3.14 TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

3.14.1 INTRODUCTION

This section presents an overview of the existing traffic and circulation system in the area surrounding the project site. It also discusses the potential effects on traffic and circulation as a result of the implementation of the Proposed Action and its alternatives. Where significant effects are identified, mitigation measures are recommended to reduce the severity of the effect to the extent possible.

Sources of information used in this analysis include:

- DKS Associates Placer Vineyards Specific Plan EIS Transportation Analysis (DKS 2012);
- Placer Vineyards Specific Plan EIR prepared by Placer County (Placer County 2007); and
- Regional University Specific Plan EIR prepared by Placer County (Placer County 2008).

3.14.2 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

3.14.2.1 Study Area Roadways and Intersections

The existing roadway network in the vicinity of the project site consists of state highways, arterials, collectors, and local roadways. The key roadways in the study area are described below.

State Highway System

The following three state highways extend through the study area.

- Interstate 80 (I-80)
- State Route 65 (SR 65)
- State Route 70/99 (SR 70/99)

I-80 is located approximately 5 miles (8 kilometers) southeast of the project site, while SR 65 is 5 miles (8 kilometers) to the east, and SR 70/99 is 3 miles (4.8 kilometers) to the west. Detailed descriptions of each state highway are provided below.

Interstate 80

This freeway is Northern California's major east-west freeway connecting the Sacramento region and the San Francisco Bay Area with the rest of the United States. Within the region, Interstate 80 (I-80) serves as a major commute route to job centers in southern Placer County and downtown Sacramento. It also serves interstate and interregional travel by truck, recreational travel, and tourist travel. Within the study area, I-80 is a six- to eight-lane freeway that extends from Rocklin Road to approximately Riverside Avenue. West of Riverside Avenue, I-80 is 10 lanes with four mixed-flow lanes and one high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane in each direction (Placer County 2008). The most direct route from I-80 to the project site is by Watt Avenue.

State Route 65

SR 65 is a north-south state route that connects Roseville with the City of Lincoln and extends to SR 70 south of the City of Marysville in Yuba County. SR 65 begins as a four-lane freeway at its junction with I-80 in Roseville; it transitions to a conventional four-lane highway south of Sunset Boulevard to Industrial Avenue. Through Lincoln, SR 65 is a two-lane conventional highway (Placer County 2008). The most direct route from SR 65 to the project site is by Pleasant Grove Boulevard, Fiddyment Road, and Baseline Road.

State Route 70/99

SR 70/99 is a north-south state route that connects the core of the Sacramento region with the cities of Marysville (by SR 70) and Yuba City (by SR 99). West of the project site, SR 70/99 is a four-lane divided highway (Placer County 2008). The most direct route from SR 70/99 to the project site is by Baseline Road/Riego Road.

Arterial Street System

The arterial network may be the most important system of roads within the overall street system. It links residential areas to both commercial and employment centers and links all of these uses to the regional freeway system. The existing arterial network in the vicinity of the project site is described below.

Baseline Road

This roadway is an east-west rural arterial that runs along the northern boundary of the project site. This roadway extends from the Sutter County line to Foothills Boulevard in the City of Roseville. Within Sutter County, this roadway becomes Riego Road, while east of Foothills Boulevard this roadway becomes Main Street. Baseline Road and Riego Road connect Roseville, western Placer County, and southern Sutter County with SR 70/99. East of Watt Avenue, Baseline Road carries about 12,600 vehicles per day, while west of Watt Avenue, Baseline Road carries 10,400 vehicles per day (DKS 2012).

Watt Avenue

This roadway is a north-south arterial that crosses the project site. This roadway runs from Baseline Road south to Florin Road in Sacramento County. Watt Avenue connects western Placer County with I-80 and extends across the American River to provide access to U.S. 50. The roadway becomes South Watt Avenue at Jackson Road (Hwy 16), and becomes Elk Grove-Florin Road at Florin Road. Elk Grove-Florin Road continues south to Stockton Boulevard at SR 99 in the community of Elk Grove. Within Placer County, Watt Avenue has two travel lanes and carries about 7,100 vehicles per day (DKS 2012).

PFE Road

This roadway is an east-west rural arterial that extends from Watt Avenue west to the City of Roseville, where it becomes Atkinson Street. East of Watt Avenue, this roadway carries about 4,700 vehicles per day (DKS 2012).

Walerga Road

This roadway is a two-lane rural arterial that extends from Baseline Road south to Roseville Road in Sacramento County. It provides access between western Placer County and the Antelope area of Sacramento County. Walerga Road carries about 14,900 vehicles per day near Baseline Road (DKS 2012).

Fiddyment Road

This roadway is a two-lane, north-south rural arterial that extends north from Baseline Road to Moore Road, southwest of the City of Lincoln. North of Baseline Road, Fiddyment Road carries about 19,600 vehicles per day.

Brewer Road

This roadway is a two-lane, north-south rural collector that extends from Baseline Road north across western Placer County. It terminates just south of the Bear River, which is the Yuba County line.

Locust Road

This roadway is a two-lane, north-south rural collector that extends from the Sacramento County line north to Sunset Boulevard West. In Sacramento County this roadway becomes Elwyn Avenue.

Pleasant Grove Road

This roadway is a two-lane north-south rural arterial that runs along the Placer County/Sutter County line from Baseline Road south to the Sacramento County line, where it becomes Sorrento Road. Pleasant Grove Road also extends north of Riego Road, beginning about 0.25 mile (0.4 kilometer) west of its southern section, and runs north to the Yuba County line where it becomes Forty Mile Road. Pleasant Grove Road carries about 1,600 vehicles per day south of Baseline Road (DKS 2012).

3.14.2.2 Existing Traffic Levels of Service

Roadway operating conditions are described using the concept of "Levels of Service."

Level of Service (LOS) is a qualitative measure of the effect of a number of factors which include speed and travel time, traffic interruptions, freedom to maneuver, safety, driving comfort and convenience, and operation costs. Levels of Service are designated "A" through "F," from the best to worst, which cover the entire range of traffic operations that might occur. LOS E describes conditions approaching or at maximum capacity and LOS F represents jammed conditions.

Two types of LOS analyses were conducted for the unincorporated Placer County portion of the study area: peak hour intersection analysis and daily segment-based Level of Service analysis. **Tables 3.14-1** through **3.14-4** summarize the LOS definitions used for these analyses.

Table 3.14-1
Level of Service Definitions - Signalized Intersections (Circular 212)

LOS	V/C	Description
A	0.00-0.60	**Free Flow/Insignificant Delays:** No approach phase is fully utilized by traffic and no vehicle waits longer than one red indication.
B	0.61-0.70	**Stable Operation/Minimal Delays:** An occasional approach phase is fully utilized. Many drivers begin to feel somewhat restricted.
C	0.71-0.80	**Stable Operation/Acceptable Delays:** Major approach phases fully utilized. Most drivers feel somewhat restricted.
D	0.81-0.90	**Approaching Unstable/Tolerable Delays:** Drivers may have to wait through more than one red signal indication. Queues may develop but dissipate rapidly, without excessive delays.
E	0.91-1.00	**Unstable Operation/Significant Delays:** Volumes at or near capacity. Vehicles may wait through several signal cycles. Long queues form upstream from intersection.
F	>1.00	**Forced Flow/Excessive Delays:** Represents jammed conditions. Intersection operates below capacity with low volumes. Queues may block upstream intersections.

Source: Circular 212, Transportation Research Board, 1981
Notes: V/C = Volume/Capacity

Table 3.14-2
Level of Service Definitions - Signalized Intersections (Highway Capacity Manual)

Level of Service (LOS)	Control Delay Per Vehicle (seconds)	Description
A	< 10.0	Very low control delay. Occurs when progression is extremely favorable and most vehicles arrive during the green phase. Most vehicles do not stop at all. Short cycle lengths may also contribute to low delay.
B	> 10.0 and < 20.0	Generally occurs with good progression, short cycle lengths, or both. More vehicles stop than with LOS A, causing higher levels of average delay.
C	> 20.0 and < 35.0	These higher delays may result from fair progression, longer cycle lengths, or both. Individual cycle failures may begin to appear at this level. The number of vehicles stopping is significant at this level, though many still pass through the intersection without stopping.
D	> 35.0 and < 55.0	The influence of congestion becomes more noticeable. Longer delays may result from some combination of unfavorable progression, long cycle lengths, or high V/C ratios. Many vehicles stop, and the proportion of vehicles not stopping declines. Individual cycle failures are noticeable.
E	> 55.0 and < 80.0	These high delay values generally indicate poor progression, long cycle lengths, and high V/C ratios. Individual cycle failures are frequent occurrences.
F	> 80.0	This level, considered to be unacceptable to most drivers, often occurs with over saturation, that is, when arrival flow rates exceed the capacity of the intersection. It may also occur at high V/C ratios below 1.0 with many individual cycle failures. Poor progression and long cycle lengths may also be major contributing causes to such delay levels.

Source: Highway Capacity Manual, Transportation Research Board, Special Report No. 209, Washington, D.C., 2000

Table 3.14-3
Level of Service Definitions – Unsignalized Intersections

Level of Service (LOS)	Average Delay per Vehicle (sec/vehicle)
A	0 to 5.0
B	5.1 to 10.0
C	10.1 to 20.0
D	20.1 to 30.0
E	30.1 to 45.0
F	> 45.0

Source: Highway Capacity Manual, Transportation Research Board, 1994

Table 3.14-4
Level of Service Definitions - Daily Segment Based Analysis

Roadway Capacity Class	Maximum Daily Traffic Volume Per Lane for Each Level of Service Designation				
	A	B	C	D	E
Arterial – High Access Control	6,000	7,000	8,000	9,000	10,000
Arterial – Moderate Access Control	5,400	6,300	7,200	8,100	9,000
Arterial and Collector – Low Access Control	4,500	5,250	6,000	6,870	7,500
Expressway[1] – Level Terrain	4,050	6,620	9,450	12,150	13,500
Freeway – Level Terrain	6,300	10,620	13,680	16,740	18,000

Source: Placer County General Plan Update, Countywide General Plan, Draft Environmental Impact Report, Placer County, 1994, except expressway.
Notes:
[1] *Capacity assumes one-half minimum spacing between access points, grade separations at high volume intersections and signalization at low volume intersections. Used for portions of Baseline Road west of Watt Avenue under certain analysis scenarios.*

Placer County

Under the *Placer County General Plan*, the County has established a standard of LOS C for all roadways and intersections except those for within 0.25 mile (0.8 kilometer) of state highways, where the standard is LOS D. The daily segment-based analysis criteria used to evaluate these roadways are consistent with the methodologies used in the *Placer County General Plan EIR*. Arterial roadways were evaluated using the definitions for "moderate access control arterials," while collector roadways were evaluated using the definitions for "low access control arterials." **Table 3.14-5** presents the levels of services for Placer County study area roadways under existing conditions.

Table 3.14-5
Existing Roadway Segment Levels of Service – Unincorporated Placer County

Roadway	Segment	No. of Lanes	ADT	LOS
Baseline Road	East of County Line	2	10,100	A
Baseline Road	East of 16th Street	2	10,400	A
Baseline Road	East of Country Acres	2	10,400	B
Baseline Road	East of Watt Avenue	2	12,600	B
Baseline Road	East of Walerga Road	3	15,100	A
Walerga Road	South of Baseline Road	2	14,900	D
Watt Avenue	South of Baseline Road	2	7,100	A
PFE Road	East of Watt Avenue	2	4,700	A
PFE Road	East of Walerga Road	2	7,200	A
South of Baseline Road	South of Baseline Road	2	1,000	A
Locust Road	North of County line	2	1,000	A
Palladay Road	South of Baseline Road	2	500	A
Palladay Road	North of County line	2	500	A

Source: DKS Associates, 2006
Note: ADT = average daily traffic

Placer County uses the *Transportation Research Board Circular 212* (critical movement) method to evaluate levels of service at its signalized intersections, whereas for the analysis of levels of service at unsignalized intersections, the County uses the methodology in the Transportation Research Board's *Highway Capacity Manual*. This method calculates the level of service based on the delay on each of the stop-sign controlled movements at the intersection and average delay for all movements. **Table 3.14-6** summarizes existing peak hour conditions for key study intersections in unincorporated Placer County.

