

3A.15 TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION – LAND

This chapter presents the results of the transportation impact analysis (TIA) prepared by DKS Associates (DKS) for implementation of full buildout of the Proposed Project. Because of the large volume of raw data generated during traffic counts and modeling analyses conducted in support of the traffic analysis, it is not feasible to provide these data as an appendix to this draft environmental impact report/environmental impact statement (DEIR/DEIS). However, the data are available for review at the City of Folsom, 50 Natoma Street, Folsom, CA 95630.

Development of project is anticipated to be completed by the year 2030. The SPA, other areas of Folsom, and cities and communities throughout Sacramento County are expected to experience significant growth over this period. Major projects have been entitled for development throughout the region, and more are expected. As projects develop, traffic will increase on local and regional roadways and freeways. As regional development proceeds, transportation system improvements will be provided through local and regional funding programs, individual project mitigation, and improvements funded by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans).

For analysis purposes, cumulative conditions reflect year 2030 conditions, the anticipated build-out date of the project. Year 2030 land use and transportation networks, described in additional detail later in this section, are based upon regional Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) forecasts as well as General Plan and specific project information in jurisdictions near the SPA. Year 2030 conditions also include the full operation of three rock quarries south of the SPA.

As part of the traffic analysis, the following scenarios were analyzed to assist in the identification of project-related traffic impacts:

- ▶ **Existing conditions – No Project (NP) Alternative** – Existing roadway operations were analyzed using existing roadway geometrics and existing volumes obtained from traffic count data.
- ▶ **Existing conditions – No USACE Permit (NCP) Alternative** – Similar to the Proposed Project Alternative, this scenario assumes full development of the SPA in accordance with the No USACE Permit Alternative. This alternative would change the location of certain portions of development such that no jurisdictional waters of the U.S. would be filled. The total amount of development under the No USACE Permit Alternative is less than the amount of development associated with the Proposed Project Alternative.
- ▶ **Existing conditions – Proposed Project (PP) Alternative** – Although full development of the Proposed Project would likely take many years, this scenario assumes full development of the Proposed Project immediately. In this manner, traffic conditions associated with full Project development can be directly compared to the No Project Alternative. This alternative presents an unlikely condition, given the magnitude of planned development associated with the Project. In reality, the Proposed Project will develop over a period of years (as dictated by market absorption rates), and other development outside the area of the Proposed Project would also occur in this same time frame.
- ▶ **Existing conditions – Resource Impact Minimization (RIM) Alternative** – Similar to the Proposed Project Alternative, this scenario assumes full development of the SPA in accordance with the Resource Impact Minimization Alternative. This alternative would include additional areas of high-quality biological habitat in the proposed preserve area, and would also preserve all of the on-site cultural resources eligible for listing on the California Register of Historic / National Register of Historic Places. The total amount of development under the Resource Impact Minimization Alternative is less than the amount of development associated with the Proposed Project Alternative.

