

1
2

Chapter 19 Transportation

3 19.1 Summary Comparison of Proposed Project

4 A summary comparison of important transportation impacts is provided in Figure 19-0. This figure
5 provides information on the magnitude of the most pertinent and quantifiable transportation
6 impacts that are expected to result from the proposed project. Important impacts to consider
7 include impacts on levels of service (LOS), exacerbation of unacceptable pavement conditions,
8 disruption of marine traffic due to use of barges for construction, and increased traffic volumes
9 during implementation of restoration measures.

10 Both the approved project and proposed project, as well as the No Action Alternative, would result
11 in unacceptable level of service conditions on roadway segments in and around the water
12 conveyance facilities construction site. Based on a comparison of the maximum construction project
13 generated traffic, the approved project is projected to generate a maximum of 6,194 vehicle trips in
14 Year 2024 (the 8th year of construction). The proposed project is projected to generate a maximum
15 of 4,412 vehicle trips in Year 2025 (the 5th year of construction). This corresponds to a maximum
16 project generated trip generation reduction of 1,782 vehicles or 28.8%.

17 **Figure 19-0. Comparison of Impacts on Transportation**

Chapter 19 – Transportation		Approved Project	Proposed Project (Total)	Proposed Project (Increment)
Impact TRANS-1: Increased construction vehicle trips resulting in unacceptable LOS conditions (number of roadway segments with unacceptable LOS conditions)		38	34	-4
		Significant and unavoidable/adverse	Remains significant and unavoidable/adverse. No change to the proposed project.	
Impact TRANS-2: Increased construction vehicle trips exacerbating unacceptable pavement conditions (number of segments that could experience substantial pavement condition effects)		46	41	-5
		Significant and unavoidable/adverse	Remains significant and unavoidable/adverse. No change to the proposed project.	
Impact TRANS-4: Disruption of marine traffic during construction	Number of barge unloading facilities	7	5	-2
	Number of barge trips	11,800	Approximately the same	No change
		Less than significant/not adverse	Less than significant/not adverse	

18

1 As depicted in Figure 19-0, the proposed project would not result in new impacts or a substantial
2 increase in the severity of previously identified impacts related to transportation. This chapter
3 contains the information necessary to make the Final EIR/EIS adequate for the approved project as
4 revised.

5 **19.2 Environmental Setting/Affected Environment**

6 The study area (the area in which impacts may occur) for transportation is the same as described
7 under the Final EIR/EIS, and as shown in Figures 19-1 and 19-2a through 19-2c.

8 Transportation systems in areas outside the study area—upstream of the Delta and the SWP and
9 CVP Export Service Area—would not be affected by the proposed water conveyance system.

10 **19.2.1 Affected Environment**

11 The affected environment for the proposed project would be the same as described in the Final
12 EIR/EIS Chapter 19, *Transportation*, Section 19.1, *Environmental Setting/Affected Environment*. A
13 total of 114 roadway segments in the study area were selected for analysis based on the likelihood
14 that they would be utilized for construction-related activities or by personnel involved in
15 maintenance and operation of the facilities following construction. Table 19-1 lists the study
16 roadway segments considered in the traffic analysis and their jurisdiction, location, and functional
17 classification.

18 For the purpose of this analysis, existing pavement conditions in most local jurisdictions are
19 identified as acceptable if their Pavement Condition Index (PCI) is greater than 55. For roadway
20 segments within the City of Sacramento, a Pavement Quality Index (PQI) greater than 70 is
21 considered acceptable. For roadway segments within San Joaquin County, an Overall Condition
22 Index (OCI) greater than 70 is considered acceptable, except in the Mountain House Community
23 Service District (CSD), which uses the PCI metric. Existing pavement conditions for California
24 Department of Transportation (Caltrans) roadway segments are identified as acceptable if the
25 International Roughness Index (IRI) was less than or equal to 170. As shown in Table 19-2, a total of
26 **60** roadway segments have deficient pavement under Existing Conditions (entries in **bold text**).

27 As shown in Figure 3-1, a new diamond interchange (Type L-1) would be constructed on State Route
28 (SR) 12 on Bouldin Island to connect the proposed project construction site in San Joaquin County
29 with the regional transportation system. The interchange would provide improved access and
30 egress from Caltrans two-lane highway by providing a grade-separated interchange with on-ramp
31 and off-ramps.

1 **Table 19-1. Roadway Study Segments**

Segment ID*	Roadway	From	To	Jurisdiction	Location	Analysis Functional Classification
ALA 01	Byron Hwy	Contra Costa Co./ Alameda Co. Line	Alameda Co./ San Joaquin Co. Line	Alameda Co.	Alameda Co.	Major 2-lane Highway
BRE 01	Brentwood Blvd (old SR 4)	Delta Rd (Oakley City Limits)	Balfour Rd	Caltrans D4/ City of Brentwood ^a	Brentwood	2-lane Arterial
BRE 02	Brentwood Blvd (old SR 4)	Balfour Rd	Brentwood City Limits (South)	Caltrans D4/ City of Brentwood ^a	Brentwood	4-lane Arterial Divided
BRE 03	Balfour Rd	Brentwood Blvd (Old SR 4)	Brentwood City Limits	City of Brentwood	Brentwood	4-lane Arterial Divided
CC 01	Bethel Island Rd	Oakley City Limits	End	Contra Costa Co.	Contra Costa Co.	Major 2-lane Highway
CC 02	Balfour Rd	Brentwood City Limits	Byron Hwy	Contra Costa Co.	Contra Costa Co.	Major 2-lane Highway
CC 03	Old SR 4	Brentwood City Limits (South)	Marsh Creek Rd	Caltrans D4/ Contra Costa Co. ^a	Contra Costa Co.	Major 2-lane Highway
CC 04	Byron Hwy	Delta Rd	Old SR 4	Contra Costa Co.	Contra Costa Co.	Major 2-lane Highway
CC 05	Byron Hwy	SR 4	Contra Costa Co./ Alameda Co. Line	Contra Costa Co.	Byron	Major 2-lane Highway
CT 01	I-5 NB	Florin Rd	Pocket Rd	Caltrans D3	Sacramento	3-lane Freeway
CT 02	I-5 SB	Florin Rd	Pocket Rd	Caltrans D3	Sacramento	3-lane Freeway
CT 03	I-5 NB	Pocket Rd	Laguna Blvd	Caltrans D3	Sacramento	3-lane Freeway
CT 04	I-5 SB	Pocket Rd	Laguna Blvd	Caltrans D3	Sacramento	3-lane Freeway
CT 05	I-5 NB	Laguna Blvd	Elk Grove Blvd	Caltrans D3	Elk Grove	2-lane Freeway
CT 06	I-5 SB	Laguna Blvd	Elk Grove Blvd	Caltrans D3	Elk Grove	2-lane Freeway
CT 07	I-5 NB	Elk Grove Blvd	Hood Franklin Rd	Caltrans D3	Sacramento Co.	2-lane Freeway
CT 08	I-5 SB	Elk Grove Blvd	Hood Franklin Rd	Caltrans D3	Sacramento Co.	2-lane Freeway
CT 09	I-5 NB	Hood Franklin Rd	Twin Cities Rd	Caltrans D3	Sacramento Co.	2-lane Freeway
CT 10	I-5 SB	Hood Franklin Rd	Twin Cities Rd	Caltrans D3	Sacramento Co.	2-lane Freeway
CT 11	I-5 NB	Twin Cities Rd	Walnut Grove Rd	Caltrans D10	Sacramento Co.	2-lane Freeway
CT 12	I-5 SB	Twin Cities Rd	Walnut Grove Rd	Caltrans D10	Sacramento Co.	2-lane Freeway
CT 13	I-5 NB	Walnut Grove Rd	Peltier Rd	Caltrans D10	Sacramento Co./ San Joaquin Co.	2-lane Freeway
CT 14	I-5 SB	Walnut Grove Rd	Peltier Rd	Caltrans D10	Sacramento Co./ San Joaquin Co.	2-lane Freeway
CT 15	I-5 NB	Peltier Rd	Turner Rd	Caltrans D10	San Joaquin Co.	2-lane Freeway
CT 16	I-5 SB	Peltier Rd	Turner Rd	Caltrans D10	San Joaquin Co.	2-lane Freeway

Segment ID*	Roadway	From	To	Jurisdiction	Location	Analysis Functional Classification
CT 17	I-5 NB	Turner Rd	SR 12	Caltrans D10	San Joaquin Co.	2-lane Freeway
CT 18	I-5 SB	Turner Rd	SR 12	Caltrans D10	San Joaquin Co.	2-lane Freeway
CT 19	I-5 NB	SR 12	Eight Mile Rd	Caltrans D10	San Joaquin Co.	3-lane Freeway
CT 20	I-5 SB	SR 12	Eight Mile Rd	Caltrans D10	San Joaquin Co.	3-lane Freeway
CT 21	I-5 NB	Eight Mile Rd	Hammer Ln	Caltrans D10	Stockton	3-lane Freeway
CT 22	I-5 SB	Eight Mile Rd	Hammer Ln	Caltrans D10	Stockton	3-lane Freeway
CT 23	SR 160 (Freeport Blvd)	Sacramento City Limits	Freeport Bridge	Caltrans D3	Sacramento Co.	Minor 2-lane Highway
CT 24	SR 160 (Freeport Blvd/River Rd)	Freeport Bridge	Scribner Rd	Caltrans D3	Sacramento Co.	Minor 2-lane Highway
CT 25	SR 160 (River Rd)	Scribner Rd	Hood Franklin Rd	Caltrans D3	Sacramento Co.	Minor 2-lane Highway
CT 26	SR 160 (River Rd)	Hood Franklin Rd	Lambert Rd	Caltrans D3	Sacramento Co.	Minor 2-lane Highway
CT 27	SR 160 (River Rd)	Lambert Rd	Paintersville Bridge	Caltrans D3	Sacramento Co.	Minor 2-lane Highway
CT 28	SR 160 (Paintersville Bridge)	Sutter Slough Bridge Rd	SR 160 (River Rd)	Caltrans D3	Sacramento Co./ Yolo Co.	Minor 2-lane Highway
CT 29	SR 160	Paintersville Bridge	Walnut Grove Bridge	Caltrans D3	Sacramento Co.	Minor 2-lane Highway
CT 30	SR 160 (River Rd)	Walnut Grove Bridge	A St (Isleton)	Caltrans D3	Isleton	Minor 2-lane Highway
CT 31	SR 160	A St (Isleton)	SR 12	Caltrans D3	Sacramento Co.	Minor 2-lane Highway
CT 32	SR 160	SR 12	Brannan Island Rd	Caltrans D3	Sacramento Co.	Major 2-lane Highway
CT 33	SR 84 (Jefferson Blvd)	West Sacramento City Limits	Courtland Rd	Caltrans D3	Yolo Co.	Minor 2-lane Highway
CT 34	SR 84 (Courtland Rd/ Ryer Ave)	Courtland Rd	Cache Slough Ferry	Caltrans D4	Yolo Co./Solano Co.	Minor 2-lane Highway
CT 35	I-80 EB	Suisun Valley Rd	SR 12	Caltrans D4	Fairfield	5-lane Freeway + HOV
CT 36	I-80 WB	SR 12	Suisun Valley Rd	Caltrans D4	Fairfield	5-lane Freeway + HOV
CT 37	SR 12 EB	I-80	Beck Ave	Caltrans D4	Fairfield	2-lane Freeway
CT 38	SR 12 WB	Beck Ave	I-80	Caltrans D4	Fairfield	2-lane Freeway
CT 39	SR 12	Beck Ave	Sunset Ave/Grizzly Island Rd	Caltrans D4	Suisun City	4-lane Multilane Highway
CT 40	SR 12	Sunset Ave/ Grizzly Island Rd	Walters Rd/ Lawler Ranch Pkwy	Caltrans D4	Suisun City	4-lane Multilane Highway
CT 41	SR 12	Walters Rd/ Lawler Ranch Pkwy	SR 113	Caltrans D4	Solano Co.	Major 2-lane Highway
CT 42	SR 12	SR 113	SR 84 (River Rd)	Caltrans D4	Rio Vista/Solano Co.	Major 2-lane Highway

Segment ID*	Roadway	From	To	Jurisdiction	Location	Analysis Functional Classification
CT 43	SR 12 (Rio Vista Bridge)	SR 84 (River Rd)	SR 160 (River Rd)	Caltrans D4	Sacramento Co./ Rio Vista	2-lane Arterial
CT 44	SR 12	SR 160 (River Rd)	Sacramento Co./ San Joaquin Co. Line	Caltrans D3	Sacramento Co.	Major 2-lane Highway
CT 45	SR 12	Sacramento Co./San Joaquin Co. Line	I-5	Caltrans D10	San Joaquin Co.	Major 2-lane Highway
CT 46	I-80 EB	SR 113	Pedrick Rd	Caltrans D4	Dixon	3-lane Freeway
CT 47	I-80 WB	Pedrick Rd	SR 113	Caltrans D4	Dixon	3-lane Freeway
CT 48	SR 113	I-80	Dixon City Limits	Caltrans D4	Dixon	4-lane Arterial, Divided
CT 49	SR 113	Dixon City Limits	SR 12	Caltrans D4	Solano Co.	Minor 2-lane Highway
CT 50	SR 4 (Marsh Creek Rd)	Vasco Rd	Byron Hwy (Old SR 4)	Contra Costa Co./ Caltrans D4 ^b	Contra Costa Co.	Major 2-lane Highway
CT 51	SR 4	Marsh Creek Rd	Discovery Bay Blvd	Caltrans D4	Contra Costa Co.	Major 2-lane Highway
CT 52	SR 4	Discovery Bay Blvd	Tracy Blvd	Caltrans D4	Contra Costa Co./ San Joaquin Co.	Major 2-lane Highway
CT 53	SR 4 (Charter Way)	Tracy Blvd	I-5	Caltrans D10	San Joaquin Co./ Stockton	Minor 2-lane Highway
CT 54	I-5 NB	SR 4 (Freeway)	SR 4 (Charter Way)	Caltrans D10	Stockton	4-lane Freeway
CT 55	I-5 SB	SR 4 (Freeway)	SR 4 (Charter Way)	Caltrans D10	Stockton	4-lane Freeway
CT 56	I-5 NB	SR 4 (Charter Way)	Eighth Street	Caltrans D10	Stockton	3-lane Freeway
CT 57	I-5 SB	SR 4 (Charter Way)	Eighth Street	Caltrans D10	Stockton	3-lane Freeway
CT 58	I-205 EB	I-580	Mountain House Pkwy	Caltrans D10	Mountain House	3-lane Freeway
CT 59	I-205 WB	I-580	Mountain House Pkwy	Caltrans D10	Mountain House	3-lane Freeway
CT 60	I-205 EB	Mountain House Pkwy	Eleventh St	Caltrans D10	Mountain House/ Tracy	3-lane Freeway
CT 61	I-205 WB	Mountain House Pkwy	Eleventh St	Caltrans D10	Mountain House/ Tracy	3-lane Freeway
CT 62	I-205 EB	Grant Line Rd	Tracy Blvd	Caltrans D10	Tracy	3-lane Freeway
CT 63	I-205 WB	Grant Line Rd	Tracy Blvd	Caltrans D10	Tracy	3-lane Freeway
CT 64	I-205 EB	Tracy Blvd	MacArthur Dr	Caltrans D10	Tracy	3-lane Freeway
CT 65	I-205 WB	Tracy Blvd	MacArthur Dr	Caltrans D10	Tracy	3-lane Freeway
ISL 01	A St/4th St/Jackson Blvd.	SR 160	Isleton City Limits	City of Isleton	Isleton	Major 2-lane Highway
OAK 01	Main Street (Old SR 4)	SR 160	Cypress Rd	Caltrans D4/ City of Oakley ^a	Oakley	4-lane Arterial Divided

