3.12 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

This section of the Project EIR (PEIR) describes existing transportation conditions in the Putah Creek area, and examines how the proposed Project could affect transportation, traffic, and circulation along the Creek and in the surrounding area. Descriptions and analysis are based on sources including the Solano and Yolo County General Plans (and their associated Environmental Impact Reports) and the Yolo County Transportation Impact Study Guidelines (County of Yolo, 2010). For purposes of this PEIR, all public roadways intersecting or otherwise potentially impacted by the Project were reviewed. These roads are described in the Roadway Network section in the Environmental Setting. Roadways that showed a potential for significant impacts from the Project were assessed further.

The following California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Appendix G transportation/traffic topic is not addressed in this PEIR because the Project has no potential to affect it:

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

3.12.1 Setting

Environmental Setting

General Transportation Setting

The Project Area is bordered to the south in many places by rural Putah Creek Road, various small farm roads to the south and north, and by more urban roadways in the cities of Winters and Davis to the north. Major arterials providing community circulation and connection to regional roadways in the Project vicinity include State Route 128 (SR 128) and the non-freeway portions of SR 113 south of Interstate 80 (I-80). Three freeways, I-80, I-505, and SR 113 serve as regional connectors in the Project Area.

Roadway Network

Roadway network classifications for municipalities in the Project Area are presented below, followed by descriptions of major roadways in the vicinity of the proposed Project. Roadways analyzed in this section are shown on **Figures 3.12-1A** through **3.12-1D**.

Figure 3.12-1A Access to Project Worksites

Figure 3.12-1B Access to Project Worksites

Figure 3.12-1C Access to Project Worksites

Figure 3.12-1D Access to Project Worksites

Roadway Network Classifications: Solano County

Solano County's General Plan classifies the various roadway types as follows (County of Solano, 2008a, pp. TC-10 and 11):

- **Freeways:** "These facilities provide interregional connectivity and are designed for limited access operation without any signalized controls."
- **Major Arterial Roads:** "These roads, often with multiple lanes, provide the highest level of connectivity with local land uses. These facilities are usually controlled by signal operations with multiple phases."
- **Minor Arterial Roads: "**These roads provide a higher level of connectivity with the overall roadway system. They serve the same function as collectors but are intended to carry higher speeds of traffic. These typically will have signalized intersections with other minor arterials and more important roadways."
- **Collector Roads:** "These roads link local and collector roads with arterials, freeways, and other collector roads. They usually have moderate but not congested volume."
- **Local Roads:** "These roads are used primarily for access to residences, businesses, or other abutting properties. Ideally, these are paved roads with enough width to allow vehicles to operate in both directions. Local roads are identified on Figure TC-1."
- **Route of Regional Significance:** "A key roadway that meets most of the following criteria: it has significant traffic volume, it provides an important connection between cities and/or freeways and highways, it provides regional as well as local benefit, it serves as a frontage road or as a reliever route providing an alternative to the use of freeways and highways as a connection between cities, it provides access to significant job concentrations and transit centers in Solano County, it provides an improved emergency response route."

Roadway Network Classifications: Yolo County

Yolo County's General Plan classifies the various roadway types as follows (County of Yolo, 2009a, pp. CI-7, CI-12):

- **Freeway:** "Freeways are intended to serve both intra-regional and inter-regional travel. They provide no access to adjacent properties, but rather are fed traffic from county roadways by access ramps at interchanges. Freeways provide connections to other regional highways and are capable of carrying high traffic volumes. Examples include Interstate 5, Interstate 80, Interstate 505 and portions of State Route 113."
- **Arterial:** "Arterial roadways are fed by local and collector roads and provide intra-community circulation and connection to regional roadways. Arterials within the

unincorporated areas generally represent the "main street" of communities and are usually part of the regional highway system. Although their primary purpose is to move traffic, arterial roadways often provide access to adjacent properties."

- **Conventional Two-Lane Highway:** State-maintained highway facilities that "are used as primary connections between major traffic generators or as primary links in State and national highway networks. Such routes often have sections of many miles through rural environments without traffic control interruptions. Some local access to parcels may be provided, particularly in rural areas."
- **Major Two-Lane County Road:** Major two-lane county road is defined by Yolo County as "not a highway; it functions primarily as a collector facility. Major two-lane county roads serve travel that is primarily intra-county rather than of regional or statewide importance."
- **Minor Two-Lane County Road:** "By strict definition, such a facility is not a highway; it functions primarily as a collector facility. Minor two-lane county roads primarily provide access to adjacent land and travel over relatively short distances. Minor two-lane county roads primarily carry local traffic, as compared with major two-lane roads which carry intra-county traffic."
- **Local Roads:** These "provide service to adjacent land uses and connect with other local and county roads. Local roads are typically developed as two-lane undivided roadways. Local roads are only shown on the Circulation Element Diagram for orientation purposes and are not considered General Plan Roadways."

Roadway Network Classifications: City of Winters

The City of Winters General Plan classifies the various roadway types as follows (City of Winters, 1992, pp. I-4 to I-5):

- **Freeways:** These "are not considered part of the street system for classification purposes."
- **Arterial Streets:** "streets which serve major centers of activity, the highest traffic volume corridors, and longest trip desires; are integrated internally, and provide service between major rural connections."

Regional Access to Project Area

Three freeways provide regional connector access to the vicinity of the Project Area:

- I-505 provides access from the north and south and intersects the western side of the Project Area immediately east of the City of Winters;

- SR-113 provides access from the north and reaches the Project Area immediately west of the City of Davis in the eastern half of the Project Area; and
- I-80 provides access from the northeast and southwest and crosses the eastern half of the Project Area.

Regional access is also provided by non-freeway major arterials: SR 128 provides access from the east and runs to the north along the western side of the Project Area; the non-freeway segment of SR 113 (south of I-80) provides access from the south.

Roadway Network by Reach

NAWCA/Mariani

Solano County Roadways

Putah Creek Road runs east and west to the south of the southern border of the Project Area. This is a collector road (County of Solano, 2008a, Figure TC-1).

Yolo County Roadways

SR 128 runs east and west to the north of the Project Area through the City of Winters. The City of Winters classifies SR 128 as an arterial (City of Winters, 1992, pp. I-4). The Yolo County General Plan categorizes SR 128 as a conventional two-lane highway (County of Yolo, 2009a, Figure CI-1A).

Duncan-Giovannoni

Solano County Roadways

Putah Creek Road runs east and west to the south of the southern border of the Project Area.

Yolo County Roadways

SR 128 runs east and west to the north of the Project Area through the City of Winters.

Winters Putah Creek Nature Park

Solano County Roadways

Putah Creek Road runs east and west along the southern border of the Project area.

Yolo County Roadways

SR 128 runs east and west to the north of the Project area through the City of Winters.

Roadways within Both Solano and Yolo Counties

Railroad Avenue/Road 89 (Yolo County)/Winters Road (Solano County)

This road crosses the Project Area within the City of Winters. This is an arterial road in Winters (City of Winters, 1992, Figure I-1) and a collector road in both Solano and Yolo Counties (County of Solano, 2008a, Figure TC-1; County of Yolo, 2009a, Figure CI-1A).

I-505 (Reach: Winters Putah Creek Nature Park)

This road crosses the Project Area on the eastern boundary of the City of Winters and forms the boundary between this reach and the east of I-505 reach. This road has two lanes in each direction as it crosses the Project Area. It is categorized as a freeway by Solano and Yolo Counties, and the City of Winters (County of Solano, 2008a, Figure TC-1; County of Yolo, 2009a, p. CI-7; City of Winters, 1992, Figure I-1).

East of 505

Solano County Roadways

Putah Creek Road runs east and west along the southern border of the Project Area in the upstream two-thirds of the reach. In the downstream one-third of the reach, Putah Creek turns to the north, and thereafter, Putah Creek Road runs parallel to the southern border of the Project Area.