- ▶ **Existing Conditions – Centralized Development (CD) Alternative** – Similar to the Proposed Project Alternative, this scenario assumes full development of the SPA in accordance with the Centralized Development Alternative. This alternative would preserve the eastern portion of the SPA, which lies within the Sierra Nevada foothills, leaving more of this area in its current undeveloped state for aesthetic, biological, and cultural resource purposes. The total amount of development under the Centralized Development Alternative is less than the amount of development associated with the Proposed Project Alternative.
- ▶ **Existing Conditions – Reduced Hillside Development (RHD) Alternative** – Similar to the Proposed Project Alternative, this scenario assumes full development of the SPA in accordance with the Reduced Hillside Development Alternative. This alternative would reduce the development area on the eastern portion of the SPA, which lies within the Sierra Nevada foothills, leaving more of this area in its current undeveloped state for aesthetic, biological, and cultural resource purposes. The total amount of development under the Reduced Hillside Development Alternative is greater than the amount of development associated with the Proposed Project Alternative, but the development is more compact.
- ▶ **Cumulative Conditions – No Project (NP) Alternative** – This scenario analyzes roadway conditions in the year 2030, assuming that the Proposed Project is not built. All cumulative scenarios incorporate roadway improvement projects associated with assumed development projects in the area, as identified by the City; Tier I projects identified in the SACOG *Metropolitan Transportation Plan for 2035* (MTP 2035) (SACOG 2008) that are outside the city limits through the year 2030; and additional improvements identified by the City that would be required pursuant to the City’s capital improvement program (CIP).
- ▶ **Cumulative Conditions – No USACE Permit (NCP) Alternative** – This scenario assumes full development of the No USACE Permit Alternative in the year 2030, with the same off-site land use and roadway assumptions as the No Project Alternative.
- ▶ **Cumulative Conditions – Proposed Project (PP) Alternative** – This scenario assumes full development of the Proposed Project in the year 2030, with the same off-site land use and roadway assumptions as the No Project Alternative.
- ▶ **Cumulative Conditions – Resource Impact Minimization (RIM) Alternative** – This scenario assumes full development of the Resource Impact Minimization Alternative in the year 2030, with the same off-site land use and roadway assumptions as the No Project Alternative.
- ▶ **Cumulative conditions – Centralized Development (CD) Alternative** – This scenario assumes full development of the Centralized Development Alternative in the year 2030, with the same off-site land use and roadway assumptions as the No Project Alternative.
- ▶ **Cumulative conditions – Reduced Hillside Development (RHD) Alternative** – This scenario assumes full development of the Reduced Hillside Development Alternative in the year 2030, with the same off-site land use and roadway assumptions as the No Project Alternative.

3A.15.1 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

The site location and surrounding roadway network are shown in Exhibit 3A.15-1. The SPA is in unincorporated Sacramento County, and is generally bounded by U.S. Highway 50 (U.S. 50) to the north, White Rock Road to the south, Prairie City Road to the west and the El Dorado County line to the east. Annexation into the City of Folsom would be a part of the project. Detailed traffic analyses were performed for the intersections, roadway segments, freeway facilities, and interchanges shown in Table 3A.15-1. The study roadway segments, intersections, and freeway facilities identified for inclusion in this analysis were selected in consultation with City of Folsom, City of Rancho Cordova, Sacramento County, El Dorado County and Caltrans staff members.