Segment ID*	Roadway	From	To	Jurisdiction	Location	Analysis Functional Classification
OAK 02	Main Street (Old SR 4)	Cypress Rd	Delta Road (Oakley City Limits)	Caltrans D4/ City of Oakley ^a	Oakley	2-lane Arterial
OAK 03	Cypress Rd	Main Street (Old SR 4)	Bethel Island Rd	City of Oakley	Oakley	Major 2-lane Highway
OAK 04	Bethel Island Rd	Cypress Rd	Oakley City Limits	City of Oakley	Oakley	Minor 2-lane Highway
OAK 05	Delta Rd	Main Street (Old SR 4)	Byron Hwy	City of Oakley/ Contra Costa Co. ^c	Oakley	Minor 2-lane Highway
SAC 01	Pocket Rd	I-5	Freeport Blvd (Old SR 160)	City of Sacramento	Sacramento	4-lane Arterial Divided
SAC 02	Freeport Blvd (Old SR 160)	Pocket Rd	Sacramento City Limits	City of Sacramento	Sacramento	2-lane Arterial
SC 01	Freeport Bridge	River Rd	SR 160 (Freeport Blvd)	Sacramento Co./Yolo Co.	Sacramento Co./ Yolo Co.	Minor 2-lane Highway
SC 02	Hood Franklin Rd	SR 160 (River Rd)	I-5	Sacramento Co.	Sacramento Co.	Major 2-lane Highway
SC 03	Lambert Rd	SR 160 (River Rd)	Herzog Rd	Sacramento Co.	Sacramento Co.	Minor 2-lane Highway
SC 04	Lambert Rd	Herzog Rd	Franklin Blvd	Sacramento Co.	Sacramento Co.	Minor 2-lane Highway
SC 05	Franklin Blvd	Lambert Rd	Twin Cities Rd	Sacramento Co.	Sacramento Co.	Minor 2-lane Highway
SC 06	Twin Cities Rd	River Rd	I-5	Sacramento Co.	Sacramento Co.	Minor 2-lane Highway
SC 07	Twin Cities Rd	I-5	Franklin Blvd	Sacramento Co.	Sacramento Co.	Minor 2-lane Highway
SC 08	Sutter Slough Bridge Rd	Sacramento Co./ Yolo Co. Line	Paintersville Bridge	Sacramento Co.	Sacramento Co.	Minor 2-lane Highway
SC 09	River Rd (Sac Co.)	Paintersville Bridge	Twin Cities Rd	Sacramento Co.	Sacramento Co.	Minor 2-lane Highway
SC 10	River Rd (Sac Co.)	Twin Cities Rd	Walnut Grove Bridge	Sacramento Co.	Sacramento Co.	Major 2-lane Highway
SC 11	Walnut Grove Rd/ River Rd	Walnut Grove Bridge	Sacramento Co./ San Joaquin Co. Line	Sacramento Co.	Walnut Grove	Minor 2-lane Highway
SC 12	Isleton Rd	River Rd (Walnut Grove)/Isleton Rd Bridge	1.5 miles west of Isleton Rd Bridge	Sacramento Co.	Sacramento Co.	Minor 2-lane Highway
SC 13	Race Track Rd/Tyler Island Rd	Walnut Grove Rd	Southern End of Tyler Island	Sacramento Co.	Sacramento Co.	Minor 2-lane Highway
SC 14	Tyler Island Rd	Southern End of Tyler Island	SR 160 (River Rd)	Sacramento Co.	Sacramento Co.	Minor 2-lane Highway
SC 15	Jackson Slough Rd	Isleton City Limits	SR 12	Sacramento Co.	Sacramento Co.	Minor 2-lane Highway
SC 16	Jackson Slough Rd	Brannan Island Rd	SR 12	Sacramento Co.	Sacramento Co.	Minor 2-lane Highway
SJ 01	Walnut Grove Rd	Sacramento Co./ San Joaquin Co. Line	I-5	San Joaquin Co.	San Joaquin Co.	Major 2-lane Highway
SJ 02	Peltier Rd	Blossom Rd	I-5	San Joaquin Co.	San Joaquin Co.	Minor 2-lane Highway

Segment ID*	Roadway	From	To	Jurisdiction	Location	Analysis Functional Classification
SJ 03	Tracy Blvd	SR 4	Clifton Court Rd	San Joaquin Co.	San Joaquin Co.	Major 2-lane Highway
SJ 04	Tracy Blvd	Clifton Court Rd	Tracy City Limits	San Joaquin Co.	San Joaquin Co.	Major 2-lane Highway
SJ 05	Byron Hwy	Alameda Co./ San Joaquin Co. Line	Mountain House Pkwy	San Joaquin Co.	Mountain House	Major 2-lane Highway
SJ 06	Mountain House Pkwy	Byron Hwy	Arnaudo Blvd	San Joaquin Co.	Mountain House	Minor 2-lane Highway
SJ 07	Mountain House Pkwy	Arnaudo Blvd	I-205	San Joaquin Co.	Mountain House	4-lane Arterial, Divided
STK 01	Eight Mile Rd	Stockton City Limits	I-5	City of Stockton	Stockton	2-lane Arterial
TRA 01	Tracy Blvd	Tracy City Limits	I-205	City of Tracy	Tracy	2-lane Arterial
WS 01	Harbor Blvd	Industrial Blvd	US 50	City of West Sacramento	West Sacramento	4-lane Arterial Divided
WS 02	Industrial Blvd/Lake Washington Blvd	Harbor Blvd	Jefferson Blvd (Old SR 84)	City of West Sacramento	West Sacramento	4-lane Arterial Divided
WS 03	Jefferson Blvd (Old SR 84)	Lake Washington Blvd	Southport Pkwy	City of West Sacramento	West Sacramento	4-lane Arterial Divided
WS 04	Jefferson Blvd (Old SR 84)	Southport Pkwy	West Sacramento City Limits	City of West Sacramento	West Sacramento	Minor 2-lane Highway
YOL 01	River Rd (Yolo Co.)	Freeport Bridge	Courtland Rd	Yolo Co.	Yolo Co.	Minor 2-lane Highway
YOL 02	River Rd (Yolo Co.)	Courtland Rd	Sacramento Co./ Yolo Co. Line	Yolo Co.	Yolo Co.	Minor 2-lane Highway
YOL 03	Courtland Rd	SR 84 (Jefferson Blvd)	River Rd	Yolo Co.	Yolo Co.	Minor 2-lane Highway

Source: Appendix 19A, *Bay Delta Conservation Plan Construction Traffic Impact Analysis*, in the Final EIR/EIS.

* Segment ID naming convention refers to jurisdiction and segment number. Segment IDs correspond to the roadway segment IDs shown on Figures 19-2a through 19-2c.

^a Facility is analyzed as a Caltrans facility under baseline year 2009 conditions and a local facility under Baseline Plus Background Growth Plus Project (BPPBGPP) conditions – roadway is relinquished to local jurisdiction in 2012 after baseline year 2009.

^b Facility is analyzed as a local facility under baseline year 2009 conditions and a Caltrans facility under BPPBGPP conditions – roadway is adopted as a State facility in 2012 after baseline year 2009.

^c Delta Road from Main Street (old SR 4) to Sellers Avenue is under the jurisdiction of the City of Oakley. Delta Road from Sellers Avenue to Byron Highway is under the jurisdiction of Contra Costa County Public Works Department.

1 **Table 19-2. Existing Pavement Conditions in the Study Area**

Segment ID*	Roadway	From	To	Condition	Extent of Deficiency ^a	Notes
ALA 01	Byron Hwy	Contra Costa Co./ Alameda Co. Line	Alameda Co./San Joaquin Co. Line	Acceptable	-	PCI 100. Improvement project out to bid for summer 2012.
BRE 01	SR 4 (Brentwood Blvd) ^a	Delta Rd (Oakley City Limits)	Balfour Rd	Acceptable	-	PCI range from 79 to 87.
BRE 02	SR 4 (Brentwood Blvd) ^a	Balfour Rd	Brentwood City Limits (South)	Acceptable	-	PCI range from 79 to 87.
BRE 03	Balfour Rd	SR 4 (Brentwood Blvd)	Brentwood City Limits	Acceptable	-	PCI range from 76 to 81.
CC 01	Bethel Island Rd	Oakley City Limits	End	Deficient	Majority	PCI range from 43 to 75. PCI 43 for 3,000 feet. PCI 50 to 60 for 2,900 feet. PCI 70+ for 2,700'.
CC 02	Balfour Rd	Brentwood City Limits	Byron Hwy	Deficient	Majority	PCI range from 34 to 41.
CC 03	SR 4^a	Brentwood City Limits (South)	Marsh Creek Rd	Deficient	Majority	IRI range 156 to 280. Minority of segment length is acceptable.
CC 04	Byron Hwy	Delta Rd	SR 4	Acceptable	-	PCI range from 66 to 72. Approximately 15,000 feet (majority of segment length) better than PCI 70.
CC 05	Byron Hwy	SR 4	Contra Costa Co./Alameda Co. Line	Deficient	Minority	PCI range from 51 to 85. Little more than half study segment (19,850 feet greater than PCI 70).
CT 01	I-5 NB	Florin Rd	Pocket Rd	Deficient	Majority	IRI range from 152 to 177. Approximately 1 mile exceeds IRI 170 threshold (majority of segment length).
CT 02	I-5 SB	Florin Rd	Pocket Rd	Deficient	Minority	IRI range from 152 to 189. Approximately 0.1 mile exceeds IRI 170 threshold. Vast majority of segment is acceptable.
CT 03	I-5 NB	Pocket Rd	Laguna Blvd	Deficient	Minority	IRI range from 118 to 207. Approximately 0.6 mile exceeds IRI 170 threshold. Majority of segment is acceptable.
CT 04	I-5 SB	Pocket Rd	Laguna Blvd	Deficient	Minority	IRI range from 142 to 208. Approximately 0.6 mile exceeds IRI 170 threshold. Majority of segment is acceptable.
CT 05	I-5 NB	Laguna Blvd	Elk Grove Blvd	Deficient	All	IRI range from 182 to 278. All of segment exceeds IRI 170 threshold level.

Segment ID*	Roadway	From	To	Condition	Extent of Deficiency ^a	Notes
CT 06	I-5 SB	Laguna Blvd	Elk Grove Blvd	Deficient	Minority	IRI range from 106 to 172. Majority of segment better than acceptable IRI 170. Approximately 0.4 mile at IRI 172.
CT 07	I-5 NB	Elk Grove Blvd	Hood Franklin Rd	Acceptable	-	IRI range from 96 to 118.
CT 08	I-5 SB	Elk Grove Blvd	Hood Franklin Rd	Acceptable	-	IRI range from 114 to 151.
CT 09	I-5 NB	Hood Franklin Rd	Twin Cities Rd	Deficient	Majority	IRI range from 124 to 246. Approximately half better than acceptable IRI 170.
CT 10	I-5 SB	Hood Franklin Rd	Twin Cities Rd	Deficient	Minority	IRI range from 134 to 208. Approximately 5 miles better than acceptable IRI 170 (majority of segment).
CT 11	I-5 NB	Twin Cities Rd	Walnut Grove Rd	Deficient	Minority	IRI range from 94 to 182. Approximately 0.5 mile exceeds IRI 170 threshold. Majority of segment at better than acceptable range.
CT 12	I-5 SB	Twin Cities Rd	Walnut Grove Rd	Acceptable	-	IRI range from 102 to 164.
CT 13	I-5 NB	Walnut Grove Rd	Peltier Rd	Acceptable	-	IRI range from 82 to 122.
CT 14	I-5 SB	Walnut Grove Rd	Peltier Rd	Acceptable	-	IRI range from 97 to 123.
CT 15	I-5 NB	Peltier Rd	Turner Rd	Acceptable	-	IRI range from 86 to 132.
CT 16	I-5 SB	Peltier Rd	Turner Rd	Acceptable	-	IRI range from 100 to 140.
CT 17	I-5 NB	Turner Rd	SR 12	Acceptable	-	IRI range from 106 to 144.
CT 18	I-5 SB	Turner Rd	SR 12	Acceptable	-	IRI range from 109 to 154.
CT 19	I-5 NB	SR 12	Eight Mile Rd	Deficient	Majority	IRI range from 160 to 266.
CT 20	I-5 SB	SR 12	Eight Mile Rd	Acceptable	-	IRI range from 140 to 167.
CT 21	I-5 NB	Eight Mile Rd	Hammer Ln	Deficient	Majority	IRI range from 146 to 206. Approximately half of segment length exceeds acceptable level.
CT 22	I-5 SB	Eight Mile Rd	Hammer Ln	Acceptable	-	IRI range from 148 to 192. Approximately 0.25 miles exceeds IRI 170 threshold. Majority of segment length better than acceptable level.
CT 23	SR 160 (Freeport Blvd)	Sacramento City Limits	Freeport Bridge	Deficient	Minority	IRI range from 139 to 184. Majority of segment length better than acceptable level.
CT 24	SR 160 (Freeport Blvd/River Rd)	Freeport Bridge	Scribner Rd	Deficient	Minority	IRI range from 113 to 184. Approximately 1.5 miles at or exceeds IRI 170 threshold. Majority of segment is acceptable.