Roadways within Both Solano and Yolo Counties

I-505 (Reach: Winters Putah Creek Nature Park)

This road crosses the Project Area on the eastern boundary of the City of Winters and forms the boundary between this reach and Winters Putah Creek Nature Park Reach. This road has two lanes in each direction as it crosses the Project Area. It is categorized as a freeway by Solano and Yolo Counties, and the City of Winters (County of Solano, 2008a, Figure TC-1; County of Yolo, 2009a, p. CI-7; City of Winters, 1992, Figure I-1).

Warren

Solano County Roadways

Putah Creek Road runs east and west to the south of the southern border of the Project area.

Upper McNamara

Solano County Roadways

Putah Creek Road runs east and west along the southern border of the Project Area in the upstream half of the reach. In the downstream half of the reach, Putah Creek Road turns to the southwest and runs to the south of the southern border of the Project Area.

Lower McNamara

Solano County Roadways

Putah Creek Road runs east and west to the south of the southern border of the Project Area.

MacQuiddy (Lester)

Solano County Roadways

Putah Creek Road runs east and west to the south of the southern border of the Project Area.

Russell Ranch

Solano County Roadways

Putah Creek Road runs east and west to the south of the southern border of the Project area. Martinez Lane, a local, rural two-lane road, runs east and west approximately 0.59 miles on the southern border of the Project Area.

Yolo County Roadways

Creeksedge Road (also known as Road 8306) is a local, rural two-lane road west of Road 95A that runs east and west, on the northern boundary of the Project area.

Stevenson Bridge

Solano County Roadways

Putah Creek Road runs east and west to the south of the southern border of the Project Area. Strathgordon Lane is a local, rural two-lane road that runs east-west to the south of the southern boundary of the Project Area, in the downstream portion of the reach.

Yolo County Roadways

Creeksedge Road/Road 8306 is a local, rural two-lane road that runs east and west on the northern boundary of the Project Area.

Roadways within Both Solano and Yolo Counties

Stevenson Bridge Road/Road 95A crosses the Project Area approximately 6.04 miles west of the City of Davis. This road is categorized as a collector road in the Solano County General Plan (County of Solano, 2008a, Figure TC-1). The Yolo County General Plan defines Stevenson Bridge Road as a minor two-lane county road (County of Yolo, 2009a, Figure CI-1B).

Glide Ranch

Solano County Roadways

Strathgordon Lane is a local, rural two-lane road that runs east and west to the south of the southern boundary of the Project Area. Currey Road is a local, rural two-lane road located to the south of the southern boundary of the Project Area.

Nishikawa

Roadways within Both Solano and Yolo Counties

Pedrick Road (Lincoln Highway, Road E7) crosses the Project Area approximately 3.63 miles south-southwest of the City of Davis and forms the boundary between this reach and Olmo-Hammond-UCD Reach. This road is categorized as both a collector road and as a County Route of Regional Significance by Solano County (County of Solano, 2008a, Figure TC-1). Yolo County classifies Pedrick Road as a Major Two-Lane County Road (County of Yolo, 2009a, Figure CI-1B).

Olmo-Hammond-UCD

Solano County Roadways

Vineyard Lane is a local, rural two-lane road that runs east and west to the south of the southern boundary of the upstream one-third of this reach. Thereafter, in the downstream two-thirds of the reach, Vineyard Lane runs along the southern boundary of this reach.

I-80 crosses this reach approximately 2.5 miles southwest of the City of Davis. Although I-80 crosses through both Solano and Yolo counties, within this reach, I-80 is only in

Solano County. This road has four lanes in each direction where it crosses the Project Area. It is categorized as a freeway (County of Solano, 2008a, Figure TC-1; County of Yolo, 2009a, Figure CI-1B).

SR 113 merges with I-80 as it crosses this reach approximately 2.5 miles southwest of the City of Davis. Although SR 113 crosses through both Solano and Yolo Counties, only the Solano County portion of this road lies within this reach. This road is categorized as a major arterial by Solano County (County of Solano, 2008a, Figure TC-1).

Roadways within Both Solano and Yolo Counties

I-80 crosses the Olmo-Hammond-UCD reach approximately 2.5 miles southwest of the City of Davis. Although I-80 passes through both Solano and Yolo counties, only the Solano County portion of this highway lies within this reach.

SR 113 merges with I-80 as it crosses the Project Area, approximately 2.5 miles southwest of the City of Davis. Although SR 113 crosses through both Solano and Yolo counties, only the Solano County portion of this road lies within this reach.

Pedrick Road (Lincoln Highway, Road E7) crosses the Project Area approximately 3.6 miles south, southwest of the City of Davis and forms the boundary between this reach and Nishikawa Reach.

Levee Road runs east and west on the northern boundary of this reach. Within this reach, Levee Road is located mostly within Yolo County, with a small portion of the road located within Solano County on the downstream edge of the reach, southeast of the University Airport.

I-80 to Old Davis Road

This reach is located entirely within Solano County. In this reach, SR 113 merges with I-80 as it crosses the Project Area approximately 2.5 miles southwest of the City of Davis. Although SR 113 crosses through both Solano and Yolo Counties, only the Solano County portion of this road lies within the Project Area.

Levee Road, a two-lane rural road, runs east and west on the northern boundary of this reach. Vineyard Lane, a two-lane rural road, runs east and west on the southern boundary of this reach

Old Davis Road to Mace

This reach is located entirely within Solano County. Roadways within this reach include:

Drummond Lane, a local, rural two-lane road, runs north and south and ends at the northern boundary of this reach, approximately 2.4 miles southeast of the City of Davis.

Road 104/Mace Boulevard runs east and west along the eastern edge of this reach, approximately 3.05 miles southeast of the City of Davis. In the Project Area, this roadway forms the border between Solano and Yolo Counties, as well as between this reach and the Mace to Road 106A reach. This road is categorized as a collector road by Solano County (County of Solano, 2008a, Figure TC-1).

Levee Road, a two-lane rural road, runs east and west on the northern boundary of this reach. Another Levee Road runs east and west on the southern boundary of this reach (and has the same name as the Levee Road on the north side of the creek). It also is a two-lane rural road.

Mace to Road 106A

This reach is located entirely within Yolo County. Road 104/Mace Boulevard runs east and west along the western edge of the reach, approximately 3 miles southeast of the City of Davis. In this reach, this roadway forms the border between Solano and Yolo Counties, as well as between this reach and the Old Davis Road to Mace reach.

Road 106A, a two-lane, local, rural road, crosses this reach approximately 5.4 miles southeast of the City of Davis. Another two-lane, local, rural road, Levee Road, runs east and west on the northern boundary of this reach.

Road 106A to Yolo Bypass Wildlife Area

This reach is located entirely within Yolo County. Roadways within this reach include Levee Road, which runs east and west on the northern boundary of the reach.

Roadway Level of Service Definitions

The term “level of service” (LOS) is typically used to characterize traffic conditions and identify areas of congestion and highway deficiencies (County of Solano, 2008a, p. TC-12). The Transportation Research Board Highway Capacity Manual, 2000, defines six LOS using an “A” through “F” letter rating system to describe travel delay and congestion, with LOS A representing the best operating conditions, and LOS F the most

congested. **Table 3.12-1** presents the Solano County General Plan definition of LOS. The Yolo County General Plan contains similar descriptions of LOS (County of Yolo General Plan, 2009, pp. CI-3 and CI-4).

Solano County Existing Roadway Conditions

According to traffic count data presented in the Solano County 2008 Draft General Plan EIR, LOS on roads in the Solano County portion of the Project Area have an LOS ranging between A-C (County of Solano, 2008b, Table 4.4-2). **Table 3.12-2** summarizes the LOS on roadways in the vicinity of the Project Area.