Table 3.14-6
Existing PM Peak Hour Intersection Levels of Service – Unincorporated Placer County

Intersection		Level of Service	LOS Criteria	
North-South Roadway	East-West Roadway		Signalized Intersections (V/C Ratio)	Unsignalized Intersections (Delay)[1]
Locust Road	Baseline/Riego Road	E		46.8
Brewer Road	Baseline/Riego Road	A		0.6
Watt Avenue	Baseline Road	E	0.94	
Fiddyment Road	Baseline Road	D (F)[2]	0.87 (>1.00)[2]	
Watt Avenue	PFE Road	C		16.3
Walerga Road	PFE Road	E	0.93	
Cook Riolo Road	PFE Road	B		10.2

Source: DKS Associates, 2006
Notes:
[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 impact a limited number of vehicles.*
[2] *Observed long queues indicate intersection operates at LOS F.*

City of Roseville

The City of Roseville General Plan states that it should strive to maintain LOS C on its roadway system. The City's Level of Service policy allows the City Council to take an action to accept degradation in the Level of Service of one or more of its signalized intersections from the levels identified in the 2020 CIP as long as 70 percent or more of the total signalized intersections in the City would operate at LOS C or better.

Roseville uses a modified version of the Circular 212 (critical movement) method that was adopted as part of Roseville's CIP to evaluate its intersections. This modified method assumes intersection capacities that are approximately 7 percent higher than the Circular 212 method. **Table 3.14-7** summarizes existing peak hour intersection conditions for study intersections in Roseville.

Table 3.14-7
Existing PM Peak Hour Intersection Levels of Service – City of Roseville

Intersection		Existing Conditions		
			LOS Criteria	
North-South Roadway	East-West Roadway	LOS	V/C	Delay
1 Fiddyment Road	Blue Oaks Blvd	C		14.3
2 Fiddyment Road	Pleasant Grove Blvd	B	0.62	
3 Junction Blvd	Baseline Road	A	0.48	
4 Woodcreek Oaks Blvd	Blue Oaks Blvd	B	0.65	
5 Woodcreek Oaks Blvd	Pleasant Grove Blvd	C	0.75	
6 Woodcreek Oaks Blvd	Baseline Road	B	0.64	
7 Foothills Blvd	Blue Oaks Blvd	D	0.89	
8 Foothills Blvd	Pleasant Grove Blvd	C	0.73	
9 Foothills Blvd	Junction Blvd	F	1.03	
10 Foothills Blvd	Baseline Road	D	0.81	
11 Foothills Blvd	Cirby Way	E	0.99	
12 Riverside Avenue	Cirby Way	F	1.08	
13 Washington Blvd	Pleasant Grove Blvd	C	0.76	
14 Fiddyment Road[2]	Baseline Road	C	0.76	

Source: DKS Associates, 2005
Notes:
[1] *Average delay for all movements at intersection, including uncontrolled movements. Delay in some stop-sign-controlled left-turn movements may be substantial, but typically impacts a limited number of vehicles.*
[2] *This intersection is also analyzed under the Placer County methodology (see Table 3.14-6). The volume-to-capacity ratio and level of service standards differ due to different lane capacity assumptions.*

Unlike Placer, Sacramento, and Sutter counties, Roseville does not use a daily segment-based analysis to evaluate impacts on its roadway system.

Sacramento County

The portion of Sacramento County north of Elkhorn Boulevard was included in the traffic analysis study area. Sacramento County uses a LOS E standard for urban areas and a LOS D standard for rural areas. All of the roadways in the study area are located in an urban area. Like Placer County, Sacramento County uses a daily segment-based analysis to evaluate its roadways. Sacramento County's criteria for the segment-based analysis are the same as those used by Placer County. **Table 3.14-8** presents the levels of service for study area roadway segments in Sacramento County under existing conditions.

Table 3.14-8
Existing Roadway Segment Levels of Service – Sacramento County

Roadway	Segment	No. of Lanes	ADT	LOS
Elverta Road	East of Hwy 70/99	2	5,000	A
Elverta Road	East of Rio Linda Blvd	2	8,000	A
Elverta Road	East of 16th Street	2	10,400	A
Elverta Road	West of Watt Avenue	2	19,000	F
Watt Avenue	North of Elverta Road	4	19,400	A
Watt Avenue	North of Antelope Road	4	28,900	D
Watt Avenue	North of Elkhorn Blvd	4	37,900	F
Watt Avenue	North of Air Base Drive	6	46,700	D
Watt Avenue	North of Roseville Road	5	49,200	F
Watt Avenue	North of I-80	5	62,600	F
Walerga Road	North of Elverta Road	4	24,700	B
Walerga Road	North of Antelope Road	4	40,300	F
Walerga Road	North of Elkhorn Blvd	4	31,100	D
Sorento Road	North of Elverta Road	2	1,200	A
Elwyn Road	North of Elverta Road	2	1,000	A
Palladay Road	North of Elverta Road	2	500	A
16th Street	North of Elverta Road	2	400	A
16th Street	South of Elverta Road	2	400	A
Dry Creek Road	North of Elkhorn Blvd	2	8,600	A
Dry Creek Road	South of Elkhorn Blvd	2	9,000	A
Elkhorn Blvd	East of Watt Avenue	4	25,700	C
Elkhorn Blvd	East of Walerga Road	4	50,300	F

Source: DKS Associates, 2006
Note: ADT = average daily traffic

Sacramento County uses a modified version of the Circular 212 (critical movement) method to evaluate its signalized intersections. This modified method assumes intersection capacities that are about 10 percent higher than the Circular 212 method. **Table 3.14-9** summarizes existing peak hour intersection levels of service for study intersections in Sacramento County.

Table 3.14-9
Existing Peak Hour Intersection Levels of Service– Sacramento County

Intersection		AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
			LOS Criteria			LOS Criteria	
North-South Roadway	East-West Roadway	LOS	V/C	Delay	LOS	V/C	Delay
1 SR 70/99	Elverta Road	A		8.4	A		8.3
2 16th Street	Elverta Road	A		1.61	A		2.31
3 Watt Avenue	Elverta Road	A	0.56		A	0.60	
4 Walerga Rd	Elverta Road	D	0.86		C	0.76	
5 Watt Avenue	Antelope Road	C	0.73		C	0.77	
6 Walerga Road	Antelope Road	C	0.73		D	0.89	
7 Watt Avenue	Elkhorn Blvd	C	0.76		B	0.70	
8 Walerga Road	Elkhorn Blvd	B	0.68		D	0.89	
9 Watt Avenue	Don Julio Blvd	A	0.51		C	0.74	
10 Watt Avenue	Air Base Drive	B	0.63		E	1.00	
11 Watt Avenue	Roseville Road	D	0.88		E	0.97	
12 Watt Avenue	I-80 WB	B		16.6	B		14.1

Source: DKS Associates, 2005
Notes:
[1] *Average delay for all movements at an unsignalized intersection, including uncontrolled movements. Delay on some stop-signed controlled left-turn movements may be substantial, but typically impacts a limited number of vehicles.*

Sutter County

Traffic forecasts indicate that the roadways in Sutter County that would experience significant changes in traffic volumes due to assumed development of the South Sutter County Specific Plan area are Riego Road and SR 70/99. Thus, these roadways are included in the traffic analysis study area. Sutter County has set a standard of LOS D for its roadway system in the Sutter County General Plan 2015. **Table 3.14-10** contains the levels of service on these roadways under existing conditions using the same daily segment-based methodology as Placer and Sacramento counties.

Table 3.14-10
Existing Roadway Segment Levels of Service – Sutter County

Roadway	Segment	No. of Lanes	ADT	LOS
SR 70/99	South of Riego Road	4	32,000	A
SR 70/99	North of Riego Road	4	29,000	B
Riego Road	East of SR 70/99	2	9,900	A
Pleasant Grove Road	North of County line	2	1,000	A

Source: DKS Associates, 2006
Note: ADT = average daily traffic

Intersection levels of service in Sutter County were evaluated using the Circular 212 method. **Table 3.14-11** summarizes existing intersection levels of service for study intersections in Sutter County.

Table 3.14-11
Existing PM Peak Hour Intersection Levels of Service– Sutter County

Intersection		Existing Conditions		
			LOS Criteria	
North-South Roadway	East-West Roadway	Level of Service	Signalized Intersection (Delay)	Unsignalized Intersection (Delay)[1]
SR 70/99	Riego Road	B	13.6	
Natomas Road	Riego Road	C (F)[2]		16.3 (50)[2]
Pleasant Grove North	Riego Road	C (F)[2]		20.9 (50)[2]
Pleasant Grove South	Riego Road	D (F)[2]		28.9 (50)[2]

Source: DKS Associates, 2005
Notes:
[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 delay is greater than the calculated delay.*

Caltrans

A daily segment-based level of service analysis was conducted on Caltrans facilities in the study area**.** **Table 3.14-12** shows the existing daily traffic volumes on Caltrans roadways in the vicinity of the project site. SR 70/99 north of Elverta Road was evaluated as an "expressway," while the other freeways were evaluated as "freeways." **Table 3.14-12** presents the levels of service for the state highways in the study area under existing conditions.

Table 3.14-12
Existing Freeway Segment Levels of Service – State Highways

Roadway	Segment	Existing Conditions		
		Lanes[1]	ADT[2]	LOS
SR 70/99[3]	North of Riego Road	4	29,000	C
SR 70/99[3]	South of Riego Road	4	32,000	C
SR 70/99	South of Elverta Road	4	40,500	B
SR 65	North of Pleasant Grove Blvd	4	76,000	F
SR 65	South of Pleasant Grove Blvd	4	83,400	F
I-80	West of Watt Avenue	10	145,000	D
I-80	East of Auburn Blvd	12	240,000	F
I-80	West of Riverside Avenue	8	184,200	F
I-80	East of Riverside Avenue	6	165,000	F
Business 80	West of Watt Avenue	6	133,000	F

Source: DKS Associates, 2005
Notes:
[1] *Excluding carpool lanes.*
[2] *ADT = average daily traffic, excluding HOV traffic*
[3] *Evaluated as expressway, not as a freeway*

3.14.2.3 Existing Transit Service

Local transit service in Placer County is currently provided by local governments and social service agencies. Most of the services are oriented towards senior citizens, disabled persons and other transit dependents, and are not geared towards commuters or congestion relief. Fixed-route service providers in southern Placer County include Placer County Transit, Lincoln Transit, Roseville Fixed Route, and Roseville Commuter Service. However, none of these transit routes serves the project site. The Sacramento Regional Transit District (RT) provides fixed-route transit service in Sacramento County. The closest RT bus routes to the project site are Routes 19, 84, and 101, which do not serve areas north of Watt Avenue and Black Saddle Drive (just north of Elverta Road, about 1 mile (1.6 kilometers) south of the project site).

The vicinity of the project site is not served by "dial-a-ride" transit services. Consolidated Transportation Services Agency, an independent provider of demand responsive transportation services to the elderly and disabled, provides services in portions of Placer County, but they do not serve the project vicinity.

3.14.2.4 Existing Bicycle Facilities

Bicycle facilities in Placer County are classified as follows:

- Class I: Off-street bike trails or paths which are physically separated from streets or roads used by motorized vehicles.
- Class II: On-street bike lanes with signs, striped lane markings, and pavement legends.

- Class III: On-street bike routes marked by signs and shared with motor vehicles and pedestrians. Optional 4-inch (10.2 centimeters) edge lines painted on the pavement.

There is a very limited bikeway system in the vicinity of the project site.

Placer County adopted a Bikeway Master Plan in 1988. That plan covered much of Placer County, but not areas west of Watt Avenue.

3.14.3 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK – APPLICABLE LAWS, REGULATIONS, PLANS, AND POLICIES

3.14.3.1 Federal and State Laws and Regulations

There are no known federal or state standards that would directly affect the transportation and circulation aspects of the Proposed Action and alternatives.

