn movements may be substantial, but typically impacts a limited number of vehicles.
[2] Observed long queues indicate intersection operates at LOS F.
Source: DKS Associates, 2007.

Table 4.7-23A
A.M. Peak Hour Levels of Service at Study Intersections – Sutter County
Existing Plus Project Conditions

Intersection		Existing Conditions			Existing Plus Project Conditions		
		Level of Service	LOS Criteria		Level of Service	LOS Criteria	
North-South Roadway	East-West Roadway		Signalized Intersection (Delay)	Unsignalized Intersection (Delay)		Signalized Intersection (Delay)	Unsignalized Intersection (Delay)
1 Hwy 70/99	Riego Road	F	86.2		**F**	**123.0**	
Pacific Avenue	Riego Road	A		1.0	A		0.6
2 Natomas Road	Riego Road	C (F)[1]		18.1 (>50)[1]	**F**		**67.7**
3 Pleasant Grove Rd. (North)	Riego Road	D (F)[1]		26.5 (>50)[1]	**F**		**115.6**
3 Pleasant Grove Rd. (South)	Riego Road	D (F)[1]		31.4 (>50)[1]	**F**		**118.6**

Note: Intersection number refers to Figure 4.7-8.
[1] Observed delay greater than calculated delay.
Source: DKS Associates, 2007.

Revised Table 4.7-30A
A.M. Peak Hour Levels of Service at Study Intersections – Unincorporated Placer County
Cumulative Plus Project with Mitigated Transportation Network Scenario

Intersection			Cumulative No Project Alternative			Cumulative Plus Project			Cumulative Plus Project with Mitigated Transportation Network		
				LOS Criteria			LOS Criteria			LOS Criteria	
	North-South Roadway	East-West Roadway	Level of Service	Signalized Intersection (V/C Ratio)	Unsignalized Intersection (Delay)[1]	Level of Service	Signalized Intersection (V/C Ratio)	Unsignalized Intersection (Delay)[1]	Level of Service	Signalized Intersection (V/C Ratio)	Unsignalized Intersection (Delay)[1]
1	Locust Road	Baseline Road	C	0.80		B	0.60		A	0.52	
2	Brewer Road	Baseline Road	D	0.83		B	0.70		A	0.52	
3	Watt Avenue	Baseline Road	F	1.13		F	1.01		E	0.95	
4	Fiddyment Road	Baseline Road	F	1.27		F	1.28		F	1.14	
5	Watt Avenue	PFE Road	E	0.95		C	0.79		D	0.81	
6	Walerga Road	PFE Road	F	1.21		F	1.10		F	1.13	
7	Cook Riolo Road	PFE Road	F	1.13		F	1.08		F	1.03	
8	Palladay Road	Baseline Road				B	0.64		A	0.54	
9	16th Avenue	Baseline Road				C	0.71		A	0.59	
10	14th Avenue	Baseline Road				D	0.82		C	0.73	
11	12th Avenue	Baseline Road				C	0.75		C	0.77	
12	11th Avenue	Baseline Road				D	0.85		C	0.73	
13	East Dyer Lane	Baseline Road	D	0.81		**F**	**1.09**		**F**	**1.06**	
14	9th Avenue	Baseline Road	B	0.65		C	0.78		B	0.66	
15	West Dyer Lane	"A" Street				A	0.48		A	0.42	
16	Palladay Road	"A" Street				B		10.7	B		10.9
17	16th Avenue	"A" Street				B		10.3	B		10.2
18	14th Avenue	"A" Street				B		11.0	A		9.5
19	12th Avenue	"A" Street				A	0.45		A	0.37	
20	Watt Avenue	"A" Street				B	0.68		A	0.50	
21	West Dyer Lane	Town Center				A	0.54		A	0.47	
22	Watt Avenue	Town Center				B	0.61		B	0.63	
23	East Dyer Lane	Town Center				B	0.61		A	0.56	
24	Walerga Rd	Town Center				**F**	**1.03**		**E**	**0.90**	

Revised Table 4.7-30A
A.M. Peak Hour Levels of Service at Study Intersections – Unincorporated Placer County
Cumulative Plus Project with Mitigated Transportation Network Scenario