Segment ID*	Roadway	From	To	Condition	Extent of Deficiency ^a	Notes
CT 25	SR 160 (River Rd)	Scribner Rd	Hood Franklin Rd	Deficient	Majority	IRI range from 144 to 242. Approximately half segment length exceeds IRI 170 threshold.
CT 26	SR 160 (River Rd)	Hood Franklin Rd	Lambert Rd	Deficient	Majority	IRI range from 166 to 214. Approximately 0.5 mile better than acceptable IRI 170 threshold (minority of segment length).
CT 27	SR 160 (River Rd)	Lambert Rd	Paintersville Bridge	Deficient	Majority	IRI range from 146 to 221. Approximately 1 mile better than acceptable IRI 170 threshold (minority of segment length).
CT 28	SR 160 (Paintersville Bridge)	Sutter Slough Bridge Rd	SR 160 (River Rd)	Not Applicable	-	Bridge
CT 29	SR 160	Paintersville Bridge	Walnut Grove Bridge	Acceptable	-	IRI range from 132 to 139.
CT 30	SR 160 (River Rd)	Walnut Grove Bridge	A St (Isleton)	Deficient	All	IRI range from 219 to 236.
CT 31	SR 160	A St (Isleton)	SR 12	Deficient	Majority	IRI range from 161 to 234. Approximately 1.2 miles better than acceptable IRI 170 (minority of segment length).
CT 32	SR 160	SR 12	Brannan Island Rd	Deficient	Majority	IRI range from 131 to 178. Approximately half segment length better than acceptable IRI threshold.
CT 33	SR 84 (Jefferson Blvd)	West Sacramento City Limits	Courtland Rd	Deficient	Majority	IRI range from 157 to 294. Approximately 1 mile better than acceptable (minority of segment length).
CT 34	SR 84 (Courtland Rd/Ryer Ave)	Courtland Rd	Cache Slough Ferry	Deficient	Majority	IRI range from 122 to 432. Approximately 6 miles better than acceptable (minority of segment length).
CT 35	I-80 EB	Suisun Valley Rd	SR 12	Acceptable	-	IRI range from 68 to 114.
CT 36	I-80 WB	SR 12	Suisun Valley Rd	Acceptable	-	IRI range from 92 to 147.
CT 37	SR 12 EB	I-80	Beck Ave	Acceptable	-	IRI range from 65 to 167.
CT 38	SR 12 WB	Beck Ave	I-80	Acceptable	-	IRI range from 63 to 167.
CT 39	SR 12	Beck Ave	Sunset Ave/ Grizzly Island Rd	Acceptable	-	IRI range from 93 to 156.
CT 40	SR 12	Sunset Ave/ Grizzly Island Rd	Walters Rd/ Lawler Ranch Pkwy	Acceptable	-	IRI range from 100 to 118.

Segment ID*	Roadway	From	To	Condition	Extent of Deficiency ^a	Notes
CT 41	SR 12	Walters Rd/ Lawler Ranch Pkwy	SR 113	Deficient	Minority	IRI range from 94 to 249. Approximately 1 mile exceeds IRI 170 threshold (minority of segment length).
CT 42	SR 12	SR 113	SR 84 (River Rd)	Deficient	Majority	IRI range 165 to 258. Approximately 2 miles better than acceptable (minority of segment length).
CT 43	SR 12 (Rio Vista Bridge)	SR 84 (River Rd)	SR 160 (River Rd)	Not Applicable	-	Bridge
CT 44	SR 12	SR 160 (River Rd)	Sacramento Co./ San Joaquin Co. Line	Deficient	Majority	IRI range from 135 to 236. Approximately 2.5 miles better than acceptable (minority of segment length).
CT 45	SR 12	Sacramento Co./ San Joaquin Co. Line	I-5	Deficient	Majority	IRI range from 106 to 325. Approximately 3 miles better than acceptable (minority of segment length).
CT 46	I-80 EB	SR 113	Pedrick Rd	Deficient	Minority	IRI range from 145 to 172. Majority of segment better than acceptable.
CT 47	I-80 WB	Pedrick Rd	SR 113	Acceptable	-	IRI range from 142 to 169.
CT 48	SR 113	I-80	Dixon City Limits	Acceptable	-	IRI range from 54 to 162.
CT 49	SR 113	Dixon City Limits	SR 12	Deficient	Majority	IRI range from 158 to 250. Approximately 1 mile better than acceptable (minority of segment length).
CT 50	Marsh Creek Rd (Future SR 4) ^b	Vasco Rd	SR 4 (Byron Hwy)	Acceptable	-	PCI 91.
CT 51	SR 4	Marsh Creek Rd	Discovery Bay Blvd	Deficient	Majority	IRI range from 135 to 248. Approximately half segment length better than acceptable 170 IRI.
CT 52	SR 4	Discovery Bay Blvd	Tracy Blvd	Deficient	Minority	IRI range from 133 to 293. Approximately 5.5 miles better than acceptable 170 IRI (majority of segment length).
CT 53	SR 4 (Charter Way)	Tracy Blvd	I-5	Deficient	Majority	IRI range from 82-301. Approximately 1.5 miles better than acceptable 170 IRI (minority of segment length).
CT 54	I-5 NB	SR 4 (Freeway)	SR 4 (Charter Way)	Deficient	All	IRI range from 174 to 205.
CT 55	I-5 SB	SR 4 (Freeway)	SR 4 (Charter Way)	Deficient	All	IRI range from 192 to 303.

Segment ID*	Roadway	From	To	Condition	Extent of Deficiency ^a	Notes
CT 56	I-5 NB	SR 4 (Charter Way)	Eighth Street	Acceptable	-	IRI range from 55 to 137.
CT 57	I-5 SB	SR 4 (Charter Way)	Eighth Street	Acceptable	-	IRI range from 78 to 103.
CT 58	I-205 EB	I-580	Mountain House Pkwy	Acceptable	-	IRI range from 71 to 133.
CT 59	I-205 WB	I-580	Mountain House Pkwy	Acceptable	-	IRI range from 63 to 132.
CT 60	I-205 EB	Mountain House Pkwy	Eleventh St	Acceptable	-	IRI range from 70 to 91.
CT 61	I-205 WB	Mountain House Pkwy	Eleventh St	Acceptable	-	IRI range from 64 to 96.
CT 62	I-205 EB	Grant Line Rd	Tracy Blvd	Acceptable	-	IRI range from 80 to 108.
CT 63	I-205 WB	Grant Line Rd	Tracy Blvd	Acceptable	-	IRI range from 77 to 121.
CT 64	I-205 EB	Tracy Blvd	MacArthur Dr	Acceptable	-	IRI range from 77 to 108.
CT 65	I-205 WB	Tracy Blvd	MacArthur Dr	Acceptable	-	IRI range from 72 to 112.
ISL 01	A St/4th St/Jackson Blvd.	SR 160	Isleton City Limits	Deficient	Unknown	PCI not available from agency. Observations from Google Maps indicate deficient conditions (image date August 2007).
OAK 01	SR 4 (Main St)^a	SR 160	Cypress Rd	Deficient	Majority	IRI range from 156 to 260 (minority of segment length acceptable). Pavement conditions supplied by Caltrans. Facility relinquished to local agency in January 2012.
OAK 02	SR 4 (Main St)^a	Cypress Rd	Delta Rd (Oakley City Limits)	Deficient	All	IRI 235. Pavement conditions supplied by Caltrans. Facility relinquished to local agency in January 2012.
OAK 03	Cypress Rd	SR 4 (Main Street)	Bethel Island Rd	Acceptable	-	PCI range from 65 to 80.
OAK 04	Bethel Island Rd	Cypress Rd	Oakley City Limits	Deficient	Majority	PCI range from 55 to 80.
OAK 05	Delta Rd	SR 4 (Main Street)	Byron Hwy	Deficient	Majority	PCI 89 from Oakley city limits to Sellers Ave. East of Sellers Ave. (Contra Costa County) PCI range from 61-67.
SAC 01	Pocket Rd	I-5	Freeport Blvd (Old SR 160)	Deficient	All	PQI 70.
SAC 02	Freeport Blvd (Old SR 160)	Pocket Rd	Sacramento City Limits	Acceptable	-	PQI 84.

Segment ID*	Roadway	From	To	Condition	Extent of Deficiency ^a	Notes
SC 01	Freeport Bridge	River Rd	SR 160 (Freeport Blvd)	Not Applicable	-	Bridge
SC 02	Hood Franklin Rd	SR 160 (River Rd)	I-5	Deficient	Majority	PCI range from 45 to 67. PCI 45 within Hood (approximately 1000').
SC 03	Lambert Rd	SR 160 (River Rd)	Herzog Rd	Acceptable	-	PCI 56.
SC 04	Lambert Rd	Herzog Rd	Franklin Blvd	Deficient	Majority	PCI range from 35 to 59. At least 1 mile at PCI 35.
SC 05	Franklin Blvd	Lambert Rd	Twin Cities Rd	Deficient	All	PCI 32.
SC 06	Twin Cities Rd	River Rd	I-5	Acceptable	-	PCI 84.
SC 07	Twin Cities Rd	I-5	Franklin Blvd	Deficient	All	PCI 45.
SC 08	Sutter Slough Bridge Rd	Sacramento Co./ Yolo Co. Line	Paintersville Bridge	Deficient	All	PCI 24.
SC 09	River Rd (Sac Co.)	Paintersville Bridge	Twin Cities Rd	Deficient	Majority	PCI range from 43 to 100. PCI 43 and 54 for approximately 1 mile on southernmost section south of Vorden and for 1 mile south of Paintersville Bridge.
SC 10	River Rd (Sac Co.)	Twin Cities Rd	Walnut Grove Bridge	Deficient	Minority	PCI range from 48 to 64. Majority of segment length has a PCI of 64. Section through Walnut Grove south of Center Avenue has a PCI of 48.
SC 11	Walnut Grove Rd/River Rd	Walnut Grove Bridge	Sacramento Co./San Joaquin Co. Line	Acceptable	-	PCI 64.
SC 12	Isleton Rd	River Rd (Walnut Grove)/Isleton Rd Bridge	1.5 miles west of Isleton Rd Bridge	Acceptable	-	PCI 85.
SC 13	Race Track Rd/ Tyler Island Rd	Walnut Grove Rd	Southern End of Tyler Island	Deficient	Majority	PCI range from 36 to 94. Race Track Road has a PCI of 94. All of Tyler Island has PCI 36 (majority of study segment).
SC 14	Tyler Island Rd	Southern End of Tyler Island	SR 160 (River Rd)	Deficient	All	PCI range from 20 to 36. Tyler Island Bridge Road (Approximately 3,500 feet PCI 20, which on the MTC scale is very poor).
SC 15	Jackson Slough Rd	Isleton City Limits	SR 12	Acceptable	-	PCI range from 86 to 94.
SC 16	Jackson Slough Rd	Brannan Island Rd	SR 12	Acceptable	-	PCI 86.
SJ 01	Walnut Grove Rd	Sacramento Co./ San Joaquin Co. Line	I-5	Deficient	Minority	OCI range from 55 to 86.

Segment ID*	Roadway	From	To	Condition	Extent of Deficiency ^a	Notes
SJ 02	Peltier Rd	Blossom Rd	I-5	Deficient	All	OCI range from 56 to 60.
SJ 03	Tracy Blvd	SR 4	Clifton Court Rd	Acceptable	-	OCI 74.
SJ 04	Tracy Blvd	Clifton Court Rd	Tracy City Limits	Acceptable	-	OCI range from 78 to 93.
SJ 05	Byron Hwy ^c	Alameda Co./San Joaquin Co. Line	Mountain House Pkwy	Acceptable	-	PCI 68.
SJ 06	Mountain House Pkwy ^c	Byron Hwy	Arnaudo Blvd	Acceptable	-	PCI 100.
SJ 07	Mountain House Pkwy ^c	Arnaudo Blvd	I-205	Acceptable	-	PCI 100.
STK 01	Eight Mile Rd	Stockton City Limits	I-5	Deficient	Majority	PCI range from 15 to 85 projected from 2009 conditions. 6,920 feet of PCI 15 along westernmost extent said to be in poor condition in need of major work. Extensive skin patching last done in 2010.
TRA 01	Tracy Blvd	Tracy City Limits	I-205	Deficient	Majority	PCI range from 54 to 89.
WS 01	Harbor Blvd	Industrial Blvd	US 50	Acceptable	-	PCI 81. (Last measured in 2005)
WS 02	Industrial Blvd/ Lake Washington Blvd	Harbor Blvd	Jefferson Blvd (Old SR 84)	Acceptable	-	PCI 94. (Last measured in 2005)
WS 03	Jefferson Blvd (Old SR 84)	Lake Washington Blvd	Southport Pkwy	Deficient	Unknown	Segment between Lake Washington Blvd and Marshall Rd new in 2005. Recent PCI is not available from agency. Observations from Google Maps indicate deficient conditions south of Marshall Road (image date August 2011).
WS 04	Jefferson Blvd (Old SR 84)	Southport Pkwy	West Sacramento City Limits	Deficient	Unknown	Recent PCI is not available from agency. Observations from Google Maps indicate deficient conditions (image date September 2011)
YOL 01	River Rd (Yolo Co.)	Freeport Bridge	Courtland Rd	Deficient	Majority	PCI unknown for majority of segment per County. PCI near 100 for section between CR 141 and 142. Comment made that most County roads do not have adequate engineering pavement section constructed to a particular TI and are therefore subject to damage under truck loads. Deficiency assumed.