3.14.3.2 Local Plans and Policies

Placer County General Plan Level of Service (LOS) Standards

Under Placer County General Plan Policy 3.A.7, the County has established a standard of LOS C or better for its roadway system, or as otherwise specified in a community plan or specific plan. Consequently, LOS A, B, and C are considered acceptable, while D, E, and F are unacceptable. Within 0.25 mile (0.8 kilometer) of a state highway, LOS D is considered acceptable under the Placer County General Plan. In addition, community plans and specific plans may set standards that differ from LOS C for roadways and intersections within the plan boundaries. Exceptions are also allowed based on the following considerations:

- The number of hours per day that the intersection or roadway segment would operate at conditions worse than the standard
- The ability of the required improvement to significantly reduce peak hour delay and improve traffic operations
- The right-of-way needs and the physical impacts on the surrounding properties
- The visual aesthetics of the required improvement and its impact on community identity and character
- Environmental impacts including air quality and noise impacts
- Construction and right-of-way acquisition costs
- The impacts on general safety
- The impacts of the required construction phasing and traffic maintenance
- The impacts on quality of life as perceived by residents
- Consideration of other environmental, social, or economic factors on which the County may base findings to allow an exceedance of the standards

Placer County Improvement Standards

Roadway improvements within Placer County must conform to a set of standard plans that detail County standards for pavement width, lighting, drainage, sewer, and other roadside facilities. Roadway facilities associated with the Proposed Action must meet or exceed these standards.

Placer County Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

The Placer County CIP dated 2009 identifies roadway improvements that are needed to meet the County's level of service standards. The County has established 11 benefit districts, each of which has a separate CIP and associated traffic impact fee. The CIP identifies roadway improvements and facilities within each district needed as a result of future development. The CIP also provides details on funding sources for each improvement project, including amounts to be collected through the Traffic Impact Fee Program. Traffic impact fees are based on Dwelling Unit Equivalents and are charged on all new development within a district, regardless of type or location. Traffic impact fees are indexed to construction costs and are adjusted annually. The CIP and fees are periodically updated as conditions change to account for approvals of major land use projects and reflect completed roadway improvements or updates to local community plans.

Placer County Bikeway Master Plan

The Placer County General Plan calls for the development of a comprehensive bikeway system that would provide connections between the major urban areas of the County, with linkages to bikeway systems in other jurisdictions. The County adopted the Placer County Regional Bikeway Plan in 2002 to provide guidelines for the development of a Countywide network of bicycle facilities and design standards (based on Caltrans standards) for new bicycle facilities.

Placer County Truck Routes

Placer County has not developed a system of truck routes for the unincorporated area. However, trucks are prohibited from using specific bridges and roadways.

3.14.4 SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS AND ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

3.14.4.1 Significance Thresholds

Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) guidance requires an evaluation of a proposed action's effect on the human environment. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) has determined that the Proposed Action or its alternatives would result in significant effects related to transportation and traffic if the traffic added by the Proposed Action or the alternatives resulted in the exceedance of significance thresholds established by the Placer County, City of Roseville, Sacramento County, Sutter County, and the State of California for facilities within their jurisdiction. The USACE has reviewed these significance thresholds and have determined them to be appropriate for use as significance thresholds in this analysis. A significant impact would occur if implementation of the Proposed Action or an alternative would result in any of the following:

- In unincorporated Placer County outside of the Dry Creek/West Placer Plan Area, the Proposed Action or an alternative would increase congestion on County roadway segments or at County

intersections to the extent that the roadway or intersection would deteriorate from LOS C or better to levels below LOS C or would increase congestion by more than 5 percent on a roadway or at an intersection already operating below LOS C.

- Within the Dry Creek/West Placer Plan Area (including adjacent roadways and intersections) the Proposed Action or an alternative would cause a roadway or intersection to operate at LOS E or F or would increase congestion by more than 5 percent on a roadway or at an intersection already operating at LOS E or F. There are noted exceptions to this policy, which are identified in the appropriate tables in this document.
- In Roseville, the Proposed Action or an alternative would increase congestion to the extent that one or more signalized intersections previously identified in Roseville's CIP as functioning at LOS C or better (volume-to-capacity [V/C] ratio of 0.81 or better) would deteriorate to LOS D or worse (V/C ratio of 0.82 or worse); or, at a signalized intersection previously identified in Roseville's CIP as functioning at LOS D or E, the increased traffic added by the Proposed Action or an alternative causes operations to deteriorate to a worse standard level. This criterion requires an analysis based on the City of Roseville's buildout development forecasts.
- In Roseville, the Proposed Action or an alternative would increase congestion to the extent that the number of signalized intersections operating at LOS C or better conditions would be reduced to less than 70 percent of the total number of signalized intersections in the City. This criterion requires an analysis based on the City of Roseville's buildout development forecasts.
- In Sacramento County, the Proposed Action or an alternative would increase congestion to the extent that one or more intersections would deteriorate from LOS E or better to LOS F. For facilities that are or will be (cumulative condition) operating at unacceptable levels of service without the addition of project traffic, an impact is considered significant if increased congestion due to the Proposed Action or an alternative would:
  - increase the average delay at an unsignalized intersection by more than five seconds, or
  - increase the V/C ratio by 0.05 or more on a roadway or at a signalized intersection.
- In Sutter County, the Proposed Action or an alternative would increase congestion to the extent that intersection operations would deteriorate to levels below Sutter County's LOS D standard.
- The Proposed Action would increase congestion to the extent that operations on a state highway would deteriorate to levels of service below those identified in Caltrans' Transportation Concept Report (TCR) for that highway or contribute traffic to facilities already operating at or below the LOS concept. The TCRs for SR 65 and SR 70/99 indicate that these state highways have a concept LOS of LOS E while the TCR for I-80 indicates that this state highway has a concept LOS of LOS F.
- Planned transit services do not meet the additional transit demand generated by the Proposed Action or an alternative, which includes helping the County meet its level of service standard, transportation systems management standards, and air quality goals.
- Planned bicycle facilities do not provide adequate capacity for the additional bicycle trips generated by the Proposed Action or an alternative, and the policies and guidelines of Placer County's Bikeway Master Plan.
- Construction traffic would result in significant delays on the roadway system within the study area.

3.14.4.2 Analysis Methodology

The travel demand model for Placer County was used to estimate future traffic volumes without the Proposed Action or an alternative. The model translates land uses into roadway volume projections. Its inputs are estimates of development (i.e., the number of single-family and multi-family dwelling units, and the amount of square footage of various categories of non-residential uses) and a detailed description of the roadway system. The model covers the portions of Placer County west of Colfax, as well as the entire Sacramento region, including Sacramento, Yolo, and southern Sutter counties. For areas outside Placer County, the model uses the trip generation estimates from the regional model developed and used by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG). The Placer County model also maintains a general consistency with the trip distribution and mode choice estimates from SACOG's regional model for the entire region.

For intersections within the project site, this analysis assumes the intersection geometries shown in the traffic appendix to the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan (PVSP) and Blueprint Specific Plan.

To evaluate impacts, two types of roadway level of service analyses were conducted in the study area. A roadway segment analysis based on average daily traffic volumes and capacities was conducted following the same methodology used in the Placer County General Plan EIR. In addition, an intersection level of service analysis was performed for PM peak hour traffic conditions. This analysis addressed the major intersections in the vicinity of the project site. Placer County assesses traffic impacts based on PM peak hour conditions as the PM peak hour is typically the worst 1-hour period during the day.

Analysis Scenarios

The following scenarios were evaluated in detail:

- 2025 Background Conditions
- 2025 plus Proposed Action – Base Plan Scenario Conditions
- 2025 plus Proposed Action – Blueprint Scenario Conditions
- 2025 plus No Action Alternative Conditions
- 2025 plus Alternative 1 (Property 1B) Conditions
- 2025 plus Alternative 2 (Property 3) Conditions
- 2025 plus Alternatives 3 and 4 (Properties 16 and 17) Conditions
- 2025 plus Alternative 5 (Property 23) Conditions

Specific Plan Trip Generation

No Action

Under the No Action Alternative, the project site would be developed in a manner that avoids activities in jurisdictional waters of the United States, including wetlands, thereby avoiding the need for USACE approvals under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Avoidance of Section 404 triggers would reduce the total development footprint to approximately 3,297 acres (1334.2 hectares), comprising approximately

2,410 acres (975.3 hectares) of residential uses (with an estimated 8,030 residential units at buildout), 221 acres (89.4 hectares) of commercial and office uses, 211 acres (85.4 hectares) of public and quasi-public uses, 124 acres (50.2 hectares) of parks, and 332 acres (135.4 hectares) of roads. About 1,933 acres (782.3 hectares) would be preserved as open space. The No Action Alternative involves a modified land use plan, along with the circulation plan that eliminates or changes a number of project roadways.

Table 3.14-13 presents the estimated number of daily vehicle trips that would be generated under the No Action Alternative.

Table 3.14-13
Land Use and Trip Generation - No Action Alternative

Land Use	Daily Trip Rate	No Action	
		Units	Trips
Single Family	9.0 per DU	4,964	44,676
Multi-Family	6.5 per DU	2,147	13,956
Age-Restricted	3.3 per DU	919	3,033
SPA	9.0 per DU	411	3,699
Total DU		*8,441*	
Commercial	35.0 per ksf	1,572.9	55,052
Office	17.7 per ksf	567.1	10,038
Public	25.0 per ksf	204.5	5,113
Church	9.3 per ksf	567.6	5,279
K–12 School	1.0 per Student	5,400	5,400
Park	2.2 per Acre	123.8	272
Total Daily Trips			**146,518**

Source: DKS Associates, 2012
Note: Single Family consists of LDR and MDR, ksf equals 1,000 square feet

Table 3.14-13 shows that buildout of the No Action Alternative would generate about 147,000 daily vehicle trips on an average weekday.

Proposed Action

Table 3.14-14 presents the estimated number of daily vehicle trips that would be generated by the Proposed Action under the Base Plan and Blueprint scenarios. **Table 3.14-14** shows that buildout of the Proposed Action Base Plan scenario would generate about 237,000 daily vehicle trips on an average weekday, an increase of approximately 62 percent over the No Action Alternative.

It should be noted that this number represents all vehicle trips generated by the project and includes trips that may begin in one portion of the project site and terminate somewhere else within the project site. Because the Proposed Action contains a mixture of residential and non-residential uses, and because it covers a very large area of land, it can be assumed that a fairly large number of vehicle trips will remain

within the boundaries of the project. The travel demand model has estimated this to be 21 percent of the project-generated trips. The trip generation rates used in this analysis reflect those contained in the Placer County Travel Demand Model. These trip rates were validated by applying them in the Travel Demand Model using 2004 land use data from throughout Placer County and comparing the model's resulting traffic volumes to extensive 2004 traffic count data from throughout Placer County.

Table 3.14-14
Land Use and Trip Generation – Base Plan and Blueprint Scenarios

Land Use	Daily Trip Rate	Base Plan Scenario		Blueprint Scenario		Difference in Daily Trips between Base Plan and Blueprint Scenario
		Units	Trips	Units	Trips	
Single Family	9.0 per DU	9,040	81,360	11,967	107,703	+ 26,343
Multi-Family	6.5 per DU	3,750	24,375	7,878	51,207	+ 26,832
Age-Restricted	3.3 per DU	931	3,072	1,375	4,538	+ 1,466
SPA	9.0 per DU	411	3,699	411	3,699	+ 0
Total DU		*14,132*		*21,631*		
Commercial	35.0 per ksf	2206.1	77,214	2,211.0	77,385	+ 171
Office	17.7 per ksf	1,346.8	23,838	1,483.2	26,252	+ 2,414
Public	25.0 per ksf	307.1	7,678	276.6	6,915	-763
Church	9.3 per ksf	766.8	7,131	1,006.3	9,359	+ 2,228
K–12 School	1.0 per Student	8,005	8,005	11,963	11,963	+ 3,958
Park	2.2 per Acre	210.0	462	257.7	567	+ 105
Total Daily Trips			**236,834**		**299,588**	**+ 62,754**
Percent Change in Total Base Plan Trip Generation						**+ 26.5 %**

Source: DKS Associates, 2012
Note: Single Family consists of LDR and MDR, Multi-Family includes CMU, ksf equals 1,000 square feet

Table 3.14-13 also shows that at buildout of the Proposed Action under the Blueprint scenario, there would be approximately 300,000 daily vehicle trips on an average weekday. This represents an increase of approximately 26.5 percent over the Proposed Action Base Plan scenario and an increase of approximately 104 percent over the No Action Alternative. As with the Base Plan scenario, it is assumed that a large number of trips (21 percent) would likely remain within the project boundaries.

Alternative 1

Alternative 1 represents an alternative land use plan that changes the land uses only on Property 1B, located west of East Dyer Lane, with the rest of the project site land uses remaining as they are under the Proposed Action (either scenario). The alternate land use plan for Property 1B consists of an increase in open space and resultant decrease in residential and religious facilities acreage compared to the Proposed

Action. **Table 3.14-15** shows the daily trips that would be generated by Property 1B development under this alternative.