Intersection			Cumulative No Project Alternative			Cumulative Plus Project			Cumulative Plus Project with Mitigated Transportation Network		
				LOS Criteria			LOS Criteria			LOS Criteria	
	North-South Roadway	East-West Roadway	Level of Service	Signalized Intersection (V/C Ratio)	Unsignalized Intersection (Delay)[1]	Level of Service	Signalized Intersection (V/C Ratio)	Unsignalized Intersection (Delay)[1]	Level of Service	Signalized Intersection (V/C Ratio)	Unsignalized Intersection (Delay)[1]
25	Watt Avenue	Oak Street				A	0.53		A	0.53	
26	18th Avenue	Dyer Lane				A	0.33		A	0.27	
27	16th Avenue	Dyer Lane				A	0.57		A	0.56	
28	Tanwood Avenue	Dyer Lane				A	0.51		A	0.58	
29	Watt Avenue	Dyer Lane				**F**	**1.08**		**F**	**1.08**	

Notes: "Blank" = Intersection does not exist under this scenario. Significant impacts are highlighted in bold letters. Intersection numbers refer to Figure 4.7-4.
[1] Average delay for all movements at intersection, including uncontrolled movements. Delay on some stop-signed controlled left-turn movements may be substantial, but typically impacts a limited number of vehicles.
Source: DKS Associates, 2007

Table 4.7-38A
A.M. Peak Hour Levels of Service at Study Intersections – Sutter County
Cumulative Plus Project Conditions

Intersection		Cumulative No Project Alternative			Cumulative Plus Project Conditions		
			LOS Criteria			LOS Criteria	
North-South Roadway	East-West Roadway	Level of Service	Signalized Intersection (V/C Ratio)	Signalized Intersection (Delay)	Level of Service	Signalized Intersection (V/C Ratio)	Signalized Intersection (Delay)
1A Hwy 70/99 SB	Riego Rd	A		3.2	A		6.3
1B Hwy 70/99 NB	Riego Rd	A		6.7	A		6.0
3 Pleasant Grove Rd (North)	Riego Rd	D	0.89		**E**	**0.95**	
4 Pleasant Grove Rd (South)	Riego Rd	D	0.89		**F**	**1.02**	

Note: Intersection numbers refer to Figure 4.7-8. Significant impacts are highlighted in bold letters
Source: DKS Associates, 2006

Table 6-12A
A.M. Peak Hour Levels of Service at Study Intersections – Unincorporated Placer County
Existing Plus Blueprint Conditions

Intersection			Existing Conditions			Existing Plus Project Conditions			Existing Plus Blueprint Conditions		
				LOS Criteria			LOS Criteria			LOS Criteria	
	North-South Roadway	East-West Roadway	Level of Service	Signalized Intersection (V/C Ratio)	Unsignalized Intersection (Delay)[1]	Level of Service	Signalized Intersection (V/C Ratio)	Unsignalized Intersection (Delay)[1]	Level of Service	Signalized Intersection (V/C Ratio)	Unsignalized Intersection (Delay)[1]
1	Locust Road	Baseline Road	E	43.0		A	0.26		A	0.37	
2	Brewer Road	Baseline Road	C	0.5		A	0.33		A	0.46	
3	Watt Avenue	Baseline Road	B	0.65		A	0.50		A	0.50	
4	Fiddyment Rd	Baseline Road	D (F)[2]	0.88 (>1)[2]		**F**	**1.20**		**F**	**1.25**	
5	Watt Avenue	PFE Road	B		14.8	B	0.63		C	0.78	
6	Walerga Road	PFE Road	F	1.01		**F**	**1.13**		**F**	**1.28**	
7	Cook Riolo Rd	PFE Road	A	9.7		B		12.4	C		28.2
8	Palladay Road	Baseline Road				A	0.36		A	0.38	
9	16th Street	Baseline Road				A	0.38		A	0.45	
10	14th Street	Baseline Road				A	0.48		A	0.54	
11	12th Street	Baseline Road				A	0.52		A	0.44	
12	11th Street	Baseline Road				A	0.45		A	0.53	
13	Dyer Lane	Baseline Road				A	0.51		A	0.50	
14	9th Street	Baseline Road				A		0.4	A		0.8
15	Watt Avenue	A Street				A	0.38		A	0.33	
16	Dyer Lane	A Street				A		8.4	A		9.2
17	Palladay Road	A Street				B		10.9	B		14.1
18	16th Street	A Street				B		10.1	B		11.2
19	14tth Street	A Street				B		10.7	A		6.8
20	12th Street	A Street				A		3.4	A		1.8
21	Dyer Lane	Town Center				A		5.9	A		8.8
22	Watt Avenue	Town Center				A	0.44		A	0.50	
23	East Dyer Lane	Town Center				A		4.7	A		6.0
24	Walerga Road	Town Center				A	0.53		B	0.62	
25	Watt Ave	Oak Street				B	0.66		D	0.80	
26	18th Street	Dyer Lane				A		6.4	A		9.9
27	16th Street	Dyer Lane				A	0.50		A	0.58	
28	Tanwood Ave	Dyer Lane				A		6.1	A		6.3