Segment ID*	Roadway	From	To	Condition	Extent of Deficiency ^a	Notes
YOL 02	River Rd (Yolo Co.)	Courtland Rd	Sacramento Co./Yolo Co. Line	Deficient	Majority	PCI unknown per County. Comment made that most County roads do not have adequate engineering pavement section constructed to a particular TI and are therefore subject to damage under truck loads. Deficiency assumed.
YOL 03	Courtland Rd	SR 84 (Jefferson Blvd)	River Rd	Deficient	Majority	PCI unknown per County. Comment made that most County roads do not have adequate engineering pavement section constructed to a particular TI and are therefore subject to damage under truck loads. Deficiency assumed.

Source: Appendix 19A, *Bay Delta Conservation Plan Construction Traffic Impact Analysis*, in the Final EIR/EIS.

* Segment IDs correspond to the roadway segment IDs shown on Figures 19-2a through 19-2c.

^a Facility is analyzed as a Caltrans facility under baseline year 2009 conditions – roadway is relinquished to local jurisdiction after baseline year 2009.

^b Facility is analyzed as a local facility under baseline year 2009 conditions – roadway is adopted as a State facility after baseline year 2009.

^c The Mountain House CSD maintains the roadways within the Mountain House Master Plan area, and uses the PCI rating system as opposed to the OCI rating system that is used in the remainder of unincorporated San Joaquin County.

1 19.3 Environmental Consequences

2 This section describes the potential effects of the proposed project on the transportation facilities in
3 the study area. Effects are evaluated for severity and, where appropriate, mitigation measures are
4 identified. This section describes potential direct and reasonably foreseeable indirect effects on
5 transportation facilities that would result with implementation of the proposed project.

6 Some impact topics addressed in the Final EIR/EIS are not addressed herein because the change in
7 the footprint of the water conveyance facilities would not result in a changed impact. Topics not
8 addressed in this chapter include impacts resulting from the ability to use transportation routes
9 which do not change under the proposed project, as well as impacts from standard operations and
10 maintenance because there would be no difference in impacts. The impacts resulting from
11 implementation of Environmental Commitments 3, 4, 6-12, 15, and 16, whether they occur under
12 the proposed project or approved project, are fully disclosed in the Final EIR/EIS and would not
13 change if the footprint changes described for the proposed project are constructed.

14 19.3.1 Methods for Analysis

15 The methods applied to the analysis of impacts on transportation are the same as indicated in
16 Section 19.3.1 in the Final EIR/EIS. Appendix 22B, *Air Quality Assumptions*, provides additional
17 detail on the modeling assumptions.

18 19.3.2 Effects and Mitigation Approaches

19 Appendix 19A, *California WaterFix Supplemental EIR/EIS Proposed Project Traffic Impact Analysis*,
20 documents the changes to Impacts TRANS-1 and TRANS-2 in this Supplemental EIR/EIS from
21 impacts in the Final EIR/EIS.

22 19.3.2.1 No Action Alternative

23 Under the No Action Alternative, the new Byron Tract Forebay, reusable tunnel material (RTM)
24 storage and other footprint changes described for the proposed project would not occur. For the
25 purposes of this Supplemental EIR/EIS, the No Action Alternative, against which this proposed
26 project is compared, is consistent with the No Action Alternative Early Long-Term in the Final
27 EIR/EIS. No differing effects on transportation would occur along the proposed project alignment
28 from what was previously described in the No Action Alternative Early Long-Term in the Final
29 EIR/EIS if the No Action Alternative were to occur.

30 19.3.2.2 Proposed Project

31 **Impact TRANS-1: Increased Construction Vehicle Trips Resulting in Unacceptable LOS** 32 **Conditions**

33 **NEPA Effects:** As shown in Table 19-4, under baseline plus background growth (BPBG) conditions, a
34 total of 23 roadway segments would exceed the acceptable LOS thresholds outlined in Table 19-3 for
35 at least 1 hour during the 6:00 AM to 7:00 PM analysis period. As also shown in Table 19-4,
36 construction associated with the proposed project would cause LOS thresholds to be exceeded for at

1 least 1 hour during the 6:00 AM to 7:00 PM analysis period on a total of 34 roadway segments under
2 baseline plus background growth plus project (BPPGPP) conditions (entries in **bold type**) as
3 opposed to the approved project, where construction would cause LOS thresholds to be exceeded
4 for at least 1 hour during the 6:00 AM to 7:00 PM analysis period on a total of 38 roadway segments
5 under BPPGPP conditions.¹ Despite the fact that this is a decrease in affected roadway segments, the
6 proposed project would still temporarily exacerbate an already unacceptable LOS under BPPG
7 conditions on **11** roadway segments (34 minus the 23 that would already be operating at an
8 unacceptable LOS under BPPG conditions). This is as opposed to the approved project which would
9 exacerbate an already unacceptable LOS under BPPG conditions on 15 roadway segments (38 minus
10 the 23 that would already be operating at an unacceptable LOS under BPPG conditions).

- 11 • The highest number of construction related trips for the approved project would occur in the
12 Year 2024.
- 13 • The highest number of construction related trips for the proposed project would occur in the
14 Year 2025.
- 15 • Over the course of the 11 year construction period, the proposed project would generate 33.0%
16 fewer trips when compared with the approved project.
- 17 • In Year 2025, the proposed project would generate 28.3% fewer trips than the approved project.
- 18 • This reduction in project generated construction traffic would reduce the proposed project's
19 impacts when compared with the approved project.

20 Compared with the approved project, the proposed project would reduce construction generated
21 traffic and would not affect the following four (4) roadway segments:

- 22 • Caltrans Segment 35 – Interstate 80 (I-80) EB – between Suisun Valley Road and SR 12;
- 23 • Caltrans Segment 37 - SR 12 EB – between I-80 and Beck Avenue;
- 24 • Caltrans Segment 39 - SR 12 EB – between Beck Avenue and Sunset Avenue / Grizzly Island
25 Road; and
- 26 • Caltrans Segment 61 – I-205 WB – between Eleventh Street and Mountain House Parkway.

27 The decrease in LOS below applicable thresholds during construction would be adverse at the
28 locations identified in Table 19-4 because construction associated with the proposed project would
29 cause LOS thresholds to be exceeded for at least 1 hour during the 6:00 AM to 7:00 PM analysis
30 period. The proposed project would also temporarily exacerbate an already unacceptable LOS under
31 BPPG conditions at 11 roadway segments (34 minus the 23 that would already be operating at an
32 unacceptable LOS under BPPG conditions). While decreases in traffic conditions would occur
33 throughout the study area, the highest concentration of roadway segments below acceptable LOS
34 threshold would occur on state roadways, including SR 12, I-80, SR 4, I-5, and I-205. Standards
35 would also be exceeded on several local roadways, including all segments studied in West
36 Sacramento.

¹ The modeled traffic volumes in Table 19-25 in the Final EIR/EIS represent a reasonable “worst-case” scenario, where all construction truck and employee trips are assigned to the roadway network for each analysis hour. Increased traffic volumes on roadway segments would vary according to the time of day, construction schedule, and intensity of construction activity. Please refer to Final EIR/EIS Section 19.3.1, *Methods for Analysis*, for additional information.

1 Mitigation Measures TRANS-1a through TRANS-1c have been adopted to reduce this effect. These
2 measures, as written in the Final EIR/EIS, remain adequate without change for dealing with the
3 impacts of the proposed project. Although TRANS-1a through TRANS-1c would reduce the severity
4 of this effect, the lead agencies are not solely responsible for the timing, nature, or complete funding
5 of required improvements. If an improvement that is identified in any mitigation agreement(s)
6 contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1c is not fully funded and constructed before the
7 project's contribution to the effect is made, an adverse effect in the form of unacceptable LOS would
8 result. Therefore, this effect would be adverse. If, however, all improvements required to avoid
9 adverse effects prove to be feasible and any necessary agreements are completed before the
10 project's contribution to the effect is made, effects would not be adverse.

11 **CEQA Conclusion:** Construction of the proposed project would add hourly traffic volumes to study
12 area roadways that would exceed acceptable LOS thresholds (Table 19-4). As shown in Table 19-25
13 of the Final EIR/EIS, traffic volumes during construction of the proposed project would temporarily
14 exacerbate already unacceptable LOS under BPBG conditions during the 6:00 AM to 7:00 PM
15 analysis period during the time of project construction. This impact would be temporary but
16 significant. Mitigation Measures TRANS-1a through TRANS-1c would reduce the severity of this
17 impact through development of traffic management plans that would minimize traffic impacts,
18 limiting construction activities during commute hours, and by working with affected state, regional,
19 or local agencies to alleviate road congestion issues.

20 **Incremental Impact:** The proposed project would have a slightly decreased incremental impact
21 from the approved project. 34 roadway segments would be affected, compared with the 38
22 roadway segments affected by the approved project. However, the impact under the proposed
23 project would remain significant and unavoidable despite mitigation.

24 The lead agencies cannot ensure that required roadway capacity improvements outlined under
25 Mitigation Measure TRANS-1c will be fully funded or constructed prior to the project's
26 contribution to the impact. If an improvement identified in the mitigation agreement(s)
27 contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1c is not fully funded and constructed before the
28 project's contribution to the impact is made, a significant impact in the form of unacceptable
29 LOS would result.

30 If, however, all improvements required to avoid significant impacts prove to be feasible and any
31 necessary agreements are completed before the project's contribution to the effect is made,
32 impacts would be less than significant, which would be the same as under the approved project.

33 There would be no new or changed impact resulting from the proposed project.

1 **Table 19-4. Level of Service for Proposed Project**

ID*	Segment	From	To	LOS Threshold	Baseline Conditions		Baseline Plus Background Growth Conditions		BPGPP Conditions		
					LOS Hourly Volume Threshold	Hourly Volume Range (6AM to 7PM)	Hours Operating Worse Than LOS Threshold	Hourly Volume Range (6AM to 7PM)	Hours Operating Worse Than LOS Threshold	Hourly Volume Range (6AM to 7PM)	Hours Operating Worse Than LOS Threshold
ALA 01	Byron Hwy	Contra Costa Co./Alameda Co. Line	Alameda Co./San Joaquin Co. Line	D	1,600	385 to 656	-	477 to 813	-	1,097 to 1,433	-
BRE 01	Brentwood Blvd (old SR 4)^a	Delta Rd (Oakley City Limits)	Balfour Rd	C	970	586 to 1,516	11 (7-9AM; 10AM-7PM)	-	-	-	-
				D	1,760	-	-	598 to 1,547	-	1,218 to 2,167	9 (8-9AM; 11-7PM)
BRE 02	Brentwood Blvd (old SR 4) ^a	Balfour Rd	Brentwood City Limits (South)	C	1,920	369 to 1,013	-	-	-	-	-
				D	3,540	-	-	373 to 1,025	-	993 to 1,645	-
BRE 03	Balfour Rd	Brentwood Blvd (Old SR 4)	Brentwood City Limits	D	3,540	437 to 1,300	-	542 to 1,612	-	922 to 1,992	-
CC 01	Bethel Island Rd	Oakley City Limits	End	D	1,600	124 to 330	-	154 to 409	-	239 to 494	-
CC 02	Balfour Rd	Brentwood City Limits	Byron Hwy	D	1,600	90 to 297	-	112 to 368	-	197 to 453	-
CC 03	Old SR 4^a	Brentwood City Limits (South)	Marsh Creek Rd	C	790	1,133 to 1,682	13 (6AM-7PM)	-	-	-	-
				D	1,600	-	-	1,320 to 1,959	4 (7-8AM; 3-6PM)	1,940 to 2,579	13 (6AM-7PM)
CC 04	Byron Hwy	Delta Rd	Old SR 4	D	1,410	108 to 240	-	109 to 243	-	194 to 328	-

ID*	Segment	From	To	LOS Threshold	LOS Volume Threshold	Baseline Conditions		Baseline Plus Background Growth Conditions		BPGPP Conditions	
						Hourly Volume Range (6AM to 7PM)	Hours Operating Worse Than LOS Threshold	Hourly Volume Range (6AM to 7PM)	Hours Operating Worse Than LOS Threshold	Hourly Volume Range (6AM to 7PM)	Hours Operating Worse Than LOS Threshold
CC 05	Byron Hwy	SR 4	Contra Costa Co./Alameda Co. Line	D	1,600	483 to 907	-	599 to 1,125	-	1,219 to 1,745	4 (7-9AM; 3-4PM; 5-6PM)
CT 01	I-5 NB	Florin Rd	Pocket Rd	F	6,060	2,589 to 5,820	-	3,131 to 7,039	1 (7-8AM)	3,336 to 7,244	1 (7-8AM)
CT 02	I-5 SB	Florin Rd	Pocket Rd	F	6,060	1,647 to 5,705	-	1,952 to 6,761	2 (4-6PM)	2,157 to 6,966	2 (4-6PM)
CT 03	I-5 NB	Pocket Rd	Laguna Blvd	F	6,060	2,359 to 5,156	-	2,688 to 5,876	-	2,793 to 5,981	-
CT 04	I-5 SB	Pocket Rd	Laguna Blvd	F	6,060	1,543 to 5,243	-	1,775 to 6,031	-	1,880 to 6,136	1 (5-6PM)
CT 05	I-5 NB	Laguna Blvd	Elk Grove Blvd	F	4,010	1,820 to 3,339	-	2,118 to 3,885	-	2,223 to 3,990	-
CT 06	I-5 SB	Laguna Blvd	Elk Grove Blvd	F	4,010	1,254 to 3,332	-	1,456 to 3,868	-	1,561 to 3,973	-
CT 07	I-5 NB	Elk Grove Blvd	Hood Franklin Rd	F	4,010	1,504 to 2,162	-	1,789 to 2,572	-	2,279 to 3,062	-
CT 08	I-5 SB	Elk Grove Blvd	Hood Franklin Rd	F	4,010	1,217 to 2,236	-	1,458 to 2,678	-	1,948 to 3,168	-
CT 09	I-5 NB	Hood Franklin Rd	Twin Cities Rd	F	4,010	1,414 to 1,851	-	1,728 to 2,262	-	1,933 to 2,467	-
CT 10	I-5 SB	Hood Franklin Rd	Twin Cities Rd	F	4,010	1,207 to 1,964	-	1,476 to 2,402	-	1,681 to 2,607	-
CT 11	I-5 NB	Twin Cities Rd	Walnut Grove Rd	C	2,880	1,312 to 1,720	-	1,600 to 2,097	-	2,090 to 2,587	-
CT 12	I-5 SB	Twin Cities Rd	Walnut Grove Rd	C	2,880	1,111 to 1,813	-	1,355 to 2,211	-	1,845 to 2,701	-