Table 3.14-15
Land Use and Trip Generation – Alternative 1 (Property 1B)

Land Use	Daily Trip Rate	Alternative 1		
		Acres	Units	Trips
Single Family	9.0 per DU	22	222	1,998
Multi-Family	6.5 per DU	8	127	826
Total DU			*349*	
Religious Facility	9.3 per ksf			0
Park	2.2 per Acre	1	1.0	2
Total Daily Trips				**2,826**

Source: DKS Associates, 2012
Note: Single Family consists of LDR and MDR, ksf equals 1,000 square feet

Alternative 2

Alternative 2 represents an alternative land use plan that changes the land uses only on Property 3, located south of Baseline Road and west of Watt Avenue, with the rest of the project site land uses remaining as they are under the Proposed Action (either scenario). The alternative changes the land use designation of Property 3 from a combination of general commercial, single and multi-family residential, and a park under the Proposed Action to commercial "Power Center" and open space. "Power Center" commercial is assumed to have a higher trip generation rate than general commercial and for this analysis, it is assumed that the residential dwelling units assumed under the Proposed Action – Base Plan scenario for Property 3 would still be located on the property. Because this would be a mixed-use property, all 259 dwelling units are assumed to be multi-family units. **Table 3.14-16** shows the daily trips that would be generated by Property 3 development under this alternative.

Alternatives 3 and 4

Alternatives 3 and 4 represent alternative land use plans that change the land uses only on Properties 16 and 17, located south of West Dyer Lane, with the rest of the project site land uses remaining as they are under the Proposed Action (either scenario). The alternate land use plan involves an increase in open space and resultant decrease in residential and religious facility acreage on Properties 16 and 17. Because the change in land use on Property 17 is dependent on the change in land use on Property 16, both alternatives are analyzed together. **Table 3.14-17** shows the daily trips that would be generated by the development of Properties 16 and 17 under these alternatives.

Table 3.14-16
Land Use and Trip Generation – Alternative 2 (Property 3)

Land Use	Daily Trip Rate	Alternative 2		
		Acres	Units	Trips
Single Family	9.0 per DU			0
Multi-Family	6.5 per DU		259	1,684
Total DU			*259*	
Commercial	35.0 per ksf			0
Power Center	40.0 per ksf	56	609.8	24,394
Religious Facility	9.3 per ksf	2	22.7	211
Park	2.2 per Acre			0
Total Daily Trips				**26,289**

Source: DKS Associates, 2012
Note: Single Family consists of LDR and MDR, ksf equals 1,000 square feet

Table 3.14-17
Land Use and Trip Generation – Alternatives 3 and 4 (Properties 16 and 17)

Land Use	Daily Trip Rate	Alternatives 3 and 4		
		Acres	Units	Trips
Single Family	9.0 per DU	43	358	3,222
Religious Facility	9.3 per ksf			0
Park	2.2 per Acre	2	2.0	4
Total Daily Trips				**3,226**

Source: DKS Associates, 2012
Note: Single Family consists of LDR and MDR, ksf equals 1,000 square feet

Alternative 5

Alternative 5 represents an alternate land use plan that change the land uses only on Property 23, located west of Locust Road, with the rest of the project site land uses remaining as they are under the Proposed Action (either scenario). The alternate land use plan involves an increase in open space and resultant decrease in residential acreage. However the same number of dwelling units is assumed and the only difference is a reduction in park acreage. **Table 3.14-18** shows the daily trips that would be generated by Property 23 development under this alternative.

Table 3.14-18
Land Use and Trip Generation – Alternative 5 (Property 23)

Land Use	Daily Trip Rate	Alternative 5		
		Acres	Units	Trips
Single Family	9.0 per DU	43	214	1,926
Park	2.2 per Acre	2	2.0	4
Total Daily Trips				**1,930**

Source: DKS Associates, 2012
Note: Single Family consists of LDR and MDR, ksf equals 1,000 square feet

Alternatives 1 through 5 Combined

If, for purposes of analysis, it is assumed that all five alternatives (Alternatives 1 through 5) would be implemented in combination with the Proposed Action Base Plan, as shown in **Table 3.14-19** below, the resulting increase in daily trips compared to the Proposed Action Base Plan would be on the order of about 13,100 daily trips.

Table 3.14-19
Trip Generation – Alternatives 1 through 5 Combined with Base Plan

Alternative	Change in Daily Trips from Base Plan	Cumulative Change
Base Plan	-	26,834
Alternative 1	-651	26,183
Alternative 2	+14,214	40,397
Alternatives 3 and 4	-450	39,947
Alternative 5	-7	39,940
Alternatives 1 through 5 Combined	+13,106	+13,106

As shown in the table above, the increase over the base plan daily trips is due to Alternative 2 with all the other alternatives resulting in minor decreases in daily trips. Given the fact that the Alternatives 1 through 5 combined scenario is dominated by the land use change under Alternative 2, the effects of this scenario are adequately reflected in the Alternative 2 analysis and a separate level of service analysis of this scenario was not conducted for this EIS.

Planned Transportation Improvements

Future transportation improvements have been identified by the Placer County General Plan and CIP, the general plans and CIPs for the City of Roseville, Sacramento County and Sutter County, and SACOG's Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). New roadways needed to serve future development areas

assumed in the 2025 scenario were identified based on discussions with local jurisdictions. For the purposes of this traffic analysis, the following key improvements to the transportation system were assumed to be in place under future conditions.

Roadway Improvements under Cumulative No PVSP Conditions

The analysis of the Cumulative No PVSP conditions assumed roadway improvements that are planned to be constructed by 2025, including all the new roadways and roadway improvements in the *Placer County General Plan EIR*, Placer County CIP, and SACOG MTP that would be implemented by 2025.

The *Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan* calls for the eventual closure of PFE Road west of Cook Riolo Road. However, based on discussions with Placer County, the analysis of Cumulative conditions assumed that this roadway would remain open.

For Sacramento County, improvements contained in SACOG's MTP were assumed. This includes the widening of Elverta Road from two lanes to four lanes from Rio Linda Boulevard to Watt Avenue. This also includes the widening of Watt Avenue and Walerga Road from two lanes to four lanes from Elverta Road to the Placer County line.

Under Cumulative (2025) No PVSP conditions, about half of the potential 17,500 dwelling units that could be constructed in the Sutter Pointe Specific Plan area were assumed to be in place by 2025. That level of development would require improvements to local roadways, including Riego Road. Under Cumulative No PVSP conditions, the improvements contained in SACOG's MTP were assumed, including an interchange at Riego Road and SR 70/99, and the widening of Riego Road from two lanes to six lanes from SR 70/99 to the Placer County line. Federal and state regulations require that the MTP be "financially constrained" and contain a set of transportation improvements that have realistic funding sources. SACOG's MTP assumed that improvements to Riego Road and other roadways in south Sutter County would be funded primarily by development in that area.

The City of Roseville has requested that traffic impacts under Cumulative conditions within the City of Roseville be evaluated using their 2020 Travel Demand Model, which was used for the development of the City's CIP. Therefore, the analysis of the Cumulative No PVSP scenario assumed the improvements contained in Roseville's CIP. The City of Roseville has adopted a Traffic Mitigation Fee that, in conjunction with other identified funding sources, will fully fund these improvements.

A planning level signal warrant analysis was conducted for the Cumulative (2025) No PVSP conditions to identify the locations where traffic signals should be assumed. This analysis indicates that the following intersections should be signalized by 2025:

- Watt Avenue and PFE Road
- Baseline Road and new roadway in proposed Sierra Vista Specific Plan area (across from 9th Street in PVSP area)
- Baseline Road and new roadway in proposed Sierra Vista Specific Plan area (across from East Dyer Lane in PVSP area)
- Locust Road and Baseline Road

- Brewer Road and Baseline Road
- Palladay Road and Baseline Road
- Pleasant Grove Road (S) and Baseline/Riego Road
- Pleasant Grove Road (N) and Riego Road
- SR 70/99 interchange ramps and Riego Road
- SR 70/99 interchange ramps and Elverta Road
- 16th Street and Elverta Road

Future Development Assumptions

Future development assumptions were prepared through discussions with the staffs of Placer County and the cities of Roseville, Rocklin, and Lincoln. Cumulative conditions were based on estimates of 2025 development levels in Placer County and the remainder of the region, including the first phase[1] of the Sutter Pointe Specific Plan in Sutter County. **Table 3.14-20** shows the assumptions for the Cumulative No PVSP scenario.

Table 3.14-20
Development Assumptions in Southwest Placer County – Cumulative 2025 No PVSP Scenario

Area		Dwelling Units	Floor Area (1,000 square feet)			College Enrollment
			Retail	Office	Industrial	
PVSP Area		261	0	0	0	0
Roseville	General Plan Area	60,002	14,400	15,319	17,401	
	MOU Remainder Area	14,154	780	584	0	
Rocklin	General Plan Area	28,606	4,586	2,848	6,494	23,000
Lincoln	General Plan Area	22,123	2,948	3,622	8,161	5,000
	SOI Expansion Area	15,000	1,875	4,000	0	
Placer Ranch		6,758	900	2,213	1,387	25,000
Remainder Sunset Industrial Area		0	357	912	7,851	
Regional University		4,387	215	75	0	6,000
Riolo Vineyards		949	88	0	0	
Total		**152,240**	**26,149**	**29,573**	**41,294**	**59,000**

Source: DKS Associates, 2006

1 Approximately 8,750 dwelling units, 1,094,000 square feet of retail, 750,000 square feet of office, and 1,500,000 square feet of industrial building space.

3.14.5 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact TRA-1 Increased Traffic along Placer County Roadways

No Action Alt. None of the roadways in unincorporated Placer County would be adversely affected by traffic generated under the No Action Alternative (see **Table 3.14-21** at the end of this section). The effect of the No Action Alternative on Placer County roadway segments would be **less than significant**.

Proposed Action (Base Plan and Blueprint Scenarios), Alternative 5 The Proposed Action would cause four roadway segments in Placer County to operate at LOS E under the Base Plan scenario and Alternative 5 and five roadway segments in Placer County to operate at LOS E or F under the Blueprint scenario. Based on the significance criteria listed above, this represents a significant effect. Mitigation would partially mitigate these effects. Residual **significant** effects would remain after mitigation**.**

The Proposed Action under both the Base Plan and Blueprint scenarios and Alternative 5 would result in the development of the project site with a variety of land uses, including residential, commercial, and business uses. As indicated in **Table 3.14-21**, four roadway segments in Placer County would be significantly affected under 2025 plus Proposed Action Base Plan scenario and Alternative 5 conditions while five roadway segments in Placer County would be significantly affected under 2025 plus Proposed Action Blueprint scenario conditions. Based on the significance criteria listed above, this represents a **significant** effect. The affected roadways include:

- Baseline Road east of Dyer Lane (Base Plan and Blueprint, Alternative E)
- Locust Road north of the Placer/Sacramento County Line (Base Plan and Blueprint, Alternative 5)
- Palladay Road north of the Placer/Sacramento County Line (Base Plan and Blueprint, Alternative 5)
- Dyer Lane (East) west of Watt Avenue (Blueprint)
- Dyer Lane (East) south of Baseline Road (Base Plan and Blueprint, Alternative 5)

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-12 would address the effects of the Proposed Action and Alternative 5 on each roadway segment. This measure was adopted by Placer County at the time of the approval of the PVSP (Proposed Action Base Plan scenario) and will be enforced by the County. Although the Blueprint scenario was evaluated for its impacts in the PVSP EIR by the County, that scenario was not approved by the County and therefore **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-12** was not imposed by the County on that scenario. The USACE assumes that Placer County would impose the same mitigation measure on the Proposed Action Blueprint scenario and Alternative 5 to address this effect.