Table 6-I2A
A.M. Peak Hour Levels of Service at Study Intersections – Unincorporated Placer County
Existing Plus Blueprint Conditions

Intersection			Existing Conditions			Existing Plus Project Conditions			Existing Plus Blueprint Conditions		
				LOS Criteria			LOS Criteria			LOS Criteria	
	North-South Roadway	East-West Roadway	Level of Service	Signalized Intersection (V/C Ratio)	Unsignalized Intersection (Delay)[1]	Level of Service	Signalized Intersection (V/C Ratio)	Unsignalized Intersection (Delay)[1]	Level of Service	Signalized Intersection (V/C Ratio)	Unsignalized Intersection (Delay)[1]
29	Watt Avenue	Dyer Lane				B	0.67		D	0.88	

Notes: Intersection numbers refer to Figure 4.7-4. Significant impacts are highlighted in bold letters
[1] Average delay for all movements at intersection, including uncontrolled movements. Delay on some stop-signed controlled left-turn movements may be substantial, but typically impacts a limited number of vehicles.
Source: DKS Associates, 2007.

Table 6-I8A
A.M. Peak Hour Levels of Service at Study Intersections – Sutter County
Existing Plus Blueprint Conditions

Intersection		Existing Conditions			Existing Plus Project Conditions			Existing Plus Blueprint Conditions		
			LOS Criteria			LOS Criteria			LOS Criteria	
North-South Roadway	East-West Roadway	Level of Service	Signalized Intersection (V/C Ratio)	Unsignalized Intersection (Delay)	Level of Service	Signalized Intersection (V/C Ratio)	Unsignalized Intersection (Delay)	Level of Service	Signalized Intersection (V/C Ratio)	Unsignalized Intersection (Delay)
1 Hwy 70/99	Riego Road	F	86.2		**F**	**123.0**		**F**	**157.8**	
Pacific Avenue	Riego Road	A		1.0	A		0.6	A		0.7
2 Natomas	Riego Road	C (F)[1]		18.1 (>50)[1]	**F**		**67.7**	**F**		**191.8**
3 Pleasant Grove Rd. (North)	Riego Road	D (F)[1]		26.5 (>50)[1]	**F**		**115.6**	**F**		**225.7**
4 Pleasant Grove Rd. (South)	Riego Road	D (F)[1]		31.4 (>50)[1]	**F**		**118.6**	**F**		**325.7**

Note: Intersection number refers to Figure 4.7-8. Significant impacts are highlighted in bold letters.
Source: DKS Associates, 2007.

Revised Table 6-24A
A.M. Peak Hour Levels of Service at Study Intersections – Unincorporated Placer County
Cumulative Plus Blueprint Conditions

Intersection			Cumulative No Project			Cumulative Plus Project			Cumulative Plus Blueprint		
				LOS Criteria			LOS Criteria			LOS Criteria	
	North-South Roadway	East-West Roadway	Level of Service	Signalized Intersection (V/C Ratio)	Unsignalized Intersection (Delay)[1]	Level of Service	Signalized Intersection (V/C Ratio)	Unsignalized Intersection (Delay)[1]	Level of Service	Signalized Intersection (V/C Ratio)	Unsignalized Intersection (Delay)[1]
1	Locust Road	Baseline Road	C	0.80		B	0.60		B	0.68	
2	Brewer Road	Baseline Road	D	0.83		B	0.70		C	0.80	
3	Watt Avenue	Baseline Road	F	1.13		F	1.01		F	1.05	
4	Fiddyment Road	Baseline Road	F	1.27		F	1.28		**F**	**1.39**	
5	Watt Avenue	PFE Road	E	0.95		C	0.79		C	0.79	
6	Walerga Road	PFE Road	F	1.21		F	1.10		F	1.19	
7	Cook Riolo Road	PFE Road	F	1.13		F	1.08		F	1.14	
8	Palladay Road	Baseline Road				B	0.64		C	0.72	
9	16th Street	Baseline Road				C	0.71		C	0.79	
10	14th Street	Baseline Road				D	0.82		D	0.85	
11	12th Street	Baseline Road				C	0.75		C	0.78	
12	11th Street	Baseline Road				D	0.85		D	0.86	
13	East Dyer Lane	Baseline Road	D	0.81		**F**	**1.09**		**F**	**1.05**	
14	9th Street	Baseline Road	B	0.65		C	0.78		D	0.83	
15	West Dyer Lane	A Street				A	0.48		B	0.62	
16	Palladay Road	A Street				B		10.7	B		13.0
17	16th Street	A Street				B		10.3	B		12.5
18	14th Street	A Street				B		11.0	B		12.1