ID*	Segment	From	To	LOS Threshold	LOS Volume Threshold	Baseline Conditions		Baseline Plus Background Growth Conditions		BPGPP Conditions	
						Hourly Volume Range (6AM to 7PM)	Hours Operating Worse Than LOS Threshold	Hourly Volume Range (6AM to 7PM)	Hours Operating Worse Than LOS Threshold	Hourly Volume Range (6AM to 7PM)	Hours Operating Worse Than LOS Threshold
CT 13	I-5 NB	Walnut Grove Rd	Peltier Rd	C	2,880	1,374 to 1,803	-	1,786 to 2,344	-	1,901 to 2,459	-
CT 14	I-5 SB	Walnut Grove Rd	Peltier Rd	C	2,880	1,128 to 1,894	-	1,466 to 2,462	-	1,581 to 2,577	-
CT 15	I-5 NB	Peltier Rd	Turner Rd	C	2,880	1,421 to 1,885	-	1,847 to 2,451	-	1,952 to 2,556	-
CT 16	I-5 SB	Peltier Rd	Turner Rd	C	2,880	1,145 to 1,974	-	1,489 to 2,566	-	1,594 to 2,671	-
CT 17	I-5 NB	Turner Rd	SR 12	C	2,880	1,288 to 1,985	-	1,674 to 2,581	-	1,779 to 2,686	-
CT 18	I-5 SB	Turner Rd	SR 12	C	2,880	1,124 to 1,482	-	1,461 to 1,927	-	1,566 to 2,032	-
CT 19	I-5 NB	SR 12	Eight Mile Rd	C	4,400	1,533 to 2,267	-	1,932 to 2,856	-	2,037 to 2,961	-
CT 20	I-5 SB	SR 12	Eight Mile Rd	C	4,400	1,243 to 2,070	-	1,566 to 2,608	-	1,671 to 2,713	-
CT 21	I-5 NB	Eight Mile Rd	Hammer Ln	D	5,410	1,937 to 3,452	-	2,441 to 4,350	-	2,546 to 4,455	-
CT 22	I-5 SB	Eight Mile Rd	Hammer Ln	D	5,410	1,817 to 2,760	-	2,289 to 3,478	-	2,394 to 3,583	-
CT 23	SR 160 (Freeport Blvd)	Sacramento City Limits	Freeport Bridge	E	1,740	136 to 476	-	162 to 566	-	572 to 976	-
CT 24	SR 160 (Freeport Blvd/River Rd)	Freeport Bridge	Scribner Rd	E	1,740	94 to 180	-	94 to 180	-	504 to 590	-
CT 25	SR 160 (River Rd)	Scribner Rd	Hood Franklin Rd	E	1,740	41 to 125	-	41 to 125	-	451 to 535	-
CT 26	SR 160 (River Rd)	Hood Franklin Rd	Lambert Rd	E	1,740	105 to 170	-	127 to 206	-	747 to 826	-

ID*	Segment	From	To	LOS Threshold	LOS Volume Threshold	Baseline Conditions		Baseline Plus Background Growth Conditions		BPGPP Conditions	
						Hourly Volume Range (6AM to 7PM)	Hours Operating Worse Than LOS Threshold	Hourly Volume Range (6AM to 7PM)	Hours Operating Worse Than LOS Threshold	Hourly Volume Range (6AM to 7PM)	Hours Operating Worse Than LOS Threshold
CT 27	SR 160 (River Rd)	Lambert Rd	Paintersville Bridge	E	1,740	69 to 122	-	79 to 139	-	699 to 759	-
CT 28	SR 160 (Paintersville Bridge)	Sutter Slough Bridge Rd	SR 160 (River Rd)	E	1,740	75 to 150	-	83 to 166	-	703 to 786	-
CT 29	SR 160	Paintersville Bridge	Walnut Grove Bridge	E	1,740	78 to 128	-	100 to 166	-	720 to 786	-
CT 30	SR 160 (River Rd)	Walnut Grove Bridge	A St (Isleton)	E	1,740	173 to 465	-	173 to 465	-	793 to 1,085	-
CT 31	SR 160	A St (Isleton)	SR 12	E	1,740	193 to 378	-	193 to 378	-	813 to 998	-
CT 32	SR 160	SR 12	Brannan Island Rd	F	1,740	530 to 894	-	587 to 991	-	1,207 to 1,611	-
CT 33	SR 84 (Jefferson Blvd)	West Sacramento City Limits	Courtland Rd	B	200	40 to 169	-	46 to 194	-	666 to 814	13 (6AM-7PM)
CT 34	SR 84 (Courtland Rd/ Ryer Ave)	Courtland Rd	Cache Slough Ferry	C	680	10 to 25	-	11 to 28	-	126 to 143	-
CT 35	I-80 EB	Suisun Valley Rd	SR 12	C	8,350	3,079 to 6,994	-	4,003 to 9,092	3 (3-6PM)	4,493 to 9,582	3 (3-6PM)
CT 36	I-80 WB	Suisun Valley Rd	SR 12	C	8,350	5,751 to 8,892	8 (6-10AM; 2-6PM)	7,476 to 11,560	6 (6-9AM; 3-6PM)	7,966 to 12,050	8 (6-10AM; 2-6PM)
CT 37	SR 12 EB	I-80	Beck Ave	C	2,880	528 to 1,847	-	697 to 2,438	-	1,187 to 2,730	-
CT 38	SR 12 WB	I-80	Beck Ave	C	2,880	829 to 1,625	-	1,094 to 2,145	-	1,584 to 2,635	-

ID*	Segment	From	To	LOS Threshold	LOS Volume Threshold	Baseline Conditions		Baseline Plus Background Growth Conditions		BPBGPP Conditions	
						Hourly Volume Range (6AM to 7PM)	Hours Operating Worse Than LOS Threshold	Hourly Volume Range (6AM to 7PM)	Hours Operating Worse Than LOS Threshold	Hourly Volume Range (6AM to 7PM)	Hours Operating Worse Than LOS Threshold
CT 39	SR 12	Beck Ave	Sunset Ave/ Grizzly Island Rd	C	5,060	2,408 to 3,573	-	3,137 to 4,655	-	3,590 to 5,050	-
CT 40	SR 12	Sunset Ave/ Grizzly Island Rd	Walters Rd/ Lawler Ranch Pkwy	C	5,060	1,607 to 2,353	-	2,121 to 3,106	-	2,741 to 3,726	-
CT 41	SR 12	Walters Rd/ Lawler Ranch Pkwy	SR 113	C	790	627 to 1,075	10 (6-8AM; 9-1PM; 2-6PM)	828 to 1,419	13 (6AM-7PM)	1,448 to 2,039	13 (6AM-7PM)
CT 42	SR 12	SR 113	SR 84 (River Rd)	C	790	1,073 to 1,544	13 (6AM-7PM)	1,416 to 2,038	13 (6AM-7PM)	2,036 to 2,658	13 (6AM-7PM)
CT 43	SR 12 (Rio Vista Bridge)	SR 84 (River Rd)	SR 160 (River Rd)	C	970	1,135 to 1,685	13 (6AM-7PM)	1,498 to 2,224	13 (6AM-7PM)	2,118 to 2,844	13 (6AM-7PM)
CT 44	SR 12	SR 160 (River Rd)	Sacramento Co./San Joaquin Co. Line	C	790	704 to 1,030	12 (6AM-6PM)	873 to 1,277	13 (6AM-7PM)	988 to 1,392	13 (6AM-7PM)
CT 45	SR 12	Sacramento Co./San Joaquin Co. Line	I-5	C	790	773 to 1,164	12 (6AM-6PM)	853 to 1,284	13 (6AM-7PM)	968 to 1,399	13 (6AM-7PM)
CT 46	I-80 EB	SR 113	Pedrick Rd	C	4,400	2,508 to 4,632	2 (3-5PM)	3,108 to 5,741	6 (7-9AM; 2-6PM)	3,350 to 5,982	6 (7-9AM; 2-6PM)
CT 47	I-80 WB	SR 113	Pedrick Rd	C	4,400	3,068 to 4,191	-	3,563 to 4,867	4 (7-8AM; 3-6PM)	3,873 to 5,177	6 (6-9AM; 3-6PM)
CT 48	SR 113	I-80	Dixon City Limits	C	1,920	569 to 1,341	-	569 to 1,341	-	1,050 to 1,825	-

ID*	Segment	From	To	LOS Threshold	Baseline Conditions			Baseline Plus Background Growth Conditions		BPGPP Conditions	
					LOS Volume Threshold	Hourly Volume Range (6AM to 7PM)	Hours Operating Worse Than LOS Threshold	Hourly Volume Range (6AM to 7PM)	Hours Operating Worse Than LOS Threshold	Hourly Volume Range (6AM to 7PM)	Hours Operating Worse Than LOS Threshold
CT 49	SR 113	Dixon City Limits	SR 12	C	680	174 to 294	-	216 to 365	-	700 to 850	9 (7AM-4PM)
CT 50	SR 4 (Marsh Creek Rd) ^b	Vasco Rd	Byron Hwy (Old SR 4)	D	1,600	442 to 733	-	-	-	-	-
				C	790	-	-	548 to 909	2 (4-6PM)	1,168 to 1,529	13 (6AM-7PM)
CT 51	SR 4	Marsh Creek Rd	Discovery Bay Blvd	D	1,600	554 to 1,224	-	654 to 1,445	-	1,274 to 2,065	11 (8AM-7PM)
CT 52	SR 4	Discovery Bay Blvd	Tracy Blvd	C	790	412 to 746	-	412 to 746	-	1,032 to 1,366	13 (6AM-7PM)
CT 53	SR 4 (Charter Way)	Tracy Blvd	I-5	D	1,410	867 to 1,492	1 (4-5PM)	867 to 1,492	1 (4-5PM)	1,487 to 2,112	13 (6AM-7PM)
CT 54	I-5 NB	SR 4 (Freeway)	SR 4 (Charter Way)	D	7,280	2,552 to 4,815	-	3,201 to 6,039	-	3,821 to 6,659	-
CT 55	I-5 SB	SR 4 (Freeway)	SR 4 (Charter Way)	D	7,280	4,550 to 5,913	-	5,747 to 7,468	2 (7-8AM; 5-6PM)	6,367 to 8,088	5 (7-8AM; 2-6PM)
CT 56	I-5 NB	SR 4 (Charter Way)	Eighth Street	D	5,410	2,430 to 4,586	-	3,159 to 5,962	3 (3-6PM)	3,640 to 6,445	3 (3-6PM)
CT 57	I-5 SB	SR 4 (Charter Way)	Eighth Street	D	5,410	4,333 to 5,631	3 (7-8AM; 4-6PM)	5,633 to 7,320	13 (6AM-7PM)	6,253 to 7,940	13 (6AM-7PM)
CT 58	I-205 EB	I-580	Mountain House Pkwy	C	4,400	1,350 to 5,071	4 (3-7PM)	1,629 to 6,118	5 (2-7PM)	1,939 to 6,428	5 (2-7PM)
CT 59	I-205 WB	I-580	Mountain House Pkwy	C	4,400	1,873 to 4,867	2 (6-8AM)	2,270 to 5,898	3 (6-9AM)	2,580 to 6,208	3 (6-9AM)
CT 60	I-205 EB	Mountain House Pkwy	Eleventh St	C	4,400	1,431 to 5,068	4 (3-7PM)	1,803 to 6,386	5 (2-7PM)	2,113 to 6,696	5 (2-7PM)

ID*	Segment	From	To	LOS Threshold	LOS Volume Threshold	Baseline Conditions		Baseline Plus Background Growth Conditions		BPGPP Conditions	
						Hourly Volume Range (6AM to 7PM)	Hours Operating Worse Than LOS Threshold	Hourly Volume Range (6AM to 7PM)	Hours Operating Worse Than LOS Threshold	Hourly Volume Range (6AM to 7PM)	Hours Operating Worse Than LOS Threshold
CT 61	I-205 WB	Mountain House Pkwy	Eleventh St	C	4,400	1,875 to 4,117	-	2,363 to 5,187	2 (6-8AM)	2,600 to 5,425	2 (6-8AM)
CT 62	I-205 EB	Grant Line Rd	Tracy Blvd	D	5,410	1,525 to 4,200	-	1,922 to 5,292	-	1,967 to 5,337	-
CT 63	I-205 WB	Grant Line Rd	Tracy Blvd	D	5,410	1,852 to 3,079	-	2,334 to 3,880	-	2,379 to 3,925	-
CT 64	I-205 EB	Tracy Blvd	MacArthur Dr	D	5,410	1,511 to 4,182	-	1,904 to 5,269	-	1,949 to 5,314	-
CT 65	I-205 WB	Tracy Blvd	MacArthur Dr	D	5,410	2,083 to 3,446	-	2,625 to 4,342	-	2,670 to 4,387	-
ISL 01	A St/4th St/Jackson Blvd.	SR 160	Isleton City Limits	D	1,410	17 to 75	-	17 to 75	-	62 to 120	-
OAK 01	Main Street (Old SR 4) ^a	SR 160	Cypress Rd	C	1,920	752 to 1,663	-	-	-	-	-
				D	3,540	-	-	882 to 1,951	-	1,502 to 2,571	-
OAK 02	Main Street (Old SR 4)^a	Cypress Rd	Delta Rd (Oakley City Limits)	C	970	722 to 1,335	10 (7-9AM; 11AM-7PM)	-	-	-	-
				D	1,760	-	-	939 to 1,736	-	1,420 to 2,219	8 (7AM-3PM)
OAK 03	Cypress Rd	Main Street (Old SR 4)	Bethel Island Rd	D	1,600	304 to 764	-	377 to 947	-	422 to 992	-
OAK 04	Bethel Island Rd	Cypress Rd	Oakley City Limits	D	1,410	140 to 367	-	174 to 455	-	219 to 500	-
OAK 05	Delta Rd	Main Street (Old SR 4)	Byron Hwy	D	1,410	155 to 334	-	157 to 339	-	202 to 384	-
SAC 01	Pocket Rd	I-5	Freeport Blvd (Old SR 160)	D	3,540	789 to 2,191	-	789 to 2,191	-	1,199 to 2,601	-