The mitigation measure requires the proposed development to pay the project's fair share of the cost of all feasible physical improvements necessary and available to reduce the severity of the project's significant transportation related impacts. However, a combination of improvements would be needed to mitigate cumulative traffic impacts, including the following: (1) construction of Placer Parkway; (2) extension of Watt Avenue from the proposed Regional University development north to Blue Oaks Boulevard; (3) widening of the Watt Avenue extension to six lanes from Baseline Road to Pleasant Grove Road; (4) widening PFE Road to four lanes between Watt Avenue and Walerga Road; (5) widening Dyer Lane to six lanes near its intersection with Watt Avenue and its eastern intersection with Baseline Road; (6) widening Locust Road south of 18th Street and widening Palladay Road south of Dyer Lane to four lanes; and (7) a substantial increase in the transit system serving the project site. However, not all of these improvements are within the jurisdiction of Placer County (e.g., Placer Parkway). The exact combination of improvements needed would depend on the size, nature, and timing of development and transportation improvements in Placer County, City of Roseville, Sacramento County, and other jurisdictions. According to the PVSP EIR, 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. Therefore, the PVSP EIR determined that this mitigation measure would not reduce these effects to less than significant (Placer County 2007). The USACE agrees with the conclusion in the PVSP EIR and finds that residual **significant** effects of the Proposed Action and Alternative 5 on Placer County roadway segments would remain after mitigation.

Alts. 1 through 4

As indicated in **Table 3.14-21**, four roadway segments would operate at LOS E or F in unincorporated Placer County under Alternatives 1 through 4. These are the same roadway segments that would be affected by the Proposed Action under both scenarios. A fourth roadway segment would operate at LOS E under Alternative 2 only, which is the same segment affected by the Proposed Action Blueprint scenario. Based on the significance criteria listed above, this represents a **significant** effect of Alternatives 1 through 4 on Placer County roadway segments.

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-12 would address the effects of the alternatives on the three roadway segments. The USACE assumes that Placer County would impose the mitigation measure on Alternatives 1 through 4 to address this effect. However, for the same reasons presented above, the mitigation measure would not fully mitigate the effects to less than significant. The USACE finds that residual **significant** effects of Alternatives 1 through 4 would remain after mitigation.

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-12: Pay fair share of the cost of improvements to Placer County roadway system
(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-12 *requires the proposed development to pay the project's fair share of the cost of all feasible physical improvements necessary and available to reduce the severity of the project's significant transportation related impacts. The full mitigation measure text is presented in* ***Appendix 3.0****.*

Impact TRA-2 Increased Traffic at Placer County Intersections

No Action Alt. Traffic added by the No Action Alternative would cause one Placer County-controlled study intersection to operate at LOS F during the AM peak hour and three Placer County-controlled intersections to operate at LOS F during the PM peak hour. Based on the significance criteria listed above, this represents a **significant** effect. Mitigation would partially mitigate these effects. Residual **significant** effects would remain after mitigation**.**

AM Peak Hour

As indicated in **Table 3.14-22** (at the end of this section), the intersection of Walerga Road & Town Center would be significantly affected during the AM Peak hour by traffic under 2025 plus No Action Alternative conditions. *PM Peak Hour*

As indicated in **Table 3.14-23** (at the end of this section), three study intersections would be significantly affected during the PM peak hour under 2025 plus No Action Conditions. Intersections affected during the PM peak hour include:

- Walegra Road & PFE Road
- East Dyer Land & Baseline Road
- Walerga Road & Town Center

Based on the significance criteria listed above, this represents a **significant** effect of the No Action Alternative.

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-13a and **4.7-13b** would address the significant effects to each affected intersection. The USACE assumes that Placer County would impose the same mitigation measures on the No Action Alternative to address this effect. The mitigation measures require the proposed development to pay the project's fair share of the cost of all feasible physical improvements necessary and available to reduce the severity of the project's significant transportation related impacts. However, a combination of improvements that are identified above under **Impact TRA-1** would be needed to mitigate cumulative traffic impacts at the Placer County intersections. However, as noted under **Impact TRA-1**, not all of the identified improvements are within the jurisdiction of Placer County (e.g., Placer Parkway). The exact combination of

improvements needed would depend on the size, nature, and timing of development and transportation improvements in Placer County, City of Roseville, Sacramento County, and other jurisdictions. Placer 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. Therefore, these mitigation measures would not reduce these effects to less than significant. The USACE finds that residual **significant** effects of the No Action Alternative would remain after mitigation.

Proposed Action (Base Plan and Blueprint Scenarios), Alt. 5

Compared to one intersection (Walerga Road & Town Center Drive) operating a LOS F during the AM peak hour under the No Action Alternative, as shown in **Table 4.13-22**, three intersections (East Dyer Lane & Baseline Road, Walerga Road & Town Center Drive, Watt Avenue & Dyer Lane) would operate at LOS E or F under the Proposed Action both scenarios and under Alternative 5 during the AM peak hour and a forth intersection (Fiddyment Road & Baseline Road) would operate a LOS F under the Proposed Action Blueprint Scenario only during the AM Peak hour. Compared to three intersections (Walegra Road & PFE Road, East Dyer Land & Baseline Road, Walerga Road & Town Center) operating at LOS F during the PM peak hour under No Action Alternative, as indicated in **Table 4.13-23**, four intersections (Walegra Road & PFE Road, East Dyer Land & Baseline Road, Walerga Road & Town Center, Watt Avenue & Dyer Lane) would operate at LOS F under the two scenarios and by Alternative 5. Based on the significance criteria listed above, this represents a **significant** effect of the Proposed Action and Alternative 5.

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-13a and **4.7-13b** would address the effects to each intersection. These measures were adopted by Placer County at the time of the approval of the PVSP (Proposed Action Base Plan scenario) and will be enforced by the County. Although the Blueprint scenario was evaluated for its impacts in the PVSP EIR by the County, that scenario was not approved by the County and therefore **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-13a** and **4.7-13b** were not imposed by the County on that scenario. The USACE assumes that Placer County would impose the same mitigation measures on the Proposed Action Blueprint scenario to address the scenario's effect on study intersections. In addition, the USACE assumes that Placer County would impose the same mitigation measures on Alternative 5 to address the alternative's effect on study intersections.

For the same reasons presented above, the mitigation measures would not fully mitigate the effects to less than significant. The USACE finds that residual **significant** effects of the Proposed Action and Alternative 5 on Placer County intersections would remain after mitigation.

Alts. 1 through 4

As indicated in **Table 3.14-22**, three intersections (East Dyer Lane & Baseline Road, Watt Avenue & Dyer Lane, and Walerga Road & Town Center) would operate at LOS F under Alternatives 1 through 4 during the AM peak hour and four intersections

(Walerga Road & PFE Road, East Dyer Land & Baseline Road, Walerga Road & Town Center, and Watt Avenue & Dyer Lane) would operate at LOS F under Alternatives 1 through 4 during the PM peak hour. In addition, one additional intersection (Fiddyment Road & Baseline Road) would operate at LOS F under Alternatives 2 through 4 only during the PM peak hour. Based on the significance criteria listed above, this represents a **significant** effect.

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-13a and **4.7-13b** would address the effects to each intersection. The USACE assumes that Placer County would impose the same mitigation measures on Alternatives 1 through 4 to address this effect. However, for the same reasons presented above, the mitigation measures would not fully mitigate the effects to less than significant. The USACE finds that residual **significant** effects of Alternatives 1 through 4 would remain after mitigation.

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-13a and
PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-13b: Pay fair share of the cost of improvements to Placer County intersections
(Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives)

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-13a *and* ***4.7-13b*** *require the proposed development to pay the project's fair share of the cost of all feasible physical improvements necessary and available to reduce the severity of the project's significant transportation related impacts. The full text of the mitigation measures is presented in* ***Appendix 3.0****.*

Impact TRA-3 Increased Traffic along Sacramento County Roadway Segments

No Action Alt. The No Action Alternative would result in four roadway segments operating at LOS F in Sacramento County (see **Table 24** in **Appendix 3.14**). Mitigation would partially mitigate these effects. Residual **significant** effects would remain after mitigation**.** The affected roadways include:

- Watt Avenue: County Line to Antelope Road
- Elwyn Road; County Line to Elverta Road
- 16th Street: County Line to Elverta Road
- Dry Creek Road: North of Elkhorn Boulevard

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-15a and **4.7-15b** would address the effects to each roadway segment. The USACE assumes that Placer County would impose the same mitigation measures on the No Action Alternative to address this effect. The mitigation measures require the proposed development to pay the project's fair share of the cost of all feasible physical improvements necessary and available to reduce the severity of the project's significant transportation related impacts. However, since Placer County cannot compel Sacramento County to collect funds and construct the improvements

identified in its jurisdiction, this impact would remain significant. The USACE finds that residual **significant** effects of the No Action Alternative would remain after mitigation.

Proposed Action (Base Plan and Blueprint Scenarios), Alt. 5

The Proposed Action under both scenarios and Alternative 5 would cause seven roadway segments to operate at LOS F in Sacramento County (see **Table 24** in **Appendix 3.14**). These roadway segments include:

- Watt Avenue: County Line to Antelope Road
- Watt Avenue: Antelope Road to Elkhorn Boulevard
- Walerga Road: County Line to Antelope Road
- Sorento Road: County Line to Elverta Road
- Elwyn Road: County Line to Elverta Road
- 16th Street: County Line to Elverta Road
- Dry Creek Road: North of Elkhorn Boulevard

Four of these segments (Watt Avenue: County Line to Antelope Road, Elwyn Road; County Line to Elverta Road; 16th Street: County Line to Elverta Road, Dry Creek Road: North of Elkhorn Boulevard) would also operate at LOS F under the No Action Alternative. Based on the significance criteria listed above, this represents a **significant** effect of the Proposed Action and Alternative 5.

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-15a and **4.7-15b** would address the effects to each roadway segment under the two Proposed Action scenarios and Alternative 5, and **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 6.7-15a** would address the additional impact of the Blueprint scenario. **Mitigation Measures 4.7-15a** and **4.7-15b** were adopted by Placer County at the time of the approval of the PVSP (Proposed Action Base Plan scenario) and will be enforced by the County. Although the Blueprint scenario was evaluated for its impacts in the PVSP EIR by the County, that scenario was not approved by the County and therefore **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-15a** and **4.7-15b,** and **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 6.7-15a**, which was a mitigation measure identified in the EIR as applicable only to the Blueprint scenario, were not imposed by the County on that scenario. The USACE assumes that Placer County would impose these mitigation measures on the Proposed Action Blueprint scenario to address the scenario's effect on Sacramento County roadway segments. In addition, the USACE assumes that Placer County would impose **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-15a** and **4.7-15b** on Alternative 5 to address the alternative's effect on Sacramento County roadway segments.

For the same reasons presented above, the mitigation measures would not fully mitigate the effects to less than significant. The USACE finds that residual **significant** effects of

the Proposed Action and Alternative 5 on Sacramento County roadway segments would remain after mitigation.

Alts. 1 through 4

Alternatives 1 through 4 would cause six roadway segments in Sacramento County to operate at LOS F (see **Table 24** in **Appendix 3.14**).

- Watt Avenue: County Line to Antelope Road
- Elwyn Road: County Line to Elverta Road
- 16th Street: County Line to Elverta Road
- Dry Creek Road: North of Elkhorn Boulevard
- Watt Avenue: Antelope Road to Elkhorn Boulevard
- Walerga Road: County Line to Antelope Road

Four of these roadway segments (Watt Avenue: County Line to Antelope Road, Elwyn Road: County Line to Elverta Road, 16th Street: County Line to Elverta Road, Dry Creek Road: North of Elkhorn Boulevard) would operate at LOS F under the No Action Alternative. A seventh roadway segment (Sorento Road: County Line to Elverta Road) would only operate at LOS F under Alternatives 2 through 4. Based on the significance criteria listed above, this represents a **significant** effect of Alternatives 1 through 4.

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-15a, 4.7-15b, and **6.7-15a** would address the effects to each roadway segment. The USACE assumes that Placer County would impose the same mitigation measures on Alternatives A through D to address this effect. However, for the same reasons presented above, the mitigation measures would not fully mitigate the effects to less than significant. The USACE finds that residual **significant** effects of Alternatives 1 through 4 would remain after mitigation.