Yolo County Existing Traffic Conditions

Like Solano County, LOS on roads in the Yolo County portion of the Project vicinity range between A-C (County of Yolo, 2009c, Appendix C). **Table 3.12-3** summarizes the existing traffic conditions on Yolo County roadways in the vicinity of the Project Area.

Public Transit

Yolobus is the public transit bus system serving Yolo County. Yolobus also serves a small portion of Sacramento County and Solano County in the City of Vacaville. Yolobus is the primary source of public transit near the Project Area and has multiple routes that cross the Project Area at the I-80 and SR 113 junction and at I-505. There is no bus service or bus stops within the Project Area (County of Yolo, 2009b p. 220; Yolobus, 2013).

Solano Express is the Solano Transit Authority public transit trip planning website that provides an interactive map of various transit services available in and adjacent to Solano County. Solano Express lists no transit services that stop within the Project Area (STA, 2015).

Amtrak commuter rail service is available in the City of Davis through Amtrak's Capital Corridor Line, but there is no other rail service available in the vicinity and none in the Project Area (County of Yolo, 2009a, Figure CI-4B; Capital Corridor JPA, 2015).

Bicycles and Pedestrians

The road network in the immediate vicinity of the Project Area is characterized by rural, two-lane roads. Higher capacity roadways, I-80 and I-505, pass over the Project Area, but do not provide direct access to the Project Area. There are no pedestrian facilities such as sidewalks or crosswalks, which is typical of the pedestrian network in unincorporated areas in the region (County of Solano, 2008b, p. 4.4-26).

Table 3.12-1 Solano County Definitions of Levels of Service (LOS)

LOS	Definition
A	Free flow. Individual users are virtually unaffected by the presence of others in the traffic stream. Freedom to select desired speeds and to maneuver within the traffic stream is extremely high. The general level of comfort and convenience provided to the motorist, passenger, or pedestrian is excellent.
B	In the range of stable flow, but the presence of other users in the traffic stream begins to be noticeable. Freedom to select desired speeds is relatively unaffected, but there is a slight decline in the freedom to maneuver within the traffic stream from LOS A. The level of comfort and convenience provided is somewhat less than at LOS A, because the presence of others in the traffic stream begins to affect individual behavior.
C	In the range of stable flow, but marks the beginning of the range of flow in which the operation of individual users becomes significantly affected by interactions with others in the traffic stream. The selection of speed is now affected by the presence of others, and maneuvering within the traffic stream requires substantial vigilance on the part of the user. The general level of comfort and convenience declines noticeably at this level.
D	High-density, but stable, flow. Speed and freedom to maneuver are severely restricted, and the driver or pedestrian experiences a generally poor level of comfort and convenience. Small increases in traffic flow will generally cause operational problems at this level.
E	Operating conditions at or near the capacity level. All speeds are reduced to a low, but relatively uniform value. Freedom to maneuver within the traffic stream is extremely difficult, and it is generally accomplished by forcing a vehicle or pedestrian to "give way" to accommodate such maneuvers. Comfort and convenience levels are extremely poor, and driver or pedestrian frustration is generally high. Operations at this level are usually unstable, because even small increases in flow or minor perturbations within the traffic stream will cause breakdowns.
F	Forced or breakdown flow. This condition exists wherever the amount of traffic approaching a point exceeds the amount that can traverse it and queues begin to form. Operations within the queue are characterized by stopping and starting. Over and over, vehicles may progress at reasonable speeds for several hundred feet or more, and then be required to stop. LOS F is used to describe operating conditions within the queue especially at the point of the breakdown, although it is noted that traffic may resume to normal conditions quite rapidly once free of the queue.

Note: See Table 4.4-3 (County of Solano, 2008b) for details regarding specific LOS traffic volumes for each roadway category and number of lanes.
Source: County of Solano. 2008b. Solano County 2008 Draft General Plan EIR, Table 4.4-2.

The following bicycle lanes occur in the Project Area:

- The Dixon-Davis Bikeway, which is approximately 6.9 miles in length and travels from I-80 in Davis to the City of Dixon (STA, 2012, pp. 21; County of Yolo, 2013, p. 8). This bikeway crosses the Project Area via Old Davis Road. This road borders the I-80 to Old Davis Road reach and the Old Davis Road to Mace Reach.
- A separated bicycle lane crosses the Project area at Stevenson Bridge Road/ Road 95A, in the Stevenson Bridge reach.

Table 3.12-2 Solano County - Existing Traffic Volume and LOS for Project Area Roads

Roadway	Direction	Location	Daily Traffic	Existing LOS
SR 128	Westbound	East of Junction SR 121 South	2,000	A-C
Road 89/Winters Road	Southbound	At Yolo County Line	1,000	A-C
I-505	Southbound	North of Allendale Road Interchange	8,000	A-C
Stevenson Bridge Road	Southbound	At Yolo County Line	<1,000	A-C
Pedrick Road/Road 98	Southbound	At Yolo County Line	1,000	A-C
SR 113	Southbound	North of I-80 (near Davis)	25,000	A-C
I-80/North Gateway	Westbound	At Yolo County Line	57,000	A-C
SR 128	Eastbound	East of Junction with SR 121 South	3,000	A-C
Road 89/Winters Road	Northbound		1,000	A-C
I-505 (North Gateway)	Northbound	North of Allendale Road Interchange	8,000	A-C
Stevenson Bridge Road	Southbound		<1,000	A-C
Pedrick Road-Road 98	Northbound		1,000	A-C
SR 113	Northbound	North of I-80 (near Davis)	26,000	A-C
I-80	Eastbound	Solano-Yolo County Line	58,000	A-C

Source: County of Yolo. 2009b. Adapted from *Solano County General Plan EIR*, Table 4.4-4, p. 4.4-8.

Table 3.12-3 Yolo County – Existing Traffic Volume and LOS for Project Area Roads

Street	Direction	Location	AM/PM Peak	Existing LOS AM/PM Peak
I-505	Northbound	Solano County Line to SR 128	330/710	A/A
I-505	Southbound	Solano County Line to SR 128	570/560	A/A
I-80	Eastbound	Solano County Line to Mace Blvd.	4,110/4,320	C/C
I-80	Westbound	Solano County Line to Mace Blvd.	4,120/4,420	C/C
SR 113	Northbound	Solano County Line to Covell Blvd.	1,030/2,270	A/C
SR 113	Southbound	Solano County Line to Covell Blvd.	2,140/1,280	C/B
Mace Blvd.		County Road 35 to County Road 32B	150*	B*
Railroad Ave.		SR 128 to Winters City Limits	470*	C*
SR 128		Railroad Avenue to I-505	930*	C*

*Daily peak hour.
Source: County of Yolo. 2009c. *Yolo County General Plan EIR*, Appendix C.

Planned Bicycle Lanes

Solano County

The Solano County Wide Bicycle Transportation Plan proposes five new bicycle lanes. These bicycle lanes are identified in **Table 3.12-4.**

Table 3.12-4 Proposed Solano County Bicycle Lane Projects

Street	From	To	Class	Length (Miles)
Pedrick Road	Solano-Yolo County Line	Sievers Road	II	2.5
Stevenson Bridge Road	County Road 95A	Sievers Road	II or III	3.5
Boyce Road	Putah Creek Road	Wolfskill Road	II	1.9
Putah Creek Road	Pleasant Valley Road	Pleasant Valley Road	II or III	12
Winters Road	Putah Creek Road	Wolfskill Road	II	1.7

Source: STA. 2012. Proposed Solano County Bikeway Network, Table 3-5B, pp. 49-67.

Yolo County

The Yolo County General Plan proposes two new bicycle lanes that would intersect the Project Area:

- A Class II bicycle lane is proposed to cross the Project Area at Stevenson Bridge Road/Road 95A (County of Yolo, 2009a, p. CI-16, Figure CI-3B).
- A Class II bicycle lane is proposed to cross the Project Area at Mace Boulevard/ County Road 104 (County of Yolo, 2009a, p. CI-16, Figure CI-3B).