ID*	Segment	From	To	LOS Threshold	LOS Volume Threshold	Baseline Conditions		Baseline Plus Background Growth Conditions		BPGPP Conditions	
						Hourly Volume Range (6AM to 7PM)	Hours Operating Worse Than LOS Threshold	Hourly Volume Range (6AM to 7PM)	Hours Operating Worse Than LOS Threshold	Hourly Volume Range (6AM to 7PM)	Hours Operating Worse Than LOS Threshold
SAC 02	Freeport Blvd (Old SR 160)	Pocket Rd	Sacramento City Limits	D	1,760	152 to 492	-	188 to 610	-	598 to 1,020	-
SC 01	Freeport Bridge	River Rd	SR 160 (Freeport Blvd)	D	1,410	98 to 346	-	119 to 421	-	164 to 466	-
SC 02	Hood Franklin Rd	SR 160 (River Rd)	I-5	D	1,410	77 to 137	-	86 to 153	-	706 to 773	-
SC 03	Lambert Rd	SR 160 (River Rd)	Herzog Rd	D	1,410	10 to 29	-	12 to 35	-	632 to 655	-
SC 04	Lambert Rd	Herzog Rd	Franklin Blvd	D	1,410	19 to 38	-	20 to 40	-	640 to 660	-
SC 05	Franklin Blvd	Lambert Rd	Twin Cities Rd	D	1,410	41 to 71	-	42 to 73	-	662 to 693	-
SC 06	Twin Cities Rd	River Rd	I-5	D	1,410	130 to 248	-	138 to 263	-	543 to 668	-
SC 07	Twin Cities Rd	I-5	Franklin Blvd	D	1,410	141 to 318	-	164 to 370	-	209 to 415	-
SC 08	Sutter Slough Bridge Rd	Sacramento Co./Yolo Co. Line	Paintersville Bridge	D	1,410	51 to 113	-	63 to 140	-	683 to 760	-
SC 09	River Rd (Sac Co.)	Paintersville Bridge	Twin Cities Rd	D	1,410	85 to 134	-	87 to 138	-	132 to 183	-
SC 10	River Rd (Sac Co.)	Twin Cities Rd	Walnut Grove Bridge	D	1,600	223 to 365	-	237 to 388	-	642 to 793	-
SC 11	Walnut Grove Rd/River Rd	Walnut Grove Bridge	Sacramento Co./San Joaquin Co. Line	D	1,410	175 to 332	-	188 to 357	-	418 to 587	-
SC 12	Isleton Rd	River Rd (Walnut Grove)/Isleton Rd Bridge	1.5 miles west of Isleton Rd Bridge	D	1,410	61 to 283	-	61 to 283	-	106 to 328	-

ID*	Segment	From	To	LOS Threshold	LOS Volume Threshold	Baseline Conditions		Baseline Plus Background Growth Conditions		BPGPP Conditions	
						Hourly Volume Range (6AM to 7PM)	Hours Operating Worse Than LOS Threshold	Hourly Volume Range (6AM to 7PM)	Hours Operating Worse Than LOS Threshold	Hourly Volume Range (6AM to 7PM)	Hours Operating Worse Than LOS Threshold
SC 13	Race Track Rd/ Tyler Island Rd	Walnut Grove Rd	Southern End of Tyler Island	D	1,410	17 to 34	-	18 to 36	-	63 to 81	-
SC 14	Tyler Island Rd	Southern End of Tyler Island	SR 160 (River Rd)	D	1,410	14 to 39	-	14 to 39	-	59 to 84	-
SC 15	Jackson Slough Rd	Isleton City Limits	SR 12	D	1,410	4 to 53	-	5 to 66	-	50 to 111	-
SC 16	Jackson Slough Rd	Brannan Island Rd	SR 12	D	1,410	16 to 52	-	20 to 64	-	65 to 109	-
SJ 01	Walnut Grove Rd	Sacramento Co./ San Joaquin Co. Line	I-5	C	790	141 to 232	-	152 to 250	-	382 to 480	-
SJ 02	Peltier Rd	Blossom Rd	I-5	C	680	8 to 23	-	8 to 23	-	53 to 68	-
SJ 03	Tracy Blvd	SR 4	Clifton Court Rd	C	790	108 to 209	-	108 to 209	-	483 to 584	-
SJ 04	Tracy Blvd	Clifton Court Rd	Tracy City Limits	C	790	69 to 171	-	86 to 212	-	461 to 587	-
SJ 05	Byron Hwy	Alameda Co./ San Joaquin Co. Line	Mountain House Pkwy	D	1,600	521 to 824	-	646 to 1,022	-	1,125 to 1,500	3 (7-8AM; 3-5PM)
SJ 06	Mountain House Pkwy	Byron Hwy	Arnaudo Blvd	D	1,410	190 to 298	-	236 to 370	-	856 to 990	-
SJ 07	Mountain House Pkwy	Arnaudo Blvd	I-205	D	3,540	418 to 769	-	543 to 1,000	-	1,163 to 1,620	-
STK 01	Eight Mile Rd	Stockton City Limits	I-5	E	1,870	309 to 769	-	383 to 954	-	428 to 999	-
TRA 01	Tracy Blvd	Tracy City Limits	I-205	E	1,870	309 to 759	-	383 to 941	-	758 to 1,316	-

ID*	Segment	From	To	LOS Threshold	LOS Volume Threshold	Baseline Conditions		Baseline Plus Background Growth Conditions		BPGPP Conditions	
						Hourly Volume Range (6AM to 7PM)	Hours Operating Worse Than LOS Threshold	Hourly Volume Range (6AM to 7PM)	Hours Operating Worse Than LOS Threshold	Hourly Volume Range (6AM to 7PM)	Hours Operating Worse Than LOS Threshold
WS 01	Harbor Blvd	Industrial Blvd	US 50	D	3,540	1,140 to 2,317	-	1,374 to 2,793	-	1,994 to 3,413	-
WS 02	Industrial Blvd/Lake Washington Blvd	Harbor Blvd	Jefferson Blvd (Old SR 84)	C	1,920	773 to 1,858	-	959 to 2,304	2 (7-8AM; 5-6PM)	1,420 to 2,775	7 (7-9AM; 12-5PM)
WS 03	Jefferson Blvd (Old SR 84)	Lake Washington Blvd	Southport Pkwy	C	1,920	546 to 1,718	-	665 to 2,094	1 (5-6PM)	1,130 to 2,550	4 (7-9AM; 3-5PM)
WS 04	Jefferson Blvd (Old SR 84)	Southport Pkwy	West Sacramento City Limits	C	680	42 to 146	-	50 to 174	-	530 to 690	9 (7AM-4PM)
YOL 01	River Rd (Yolo Co.)	Freeport Bridge	Courtland Rd	C	680	74 to 249	-	79 to 265	-	124 to 310	-
YOL 02	River Rd (Yolo Co.)	Courtland Rd	Sacramento Co./Yolo Co. Line	C	680	25 to 63	-	31 to 78	-	520 to 565	-
YOL 03	Courtland Rd	SR 84 (Jefferson Blvd)	River Rd	C	680	28 to 77	-	35 to 95	-	520 to 580	-

Source: Appendix 19A, California WaterFix Supplemental EIR/EIS Proposed Project Traffic Impact Analysis.

Note: Proposed project construction traffic estimates for construction of the pipelines, intermediate forebay, and intermediate outlet are based on construction features shared with the pipeline/tunnel alternatives. This analysis does not reflect potential reductions in construction traffic associated with the modified pipeline/tunnel for these features due to differences in the scale of construction activity. Traffic volumes for all other construction features (e.g., intakes, pumping plants) are based on estimates specific to the modified pipeline/tunnel alignment.

* Segment IDs correspond to the segment IDs mapped on Figures 19-2a through 19-2c.

^a Facility is analyzed as a Caltrans facility under Baseline Conditions and a local facility under Baseline Plus Construction Conditions – roadway is relinquished to local jurisdiction after Baseline Year (2009). LOS Threshold is LOS C under Baseline Conditions and changes to LOS D under Baseline Plus Construction Conditions.

^b Facility is analyzed as a local facility under Baseline Conditions and a Caltrans facility under Baseline Plus Construction Conditions – roadway is adopted as a State facility after Baseline Year (2009). LOS Threshold is LOS D under Baseline Conditions and changes to LOS C under Baseline Plus Construction Conditions.

1 **Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a: Implement Site-Specific Construction Traffic Management**
2 **Plan**

3 Please refer to Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a under Impact TRANS-1 in Chapter 19,
4 *Transportation*, of the Final EIR/EIS.

5 **Mitigation Measure TRANS-1b: Limit Hours or Amount of Construction Activity on**
6 **Congested Roadway Segments**

7 Please refer to Mitigation Measure TRANS-1b under Impact TRANS-1 in Chapter 19,
8 *Transportation*, of the Final EIR/EIS.

9 **Mitigation Measure TRANS-1c: Make Good Faith Efforts to Enter into Mitigation Agreements**
10 **to Enhance Capacity of Congested Roadway Segments**

11 Please refer to Mitigation Measure TRANS-1c under Impact TRANS-1 in Chapter 19,
12 *Transportation*, of the Final EIR/EIS.

13 **Impact TRANS-2: Increased Construction Vehicle Trips Exacerbating Unacceptable Pavement**
14 **Conditions**

15 **NEPA Effects:** As shown in Table 19-5, construction of the proposed project would contribute to
16 further deterioration of the existing pavement condition, to less than the acceptable PCI or similar
17 applicable threshold (Table 19-3), on a total of **41** roadway segments. Damage to roadway pavement
18 is expected throughout the study area on various local and state roads, as well as on a few interstates.

19 Compared with the approved project, the proposed project would reduce construction generated
20 traffic and would not affect pavement conditions at the following five (5) roadway segments:

- 21 ● Contra Costa County Segment 01 – Bethel Island Road – between Oakley City Limits and end of
22 Roadway;
- 23 ● Contra Costa County Segment 02 – Balfour Road – between Brentwood City Limits and Byron
24 Highway;
- 25 ● Caltrans Segment 11 – I-5 NB – between Twin Cities Road and Walnut Grove Road;
- 26 ● Caltrans Segment 21 – I-5 NB – between Eight Mile Road and Hammer Lane; and
- 27 ● Caltrans Segment 46 – I-80 EB – between SR 113 and Pedrick Road.

28 The effect of roadway damage to the 41 roadway segments during construction of the proposed
29 project would be adverse. Mitigation Measures TRANS-2a through TRANS-2c have been adopted and
30 would reduce this effect, but not necessarily to a level that would not be adverse, as the lead agencies
31 cannot ensure that the agreements or encroachment permits would be obtained from the relevant
32 transportation agencies. These measures, as written in the Final EIR/EIS, remain adequate without
33 change for dealing with the impacts of the proposed project. If an agreement or encroachment permit
34 is not obtained, an adverse effect in the form of deficient pavement conditions would occur.
35 Accordingly, this effect could remain adverse. If, however, mitigation agreement(s) or encroachment
36 permit(s) providing for the improvement or replacement of pavement are obtained and any other
37 necessary agreements are completed, adverse effects could be avoided.

1 **CEQA Conclusion:** Construction would add traffic trips, exacerbating unacceptable pavement
2 conditions to below acceptable thresholds (Table 19-3) at the 41 locations shown in Table 19-5. The
3 impact of roadway damage during construction would be potentially significant. Mitigation Measures
4 TRANS-2a through TRANS-2c have been adopted to reduce the severity of this impact by prohibiting
5 or limiting construction traffic on already physically deficient roadway segments to the extent feasible,
6 as well as improving the condition of affected roadway segments following construction.

7 **Incremental Impact:** The proposed project would have a slightly decreased incremental impact
8 from the approved project. 41 roadway segments would be affected compared with the 46
9 roadway segments affected by the approved project. Mitigation Measures TRANS-2a through
10 TRANS-2c would reduce the severity of this impact, but not necessarily to less-than-significant
11 levels, because the lead agencies cannot ensure that the agreements or encroachment permits
12 would be obtained from the relevant transportation agencies. If an agreement or encroachment
13 permit is not obtained, a significant impact in the form of deficient pavement conditions would
14 result. If, however, mitigation agreement(s) or encroachment permit(s) providing for the
15 improvement or replacement of pavement are obtained and any other necessary agreements are
16 completed, impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level, which would be the same as
17 under the approved project.

18 Because there is no guarantee of a mitigation agreement or encroachment permit being obtained,
19 the impact under the proposed project would remain significant and unavoidable. There would be
20 no new or changed impact resulting from the proposed project.