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-15a and
PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-15b: Pay fair share of the cost of improvements to Sacramento County roadway segments
(Applicability – No Action, Proposed Action, and All Alternatives)

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-15a *and* ***4.7-15b*** *require the proposed development to pay the project's fair share of the cost of all feasible physical improvements necessary and available to reduce the severity of the project's significant transportation related impacts. The full text of the mitigation measures is presented in* ***Appendix 3.0****.*

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 6.7-15a: Pay fair share of the cost of improvements to Watt Avenue
(Applicability – Blueprint scenario; Alternatives A through D)

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 6.7-15a *requires the proposed development to construct Watt Avenue to eight lanes (or a one-way couplet) from Antelope Road to Don Julio Boulevard. The full text of the mitigation measure is presented in* ***Appendix 3.0****.*

Impact TRA-4 Increased Traffic at Sacramento County Intersections

No Action Alt. Traffic added at buildout under the No Action Alternative would result in **significant** effects at two study intersections in Sacramento County during the AM peak hour and eight study intersections in Sacramento County during the PM peak hour. Mitigation would partially mitigate these effects. Residual **significant** effects would remain after mitigation**.**

AM Peak Hour

Traffic under 2025 plus No Action Alternative conditions would significantly affect two study intersections during the AM peak hour (see **Table 25** in **Appendix 3.14**). Intersections affected during the AM peak hour include:

- 16th Street & Elverta Road
- Walerga Road & Elverta Road

PM Peak Hour

Traffic under 2025 plus No Action Alternative would significantly affect eight study intersections during the PM peak hour (see **Table 26** in **Appendix 3.14**). Intersections affected during the PM peak hour include:

- Elwyn Avenue & Elverta Road
- Palladay Road & Elverta Road
- 16th Street & Elverta Road
- Watt Avenue & Elverta Road
- Dry Creek Road & Elkhorn Boulevard
- Watt Avenue & Elkhorn Boulevard
- Watt Avenue & Air Base Drive
- Watt Avenue & Roseville Road

Based on the significance criteria listed above, this represents a **significant** effect of the No Action Alternative.

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-16a and **4.7-16b** would address the effects to each intersection. The USACE assumes that Placer County would impose the same mitigation measures on the No Action Alternative to address this effect. The mitigation measures require the proposed development to pay the project's fair share of the cost of all feasible physical improvements necessary and available to reduce the severity of the project's significant transportation related impacts. However, since Placer County cannot compel Sacramento County to collect funds and construct the improvements identified in its jurisdiction, this impact would remain significant. The USACE finds

that residual **significant** effects of the No Action Alternative would remain after mitigation.

Proposed Action (Base Plan and Blueprint Scenarios), Alt. 5

The Proposed Action under both scenarios and Alternative 5 would significantly affect four study intersections during the AM peak hour (see **Table 25** in **Appendix 3.14**). These intersections include:

- Sorento Road & Elverta Road
- 16th Street & Elverta Road
- Walerga Road & Elverta Road
- Watt Avenue & Elkhorn Boulevard

Two of these intersections (16th Street & Elverta Road, Walerga Road & Elverta Road) would also be significantly affected under the No Action Alternative. Based on the significance criteria listed above, this represents a **significant** effect of the Proposed Action and Alternative 5.

The Proposed Action Base Plan scenario and Alternative 5 would significantly affect 10 study intersections during the PM peak hour while the Proposed Action Blueprint scenario would significantly affect eight study intersections during the PM peak hour (see **Table 26** in **Appendix 3.14**).

Intersections common among both scenarios and Alternative 5 during the PM peak hour include:

- Elwyn Avenue & Elverta Road
- Palladay Road & Elverta Road
- 16th Street & Elverta Road
- Watt Avenue & Elverta Road
- Watt Avenue & Antelope Road
- Dry Creek Road & Elkhorn Boulevard
- Watt Avenue & Elkhorn Boulevard
- Watt Avenue & Airbase Drive

Additional intersections under the Proposed Action Base Plan scenario that would be significantly affected during the PM peak hour include Walerga Road & Elkhorn Boulevard and Watt Avenue & Roseville Road.

Eight of these intersections (Elwyn Avenue & Elverta Road, Palladay Road & Elverta Road, 16th Street & Elverta Road, Watt Avenue & Elverta Road, Dry Creek Road & Elkhorn Boulevard, Watt Avenue & Elkhorn Boulevard, Watt Avenue & Air Base Drive, Watt Avenue & Roseville Road) would also be significantly affected under the No

Action Alternative. Based on the significance criteria listed above, this represents a **significant** effect of the Proposed Action and Alternative 5.

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-16a and **4.7-16b** would address the effects to each intersection. These measures were adopted by Placer County at the time of the approval of the PVSP (Proposed Action Base Plan scenario) and will be enforced by the County. Although the Blueprint scenario was evaluated for its impacts in the PVSP EIR by the County, that scenario was not approved by the County and therefore **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-16a** and **4.7-16b** were not imposed by the County on that scenario. The USACE assumes that Placer County would impose the same mitigation measures on the Proposed Action Blueprint scenario to address the scenario's effect on Sacramento County intersections. In addition, the USACE assumes that Placer County would impose the same mitigation measures on Alternative 5 to address the alternative's effect on Sacramento County intersections.

For the same reasons presented above, the mitigation measures would not fully mitigate the effects to less than significant. The USACE finds that residual **significant** effects of the Proposed Action and Alternative 5 on Sacramento County intersections would remain after mitigation.

Alts. 1 through 4

Alternatives 1 through 4 would significantly affect four intersections in Sacramento County during the AM peak hour (see **Table 25** in **Appendix 3.14**). These include:

- Sorento Road & Elverta Road
- 16th Street & Elverta Road
- Walerga Road & Elverta Road
- Watt Avenue & Elkhorn Boulevard

Two of these intersections (16th Street & Elverta Road, Walerga Road & Elverta Road) would also be significantly affected under the No Action Alternative. All four intersections would be affected by the Proposed Action under both scenarios.

Alternatives 1 through 4 would also significantly affect eight intersections in Sacramento County during the PM peak hour (see Table 26 in **Appendix 3.14**).

- Elwyn Avenue & Elverta Road
- Palladay Road & Elverta Road
- 16th Street & Elverta Road
- Watt Avenue & Elverta Road
- Dry Creek Road & Elkhorn Boulevard
- Watt Avenue & Air Base Drive

- Watt Avenue & Roseville Road

These intersections would also be significantly affected under the No Action Alternative and Proposed Action Base Plan scenario. A ninth intersection (Watt Avenue & Antelope Road) would only be adversely affected under Alternatives 1 and 2 while a tenth intersection (Walerga Road & Elkhorn Boulevard) would only be adversely affected under Alternative 1. Based on the significance criteria listed above, this represents a **significant** effect.

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-16a and **4.7-16b** would address the effects to each intersection. The USACE assumes that Placer County would impose the same mitigation measures on Alternatives 1 through 4 to address this effect. However, for the same reasons presented above, the mitigation measures would not fully mitigate the effects to less than significant. The USACE finds that residual **significant** effects of Alternatives 1 through 4 would remain after mitigation.

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-16a and
PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-16b: **Pay fair share of the cost of improvements to Sacramento County intersections**
(Applicability – No Action, Proposed Action, and All Alternatives)

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-16a *and* ***4.7-16b*** *require the proposed development to pay the project's fair share of the cost of all feasible physical improvements necessary and available to reduce the severity of the project's significant transportation related impacts. The full text of the mitigation measures is presented in* ***Appendix 3.0****.*

Impact TRA-5 Increased Traffic along Sutter County Roadway Segments

No Action Alt. Traffic added under the No Action Alternative would significantly affect the segment of Pleasant Grove Road north of the county line which is under the jurisdiction of Sutter County (see Table 27 in **Appendix 3.14**).

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-17a and **4.7-17b** would address the effect to the roadway segment. The USACE assumes that Placer County would impose the same mitigation measures on the No Action Alternative to address this effect. The mitigation measures require the proposed development to pay the project's fair share of the cost of all feasible physical improvements necessary and available to reduce the severity of the project's significant transportation related impacts. However, since Placer County cannot compel Sutter County to collect funds and construct the improvements identified in its jurisdiction, this impact would remain significant. The USACE finds that residual **significant** effects of the No Action Alternative would remain after mitigation.

Proposed Action (Base Plan and Blueprint Scenarios), Alt. 5

The same roadway segment would be significantly affected under the Proposed Action Base Plan and Blueprint scenarios and Alternative 5 (see Table 27 in **Appendix 3.14**).

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-17a and **4.7-17b** would address the effect to this roadway segment. These measures were adopted by Placer County at the time of the approval of the PVSP (Proposed Action Base Plan scenario) and will be enforced by the County. Although the Blueprint scenario was evaluated for its impacts in the PVSP EIR by the County, that scenario was not approved by the County and therefore **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-17a** and **4.7-17b** were not imposed by the County on that scenario. The USACE assumes that Placer County would impose the same mitigation measures on the Proposed Action Blueprint scenario to address the scenario's effect on this Sutter County roadway segment. In addition, the USACE assumes that Placer County would impose the same mitigation measures on Alternative 5 to address the alternative's effect on this Sutter County roadway segment.

For the same reasons presented above, the mitigation measures would not fully mitigate the effects to less than significant. The USACE finds that residual **significant** effects of the Proposed Action and Alternative 5 on this Sutter County roadway segment would remain after mitigation.

Alts. 1 through 4

The same roadway segment would be adversely affected under Alternatives 1 through 4 (see Table 27 in **Appendix 3.14**).

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-17a and **4.7-17b** would address the effect to the segment of Pleasant Grove Road north of the County line. The USACE assumes that Placer County would impose the same mitigation measures on Alternatives 1 through 4 to address this effect. However, for the same reasons presented above, the mitigation measures would not fully mitigate the effects to less than significant. The USACE finds that residual **significant** effects of Alternatives 1 through 4 would remain after mitigation.

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-17a and
PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-17b: Pay fair share of the cost of improvements to Sutter County roadway segments
(Applicability – No Action, Proposed Action, and All Alternatives)

***PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-17a** and **4.7-17b** require the proposed development to pay the project's fair share of the cost of all feasible physical improvements necessary and available to reduce the severity of the project's significant transportation related impacts. The full text of the mitigation measures is presented in **Appendix 3.0**.*

Impact TRA-6 Increased Traffic at Sutter County Intersections

No Action Alt. Traffic added at buildout under the No Action Alternative would result in a **significant** effect at two study intersections during the AM peak hour and one study intersection during the PM peak hour. Mitigation would partially mitigate these effects. Residual **significant** effects would remain after mitigation**.**

AM Peak Hour

Traffic under 2025 plus No Action Alternative would significantly affect the intersections of Pleasant Grove Road (North) & Riego Road and Pleasant Gove Road (South) & Riego Road during the AM peak hour (see Table 28 in **Appendix 3.14**).

PM Peak Hour

Traffic under 2025 plus No Action Alternative would significantly affect the intersection of Pleasant Grove Road (North) & Riego Road during the PM peak hour (see Table 29 in **Appendix 3.14**).

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-18a and **4.7-18b** would address the effects to each intersection. The USACE assumes that Placer County would impose the same mitigation measures on the No Action Alternative to address this effect. The mitigation measures require the proposed development to pay the project's fair share of the cost of all feasible physical improvements necessary and available to reduce the severity of the project's significant transportation related impacts. However, since Placer County cannot compel Sutter County to collect funds and construct the improvements identified in its jurisdiction, this impact would remain significant. The USACE finds that residual **significant** effects of the No Action Alternative would remain after mitigation.

Proposed Action (Base Plan and Blueprint Scenarios), Alt. 5

The same intersections that would be significantly affected under the No Action Alternative during the AM and PM peak hours would be significantly affected under the Proposed Action Base Plan scenario and Alternative 5 during the AM and PM peak hours (see Tables 28 and 29 in **Appendix 3.14**).

Only one intersection (Pleasant Grove Road [South] & Riego Road) would be significantly affected under the Proposed Project Blueprint scenario during the AM peak hour, and one intersection would be significantly affected under the Proposed Project Blueprint scenario during the PM peak hour (see Tables 28 and 29 in **Appendix 3.14**). Based on the significance criteria listed above, this represents a **significant** effect of the Proposed Action and Alternative 5.

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-18a and **4.7-18b** would address the effects to each intersection. These mitigation measures were adopted by Placer County at the time of the approval of the PVSP (Proposed Action Base Plan scenario) and will be enforced by the County. Although the Blueprint scenario was evaluated for its impacts in the PVSP

EIR by the County, that scenario was not approved by the County and therefore **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-18a** and **4.7-18b** were not imposed by the County on that scenario. The USACE assumes that Placer County would impose the same mitigation measures on the Proposed Action Blueprint scenario to address the scenario's effect on Sutter County intersections. In addition, the USACE assumes that Placer County would impose the same mitigation measures on Alternative 5 to address the alternative's effect on Sutter County intersections.