Air Transportation

The closest airport to the Project Area is the Davis University Airport, located approximately 0.45 miles northeast. Other nearby airports include the Yolo County Airport (approximately 2.85 miles north), Blake Sky Park (approximately 3.36 miles south), the Nut Tree Airport in Vacaville (approximately 8.49 miles southeast), and the Watts-Woodland Airport (approximately 9.25 miles north).

Rail

An active railroad line crosses the Project area approximately 2.19 miles southwest of the City of Davis, in the I-80 to Old Davis Road reach.

Project Area Roadway Safety

None of the roadways within the Project Area have been identified as high-accident roadways by Solano or Yolo County (STA, 2005, p. 4, Figure 1; County of Yolo, 2009b, p. 218, Figure IV.C-5).

Regulatory Setting

Regional Transportation Planning

Solano County Regional Transportation Planning

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is the transportation planning, coordinating and financing agency for Solano County and the eight other San Francisco Bay Area Counties. Pursuant to California law (Government Code Section 66500 et seq.), the MTC is the designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for the Bay Area region. Acting in this capacity, the MTC is responsible for developing and adopting regional transportation planning documents and studies, including the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), a 20-year general plan for the region's transportation network. MTC also acts as the federally designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the region (MTC, 2014).

Additional county-level planning is performed by the Solano Transportation Authority, which was created in 1990 through a Joint Powers Agreement between the cities of Benicia, Dixon, Fairfield, Rio Vista, Suisun City, Vacaville, Vallejo, and the County of Solano to serve as the Congestion Management Agency (CMA) for the Solano region (STA, 2010). The STA is responsible for countywide transportation planning, programming transportation funds, managing and providing transportation programs and services, delivering projects, and setting priorities.

Yolo County Regional Transportation Planning

Regional transportation planning in Yolo County is the responsibility of the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), an association of local governments in the six-county Sacramento region (County of Yolo, 2009a, p. CI-6; SACOG, 2015c, p. 1). SACOG is the state RTPA and the federal MPO for transportation planning in Yolo County and the greater Sacramento region (SACOG, 2015c, p. 2).

County-level transportation planning is performed by Yolo County, local cities, and the Yolo County Transportation District (County of Yolo, 2009a, p. CI-6).

Local Regulations

Solano County General Plan

Traffic and circulation issues are addressed in the Transportation and Circulation Element of the General Plan (County of Solano, 2008a, Chapter 7, pp. TC-6 and TC-7). The Element contains the following policies regarding traffic and circulation impacts that are relevant to the proposed Project.

> Policy TC.P-1: Maintain and improve current transportation systems to remedy safety and congestion issues, and establish specific actions to address these issues when they occur.
>
> Policy TC.P-4: Evaluate proposals for new development for their compatibility with and potential effects on transportation systems.
>
> Policy TC.P-9: Plan, fund, build, and improve roadways that support agriculture by providing increased connectivity across Interstate 80, including the intersection at Pedrick Road, for farmers and their equipment, and by grading and paving unimproved rural roads.
>
> Policy TC.P-10: Anticipate increases in vehicular traffic on rural roads that serve agricultural-tourist centers, value-added agricultural uses in the interior valleys, and other unique land uses; complete related roadway improvements that support the viability of such uses.

Yolo County General Plan

Traffic and circulation issues are addressed in the Circulation Element of the 2030 Countywide General Plan (County of Yolo, 2009a, pp. CI-25 to CI-26). The element contains the following objectives, policies, and standards regarding traffic and circulation impacts that are relevant to the proposed Project.

> Policy CI-1.2: Preserve and continue to develop a fully connected grid-based circulation system that distributes traffic evenly and avoids excessive concentrations of traffic in any given area.
>
> Policy CI-1.7: Coordinate with other local governments to maintain jointly owned infrastructure (e.g., County Line Road, Freeport Bridge, Putah Creek bridges).

Policy CI-1.8: Work with adjoining landowners to reduce roadway flooding.

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

- Interstate 5 – North towards Redding and east into Sacramento.
- Interstate 80 – East into Sacramento and west toward Solano County and the San Francisco Bay Area.
- Interstate 505 – South to the junction of E/WB Interstate 80.
- State Route 16 – West from Woodland into the Capay Valley and then north into Colusa County.
- State Route 45 – North from Knights Landing into Colusa County.
- State Route 84 – South from West Sacramento into Solano County with one crossing east into Sacramento County across the Sacramento River.
- State Route 113/County Road 102 – North from Woodland into Sutter County and south from Davis into Solano County.
- State Route 128 – West from Winters into Napa County.
- County Road 22 – East from Woodland into West Sacramento and then into Sacramento at two locations across the Sacramento River.
- County Road 98 – South from Woodland into Solano County.

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

(County of Yolo, 2009a, p. CI-28)

The General Plan allows a LOS worse than LOS C on certain specified roadways listed on page CI-28 to CI-30 of the Plan. General Plan maps indicate that the LOS C is the threshold for roadways in the Project Area (County of Yolo, 2010, Figure 1 (West) and Figure 1 (East) Level of Service Threshold). One exception to this is SR 128, on which LOS D is acceptable (County of Yolo, 2009a, p. CI-29).

3.12.2 Significance Criteria

CEQA Guidelines Criteria

The following thresholds for measuring a project's environmental impacts are based on CEQA Guidelines Appendix G (OPR, 2013). For the purposes of this PEIR, impacts are considered significant if the following would result from implementation of the proposed Project:

1. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit.
2. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to LOS and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.
3. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., obstructions to and by farm equipment).
4. Result in inadequate emergency access.
5. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

Other Significance Criteria

Solano County does not have its own set of thresholds for transportation impact analysis; it follows the Appendix G CEQA Criteria listed above (County of Solano, 2014).

Yolo County Traffic Impact Study Guidelines

In 2010, Yolo County established Transportation Impact Study Guidelines (Yolo TIS Guidelines) to assess potential traffic impacts of proposed projects. The Guidelines identify specific project parameters or conditions that may trigger the need for a formal Traffic Impact Study (TIS) for a project (County of Yolo, 2010, pp. 1, 4).

Under the Yolo TIS Guidelines, the following project conditions would trigger the need for a TIS and are evaluated in this PEIR:

- If the proposed project has the potential to generate 100 new passenger vehicle trips per day or an equivalent number of truck trips (50 trips per day for 2-axle/6-tire trucks; 20 trips per day for 3- and 4-axle trucks, 5 trips per day for trucks with 5 or more axles) (County of Yolo, 2010, p. 4).
- If the proposed project has the potential to create a significant environmental impact under CEQA, including the following:
  - A proposed project fails to provide safe accommodation of forecast truck traffic or temporary construction-related truck traffic.
  - The construction of a proposed project creates a temporary but prolonged impact due to lane closures, need for temporary signals, emergency vehicles access, traffic hazards to bikes/pedestrians, damage to roadbed, truck traffic on roadways not designated as truck routes, etc.

County of Yolo, 2010, pp. 30 to 31.

LOS Thresholds

For the purposes of this PEIR, transportation impacts on LOS are considered significant under either of the following two conditions:

1. If project vehicle trips would place a roadway into a more congested LOS category than its current LOS. For example, if a roadway is currently operating at LOS C and project traffic would move the roadway to LOS D; that would be considered a significant impact.
2. If project vehicle trips would place a roadway into a lower LOS than the policy expressed in the county transportation planning documents. For Solano County, the minimum LOS standard throughout the system is LOS E (STA, 2013, p. 14). In Yolo County, the minimum standard is LOS C in most unincorporated areas, including the Project Area (see County of Yolo, 2009a, p. CI-28; County of Yolo, 2010, Figure 1 (West) and Figure 1 (East) Level of Service Threshold). The only exception to this standard within the immediate Project Area is SR 128, on which LOS D is acceptable (County of Yolo, 2009a, p. CI-29).