1 **Table 19-5. Pavement Conditions for Proposed Project**

Segment ID*	Roadway	From	To	Baseline Year 2009 Conditions	BPGPP Conditions	
					Alternative Results in Construction Trips Added to Roadway	Alternative Results in Impact on Deficient Roadway
ALA 01	Byron Hwy	Contra Costa Co./Alameda Co. Line	Alameda Co./San Joaquin Co. Line	Acceptable	Yes	No
BRE 01	Brentwood Blvd (old SR 4)	Delta Rd (Oakley City Limits)	Balfour Rd	Acceptable	Yes	No
BRE 02	Brentwood Blvd (old SR 4)	Balfour Rd	Brentwood City Limits (South)	Acceptable	Yes	No
BRE 03	Balfour Rd	Brentwood Blvd (Old SR 4)	Brentwood City Limits	Acceptable	Yes	No
CC 01	Bethel Island Rd	Oakley City Limits	End	Deficient	No	No
CC 02	Balfour Rd	Brentwood City Limits	Byron Hwy	Deficient	No	No
CC 03	Old SR 4	Brentwood City Limits (South)	Marsh Creek Rd	Deficient	Yes	Yes
CC 04	Byron Hwy	Delta Rd	Old SR 4	Acceptable	Yes	No
CC 05	Byron Hwy	SR 4	Contra Costa Co./Alameda Co. Line	Deficient	Yes	Yes
CT 01	I-5 NB	Florin Rd	Pocket Rd	Deficient	Yes	Yes
CT 02	I-5 SB	Florin Rd	Pocket Rd	Deficient	Yes	Yes
CT 03	I-5 NB	Pocket Rd	Laguna Blvd	Deficient	Yes	Yes
CT 04	I-5 SB	Pocket Rd	Laguna Blvd	Deficient	Yes	Yes
CT 05	I-5 NB	Laguna Blvd	Elk Grove Blvd	Deficient	Yes	Yes
CT 06	I-5 SB	Laguna Blvd	Elk Grove Blvd	Deficient	Yes	Yes
CT 07	I-5 NB	Elk Grove Blvd	Hood Franklin Rd	Acceptable	Yes	No
CT 08	I-5 SB	Elk Grove Blvd	Hood Franklin Rd	Acceptable	Yes	No
CT 09	I-5 NB	Hood Franklin Rd	Twin Cities Rd	Deficient	Yes	Yes
CT 10	I-5 SB	Hood Franklin Rd	Twin Cities Rd	Deficient	Yes	Yes
CT 11	I-5 NB	Twin Cities Rd	Walnut Grove Rd	Deficient	Yes	No
CT 12	I-5 SB	Twin Cities Rd	Walnut Grove Rd	Acceptable	Yes	No
CT 13	I-5 NB	Walnut Grove Rd	Peltier Rd	Acceptable	Yes	No
CT 14	I-5 SB	Walnut Grove Rd	Peltier Rd	Acceptable	Yes	No
CT 15	I-5 NB	Peltier Rd	Turner Rd	Acceptable	Yes	No
CT 16	I-5 SB	Peltier Rd	Turner Rd	Acceptable	Yes	No
CT 17	I-5 NB	Turner Rd	SR 12	Acceptable	Yes	No
CT 18	I-5 SB	Turner Rd	SR 12	Acceptable	Yes	No

Segment ID*	Roadway	From	To	Baseline Year 2009 Conditions	BPGPP Conditions	
					Alternative Results in Construction Trips Added to Roadway	Alternative Results in Impact on Deficient Roadway
CT 19	I-5 NB	SR 12	Eight Mile Rd	Deficient	Yes	Yes
CT 20	I-5 SB	SR 12	Eight Mile Rd	Acceptable	Yes	No
CT 21	I-5 NB	Eight Mile Rd	Hammer Ln	Deficient	No	No
CT 22	I-5 SB	Eight Mile Rd	Hammer Ln	Acceptable	Yes	No
CT 23	SR 160 (Freeport Blvd)	Sacramento City Limits	Freeport Bridge	Deficient	Yes	Yes
CT 24	SR 160 (Freeport Blvd/ River Rd)	Freeport Bridge	Scribner Rd	Deficient	Yes	Yes
CT 25	SR 160 (River Rd)	Scribner Rd	Hood Franklin Rd	Deficient	Yes	Yes
CT 26	SR 160 (River Rd)	Hood Franklin Rd	Lambert Rd	Deficient	Yes	Yes
CT 27	SR 160 (River Rd)	Lambert Rd	Paintersville Bridge	Deficient	Yes	Yes
CT 28	SR 160 (Paintersville Bridge)	Sutter Slough Bridge Rd	SR 160 (River Rd)	Not Applicable	Yes	No
CT 29	SR 160	Paintersville Bridge	Walnut Grove Bridge	Acceptable	Yes	No
CT 30	SR 160 (River Rd)	Walnut Grove Bridge	A St (Isleton)	Deficient	Yes	Yes
CT 31	SR 160	A St (Isleton)	SR 12	Deficient	Yes	Yes
CT 32	SR 160	SR 12	Brannan Island Rd	Deficient	Yes	Yes
CT 33	SR 84 (Jefferson Blvd)	West Sacramento City Limits	Courtland Rd	Deficient	Yes	Yes
CT 34	SR 84 (Courtland Rd/Ryer Ave)	Courtland Rd	Cache Slough Ferry	Deficient	No	No
CT 35	I-80 EB	Suisun Valley Rd	SR 12	Acceptable	Yes	No
CT 36	I-80 WB	SR 12	Suisun Valley Rd	Acceptable	Yes	No
CT 37	SR 12 EB	I-80	Beck Ave	Acceptable	Yes	No
CT 38	SR 12 WB	Beck Ave	I-80	Acceptable	Yes	No
CT 39	SR 12	Beck Ave	Sunset Ave/Grizzly Island Rd	Acceptable	Yes	No
CT 40	SR 12	Sunset Ave/Grizzly Island Rd	Walters Rd/Lawler Ranch Pkwy	Acceptable	Yes	No
CT 41	SR 12	Walters Rd/Lawler Ranch Pkwy	SR 113	Deficient	Yes	Yes
CT 42	SR 12	SR 113	SR 84 (River Rd)	Deficient	Yes	Yes
CT 43	SR 12 (Rio Vista Bridge)	SR 84 (River Rd)	SR 160 (River Rd)	Not Applicable	Yes	No
CT 44	SR 12	SR 160 (River Rd)	Sacramento Co./San Joaquin Co. Line	Deficient	Yes	Yes

Segment ID*	Roadway	From	To	Baseline Year 2009 Conditions	BPGPP Conditions	
					Alternative Results in Construction Trips Added to Roadway	Alternative Results in Impact on Deficient Roadway
CT 45	SR 12	Sacramento Co./San Joaquin Co. Line	I-5	Deficient	Yes	Yes
CT 46	I-80 EB	SR 113	Pedrick Rd	Deficient	Yes	No
CT 47	I-80 WB	Pedrick Rd	SR 113	Acceptable	Yes	No
CT 48	SR 113	I-80	Dixon City Limits	Acceptable	Yes	No
CT 49	SR 113	Dixon City Limits	SR 12	Deficient	Yes	Yes
CT 50	SR 4 (Marsh Creek Rd)	Vasco Rd	Byron Hwy (Old SR 4)	Acceptable	Yes	No
CT 51	SR 4	Marsh Creek Rd	Discovery Bay Blvd	Deficient	Yes	Yes
CT 52	SR 4	Discovery Bay Blvd	Tracy Blvd	Deficient	Yes	Yes
CT 53	SR 4 (Charter Way)	Tracy Blvd	I-5	Deficient	Yes	Yes
CT 54	I-5 NB	SR 4 (Freeway)	SR 4 (Charter Way)	Deficient	Yes	Yes
CT 55	I-5 SB	SR 4 (Freeway)	SR 4 (Charter Way)	Deficient	Yes	Yes
CT 56	I-5 NB	SR 4 (Charter Way)	Eighth Street	Acceptable	Yes	No
CT 57	I-5 SB	SR 4 (Charter Way)	Eighth Street	Acceptable	Yes	No
CT 58	I-205 EB	I-580	Mountain House Pkwy	Acceptable	Yes	No
CT 59	I-205 WB	I-580	Mountain House Pkwy	Acceptable	Yes	No
CT 60	I-205 EB	Mountain House Pkwy	Eleventh St	Acceptable	Yes	No
CT 61	I-205 WB	Mountain House Pkwy	Eleventh St	Acceptable	Yes	No
CT 62	I-205 EB	Grant Line Rd	Tracy Blvd	Acceptable	Yes	No
CT 63	I-205 WB	Grant Line Rd	Tracy Blvd	Acceptable	Yes	No
CT 64	I-205 EB	Tracy Blvd	MacArthur Dr	Acceptable	Yes	No
CT 65	I-205 WB	Tracy Blvd	MacArthur Dr	Acceptable	Yes	No
ISL 01	A St/4th St/Jackson Blvd.	SR 160	Isleton City Limits	Deficient	No	No
OAK 01	Main Street (Old SR 4)	SR 160	Cypress Rd	Deficient	Yes	Yes
OAK 02	Main Street (Old SR 4)	Cypress Rd	Delta Rd (Oakley City Limits)	Deficient	Yes	Yes
OAK 03	Cypress Rd	Main Street (Old SR 4)	Bethel Island Rd	Acceptable	No	No
OAK 04	Bethel Island Rd	Cypress Rd	Oakley City Limits	Deficient	No	No
OAK 05	Delta Rd	Main Street (Old SR 4)	Byron Hwy	Deficient	No	No

Segment ID*	Roadway	From	To	Baseline Year 2009 Conditions	BPGPP Conditions	
					Alternative Results in Construction Trips Added to Roadway	Alternative Results in Deficient Roadway
SAC 01	Pocket Rd	I-5	Freeport Blvd (Old SR 160)	Deficient	Yes	Yes
SAC 02	Freeport Blvd (Old SR 160)	Pocket Rd	Sacramento City Limits	Acceptable	Yes	No
SC 01	Freeport Bridge	River Rd	SR 160 (Freeport Blvd)	Not Applicable	No	No
SC 02	Hood Franklin Rd	SR 160 (River Rd)	I-5	Deficient	Yes	Yes
SC 03	Lambert Rd	SR 160 (River Rd)	Herzog Rd	Acceptable	Yes	No
SC 04	Lambert Rd	Herzog Rd	Franklin Blvd	Deficient	Yes	Yes
SC 05	Franklin Blvd	Lambert Rd	Twin Cities Rd	Deficient	Yes	Yes
SC 06	Twin Cities Rd	River Rd	I-5	Acceptable	Yes	No
SC 07	Twin Cities Rd	I-5	Franklin Blvd	Deficient	No	No
SC 08	Sutter Slough Bridge Rd	Sacramento Co./Yolo Co. Line	Paintersville Bridge	Deficient	Yes	Yes
SC 09	River Rd (Sac Co.)	Paintersville Bridge	Twin Cities Rd	Deficient	No	No
SC 10	River Rd (Sac Co.)	Twin Cities Rd	Walnut Grove Bridge	Deficient	Yes	Yes
SC 11	Walnut Grove Rd/River Rd	Walnut Grove Bridge	Sacramento Co./San Joaquin Co. Line	Acceptable	Yes	No
SC 12	Isleton Rd	River Rd (Walnut Grove)/ Isleton Rd Bridge	1.5 miles west of Isleton Rd Bridge	Acceptable	No	No
SC 13	Race Track Rd/Tyler Island Rd	Walnut Grove Rd	Southern End of Tyler Island	Deficient	No	No
SC 14	Tyler Island Rd	Southern End of Tyler Island	SR 160 (River Rd)	Deficient	No	No
SC 15	Jackson Slough Rd	Isleton City Limits	SR 12	Acceptable	No	No
SC 16	Jackson Slough Rd	Brannan Island Rd	SR 12	Acceptable	No	No
SJ 01	Walnut Grove Rd	Sacramento Co./San Joaquin Co. Line	I-5	Deficient	Yes	Yes
SJ 02	Peltier Rd	Blossom Rd	I-5	Deficient	No	No
SJ 03	Tracy Blvd	SR 4	Clifton Court Rd	Acceptable	Yes	No
SJ 04	Tracy Blvd	Clifton Court Rd	Tracy City Limits	Acceptable	Yes	No
SJ 05	Byron Hwy	Alameda Co./San Joaquin Co. Line	Mountain House Pkwy	Acceptable	Yes	No
SJ 06	Mountain House Pkwy	Byron Hwy	Arnaudo Blvd	Acceptable	Yes	No
SJ 07	Mountain House Pkwy	Arnaudo Blvd	I-205	Acceptable	Yes	No
STK 01	Eight Mile Rd	Stockton City Limits	I-5	Deficient	No	No
TRA 01	Tracy Blvd	Tracy City Limits	I-205	Deficient	Yes	No

Segment ID*	Roadway	From	To	Baseline Year 2009 Conditions	BPBGP Conditions	
					Alternative Results in Construction Trips Added to Roadway	Alternative Results in Impact on Deficient Roadway
WS 01	Harbor Blvd	Industrial Blvd	US 50	Acceptable	Yes	No
WS 02	Industrial Blvd/ Lake Washington Blvd	Harbor Blvd	Jefferson Blvd (Old SR 84)	Acceptable	Yes	No
WS 03	Jefferson Blvd (Old SR 84)	Lake Washington Blvd	Southport Pkwy	Deficient	Yes	Yes
WS 04	Jefferson Blvd (Old SR 84)	Southport Pkwy	West Sacramento City Limits	Deficient	Yes	Yes
YOL 01	River Rd (Yolo Co.)	Freeport Bridge	Courtland Rd	Deficient	No	No
YOL 02	River Rd (Yolo Co.)	Courtland Rd	Sacramento Co./Yolo Co. Line	Deficient	Yes	No
YOL 03	Courtland Rd	SR 84 (Jefferson Blvd)	River Rd	Deficient	Yes	No

Source: Appendix 19A, California WaterFix Supplemental EIR/EIS Proposed Project Traffic Impact Analysis.
 * Segment IDs correspond to the roadway segment IDs shown on Figures 19-2a through 19-2c.

1

1 **Mitigation Measure TRANS-2a: Prohibit Construction Activity on Physically Deficient**
2 **Roadway Segments**

3 Please refer to Mitigation Measure TRANS-2a under Impact TRANS-2 in Chapter 19,
4 *Transportation*, of the Final EIR/EIS.

5 **Mitigation Measure TRANS-2b: Limit Construction Activity on Physically Deficient**
6 **Roadway Segments**

7 Please refer to Mitigation Measure TRANS-2b under Impact TRANS-2 in Chapter 19,
8 *Transportation*, of the Final EIR/EIS.

9 **Mitigation Measure TRANS-2c: Improve Physical Condition of Affected Roadway Segments**
10 **as Stipulated in Mitigation Agreements or Encroachment Permits**

11 Please refer to Mitigation Measure TRANS-2c under Impact TRANS-2 in Chapter 19,
12 *Transportation*, of the Final EIR/EIS.