For the same reasons presented above, the mitigation measures would not fully mitigate the effects to less than significant. The USACE finds that residual **significant** effects of the Proposed Action and Alternative 5 on Sutter County intersections would remain after mitigation.

Alts. 1 through 4 The same intersections that would be significantly affected under the No Action Alternative and the Proposed Action Base Plan scenario during the AM and PM peak hours would be significantly affected under Alternatives 1 through 4 during the AM and PM peak hours (see Tables 28 and 29 in **Appendix 3.14**). Based on the significance criteria listed above, this represents a **significant** effect.

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-18a and **4.7-18b** would address the effects to each intersection. The USACE assumes that Placer County would impose the same mitigation measures on Alternatives 1 through 4 to address this effect. However, for the same reasons presented above, the mitigation measures would not fully mitigate the effects to less than significant. The USACE finds that residual **significant** effects of Alternatives 1 through 4 would remain after mitigation.

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-18a and
PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-18b: Pay fair share of the cost of improvements to Sutter County intersections
(Applicability – No Action, Proposed Action, and All Alternatives)

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-18a *and* ***4.7-18b*** *require the proposed development to pay the project's fair share of the cost of all feasible physical improvements necessary and available to reduce the severity of the project's significant transportation related impacts. The full text of the mitigation measures is presented in* ***Appendix 3.0****.*

Impact TRA-7 Increased Traffic at City of Roseville Intersections

No Action Alt. Traffic added at buildout under the No Action Alternative would result in a **significant** effect at three study intersections during the PM peak hour (see Table 30 in **Appendix 3.14**). The affected intersections include:

- Fiddyment Road & Baseline Road

- Foothills Boulevard & Junction Boulevard
- Washington Boulevard & Junction Boulevard

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-14a through **4.7-14c** would address the effects to each intersection. The USACE assumes that Placer County would impose the same mitigation measures on the No Action Alternative to address this effect. The mitigation measures require the proposed development to pay the project's fair share of the cost of all feasible physical improvements necessary and available to reduce the severity of the project's significant transportation related impacts. However, since Placer County cannot compel the City of Roseville to collect funds and construct the improvements identified in its jurisdiction, this impact would remain significant. The USACE finds that residual **significant** effects of the No Action Alternative would remain after mitigation.

Proposed Action (Base Plan and Blueprint Scenarios), Alt. 5

The Proposed Action under both scenarios and Alternative E would significantly affect the same three intersections in the City of Roseville during the PM peak hour (see Table 30 in **Appendix 3.14**) that would be significantly affected under the No Action Alternative. In addition, the Proposed Action Blueprint scenario would also significantly affect the intersection of Foothills Boulevard & Baseline Road, Main Street. Based on the significance criteria listed above, this represents a **significant** effect of the Proposed Action under both scenarios and Alternative 5.

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-14a through **4.7-14c** would address the effects to each intersection. These measures were adopted by Placer County at the time of the approval of the PVSP (Proposed Action Base Plan scenario) and will be enforced by the County. Although the Blueprint scenario was evaluated for its impacts in the PVSP EIR by the County, that scenario was not approved by the County and therefore **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-14a** through **4.7-14c** were not imposed by the County on that scenario. The USACE assumes that Placer County would impose the same mitigation measures on the Proposed Action Blueprint scenario to address the scenario's effect on City of Roseville intersections. In addition, the USACE assumes that Placer County would impose the same mitigation measures on Alternative 5 to address the alternative's effect on City of Roseville intersections.

For the same reasons presented above, the mitigation measures would not fully mitigate the effects to less than significant. The USACE finds that residual **significant** effects of the Proposed Action and Alternative 5 on City of Roseville intersections would remain after mitigation.

Alts. 1 through 4 Alternatives 1 through 4 would significantly affect the same three intersections in the City of Roseville during the PM peak hour (see Table 30 in **Appendix 3.14**) that be significantly affected under the No Action Alternative and Proposed Action Base Plan scenario. Based on the significance criteria listed above, this represents a **significant** effect of Alternatives 1 through 4.

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-14a through **4.7-14c** would address the effects to each intersection. The USACE assumes that Placer County would impose the same mitigation measures on Alternatives 1 through 4 to address this effect. However, for the same reasons presented above, the mitigation measures would not fully mitigate the effects to less than significant. The USACE finds that residual **significant** effects of Alternatives 1 through 4 would remain after mitigation.

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-14a through
PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-14c: Pay fair share of the cost of improvements to City of Roseville intersections
(Applicability – No Action, Proposed Action, and All Alternatives)

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-14a *through* ***4.7-14c****. These measures require the proposed development to pay the project's fair share of the cost of all feasible physical improvements necessary and available to reduce the severity of the project's significant transportation related impacts. The full text of the mitigation measures is presented in* ***Appendix 3.0****.*

Impact TRA-8 Increased Traffic on State Highway Segments

No Action Alt. The No Action Alternative would result in **significant** effects on eight state highway segments (see Table 31 in **Appendix 3.14**). Mitigation would partially mitigate these effects. Residual **significant** effects would remain after mitigation**.**

The affected highway segments include:

- SR 70/99 South of Riego Road
- SR 70/99 South of Elverta Road
- SR 65 North of Pleasant Grove Boulevard
- SR 65 South of Pleasant Grove Boulevard
- I-80 West of Watt Avenue
- I-80 East of Auburn Boulevard
- I-80 West of Riverside Avenue
- I-80 East of Riverside Avenue

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-19a and **4.7-19b** would address the effects to each

highway segment. The USACE assumes that Placer County would impose the same mitigation measures on the No Action Alternative to address this effect. The mitigation measures require the proposed development to pay the project's fair share of the cost of all feasible physical improvements necessary and available to reduce the severity of the project's significant transportation related impacts. However, since Placer County cannot compel Caltrans to collect funds and construct the improvements identified in its jurisdiction, this impact would remain significant. The USACE finds that residual **significant** effects of the No Action Alternative would remain after mitigation.

Proposed Action (Base Plan and Blueprint Scenarios), Alt. 5

The Proposed Action under the Base Plan scenario and Alternative 5 would significantly affect the same eight state highway segments (see Table 31 in **Appendix 3.14**) that would be significantly affected under the No Action Alternative. In addition, the Proposed Action Blueprint scenario would also significantly affect the segment of Business 80 (SR 51) West of Watt Avenue. Based on the significance criteria listed above, this represents a **significant** effect of the Proposed Action under both scenarios and Alternative 5.

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-19a, 4.7-19b, and **6.7-16a** would address the effects to each highway segment. These were adopted by Placer County at the time of the approval of the PVSP (Proposed Action Base Plan scenario) and will be enforced by the County. Although the Blueprint scenario was evaluated for its impacts in the PVSP EIR by the County, that scenario was not approved by the County and therefore **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-19a, 4.7-19b**, and **6.7-16a** were not imposed by the County on that scenario. The USACE assumes that Placer County would impose these mitigation measures on the Proposed Action Blueprint scenario to address the scenario's effect on state highways. In addition, the USACE assumes that Placer County would impose the same mitigation measures on Alternative 5 to address the alternative's effect on state highways.

For the same reasons presented above, the mitigation measures would not fully mitigate the effects to less than significant. The USACE finds that residual **significant** effects of the Proposed Action and Alternative 5 on state highways would remain after mitigation.

Alts. 1 through 4

Alternatives 1 through 4 would significantly affect the same eight state highway segments (see Table 31 in **Appendix 3.14**) that would be significantly affected under the No Action Alternative and Proposed Action Base Plan scenario. In addition a ninth segment (Business 80 west of Watt Avenue) would be significantly affected under Alternatives 1 and 2. This segment would also be significantly affected under the Proposed Action Blueprint Scenario. Based on the significance criteria listed above, this represents a **significant** effect of Alternatives 1 through 4.

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-19a, 4.7-19b, and **6.7-16a** would address the effects

to each highway segment. The USACE assumes that Placer County would impose the same mitigation measures on Alternatives 1 through 4 to address this effect. However, for the same reasons presented above, the mitigation measures would not fully mitigate the effects to less than significant. The USACE finds that residual **significant** effects of Alternatives 1 through 4 would remain after mitigation.

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-19a through
PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-19b, and
PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 6.7-16a: Pay fair share of the cost of improvements to state highway segments
(Applicability – No Action, Proposed Action, and All Alternatives)

***PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-19a** through **4.7-19b**, and **6.7-16a** require the proposed development to pay the project's fair share of the cost of all feasible physical improvements necessary and available to reduce the severity of the project's significant transportation related impacts. The full mitigation measure text is presented in **Appendix 3.0**.*

Impact TRA-9 Increased Demand for Local Transit Service

No Action Alt. The No Action Alternative would result in the development of the project site with a variety of land uses, including residential, commercial, and business uses. The addition of these uses would increase the demand for transit within unincorporated Placer County. There are currently no transit routes directly serving the project site. Funding for transit service to the project site would be costly due to the trip lengths involved to connect to surrounding communities and areas. Placer County would receive some additional funding for transit services through its key existing funding source, Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds, due to buildout of the project site since these funds will be generated by sales tax revenue and returned to the County based on population. However, the additional TDA funds would only allow limited transit service to the project site. The potential for inadequate funding for the needed transit service is considered a **significant** effect.

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-10a and **4.7-10b** would address this effect. These measures would establish a Community Service Area to fund the cost of transit and ensure that bus shelters are placed along major roadways. The USACE assumes that Placer County would impose the same mitigation measures on the No Action Alternative to address this effect. The USACE finds that the mitigation measures would fully mitigate the effect to **less than significant**.

Proposed Action (Base Plan and Blueprint Scenarios), Alt. 5

The potential for inadequate funding for the needed transit service under the Proposed Action and Alternative 5 would be the same as described above for the No Action Alternative. This is considered a **significant** effect.

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-10a and **4.7-10b** would address this effect. These measures were adopted by Placer County at the time of the approval of the PVSP (Proposed Action Base Plan scenario) and will be enforced by the County. Although the Blueprint scenario was evaluated for its impacts in the PVSP EIR by the County, that scenario was not approved by the County and therefore **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-10a** and **4.7-10b** were not imposed by the County on that scenario. The USACE assumes that Placer County would impose these mitigation measures on the Proposed Action Blueprint scenario and Alternative 5 to address the effect on transit service. The PVSP EIR concluded that this impact would be reduced to less than significant with mitigation (Placer County 2007). The USACE agrees with the conclusion in the PVSP EIR and finds that with mitigation, this effect would be reduced to **less than significant**.

Alts. 1 through 4

The potential for inadequate funding for the needed transit services under Alternatives 1 through 4 would be the same as described above for the Proposed Action. This is considered a **significant** effect.

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-10a and **4.7-10b** would address this effect. The USACE assumes that Placer County would impose the same mitigation measures on Alternatives 1 through 4 to address this effect. The USACE finds that the mitigation measures would fully mitigate the effect to **less than significant**.

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-10a: Transit Funding (*Applicability – No Action, Proposed Action, and All Alternatives*)

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-10a *would establish a Community Service Area to fund the cost of transit. The full mitigation measure text is presented in* ***Appendix 3.0****.*

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-10b: Bus Shelters (*Applicability – No Action, Proposed Action, and All Alternatives*)

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-10b *would ensure that bus shelters are placed along major roadways. The full mitigation measure text is presented in* ***Appendix 3.0****.*

Impact TRA-10 Increased Demand for Local Bicycle Facilities

No Action Alt. Implementation of the No Action Alternative would result in the development of the project site with a wide variety of land uses. The addition of these uses would increase the demand for bicycle facilities within the unincorporated Placer County and neighboring jurisdictions. The No Action Alternative would include Class I off-street bike trails and Class II on-street bike lanes. These would be connected within the project site and to the existing County bikeway system. The proposed bikeway system on the project site meets the intent of policies listed in the Placer County General Plan, and this effect is considered **less than significant**.

Proposed Action (Base Plan and Blueprint Scenarios), Alt. 1 through 5 The effect would be the same as described above for the No Action Alternative and would be **less than significant**.

Impact TRA-11 Impact to the Riego Road Railroad Crossing

No Action Alt. The No Action Alternative would contribute to the need to widen Riego Road to six lanes. It is expected that a six lane roadway along Riego Road would be able accommodate traffic generated under the No Project Alternative and additional widening beyond the six planned lanes would not be needed.