**Table 3A.15-1
Locations of Detailed Traffic Analyses**

Intersections	
City of Folsom	Sacramento County
1. Folsom Boulevard / Blue Ravine Road	1. Hazel Avenue / Gold Country Boulevard
2. Sibly Street / Blue Ravine Road	2. Hazel Avenue / Folsom Boulevard
3. Oak Avenue Parkway / Blue Ravine Road	3. Grant Line Road / White Rock Road
4. Empire Ranch Road / Natoma Street	4. Grant Line Road / Sunrise Boulevard
5. Oak Avenue Parkway / Riley Street	5. Hazel Avenue / Easton Valley Parkway (Cumulative)
6. Oak Avenue Parkway / East Bidwell Street	6. Aerojet Road / Easton Valley Parkway (Cumulative)
7. Nesmith Court / East Bidwell Street	7. Alabama Avenue / Easton Valley Parkway (Cumulative)
8. Scholar Way / East Bidwell Street	8. Glenborough Road / Easton Valley Parkway (Cumulative)
9. Power Center Drive / East Bidwell Street	City of Rancho Cordova
10. Broadstone Parkway / East Bidwell Street	1. Sunrise Boulevard / White Rock Road
11. Empire Ranch Road / Broadstone Parkway	2. Fitzgerald Road / White Rock Road
12. Oak Avenue Parkway / Haverhill Drive	3. Sunrise Boulevard / Douglas Road
13. Oak Avenue Parkway / Halidon Way	4. Grant Line Road / Douglas Road
14. Folsom Boulevard / Iron Point Road	5. Grant Line Road / Kiefer Road
15. Prairie City Road / Iron Point Road	6. Rancho Cordova Parkway / Easton Valley Parkway (Cumulative)
16. Grover Road / Iron Point Road	7. Rancho Cordova Parkway / White Rock Road (Cumulative)
17. McAdoo Drive / Iron Point Road	8. International Drive / White Rock Road (Cumulative)
18. Oak Avenue Parkway / Iron Point Road	9. Rio Del Oro Parkway / White Rock Road (Cumulative)
19. Rowberry Drive / Iron Point Road	10. Villagio Parkway / White Rock Road (Cumulative)
20. Broadstone Parkway / Iron Point Road	11. Sunrise Boulevard / International Drive (Cumulative)
21. East Bidwell Street / Iron Point Road	12. Villagio Parkway / Americanos Road (Cumulative)
22. Cavitt Road / Iron Point Road	13. Villagio Parkway / Rancho Cordova Parkway (Cumulative)
23. Serpa Way / Iron Point Road	14. Grant Line Road / Centennial Road
24. Empire Ranch Road / Iron Point Road	15. Rancho Cordova Parkway / Douglas Road (Cumulative)
25. Prairie City Road / High School	16. Americanos Boulevard / Douglas Road (Cumulative)
26. East Bidwell Street / Placerville Road	17. Grant Line Road / Chrysanthy Boulevard
27. Prairie City Road / White Rock Road	18. Grant Line Road / Rancho Cordova Parkway
28. Scott Road (West) / White Rock Road	El Dorado County
29. Scott Road (East) / White Rock Road	1. White Rock Road / Carson Crossing Road
30. Placerville Road / White Rock Road	2. White Rock Road / Stonebriar Drive
31. Empire Ranch Road / North Road (Project)	3. White Rock Road / Windfield Way
32. Prairie City Road / Easton Valley Parkway (Project)	4. White Rock Road / Latrobe Road
33. Oak Avenue Parkway / Easton Valley Parkway (Project)	5. White Rock Road / Valley View Parkway
34. Rowberry Drive / Easton Valley Parkway (Project)	6. El Dorado Hills Boulevard / Serrano Parkway
35. 1 st Street / Easton Valley Parkway (Project)	7. El Dorado Hills Boulevard / Saratoga Way
36. 2 nd Street / Easton Valley Parkway (Project)	8. El Dorado Hills Boulevard / Park Drive
37. 3 rd Street / Easton Valley Parkway (Project)	9. Latrobe Road / Town Center Boulevard
38. Scott Road (East) / Easton Valley Parkway (Project)	Caltrans
39. Power Center Drive / Easton Valley Parkway (Project)	1. Hazel Avenue / Tributary - WB U.S. 50 ramps
40. Placerville Road / Easton Valley Parkway (Project)	2. Hazel Avenue / EB U.S. 50 ramps
41. Hillside Drive / Easton Valley Parkway (Project)	3. Folsom Boulevard / WB U.S. 50 ramps
42. Empire Ranch Road / Easton Valley Parkway (Project)	4. Folsom Boulevard / EB U.S. 50 ramps
43. Prairie City Road / Middle Road (Project)	5. Prairie City Road / WB U.S. 50 ramps
44. Oak Avenue Parkway / Middle Road (Project)	6. Prairie City Road / EB U.S. 50 ramps
45. Scott Road (East) / Street "B" (Project)	7. East Bidwell Street / WB U.S. 50 ramps
46. East Road / Street "B" (Project)	8. East Bidwell Street / EB U.S. 50 ramps
47. Prairie City Road / Street "A" (Project)	9. El Dorado Hills Boulevard / WB U.S. 50 ramps
48. Oak Avenue Parkway / Street "A" (Project)	10. El Dorado Hills Boulevard / EB U.S. 50 ramps
49. West Road / Street "A" (Project)	11. Sunrise Boulevard / Jackson Highway (SR 16)
50. Scott Road (East) / Street "A" (Project)	12. Grant Line Road / Jackson Highway (SR 16)
51. East Road / Street "A" (Project)	13. Oak Avenue Parkway / WB U.S. 50 ramps (Cumulative)
52. Placerville Road / Street "A" (Project)	14. Oak Avenue Parkway / EB U.S. 50 ramps (Cumulative)
53. Empire Ranch Road / Street "A" (Project)	15. Empire Ranch Road / WB U.S. 50 ramps (Cumulative)
54. Scott Road (East) / South Road (Project)	16. Empire Ranch Road / EB U.S. 50 ramps (Cumulative)
55. Oak Avenue Parkway / White Rock Road (Project)	17. Silva Valley / WB U.S. 50 ramps (Cumulative)
56. Empire Ranch Road / White Rock Road (Project)	18. Silva Valley / EB U.S. 50 ramps (Cumulative)