3.12.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Project Activities and Equipment Overview

Project activities would consist of a series of short-term construction phases followed by long-term maintenance activities.

Project construction activities would typically entail the use of trucks, excavators, and rubber-tired loaders. Construction materials, including any needed soil and aggregate, would be hauled from a permitted quarry or borrow site located within a maximum of 30 miles of the Project Area. Typically 4 to 8 trucks would be used at one time, with a maximum of six trucks being used at one time in the Project Area. Typically the trucks typically would line up and be filled as a group and run back and forth from the haul/backhaul site as a group. Project construction activities would usually involve the use of 3- and 4-axle trucks, primarily standard 10-yard, 3-axle trucks, but may also involve incidental use of larger end-dump trucks or full-size semis where suitable access exists.

For ease of access and for most efficient transport of gravel and other fill material, Project activities would preferentially use Solano County roadways. In the Solano County portion of the Project Area, the maximum expected number of one-way 3- and 4-axle-truck trips would be 42 per day. This number was calculated based on experience with previous Solano County Water Agency (SCWA) stream restoration projects in the vicinity. In the Yolo County portion of the Project Area, daily 3- and 4-axle-truck trips would not exceed 19 one-way trips. Fewer trips would be needed in the Yolo County portion of the Project because most of the Project Area is more easily accessed from Solano County. For prior SCWA stream restoration projects in the vicinity, all vehicle traffic was to and from Solano County, with the possible exception of workers commuting to project sites. These maximum daily truck trip figures include both on-site off-road trucks, and trucks transporting materials to and from a material site.

Traffic impacts would be further minimized through limits on the annual scope of activities, as described in Chapter 2.0, *Project Description*. These limits cap annual Project activities at a *combined* total maximum of 640 acres per calendar year, with a typical range from 20 to 60 acres/year, with a maximum total project length of five stream miles, and a typical distance of 2 miles/year.

Access to Project Work Sites

The roadways providing the most direct access to Project work areas are located on the Solano County side of the creek; therefore, Project activities would preferentially use Solano County roadways, both for ease of access to the creek and for the transport of gravel and other fill material. The following roadway segments are anticipated to be used for access to Project work sites, and are further evaluated for potential Project impacts in this section:

Solano County

- **Putah Creek Road** from Olive School Lane to eastern end of road (dead end past Stevenson Bridge Road)
- **Vineyard Lane** from Pedrick Road to Road 104/Mace Boulevard
- **Martinez Lane** from western entrance on Putah Creek Road to Putah Creek/county line
- **Strathgordon Lane** from Stevenson Bridge Road/Road 95A to Putah Creek Road
- **Currey Road** from western end of road (dead end) to Pedrick Road

Yolo County

- **Railroad Avenue/Road 89** (Yolo County)/Winters Road (Solano County) from SR 128 to Putah Creek/county line
- **Creeksedge Road/Road 8036** (Yolo County) from western end of road to Stevenson Bridge Road/Road 95A

Yolo and Solano Counties

- **Stevenson Bridge Road/Road 95A**
  - Yolo County: from Russell Boulevard to Putah Creek/county line
  - Solano County: from Putah Creek/county line to Putah Creek Road
- **Pedrick Road** (Lincoln Hwy, Road E7)
  - Yolo County: from Russell Boulevard to Putah Creek/county line
  - Solano County: from Putah Creek/county line to SR 113
- **Road 104/Mace Boulevard**
  - Yolo County: from I-80 to Putah Creek/county line
  - Solano County: from Putah Creek/county line to Vineyard Lane
- **Levee Road** (east of SR 113)
  - Solano County: from Old Davis Road to Road 104/Mace Boulevard
  - Yolo County: Road 104/Mace Boulevard to eastern end of road (dead end at western boundary of Yolo Basin Wildlife area)
- **I-505** may be used for incidental access to the Project Area by individual haul contractors and commuting workers, but it not expected to be used for primary access to the Project Area.

General Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact 3.12-1: Conflict with Yolo County Transportation Planning Policies Significance Criteria.

As described above, traffic during the construction phase of the Project would be from two sources: workers in passenger vehicles driving to Project Area work sites, and trucks engaged in Project construction activities. As described above, in the Solano County portion of the Project Area, the expected maximum number of 3- and 4-axle one-way truck trips would be 42 per day during the construction period. In the Yolo County portion of the Project Area, daily 3- and 4-axle-truck trips would not exceed 19 one-way trips during construction.

Worker commute trips generated by the Project would be minimal. During both Project construction activities and operational maintenance phase activities, typically only 2 to 4 workers would access the Project Area at a time, with a maximum of six workers traveling to the Project Area per day. This would result in a maximum of 12 one-way passenger vehicle trips per day attributable to the Project.

Solano County

Based on the LOS standard (LOS E) articulated in the Solano County Congestion Management Plan¸ the Project would not have a significant impact on county roadways (STA, 2013, p. 14). The Solano County roadways anticipated to be primarily used for Project access (see list above under Access to Project Worksites/Area Detail) are two-lane rural roadway segments. Use of highways in the Project vicinity would be minimized because construction materials, including any needed soil and aggregate, would be hauled from sources located within 30 miles of the Project Area. Regardless, given that the Project's construction phase would contribute an expected daily maximum of 42 one-way 3- and 4-axle-truck trips and 12 one-way passenger vehicle trips, impacts on local highways would likely have no impact. I-505 may be used for incidental access to the Project Area by individual contractors and commuting workers, but it not expected to be used for primary access to the Project Area.

Regarding the two-lane rural roadway segments expected to be used for primary access to the Project Area during construction, in order to reach LOS E, traffic volumes on these roads would have to be greater than or equal to 27,100 average daily trips. To reach LOS D, traffic would have to be greater than or equal to 21,300 average daily trips (County of Solano, 2008b, p. 4.4-7, Table 4.4-3). The existing estimated daily roadway

volume is less than 1,000 trips (current LOS A-C) on Stevenson Bridge Road/Road 95A and 1,000 trips (current LOS A-C) on Pedrick Road (County of Solano, 2008b, p. 4.4-8). In Solano County, the Project would add no more than 12 daily one-way passenger vehicle trips during construction and operations and no more than 42 daily one-way truck trips during construction; therefore, the addition of Project trips to these roads would not exceed the County threshold.

Traffic counts are unavailable for the remaining Solano County roadways that may be used for Project access. However, given the example of the two roadways above, and given that the Project would add no more than 12 daily one-way passenger vehicle trips during construction and operations and no more than 42 daily one-way truck trips during construction, the Project trips would not cause traffic to exceed the County LOS standard.

Yolo County

Based on the LOS standard (LOS C) articulated in the Yolo County General Plan¸ the Project would not have a significant impact on county roadways (County of Yolo, 2009a, p. CI-28; County of Yolo, 2010, Figure 1 (West) and Figure 1 (East) Level of Service Threshold).

In Yolo County, the Project would add up to 12 daily passenger one-way vehicle trips during construction and operations, and no more than 19 daily one-way truck trips during construction.

Traffic counts for nearby segments of two minor two-lane highways that may be used for Project access are summarized below:

- On Mace Boulevard/Road 104 between County Road 35 and County Road 32D, the existing peak hour traffic volume is 150, with a LOS at B (County of Yolo, 2009c). To move the roadway to LOS C and have a significant impact, a project would have to bring the peak hour traffic volume to 680. Assuming traffic volumes in the Project Area are roughly equivalent, the proposed Project would not have a significant impact, because it would add no more than 12 daily passenger one-way vehicle trips during construction and operations, and no more than 19 truck trips during construction.
- On Railroad Avenue/County Road 89 between SR 128 to Winters City Limits, the existing peak hour traffic volume is 470 with a LOS at C (County of Yolo, 2009c). To move the roadway to LOS D and have a significant impact, a project would have to

bring the peak hour traffic volume to 1,410. Here again, assuming traffic volumes in the Project Area are roughly equivalent, the proposed Project would not have a significant impact because it would add no more than 12 daily one-way passenger vehicle trips during construction and operations, and no more than 19 one-way truck trips during construction.