The Public Utilities Commission (PUC) would be responsible for issuing a permit for any roadway widening across the Union Pacific rail line along Riego Road, 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. One concern of PUC staff is that adequate land be reserved to provide the right-of-way for the separation. Because the rail line is located outside of the project site and in Sutter County, Placer County cannot ensure that adequate land is reserved. Sutter County would have jurisdiction over the roadway widening, including the right-of-way for the rail crossing. The No Action Alternative would pay its fair share toward the road widening, including a grade separation if needed. Because the contribution of the No Action Alternative to cumulative traffic would not trigger the need for additional widening over the rail line, this effect is considered **less than significant**.

Proposed Action (Base Plan and Blueprint Scenarios), Alt. 1 through 5

The effect would be the same as described above for the No Action Alternative and would be **less than significant**.

Impact TRA-12 Construction Impacts

No Action Alt.

The No Action Alternative would increase traffic volumes in the vicinity of the project site during construction. The on-site construction within the project site is expected to last for approximately 20 to 25 years, subject to economic conditions. The concentration of construction traffic could cause temporary delays in traffic flow. This effect would be **significant**.

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-1 would address this effect. This mitigation measure requires the preparation and implementation of construction traffic management plans for on-site and off-site construction activities. The USACE assumes that Placer County would impose the same mitigation measure on the No Action Alternative to address this effect. The USACE finds that the mitigation measure would fully mitigate the effect to **less than significant**.

Proposed Action (Base Plan and Blueprint Scenarios), Alt. 5

The potential for traffic impacts during construction would be similar to the No Action Alternative. The maximum number of construction workers on the project site on any given day is estimated to be 500. During the peak construction period, there would be about 1,500 daily vehicle trips generated by construction workers, plus about 50 vehicles (mostly trucks) per day delivering materials to the project site. Site access during construction could be from a variety of locations, including Watt Avenue and Baseline Road. In some cases, the concentration of construction traffic could cause temporary delays in traffic flow (Placer County 2007). This effect would be **significant**.

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-1 would address this effect. This measure was adopted by Placer County at the time of the approval of the PVSP (Proposed Action Base Plan scenario) and will be enforced by the County. Although the Blueprint scenario was evaluated for its impacts in the PVSP EIR by the County, that scenario was not approved by the County and therefore **PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-1** was not imposed by the County on that scenario. The USACE assumes that Placer County would impose this mitigation measure on the Proposed Action Blueprint scenario to address the scenario's construction traffic impacts. The USACE also assumes that Placer County would impose this mitigation measure on Alternative 5 to address the

alternative's construction traffic impacts. The PVSP EIR concluded that this impact would be reduced to less than significant with mitigation (Placer County 2007). The USACE agrees with the conclusion in the PVSP EIR and finds that this impact would be reduced to **less than significant**.

Alts. 1 through 4 The potential for traffic impacts during construction under Alternatives 1 through 4 would be the same as described above for the No Action Alternative and Proposed Action. This would be a **significant** effect.

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-1 would address this effect. The USACE assumes that Placer County would impose the same mitigation measure on Alternatives 1 through 4 to address this effect. The USACE finds that the mitigation measure would fully mitigate the effect to **less than significant**.

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-1: Construction Traffic Management Plan (*Applicability – Proposed Action and All Alternatives*)

PVSP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-1 *requires the preparation and implementation of construction traffic management plans for on-site and off-site construction activities. The full text of the mitigation measure is presented in* ***Appendix 3.0****.*

Impact TRA-13 Indirect Effects on Transportation and Traffic from Off-Site Infrastructure Not Constructed as Part of the Project

No Action Alt., Proposed Action (Base Plan and Blueprint Scenarios), and Alts. 1 through 5 The construction and operation of off-site water pipeline infrastructure by the Placer County Water Agency (PCWA) which would be used by the No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 through 5, would result in **less than significant** effects to transportation and traffic. As analyzed in the PVSP Second Partially Recirculated RDEIR dated March 2007, construction activities would increase truck traffic on roads in the area. However, construction would be temporary and the project would be subject to standard County and State traffic control and access procedures. Once installed underground, the pipelines would not affect traffic. Therefore, the effects on transportation and traffic from the water pipeline project would be **less than significant**.

3.14.6 RESIDUAL SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

Residual **significant** effects would remain under the Proposed Action and Alternatives 1 through 5 for **Impact TRA-1** after mitigation. Residual significant effects would remain under the No Action Alternative, Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1 through 5 for **Impacts TRA-2, TRA-3, TRA-4, TRA-5**, **TRA-6, TRA-7,** and **TRA-8** after mitigation. All of the other effects would either be **less than significant** or would be reduced to a **less than significant** level by the proposed mitigation.

3.14.7 REFERENCES

DKS Associates, Placer Vineyards Specific Plan EIS Transportation Analysis, January 2012.

Placer County. 2007. Final Environmental Impact Report for the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan. Prepared by Quad Knopf.

Placer County. 2008. Final Environmental Impact Report for the Regional University Specific Plan. Prepared by PBS&J. September.

Table 3.14-21
Roadway Segment Levels of Service Impacts – Unincorporated Placer County
Cumulative Plus Project Conditions

Roadway Segment	Cumulative No Development			Cumulative Plus Project		
	ADT	V/C	LOS	ADT	V/C	LOS
Baseline Road: east of Dyer Lane	36,600	0.68	B			
LOS F Policy 6 Lane Roadway	No Action Alternative			40,700	0.75	C
	Base Plan Scenario			**50,200**	**0.93**	**E**
	Blueprint Scenario			**51,800**	**0.96**	**E**
	Alternative 1			**49,600**	**0.92**	**E**
	Alternative 2			**51,100**	**0.95**	**E**
	Alternatives 3/4			**50,400**	**0.93**	**E**
	Alternative 5			**50,200**	**0.93**	**E**
Locust Road: north of county line	12,500	0.69	B			
LOS D Policy 2 Lane Roadway	No Action Alternative			16,000	0.89	D
	Base Plan Scenario			**17,100**	**0.95**	**E**
	Blueprint Scenario			**18,200**	**1.01**	**F**
	Alternative 1			**17,200**	**0.96**	**E**
	Alternative 2			**17,100**	**0.95**	**E**
	Alternatives 3/4			**17,100**	**0.95**	**E**
	Alternative 5			**17,100**	**0.95**	**E**
Palladay Road: north of county line	10,200	0.57	A			
LOS D Policy 2 Lane Roadway	No Action Alternative			13,200	0.73	C
	Base Plan Scenario			**16,600**	**0.92**	**E**
	Blueprint Scenario			**17,800**	***0.99***	**E**
	Alternative 1			**16,600**	**0.92**	**E**
	Alternative 2			**16,800**	**0.93**	**E**
	Alternatives 3/4			**16,600**	**0.92**	**E**
	Alternative 5			**16,600**	**0.92**	**E**

Roadway Segment	Cumulative No Development			Cumulative Plus Project		
	ADT	V/C	LOS	ADT	V/C	LOS
Dyer Lane (East): west of Watt Avenue	n/a	n/a	n/a			
LOS D Policy 4 Lane Roadway	No Action Alternative			5,300	0.15	A
	Base Plan Scenario			32,300	0.90	D
	Blueprint Scenario			**35,600**	**0.99**	**E**
	Alternative 1			32,000	0.89	D
	Alternative 2			**32,800**	**0.91**	**E**
	Alternatives 3/4			32,300	0.90	D
	Alternative 5			32,300	0.90	D
Dyer Lane (East): south of Baseline Road	n/a	n/a	n/a			
LOS D Policy 4 Lane Roadway	No Action Alternative			n/a	n/a	n/a
	Base Plan Scenario			**35,400**	**0.98**	**E**
	Blueprint Scenario			**36,400**	**1.01**	**F**
	Alternative 1			**34,600**	**0.96**	**E**
	Alternative 2			**40,600**	**1.13**	**F**
	Alternatives 3/4			**35,500**	**0.99**	**E**
	Alternative 5			**35,400**	**0.98**	**E**

Source: DKS Associates, 2012
*Note: ADT = average daily traffic. Significant impacts are highlighted in **bold**.*

Table 3.14-22
AM Peak Hour Intersection Levels of Service – Unincorporated Placer County
Cumulative Plus Project Conditions

Intersection/ LOS Policy	Cumulative No Development		Cumulative Plus Project	
	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
Fiddyment Road & Baseline Road	F	1.27		
LOS F Policy	No Action Alternative		F	1.26
	Base Plan Scenario		F	1.28
	Blueprint Scenario		**F**	**1.39**
	Alternative 1		F	1.27
	Alternative 2		F	1.29
	Alternatives 3/4		F	1.29
	Alternative 5		F	1.28
East Dyer Lane & Baseline Road	D	0.81		
LOS D Policy	No Action Alternative		D	0.89
	Base Plan Scenario		**F**	**1.09**
	Blueprint Scenario		**F**	**1.05**
	Alternative 1		**F**	**1.09**
	Alternative 2		**F**	**1.10**
	Alternatives 3/4		**F**	**1.10**
	Alternative 5		**F**	**1.09**
Walerga Road & Town Center	n/a	n/a		
LOS D Policy	No Action Alternative		**F**	**1.04**
	Base Plan Scenario		**F**	**1.03**
	Blueprint Scenario		**E**	**0.99**
	Alternative 1		**F**	**1.02**
	Alternative 2		**F**	**1.02**
	Alternatives 3/4		**F**	**1.03**
	Alternative 5		**F**	**1.03**
Watt Avenue & Dyer Lane	n/a	n/a		
LOS D Policy	No Action Alternative		C	0.72
	Base Plan Scenario		**F**	**1.08**
	Blueprint Scenario		**F**	**1.25**
	Alternative 1		**F**	**1.08**
	Alternative 2		**F**	**1.07**
	Alternatives 3/4		**F**	**1.07**
	Alternative 5		**F**	**1.08**

Source: DKS Associates, 2012
Note: ADT = average daily traffic. Significant impacts are highlighted in ***bold****.*

Table 3.14-23
PM Peak Hour Intersection Levels of Service – Unincorporated Placer County
Cumulative Plus Project Conditions

Intersection/ LOS Policy	Cumulative No Development		Cumulative Plus Project	
	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
Fiddyment Road & Baseline Road	F	1.12		
LOS F Policy	No Action Alternative		F	1.10
	Base Plan Scenario		F	1.16
	Blueprint Scenario		F	1.14
	Alternative 1		F	1.16
	Alternative2		**F**	**1.18**
	Alternatives 3/4		**F**	**1.18**
	Alternative 5		F	1.16
Walerga Road & PFE Road	F	1.42		
LOS F Policy[1]	No Action Alternative		**F**	**1.56**
	Base Plan Scenario		**F**	**1.62**
	Blueprint Scenario		**F**	**1.71**
	Alternative 1		**F**	**1.62**
	Alternative 2		**F**	**1.64**
	Alternatives 3/4		**F**	**1.63**
	Alternative 5		**F**	**1.62**
East Dyer Lane & Baseline Road	D	0.84		
LOS D Policy	No Action Alternative		**F**	**1.06**
	Base Plan Scenario		**F**	**1.05**
	Blueprint Scenario		**F**	**1.10**
	Alternative 1		**F**	**1.03**
	Alternative 2		**F**	**1.07**
	Alternatives 3/4		**F**	**1.06**
	Alternative 5		**F**	**1.05**
Walerga Road & Town Center	n/a	n/a		
LOS D Policy	No Action Alternative		**F**	**1.15**
	Base Plan Scenario		**F**	**1.07**
	Blueprint Scenario		**F**	**1.08**
	Alternative 1		**F**	**1.07**
	Alternative 2		**F**	**1.07**
	Alternatives 3/4		**F**	**1.07**
	Alternative 5		**F**	**1.07**

Intersection/ LOS Policy	Cumulative No Development		Cumulative Plus Project	
	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C
Watt Avenue & Dyer Lane	n/a	n/a		
LOS D Policy	No Action Alternative		C	0.71
	Base Plan Scenario		**F**	**1.06**
	Blueprint Scenario		**F**	**1.10**
	Alternative 1		**F**	**1.07**
	Alternative 2		**F**	**1.09**
	Alternatives 3/4		**F**	**1.07**
	Alternative 5		**F**	**1.06**

Source: DKS Associates, 2012

Note: ADT = average daily traffic. Significant impacts are highlighted in ***bold****.*

[1] *The Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan Final Transportation and Circulation Element modified the threshold for this intersection from LOS D to LOS F.*