**Table 3A.15-1
Locations of Detailed Traffic Analyses**

Roadways	
Sacramento County	
1. Folsom Boulevard—Sunrise Boulevard to Mercantile Drive	29. Easton Valley Parkway—Hazel Avenue to Aerojet Road
2. Folsom Boulevard—Mercantile Drive to Hazel Avenue	30. Easton Valley Parkway—Aerojet Road to Alabama Avenue
3. Folsom Boulevard—Hazel Avenue to Aerojet Road	31. Easton Valley Parkway—Alabama Avenue to Glenborough Road
4. Folsom Boulevard—Aerojet Road to U.S. 50	32. Easton Valley Parkway—Glenborough Road to Oak Avenue Parkway
5. Grant Line Road—White Rock Road to Centennial Road	33. Empire Ranch Road—White Rock Road to Carson Crossing Road
6. Grant Line Road—Centennial Road to Douglas Road	
7. Grant Line Road—Douglas Road to Keifer Boulevard	
8. Grant Line Road—Keifer Boulevard to Jackson Road	City of Rancho Cordova
9. Grant Line Road—Jackson Road to Sunrise Boulevard	1. Douglas Road—Sunrise Boulevard to Grant Line Road
10. Hazel Avenue—Greenback Lane to Madison Avenue	2. Grant Line Road—White Rock Road to Douglas Road
11. Hazel Avenue—Madison Avenue to Curragh Downs Drive	3. Grant Line Road—Douglas Road to Keifer Boulevard
12. Hazel Avenue—Curragh Downs Drive to Gold Country Boulevard	4. Grant Line Road—Keifer Boulevard to Jackson Road
13. Hazel Avenue—Gold Country Boulevard to U.S. 50	5. Sunrise Boulevard—U.S. 50 to Folsom Boulevard
14. SR 16—Dillard Road to Murieta Parkway	6. Sunrise Boulevard—Folsom Boulevard to White Rock Road
15. SR 16—Grant Line Road to Dillard Road	7. Sunrise Boulevard—White Rock Road to Douglas Road
16. Prairie City Road—U.S. 50 to Easton Valley Parkway	8. Sunrise Boulevard—Douglas Road to Keifer Boulevard
17. Prairie City Road—Easton Valley Parkway to White Rock Road	9. Sunrise Boulevard—Keifer Boulevard to SR 16
18. Scott Road—White Rock Road to Latrobe Road	10. White Rock Road—Zinfandel Drive to Sunrise Boulevard
19. Stonehouse Road—Latrobe Road to SR 16	11. White Rock Road—Sunrise Boulevard to Fitzgerald Road
20. Sunrise Boulevard—Jackson Road to Grant Line Road	12. White Rock Road—Fitzgerald Road to Rancho Cordova Parkway
21. White Rock Road—Fitzgerald Road (Villagio Parkway) to Grant Line Road	13. White Rock Road—Rancho Cordova Parkway to International Drive
22. White Rock Road—Grant Line Road to Prairie City Road	14. White Rock Road—International Drive to Rio Del Oro Parkway
23. White Rock Road—Prairie City Road to Scott Road (West)	15. White Rock Road—Rio Del Oro Parkway to Villagio Parkway
24. White Rock Road—Scott Road (West) to Oak Avenue Parkway	16. SR 16—Sunrise Boulevard to Grant Line Road
25. White Rock Road—Oak Avenue Parkway to Scott Road (East)	17. International Drive—Sunrise Boulevard to Rancho Cordova Parkway
26. White Rock Road—Scott Road (East) to Placerville Road	18. International Drive—Rancho Cordova Parkway to Americanos Boulevard
27. White Rock Road—Placerville Road to Empire Ranch Road	19. International Drive—Americanos Boulevard to White Rock Road
28. White Rock Road—Empire Ranch Road to Carson Crossing Road	
Freeway Segments	
1. U.S. 50—Zinfandel Drive to Sunrise Boulevard	
2. U.S. 50—Sunrise Boulevard to Rancho Cordova Parkway	
3. U.S. 50—Rancho Cordova Parkway to Hazel Avenue	
4. U.S. 50—Hazel Avenue to Folsom Boulevard	
5. U.S. 50—Folsom Boulevard to Prairie City Road	
6. U.S. 50—Prairie City Road to Oak Avenue Parkway	
7. U.S. 50—Oak Avenue Parkway to East Bidwell Street—Scott Road	
8. U.S. 50—East Bidwell Street—Scott Road to Empire Ranch Road	
9. U.S. 50—Empire Ranch Road to El Dorado Hills Boulevard—Latrobe Road	
10. U.S. 50—El Dorado Hills Boulevard—Latrobe Road to Silva Valley Road	
11. U.S. 50—Silva Valley Road to Bass Lake Road	
Interchanges	
1. Hazel Avenue interchange at U.S. 50	
2. Folsom Boulevard interchange at U.S. 50	
3. Prairie City Road interchange at U.S. 50	
4. Oak Avenue Parkway interchange at U.S. 50—build and cumulative scenarios	
5. East Bidwell Street—Road interchange at U.S. 50	
6. Empire Ranch Road interchange at U.S. 50—build and cumulative scenarios	
7. El Dorado Hills Boulevard—Latrobe Road interchange at U.S. 50	
8. Silva Valley Road interchange at U.S. 50—cumulative scenarios	
Notes: SR = State Route; U.S. 50 = U.S. Highway 50	
Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2006–2007	