Traffic counts are unavailable for the remaining Solano County roadways that may be used for Project access. These are minor two-lane roadways, and in order to reach LOS C, these roadways would need to reach a peak hour traffic volume of 680 trips. Given the example of the two roadways above and that the Project would add no more than 12 daily passenger vehicle trips during construction and operations and no more than 42 daily truck trips during construction, trips generated by the Project would not cause these roadways to exceed the County LOS standard for significance.

The Project would not result in a significant impact according the standards articulated in the Yolo County Traffic Impact Study Guidelines (County of Yolo, 2010, pp. 4 and 30-31.):

1. The Project would generate fewer than 100 new passenger vehicle trips per day. Typically, only 2 to 4 workers would access the Project Area per day, with an expected maximum of six workers accessing the site in one day, resulting in a maximum of 12 one-way passenger vehicle trips per day.
2. The Project would generate less than 20 3- and 4-axle one-way truck trips per day within Yolo County. As stated in Chapter 2, *Project Description*, no more than 19 one-way 3-and 4-axle-truck trips per day would occur in Yolo County. Project activities would preferentially use Solano County roadways, both for ease of access to the creek, and for the transport of aggregate and other fill material.
3. The Project would provide safe accommodation of temporary construction-related truck traffic: If line of sight is obstructed, construction signs would be posted along the haul routes in the immediate vicinity of the Project Area, and warning signage, traffic cones, and/or flaggers may be used to minimize traffic problems and ensure public safety during construction.

The Project would not result in a significant impact according the standards articulated in the Solano County Congestion Management Plan and the Yolo County General Plan because the Project is consistent with the LOS standards of both plans (STA, 2013, p. 14; County of Yolo, 2009a, p. CI-28; County of Yolo, 2010, Figure 1 (West) and Figure 1 (East)

Level of Service Threshold). See Impact 3.12-2 below for analysis of the Project's effects related to LOS.

Impact 3.12-2: Substantially Increase Roadway Hazards.

The Project involves stream restoration activities and would not alter the roadway network or build structures or impediments on or near the roadway network or create significant roadway hazards. As described above under Project Activities and Equipment in the General Setting, during the most intensive construction activities, groups of trucks would haul aggregate or fill material to the work site with 4 to 8 trucks typically being used at one time, up to a maximum of six trucks being used at one time in the Project Area. As detailed in Chapter 2, *Project Description* safety precautions would be taken to avoid any safety hazards related to truck use: if line of sight is obstructed, construction signs would be posted along the haul routes in the immediate vicinity of the Project Area, and warning signage, traffic cones, and/or flaggers would be used to minimize traffic problems and ensure public safety during construction. Construction activities would be short-term and maintenance activities would involve only 2 to 4 workers accessing any given location within the Project Area. Consequently, Project activities would not create obstructions that would interfere with the circulation of vehicles or farm equipment; therefore, the Project would have a **less-than-significant** impact related to an increase in hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses.

Impact 3.12-3: Adversely Affect Emergency Access.

The Project involves stream restoration activities and would not alter the roadway network or build structures or impediments on or near the roadway network or create significant roadway hazards. The Project would add no more than 12 daily passenger vehicle trips during construction and operations, and no more than 42 daily truck trips during construction (with no more than 19 in Yolo County). Consequently, Project activities would not create substantially increase traffic volumes at an intensity that would interfere with the emergency access to and from the Project Area; therefore, the Project would have **no impact** related to emergency access. No mitigation is required.

Impact 3.12-4: Adversely Affect Public Transit, Bicycle, or Pedestrian Facilities.

As described above, there are no pedestrian facilities and few bicycle facilities in the Project Area. The Project involves stream restoration activities and would not alter the roadway network. Construction activities would be short-term and maintenance activities would involve only 2 to 4 workers accessing any given location within the Project Area. Consequently, Project activities would not prevent the development of

pedestrian and bicycle facilities or interfere with the functioning of facilities; therefore, the Project would have **no impact** related to conflicts with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, and no impact on the performance or safety of such facilities. No mitigation is required.

Site-Specific Impacts and Mitigation Measures

NAWCA/Mariani

County Planning Policies and Congestion Management Program

There are no additional potential impacts of proposed Project activities in this reach besides those analyzed in Impact 3.12-1 above and Project-related traffic would be no higher in this reach compared to other reaches; therefore, the proposed Project would have **no impact** related to conflicts with traffic plans.

Roadway Hazards and Emergency Access

There are no unusual conditions in this reach and no unusual aspects of Project activities that would result in increased roadway hazards or decreased emergency access; therefore, the Project would have a **less-than-significant** impact related to increased roadway hazards or adverse effects on emergency access.

Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Facilities

There are no significant transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities located in this reach and Project activities would not prevent the development of future transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities; therefore, the Project would have **no impact**.

Duncan-Giovannoni

County Planning Policies and Congestion Management Program

There are no additional potential impacts of proposed Project activities in this reach besides those analyzed in Impact 3.12-1 above and Project-related traffic would be no higher in this reach compared to other reaches; therefore, the proposed Project would have **no impact** related to conflicts with traffic plans.

Roadway Hazards and Emergency Access

There are no unusual conditions in this reach and no unusual aspects of Project activities that would result in increased roadway hazards or decreased emergency access; therefore, the Project would have a **less-than-significant** impact related to increased roadway hazards or adverse effects on emergency access.

Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Facilities

There are no significant transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities located in this reach and Project activities would not prevent the development of future transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities; therefore, the Project would have **no impact**.

Winters Putah Creek Nature Park

County Planning Policies and Congestion Management Program

I-505, which crosses this reach, may be used for incidental access to the Project Area by individual contractors and commuting workers, but it not expected to be a primary access route to the Project Area. Railroad Avenue/County Road 89 is a minor two-lane highway in this reach that is anticipated to be a primary Project access route. As was analyzed in Impact 3.12-1 above, on the segment of this roadway between SR 128 to the Winters City Limit, the existing peak hour traffic volume is 470 with a LOS at C (County of Yolo, 2009c). To move the roadway to LOS D and have a significant impact, a project would have to bring the peak hour traffic volume to 1,410. Assuming traffic volumes in the Project Area are roughly equivalent to those between SR 128 to the Winters City Limit, the proposed Project would not have a significant impact, given that it would add no more than 12 daily passenger one-way vehicle trips during construction and operations, and no more than 19 one-way truck trips during construction.

Additionally, except for a small portion of the reach far upstream, restoration activities have already been completed for this reach, so the only activities anticipated in this reach are maintenance, including weed control. This means that no traffic related to Project construction would occur in this reach and the only sources of Project-generated traffic would be from maintenance activities. As discussed in Impact 3.12-1, during maintenance typically only 2 to 4 workers would access the Project Area at a time, with a maximum of six (non-trucking) workers traveling to the Project Area per day. Project activities would have **no impact** related to conflicts with traffic plans.

Roadway Hazards and Emergency Access

There are no unusual conditions in this reach and no unusual aspects of Project activities that would result in increased roadway hazards or decreased emergency access; therefore, the Project would have a **less-than-significant** impact related to increased roadway hazards or adverse effects on emergency access.

Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Facilities

There are no significant transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities located in this reach and Project activities would not prevent the development of future transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities; therefore, the Project would have **no impact**.