Revised Table 6-24A
A.M. Peak Hour Levels of Service at Study Intersections – Unincorporated Placer County
Cumulative Plus Blueprint Conditions

Intersection			Cumulative No Project			Cumulative Plus Project			Cumulative Plus Blueprint		
				LOS Criteria			LOS Criteria			LOS Criteria	
	North-South Roadway	East-West Roadway	Level of Service	Signalized Intersection (V/C Ratio)	Unsignalized Intersection (Delay)[1]	Level of Service	Signalized Intersection (V/C Ratio)	Unsignalized Intersection (Delay)[1]	Level of Service	Signalized Intersection (V/C Ratio)	Unsignalized Intersection (Delay)[1]
19	12th Street	A Street				A	0.45		A	0.57	
20	Watt Avenue	A Street				B	0.68		A	0.58	
21	West Dyer Lane	Town Center Dr				A	0.54		A	0.59	
22	Watt Avenue	Town Center Dr				B	0.61		B	0.65	
23	East Dyer Lane	Town Center Dr				B	0.61		B	0.69	
24	Walerga Road	Town Center Dr				**F**	**1.03**		**E**	**0.99**	
25	Watt Avenue	Oak Street				A	0.53		B	0.68	
26	18th Street	Dyer Lane				A	0.33		A	0.41	
27	16th Street	Dyer Lane				A	0.57		A	0.59	
28	Tanwood Avenue	Dyer Lane				A	0.51		A	0.57	
29	Watt Avenue	Dyer Lane				**F**	**1.08**		**F**	**1.25**	

Notes: "Blank" = Intersection does not exist under this scenario. Significant impacts are highlighted in bold letters. Intersection numbers refer to Figure 4.7-4.
[1] Average delay for all movements at intersection, including uncontrolled movements. Delay on some stop-signed controlled left-turn movements may be substantial, but typically impacts a limited number of vehicles.
Source: DKS Associates, 2007

Revised Table 6-25A
A.M. Peak Hour Levels of Service at Study Intersections – Unincorporated Placer County
Cumulative Plus Blueprint With Mitigated Transportation Network Scenario

Intersection			Cumulative No Project			Cumulative Plus Blueprint			Cumulative Plus Blueprint With Mitigated Transportation Network		
				LOS Criteria			LOS Criteria			LOS Criteria	
	North-South Roadway	East-West Roadway	Level of Service	Signalized Intersection (V/C Ratio)	Unsignalized Intersection (Delay)[1]	Level of Service	Signalized Intersection (V/C Ratio)	Unsignalized Intersection (Delay)[1]	Level of Service	Signalized Intersection (V/C Ratio)	Unsignalized Intersection (Delay)[1]
1	Locust Road	Baseline Road	C	0.80		B	0.68		B	0.63	
2	Brewer Road	Baseline Road	D	0.83		C	0.80		B	0.63	
3	Watt Avenue	Baseline Road	F	1.13		F	1.05		F	1.06	
4	Fiddyment Road	Baseline Road	F	1.27		**F**	**1.39**		F	1.26	
5	Watt Avenue	PFE Road	E	0.95		C	0.79		D	0.83	
6	Walerga Road	PFE Road	F	1.21		F	1.19		F	1.22	
7	Cook Riolo Road	PFE Road	F	1.13		F	1.14		F	1.06	
8	Palladay Road	Baseline Road				C	0.72		B	0.62	
9	16th Street	Baseline Road				C	0.79		C	0.76	
10	14th Street	Baseline Road				D	0.85		C	0.79	
11	12th Street	Baseline Road				C	0.78		B	0.70	
12	11th Street	Baseline Road				D	0.86		C	0.74	
13	East Dyer Lane	Baseline Road	D	0.81		**F**	**1.05**		**F**	**1.02**	
14	9th Street	Baseline Road	B	0.65		D	0.83		C	0.73	
15	West Dyer Lane	A Street				B	0.62		A	0.55	
16	Palladay Road	A Street				B		13.0	B		12.6
17	16th Street	A Street				B		12.5	B		12.7
18	14th Street	A Street				B		12.1	B		10.9
19	12th Street	A Street				A	0.57		A	0.57	
20	Watt Avenue	A Street				A	0.58		A	0.55	
21	West Dyer Lane	Town Center Dr				A	0.59		A	0.51	