13 **Impact TRANS-4: Disruption of Marine Traffic during Construction**

14 ***RTM Storage and Other Footprint Changes***

15 Under the proposed project, commercial barges would be used to transport precast tunnel segment
16 liners from the ports to temporary barge unloading facilities near construction sites. The tunnel
17 segment liners would then be unloaded and trucked to the construction sites. Temporary barge
18 unloading facilities for construction materials would be installed at the following locations.

- 19 • Venice Island
20 • Bacon Island
21 • Victoria Island
22 • Bouldin Island on San Joaquin River
23 • Mandeville Island at the intersection of Middle River and San Joaquin River

24 When compared to the approved project, this is two (2) less than the number of barge unloading
25 facilities under the approved project.

26 Construction of the proposed project would not require modification to existing deep water
27 channels, interfere with Port of Stockton navigation, or substantially increase the volume of barge
28 movement within the study area such that existing marine traffic would be disrupted.

29 With an average of 4 roundtrips per day, the majority of the proposed project's barge traffic would
30 travel outside of the morning and evening vehicle commute periods. This will reduce potential
31 impact to traffic at the following drawbridge locations:

- 32 • Highway 4 Bridge
33 • Isleton Bridge
34 • Walnut Grove Bridge
35 • Paintersville Bridge

1 • Freeport Bridge

2 **NEPA Effects:** Approximately 11,800 barge trips are projected to carry tunnel segment liners from
3 ports to the sites listed above via the Sacramento River under the proposed project, averaging
4 approximately 4 roundtrips per day during construction of the water conveyance features for up to
5 5.5 years. The majority of barge trips would probably originate at the Port of Pittsburg or Stockton
6 due to their centralized locations relative to the proposed alignment. If necessary, alternate
7 departure points include the Ports of Sacramento and Rio Vista. Although barges are relatively slow
8 and have less maneuverability than smaller vessels, commercial barge operators on the Sacramento
9 River are required to operate in compliance with navigational guidelines. The majority of
10 commercial barge activity in the Delta travels from the San Francisco Bay to the Sacramento area via
11 the Sacramento River Deep Water Ship Channel (SRDWSC) (Delta Protection Commission 2012).

12 The proposed project would avoid direct effects on this barge traffic because the proposed project
13 features would be located along the Sacramento River (not the SRDWSC) and no modifications to the
14 SRDWSC would be required. The barge unloading facility by Venice Island would not be expected to
15 interfere with navigation to the Port of Stockton because it would be outside the main channel and
16 would be designed to facilitate barge operations. The barge unloading facilities would be temporary
17 and removed following construction. Increased barge traffic related to delivery of tunnel segment
18 liners to the proposed project work site would average up to 4 roundtrips per day for up to 5.5 years
19 and is not anticipated to cause impediments to the passage of other vessels. There is 135 feet of
20 open air clearance at the Antioch Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) Bridge and 144 feet at the Rio Vista
21 Bridge when open, and additional raising of draw bridges in the study area would not be required.

22 Although some in-water work would be necessary for construction of the intakes, and a portion of
23 the tunnel segment, the Sacramento River would remain open to boat traffic at all times during
24 construction. The intake cofferdams would extend into the river channel up to 60 feet, depending on
25 location. The width of the river near the intakes (approximately 500–700 feet) would therefore
26 allow for passage of the types of boats typically observed on the Sacramento River (channel width
27 during construction 440–640 feet). (Refer to Chapter 15, *Recreation*, for additional discussion of the
28 effects of intake construction on boating.). This potential effect is not considered adverse because
29 construction of the proposed project would not require modification to existing deep water
30 channels, interfere with Port of Stockton navigation, or substantially increase the volume of barge
31 movement within the study area, such that existing marine traffic would be disrupted (on average, 4
32 roundtrips per day for up to 5.5 years throughout the alignment). As noted in Final EIR/EIS Chapter
33 15, *Recreation*, Impact REC-3, temporary barge unloading facilities would occupy 200 to 1,000 feet
34 of riverbank, depending on the location. Based on the river channel width, all barge facilities except
35 the San Joaquin River facility could occupy substantial portions of the waterway. However, all barge
36 routes and unloading facilities will be selected to maximize continuous waterway access and a
37 minimum waterway width greater than 100 feet. Moreover, Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a, which
38 would be implemented to reduce effects identified under Impact TRANS-1, would reduce any
39 potential disruptions as it includes stipulations to notify the commercial and leisure boating
40 community of proposed barge operations in the waterways.

41 **CEQA Conclusion:** Construction of the proposed project would not require modification to existing
42 deep water channels, interfere with Port of Stockton navigation, or substantially increase the
43 volume of barge movement within the study area such that existing marine traffic would be
44 disrupted (on average, only 4 roundtrips per day for up to 5.5 years). Therefore, this impact would
45 be less than significant. Moreover, Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a, which would be implemented to

1 reduce effects identified under Impact TRANS-1, would reduce any potential disruptions because it
2 includes stipulations to notify the commercial and leisure boating community of proposed barge
3 operations in the waterways.

4 **Incremental Impact:** The impact on disruption of marine traffic during construction under the
5 proposed project would be the same as under the approved project. The impact under the
6 proposed project would remain less than significant. No mitigation is required.

7 **Impact TRANS-5: Disruption of Rail Traffic during Construction**

8 ***Byron Tract Forebay and Conveyance***

9 Under the proposed project, two 40-foot tunnels would run approximately 1.58 miles from the new
10 Byron Tract Forebay to the South Tunnel Outlet structure. These tunnels would be at approximately
11 the same depth as those entering the Byron Tract Forebay at 100-150 feet below grade. Two open
12 canals would also be constructed. One 2,800 foot canal connecting the south tunnel outlet structure
13 to the existing Banks Pumping Plant intake channel would be constructed, as well as one 4,815 foot
14 canal connecting the south tunnel outlet structure to the existing Jones Pumping Plant intake
15 channel.

16 ***NEPA Effects:*** These features under the proposed project would not require re-routing of either
17 Byron Highway or the UPRR Tracy Subdivision (branch line) which runs parallel to Byron Highway.
18 The effect of this crossing would be minimal to non-existent because the proposed conveyance
19 would traverse the railroad in a deep bore tunnel. Construction contractors and the lead agencies
20 would be in close contact with the UPRR to coordinate construction. Additionally, much of this line
21 has not been in service recently. The UPRR may return it to freight service in the future.

22 Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a, which, among other things, includes stipulations to coordinate with
23 rail providers (BNSF Railway, Amtrak, and UPRR) to develop alternative interim transportation
24 modes (e.g., trucks or buses) would address this effect. This measure, as written in the Final EIR/EIS,
25 remains adequate without change for dealing with the impacts of the proposed project. Therefore,
26 there would be no adverse effect.

27 ***CEQA Conclusion:*** Construction of the proposed project would physically cross or require
28 modification to an existing or proposed railroad. The water conveyance would cross the UPRR Tracy
29 Subdivision branch line well below grade in a deep bore tunnel. Accordingly, construction would not
30 be likely to disrupt rail service at this location. Additionally, implementation of Mitigation Measure
31 TRANS-1a which, among other things, includes stipulations to coordinate with rail providers (BNSF
32 Railway, Amtrak, and UPRR) to develop alternative transportation modes (e.g., trucks or buses)
33 would ensure this impact remains less than significant, the same as under the approved project.

34 **Incremental Impact:** The impact on disruption of rail traffic during construction under the
35 proposed project would be the same as under the approved project. The impact under the
36 proposed project would remain less than significant, especially with implementation of
37 Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.

38 **Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a: Implement Site-Specific Construction Traffic Management** 39 **Plan**

40 Please refer to Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a under Impact TRANS-1 in Final EIR/EIS Chapter
41 19.

1 **Impact TRANS-15: Potential Effects on Navigation Caused by Sedimentation from**
2 **Construction of Barge Facilities**

3 Under the proposed project, five temporary barge unloading facilities would be constructed at
4 locations adjacent to construction work areas for the delivery of construction materials. Each of the
5 five proposed barge unloading facilities would include in-water and over-water structures, such as
6 piling dolphins, docks, ramps, and possibly conveyors for loading and unloading materials; and
7 vehicles and other machinery. Construction of the five barge unloading facilities would involve piles
8 at each site.

9 **NEPA Effects:** To address potential erosion and sedimentation impacts from barge facility
10 construction associated with the proposed project, the lead agencies would ensure that a Barge
11 Operations Plan is developed and implemented for facility construction. The requirements for the
12 Barge Operations Plan are described in Appendix 3B, *Environmental Commitments, AMMs, and CMs*,
13 in the Final EIR/EIS. This commitment is related to *AMM7 Barge Operations Plan*, described in
14 Appendix 3B and BDCP Appendix 3.C, *Avoidance and Minimization Measures*. This plan would be
15 developed and submitted by the construction contractors pursuant to standard DWR contract
16 specifications. Erosion control measures during construction activities at project locations are
17 provided in Appendix 3B. Fleeting facilities would be either docking facilities built through pile and
18 wharves or loaded and unloaded using landward positioned cranes. In either case, through AMM7
19 and the environmental commitments, sedimentation effects of construction-related activities would
20 be localized and minimal.

21 Implementation of Mitigation Measure SW-4 would further ensure that impacts from sedimentation
22 are minimal. This measure, as written in the Final EIR/EIS, remains adequate without change for
23 dealing with the impacts of the proposed project. Therefore, it would not be adverse. Construction
24 and operation of the barge facilities under the proposed project would not have an adverse effect on
25 navigation.

26 **CEQA Conclusion:** Because they would not involve a physical change in the environment, effects on
27 navigation caused by changes in sedimentation, by themselves, are not considered environmental
28 impacts under CEQA. Any secondary physical environmental impacts that may result are covered
29 under other impacts. Nonetheless, as explained above, changes in sedimentation from the
30 temporary barge facilities would not have a significant impact on navigation.

31 **Incremental Impact:** The incremental impact on navigation caused by sedimentation from
32 construction of barge facilities under the proposed project would be slightly less than under the
33 approved project because only five barge unloading facilities would be constructed instead of
34 seven. However, due to the implementation of Mitigation Measure SW-4 and environmental
35 commitments requiring a Barge Operations Plan and erosion control measures, the impact
36 under the proposed project would remain less than significant, as it would be under the
37 approved project.

38 **Mitigation Measure SW-4: Implement Measures to Reduce Runoff and Sedimentation**

39 Please refer to Mitigation Measure SW-4 under Impact SW-4 in Chapter 6, *Surface Water*, of the
40 Final EIR/EIS.

1 **Impact TRANS-16: Potential Effects on Navigation Caused by Sedimentation from**
2 **Construction of Clifton Court Forebay**

3 Under the proposed project, Clifton Court Forebay would not be dredged or redesigned unlike under
4 the approved project.

5 **NEPA Effects:** There would be no effect on navigation related to Clifton Court Forebay dredging
6 because under the proposed project, Clifton Court Forebay, which already is not open to commercial
7 or recreational navigation, would not be dredged or redesigned, and no changes would be made to
8 the existing forebay.

9 **CEQA Conclusion:** There would be no impact on navigation related to Clifton Court Forebay
10 dredging because, under the proposed project, the forebay would not be altered.

11 **Incremental Impact:** The impact on navigation caused by sedimentation from construction of
12 Clifton Court Forebay under the proposed project would be the same as under the approved
13 project. There would be no impact under the proposed project. No mitigation is required.

14 **19.3.3 Cumulative Analysis**

15 The Final EIR/EIS found that there was a potential for the approved project to have a cumulative
16 effect on transportation systems, both as a result of construction as well as from operations and
17 maintenance activities. The analysis for cumulative effects on transportation systems remains the
18 same as described in the Final EIR/EIS with consideration of the proposed project modifications.

19 Although Mitigation Measures TRANS-1 and TRANS-2 would reduce the severity of this impact, the
20 lead agencies cannot ensure that the improvements will be fully funded or constructed prior to the
21 project's contribution to the impact. If an improvement identified in the mitigation agreement(s) is
22 not fully funded and constructed before the project's contribution to the effect is made, construction
23 of the proposed project combined with other projects in the study area would make a cumulatively
24 considerable contribution to the effects on transportation systems in the Delta. Accordingly, this
25 effect would be significant and unavoidable, same as under the approved project.

26 **Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a: Implement Site-Specific Construction Traffic Management**
27 **Plan**

28 Please refer to Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a under Impact TRANS-1 in Final EIR/EIS Chapter
29 19.

30 **Mitigation Measure TRANS-1b: Limit Hours or Amount of Construction Activity on**
31 **Congested Roadway Segments**

32 Please refer to Mitigation Measure TRANS-1b under Impact TRANS-1 in Final EIR/EIS
33 Chapter 19.

34 **Mitigation Measure TRANS-1c: Make Good Faith Efforts to Enter into Mitigation**
35 **Agreements to Enhance Capacity of Congested Roadway Segments**

36 Please refer to Mitigation Measure TRANS-1c under Impact TRANS-1 in Final EIR/EIS Chapter
37 19.

1 **Mitigation Measure TRANS-2a: Prohibit Construction Activity on Physically Deficient**
2 **Roadway Segments**

3 Please refer to Mitigation Measure TRANS-2a under Impact TRANS-2 in Final EIR/EIS Chapter
4 19.

5 **Mitigation Measure TRANS-2b: Limit Construction Activity on Physically Deficient**
6 **Roadway Segments**

7 Please refer to Mitigation Measure TRANS-2b under Impact TRANS-2 in Final EIR/EIS Chapter
8 19.

9 **Mitigation Measure TRANS-2c: Improve Physical Condition of Affected Roadway Segments**
10 **as Stipulated in Mitigation Agreements or Encroachment Permits**

11 Please refer to Mitigation Measure TRANS-2c under Impact TRANS-2 in Final EIR/EIS Chapter
12 19.

13 **19.4 References Cited**

14 Delta Protection Commission. 2012. *Economic Sustainability Plan for the Sacramento-San Joaquin*
15 *Delta*. Available: <http://www.delta.ca.gov/res/docs/ESP_1_12.pdf>. Accessed: March 5, 2012.