East of 505

County Planning Policies and Congestion Management Program

I-505, which crosses this reach, may be used for incidental access to the Project Area by individual contractors and commuting workers, but it not expected to be used for primary access to the Project Area. There are no additional potential impacts of proposed Project activities in this reach besides those analyzed in Impacts 3.12-1 above and Project-related traffic would be no higher in this reach compared to other reaches; therefore, the proposed Project would have **no impact** related to conflicts with traffic plans.

Roadway Hazards and Emergency Access

There are no unusual conditions in this reach, and no unusual aspects of Project activities that would result in increased roadway hazards or decreased emergency access, therefore; the Project would have **no impact** related to increased roadway hazards or adverse effects on emergency access.

Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Facilities

There are no significant transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities located in this reach and Project activities would not prevent the development of future transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities; therefore, the Project would have **no impact**.

Warren

County Planning Policies and Congestion Management Program

There are no additional potential impacts of proposed Project activities in this reach besides those analyzed in Impact 3.12-1 above and Project-related traffic would be no higher in this reach compared to other reaches; therefore, the proposed Project would have **no impact** related to conflicts with traffic plans.

Roadway Hazards and Emergency Access

There are no unusual conditions in this reach and no unusual aspects of Project activities that would result in increased roadway hazards or decreased emergency access;

therefore, the Project would have a **less-than-significant** impact related to increased roadway hazards or adverse effects on emergency access.

Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Facilities

There are no significant transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities located in this reach and Project activities would not prevent the development of future transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities; therefore, the Project would have **no impact**.

Upper McNamara

County Planning Policies and Congestion Management Program

There are no additional potential impacts of proposed Project activities in this reach besides those analyzed in Impact 3.12-1 above and Project-related traffic would be no higher in this reach compared to other reaches; therefore, the proposed Project would have **no impact** related to conflicts with traffic plans.

Roadway Hazards and Emergency Access

There are no unusual conditions in this reach and no unusual aspects of Project activities that would result in increased roadway hazards or decreased emergency access; therefore, the Project would have a **less-than-significant** impact related to increased roadway hazards or adverse effects on emergency access.

Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Facilities

There are no significant transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities located in this reach and Project activities would not prevent the development of future transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities; therefore, the Project would have **no impact**.

Lower McNamara

County Planning Policies and Congestion Management Program

There are no additional potential impacts of proposed Project activities in this reach besides those analyzed in Impact 3.12-1 above and Project-related traffic would be no higher in this reach compared to other reaches; therefore, the proposed Project would have **no impact** related to conflicts with traffic plans.

Roadway Hazards and Emergency Access

There are no unusual conditions in this reach and no unusual aspects of Project activities that would result in increased roadway hazards or decreased emergency access;

therefore, the Project would have a **less-than-significant** impact related to increased roadway hazards or adverse effects on emergency access.

Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Facilities

There are no significant transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities located in this reach and Project activities would not prevent the development of future transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities; therefore, the Project would have **no impact**.

MacQuiddy (Lester)

County Planning Policies and Congestion Management Program

There are no additional potential impacts of proposed Project activities in this reach besides those analyzed in Impact 3.12-1 above and Project-related traffic would be no higher in this reach compared to other reaches; therefore, the proposed Project would have **no impact** related to conflicts with traffic plans.

Roadway Hazards and Emergency Access

There are no unusual conditions in this reach and no unusual aspects of Project activities that would result in increased roadway hazards or decreased emergency access; therefore, the Project would have a **less-than-significant** impact related to increased roadway hazards or adverse effects on emergency access.

Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Facilities

There are no significant transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities located in this reach and Project activities would not prevent the development of future transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities; therefore, the Project would have **no impact**.

Russell Ranch

County Planning Policies and Congestion Management Program

There are no additional potential impacts of proposed Project activities in this reach besides those analyzed in Impact 3.12-1 above and Project-related traffic would be no higher in this reach compared to other reaches; therefore, the proposed Project would have **no impact** related to conflicts with traffic plans.

Roadway Hazards and Emergency Access

There are no unusual conditions in this reach and no unusual aspects of Project activities that would result in increased roadway hazards or decreased emergency access;

therefore, the Project would have a **less-than-significant** impact related to increased roadway hazards or adverse effects on emergency access.

Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Facilities

There are no significant transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities located in this reach and Project activities would not prevent the development of future transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities; therefore, the Project would have **no impact**.

Stevenson Bridge

County Planning Policies and Congestion Management Program

Stevenson Bridge Road/Road 95A is a minor two-lane highway that is anticipated to be used as primary access for Project construction. As was analyzed in Impact 3.12-2 above, in order to attain LOS E and exceed the level of significance, traffic counts on this road would have to be greater than or equal to 27,100 average daily trips. To reach LOS D, traffic counts would have to be greater than or equal to 21,300 average daily trips (County of Solano, 2008b, p. 4.4-7, Table 4.4-3). The existing estimated daily roadway volume on this road is less than 1,000 (current LOS A-C) (County of Solano, 2008b, p. 4.4-8). In Solano County, the Project would add no more than 12 daily one-way passenger vehicle trips during construction and operations, and no more than 42 daily one-way truck trips during construction; therefore, the addition of Project trips to this road would not exceed the County threshold.

Roadway Hazards and Emergency Access

There are no unusual conditions in this reach and no unusual aspects of Project activities that would result in increased roadway hazards or decreased emergency access; therefore, the Project would have a **less-than-significant** impact related to increased roadway hazards or adverse effects on emergency access.

Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Facilities

A separated bicycle lane crosses the Project Area in this reach at Stevenson Bridge Road/Road 95A. Project activities would not interfere with the function or use of this bicycle lane. There are no other significant transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities located in this reach and Project activities would not prevent the development of future transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities; therefore, the Project would have **no impact**.

Glide Ranch

County Planning Policies and Congestion Management Program

There are no additional potential impacts of proposed Project activities in this reach besides those analyzed in Impact 3.12-1 above and Project-related traffic would be no higher in this reach compared to other reaches; therefore, the proposed Project would have **no impact** related to conflicts with traffic plans.

Roadway Hazards and Emergency Access

There are no unusual conditions in this reach, and no unusual aspects of Project activities that would result in increased roadway hazards or decreased emergency access; therefore, the Project would have a **less-than-significant** impact related to increased roadway hazards or adverse effects on emergency access.

Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Facilities

There are no significant transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities located in this reach, and Project activities would not prevent the development of future transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities; therefore, the Project would have **no impact**.

Nishikawa

County Planning Policies and Congestion Management Program

Pedrick Road is a minor two-lane highway in this reach that is anticipated to be a primary Project access during the construction period. As was analyzed in Impact 3.12-2 above, in order to reach LOS E and exceed the level of significance, traffic counts on this road would have to be greater than or equal to 27,100 average daily trips. To reach LOS D, traffic counts would have to be greater than or equal to 21,300 average daily trips (County of Solano, 2008b, p. 4.4-7, Table 4.4-3). The existing estimated daily roadway volume is 1,000 (current LOS A-C) on Pedrick Road (County of Solano, 2008b, p. 4.4-8). In Solano County, the Project would add no more than 12 daily one-way passenger vehicle trips during construction and operations and no more than 42 daily one-way truck trips during construction; therefore, the addition of Project trips to this road would not exceed the County threshold.

There are no additional potential impacts of proposed Project activities in this reach besides those analyzed in Impact 3.12-1 above and Project-related traffic would be no higher in this reach compared to other reaches; therefore, the proposed Project would have **no impact** related to conflicts with traffic plans.

Roadway Hazards and Emergency Access

There are no unusual conditions in this reach and no unusual aspects of Project activities that would result in increased roadway hazards or decreased emergency access; therefore, the Project would have a **less-than-significant** impact related to increased roadway hazards or adverse effects on emergency access.

Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Facilities

There are no significant transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities located in this reach and Project activities would not prevent the development of future transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities; therefore, the Project would have **no impact**.