Revised Table 6-25A
A.M. Peak Hour Levels of Service at Study Intersections – Unincorporated Placer County
Cumulative Plus Blueprint With Mitigated Transportation Network Scenario

Intersection			Cumulative No Project			Cumulative Plus Blueprint			Cumulative Plus Blueprint With Mitigated Transportation Network		
				LOS Criteria			LOS Criteria			LOS Criteria	
	North-South Roadway	East-West Roadway	Level of Service	Signalized Intersection (V/C Ratio)	Unsignalized Intersection (Delay)[1]	Level of Service	Signalized Intersection (V/C Ratio)	Unsignalized Intersection (Delay)[1]	Level of Service	Signalized Intersection (V/C Ratio)	Unsignalized Intersection (Delay)[1]
22	Watt Avenue	Town Center Dr				B	0.65		B	0.68	
23	East Dyer Lane	Town Center Dr				B	0.69		B	0.65	
24	Walerga Road	Town Center Dr				**E**	**0.99**		**E**	**0.98**	
25	Watt Avenue	Oak Street				B	0.68		B	0.64	
26	18th Street	Dyer Lane				A	0.41		A	0.37	
27	16th Street	Dyer Lane				A	0.59		A	0.58	
28	Tanwood Ave	Dyer Lane				A	0.57		A	0.57	
29	Watt Avenue	Dyer Lane				**F**	**1.25**		**F**	**1.24**	

Notes: "Blank" = Intersection does not exist under this scenario. Significant impacts are highlighted in bold letters. Intersection numbers refer to Figure 4.7-4.
[1] Average delay for all movements at intersection, including uncontrolled movements. Delay on some stop-signed controlled left-turn movements may be substantial, but typically impacts a limited number of vehicles.
Source: DKS Associates, 2007

Table 6-32A
A.M. Peak Hour Levels of Service at Study Intersections – Sutter County
Cumulative Plus Blueprint Conditions

Intersection		Cumulative No Project			Cumulative Plus Project			Cumulative Plus Blueprint		
			LOS Criteria			LOS Criteria			LOS Criteria	
North-South Roadway	East-West Roadway	Level of Service	Signalized Intersection (V/C Ratio)	Signalized Intersection (Delay)	Level of Service	Signalized Intersection (V/C Ratio)	Signalized Intersection (Delay)	Level of Service	Signalized Intersection (V/C Ratio)	Signalized Intersection (Delay)
1A Hwy 70/99 SB	Riego Rd	A		3.2	A		6.3	A		7.2
1B Hwy 70/99 NB	Riego Rd	A		6.7	A		6.0	A		6.0
3 Pleasant Grove Rd (North)	Riego Rd	D	0.89		**E**	**0.95**		D	0.90	
4 Pleasant Grove Rd (South)	Riego Rd	D	0.89		**F**	**1.02**		**F**	**1.10**	

Note: Intersection numbers refer to Figure 4.7-8.
Source: DKS Associates, 2005

UPRR CROSSING IMPACTS

The following text and impact statements are added to the Revised Draft EIR immediately following Impact 4.7-22 on Revised Draft EIR page 4.7-101:

EXISTING CONDITIONS

There are no active rail lines within the Plan area. The nearest active rail line is the Union Pacific Rail Road (UPRR) line in Sutter County. This rail line runs north-south less than one-half mile west of the Specific Plan area. The area surrounding the rail line in this area is rural in character, composed primarily of agricultural land.

The only crossing of the rail line in proximity to the Specific Plan area is on Riego Road. Traffic controls at this crossing include warning lights and crossing arms. There is no evidence of a safety problem at this crossing.

At present, approximately 18 freight trains and two passenger trains (Amtrak) use the UPRR line on a daily basis[1]. Maximum speed is 70 miles per hour. The number of trains that could use the rail line in the future is unknown at this time.[2]

REGULATORY SETTING

Rail crossings are regulated by the California Public Utilities Commission under Public Utilities Code Sections 1201 through 1220.

METHOD OF ANALYSIS

In order to determine whether the proposed project would substantially alter conditions at the Riego Road rail line crossing, increases in traffic due to the proposed project were reviewed.

Because the rail line is not located near the project site, and there are no schools, parks or similar facilities west of the rail line, few or no pedestrians and bicyclists from Placer Vineyards are expected to travel across the rail line on Riego Road. Therefore, there would be no impact associated with pedestrian and bicycle traffic.

---

[1] David R. Stewart, California Public Utilities Commission, Consumer Protection & Safety Division Rail Safety & Crossing Branch, electronic communication to Jim Ray, McKay and Somps, February 16, 2007; Bree Arnett, Utilities Engineer, California Public Utilities Commission, Consumer Protection & Safety Division Rail Safety & Crossing Branch, personal communication with Jim Ray, McKay and Somps, February 19, 2007.

[2] David R. Stewart, California Public Utilities Commission, electronic communication to Jim Ray, McKay and Somps, February 16, 2007.

STANDARD OF SIGNIFICANCE

The proposed project would have a significant effect on rail lines if it would increase traffic to the extent that crossing improvements, such as a grade separation, would be warranted.

IMPACTS

4.7-23 The proposed project would increase vehicular traffic at the Riego Road crossing of the UPRR rail line.

The proposed project would increase traffic on Riego Road, including the segment that crosses the UPRR rail line. As a result, the potential for conflicts between vehicles and trains would increase. At present, there are approximately 9,900 vehicle trips per day on Riego Road. The proposed project would increase traffic on this segment to 14,000 vehicles per day (see Table 4.7-22). Even with the project-related increase, traffic levels on Riego Road would be within the capacity of a two-lane road. The rail crossing has warning lights and crossing gates, so vehicles could continue to cross the rail safely. Therefore, the impact on the rail line would be ***less than significant***.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.

4.7-24 The proposed project would contribute to cumulative increases in vehicular traffic at the Riego Road crossing of the UPRR rail line.

Under cumulative conditions, an average of 36,500 vehicles are expected to use Riego Road daily, which would be expanded to six lanes. The Public Utilities Commission (PUC) will need to issue a permit for any roadway expansion across the rail line, and could require that a grade separation be constructed as part of the roadway widening. The need and design of the crossing would be determined during planning for the roadway widening. According to PUC staff, a variety of funding sources are available for construction of grade separations[3]. One concern is that adequate land be reserved to provide the right-of-way for the separation.[4] Because the rail line is located outside of the Plan area and in Sutter County, neither the proposed project nor Placer County can ensure that adequate land is reserved. Sutter County would have jurisdiction over the roadway widening, including the right-of-way for the rail crossing.

Under cumulative conditions, the proposed project is projected to increase traffic on Riego Road to an average of 44,800 vehicles per day (see Table 4.7-37). A six-lane roadway would be able

---

[3] Kevin Boles, Utilities Engineer, Rail Crossing Engineering Section, Consumer Protection and Safety Division, personal communication to Adrienne Graham, March 14, 2007.

[4] Kevin Boles, Utilities Engineer, Rail Crossing Engineering Section to Adrienne Graham, Consumer Protection and Safety Division, personal communication, March 14, 2007.

to accommodate this level of traffic, so the proposed project would not result in the need for additional widening over the rail line. Nonetheless, as required by Mitigation Measure 4.7-2, the proposed project would pay its fair share toward the roadway widening, including a grade separation if needed, if and when Placer County and Sutter County enter into an enforceable agreement regarding funding of transportation improvements. Because the proposed project's contribution to cumulative traffic would not trigger the need for additional widening over the rail line, this impact is considered ***less than significant***.

Mitigation Measure

No mitigation is required.

BLUEPRINT ALTERNATIVE

UPRR CROSSING IMPACTS

The following text is added to the Revised Draft EIR at the bottom of page 6-115.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Like the proposed project, the Blueprint alternative would increase traffic on Riego Road. Under existing conditions, traffic levels would increase from 9,900 to 16,400 average daily trips with the addition of Blueprint traffic. Riego Road would continue to operate acceptably, so no widening would be required. With the crossing arms and warning lights that are already in place, the additional traffic should be able to cross the tracks safely.

CUMULATIVE CONDITIONS

Under cumulative conditions, traffic on Riego Road would increase from 37,600 to 46,300 average daily trips with the addition of Blueprint traffic. The six-lane road would operate acceptably with the additional traffic. The PUC could require that a grade separation be constructed when Sutter County widens Riego Road to four or six lanes. As with the proposed project, the Blueprint alternative would contribute its fair share to such a grade separation, if required, as part of a traffic impact fee, if adopted, consistent with Revised Draft EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-2.