Olmo-Hammond-UCD

County Planning Policies and Congestion Management Program

Pedrick Road is a minor two-lane highway in this reach that is anticipated to be a primary Project access during construction. As was analyzed in Impact 3.12-2 above, in order to reach LOS E, traffic counts on this road would have to be greater than or equal to 27,100 average daily trips. To reach LOS D, traffic counts would have to be greater than or equal to 21,300 average daily trips (County of Solano, 2008b, p. 4.4-7, Table 4.4-3). The existing estimated daily roadway volume is 1,000 (current LOS A-C) on Pedrick Road (County of Solano, 2008b, p. 4.4-8). In Solano County, the Project would add no more than 12 daily one-way passenger vehicle trips during construction and operations and no more than 42 daily one-way truck trips during construction; therefore, the addition of Project trips to this road would not exceed the County threshold.

There are no additional potential impacts of proposed Project activities in this reach besides those analyzed in Impact 3.12-1 and Project-related traffic would be no higher in this reach compared to other reaches; therefore, the proposed Project would have **no impact** related to conflicts with traffic plans.

Roadway Hazards and Emergency Access

There are no unusual conditions in this reach and no unusual aspects of Project activities that would result in increased roadway hazards or decreased emergency access; therefore, the Project would have a **less-than-significant** impact related to increased roadway hazards or adverse effects on emergency access.

Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Facilities

There are no significant transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities located in this reach and Project activities would not prevent the development of future transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities; therefore, the Project would have **no impact**.

I-80 to Old Davis Road

County Planning Policies and Congestion Management Program

There are no additional potential impacts of proposed Project activities in this reach besides those analyzed in Impact 3.12-1 above and Project-related traffic would be no higher in this reach compared to other reaches therefore, the proposed Project would have **no impact** related to conflicts with traffic plans.

Roadway Hazards and Emergency Access

There are no unusual conditions in this reach and no unusual aspects of Project activities that would result in increased roadway hazards or decreased emergency access; therefore, the Project would have a **less-than-significant** impact related to increased roadway hazards or adverse effects on emergency access.

Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Facilities

An active railroad line crosses the Project Area in this reach approximately 2.19 miles southwest of the City of Davis. The Dixon-Davis Bikeway crosses the Project Area in this reach at Old Davis Road (STA, 2012, pp. 21; County of Yolo, 2013, p. 8). Project activities would not interfere with the function or use of the railroad line or the bicycle lane. There are no other significant transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities located in this reach and Project activities would not prevent the development of future transit; bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, therefore, the Project would have **no impact**.

Old Davis Road to Mace

County Planning Policies and Congestion Management Program

Mace Boulevard/Road 104 is a minor two-lane highway in this reach that is anticipated to be a primary Project construction access. As was analyzed in Impact 3.12-2 above, on the segment of this roadway between County Road 35 and County Road 32D the existing peak hour traffic volume is 150 with a LOS at B (County of Yolo, 2009c). To move the roadway to LOS C and have a significant impact, a project would have to bring the peak hour traffic volume to 680. Assuming traffic volumes in the Project Area are roughly equivalent to the segment between County Road 35 and County Road 32D, the

proposed Project would not have a significant impact given that the Project would add no more than 12 daily passenger one-way vehicle trips during construction and operations and no more than 19 truck trips during construction.

There are no additional potential impacts of proposed Project activities in this reach besides those analyzed in Impact 3.12-1 and Project-related traffic would be no higher in this reach compared to other reaches; therefore, the proposed Project would have **no impact** related to conflicts with traffic plans.

Roadway Hazards and Emergency Access

There are no unusual conditions in this reach and no unusual aspects of Project activities that would result in increased roadway hazards or decreased emergency access; therefore, the Project would have a **less-than-significant** impact related to increased roadway hazards or adverse effects on emergency access.

Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Facilities

The Dixon-Davis Bikeway crosses the Project Area in this reach at Old Davis Road (STA, 2012, pp. 21; County of Yolo, 2013, p. 8). Project activities would not interfere with the function or use of this bicycle lane. There are no other significant transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities located in this reach and Project activities would not prevent the development of future transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities; therefore, the Project would have **no impact**.

Mace to Road 106A

County Planning Policies and Congestion Management Program

Mace Boulevard/Road 104 is a minor two-lane highway in this reach that is anticipated to be a primary Project construction access. As was analyzed in Impact 3.12-2 above, on the segment of this roadway between County Road 35 and County Road 32D the existing peak hour traffic volume is 150 with a LOS at B (County of Yolo, 2009c). To move the roadway to LOS C and have a significant impact, a project would have to bring the peak hour traffic volume to 680. Assuming traffic volumes in the Project Area are roughly equivalent to the segment between County Road 35 and County Road 32D, the proposed Project would not have a significant impact given that it would add no more than 12 daily passenger one-way vehicle trips during construction and operations, and no more than 19 truck trips during construction.

There are no additional potential impacts of proposed Project activities in this reach besides those analyzed in Impact 3.12-1 and Project-related traffic would be no higher

in this reach compared to other reaches; therefore, the proposed Project would have **no impact** related to conflicts with traffic plans.

Roadway Hazards and Emergency Access

There are no unusual conditions in this reach and no unusual aspects of Project activities that would result in increased roadway hazards or decreased emergency access; therefore, the Project would have a **less-than-significant** impact related to increased roadway hazards or adverse effects on emergency access.

Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Facilities

There are no significant transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities located in this reach and Project activities would not prevent the development of future transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities; therefore, the Project would have **no impact**.

Road 106A to Yolo Bypass Wildlife Area

County Planning Policies and Congestion Management Program

There are no additional potential impacts of proposed Project activities in this reach besides those analyzed in Impact 3.12-1 above and Project-related traffic would be no higher in this reach compared to other reaches; therefore, the proposed Project would have **no impact** related to conflicts with traffic plans.

Roadway Hazards and Emergency Access

There are no unusual conditions in this reach and no unusual aspects of Project activities that would result in increased roadway hazards or decreased emergency access; therefore, the Project would have a **less-than-significant** impact related to increased roadway hazards or adverse effects on emergency access.

Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Facilities

There are no significant transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities located in this reach and Project activities would not prevent the development of future transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities; therefore, the Project would have **no impact**.

Table 3.12-5 Summary of Transportation/Traffic Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Reach	Impact 3.12-1 County Planning Policies	Impact 3.12-2 Roadway Hazards	Impact 3.12-3 Emergency Access	Impact 3.12-4 Transit, Bicycle, Pedestrian Facilities	Applicable Mitigation Measures
NAWCA/Mariani	NI	LTS	NI	NI	N/A
Duncan-Giovannoni	NI	LTS	NI	NI	N/A
Winters Putah Creek Nature Park	NI	LTS	NI	NI	N/A
East of I-505	NI	LTS	NI	NI	N/A
Warren	NI	LTS	NI	NI	N/A
Upper McNamara	NI	LTS	NI	NI	N/A
Lower McNamara	NI	LTS	NI	NI	N/A
MacQuiddy (Lester)	NI	LTS	NI	NI	N/A
Russell Ranch	NI	LTS	NI	NI	N/A
Stevenson Bridge	NI	LTS	NI	NI	N/A
Glide Ranch	NI	LTS	NI	NI	N/A
Nishikawa	NI	LTS	NI	NI	N/A
Olmo-Hammond-UCD	NI	LTS	NI	NI	N/A
I-80 to Old Davis Road	NI	LTS	NI	NI	N/A
Old Davis Road to Mace	NI	LTS	NI	NI	N/A
Mace to Road 106A	NI	LTS	NI	NI	N/A
Road 106A to YBWA	NI	LTS	NI	NI	N/A

Notes: NI = No Impact, LTS = Less than Significant Impact.