EXISTING ROADWAY NETWORK

Exhibit 3A.15-1 shows the surface roadways in the vicinity of the SPA and the number of lanes on each roadway. Intersection lane configurations and traffic control devices for the existing roadway network were obtained during a field visit to the project study area in fall 2007. The lane configurations are shown in Exhibits 3A.15-2 through 3A.15-6. A brief description of each of the key roadways in the project study area is provided below.

U.S. Highway 50

U.S. Highway 50 (U.S. 50) is an east-west freeway that extends from the Interstate 80 (I-80) junction in West Sacramento to Canal Street in the City of Placerville, where it continues as a highway across the Sierra Nevada to South Lake Tahoe and Nevada. West of Sunrise Boulevard it is an eight lane freeway. Between Sunrise Boulevard and Folsom Boulevard it has six mixed flow lanes and two High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes (carpool lanes). Between Folsom Boulevard and El Dorado Hills Boulevard U.S. 50 has four mixed flow lanes and two HOV lanes. East of El Dorado Hills Boulevard it has four mixed flow lanes.

Prairie City Road

Prairie City Road is a north-south arterial that extends from Blue Ravine Road (north of Blue Ravine Road it is called Sibley Street) to White Rock Road. It is a five lane urban arterial road between Blue Ravine Road and Iron Point Road. Prairie City Road is a six lane urban arterial road between Iron Point Road and U.S. 50. It is a two lane rural road between U.S. 50 and White Rock Road.

Scott Road

Scott Road is a north-south two lane rural road that extends from U.S. 50 at East Bidwell Street to White Rock Road. Another segment of Scott Road extends southerly from White Rock Road to Latrobe Road.

Placerville Road

Placerville Road is a two lane north-south rural road that extends from East Bidwell Street to White Rock Road, where it continues as Payen Road.

White Rock Road

White Rock Road is an east-west arterial that extends from International Drive in Rancho Cordova to Silva Valley Road in El Dorado County. It is a two lane rural road between Sunrise Boulevard in Rancho Cordova and Carson Crossing Road in El Dorado County. It is a two lane urban arterial road between Carson Crossing Road and Silva Valley Road, with a four lane section between Manchester Drive and Latrobe Road.

Blue Ravine Road

Blue Ravine Road is a southwest-northeast arterial that extends from Folsom Boulevard to East Natoma Street, where it becomes Green Valley Road. It is a six lane arterial road between Folsom Boulevard and Prairie City Road. It is a four lane urban arterial road between Prairie City Road and East Natoma Street.

East Bidwell Street

East Bidwell Street is a northwest-southeast arterial that extends from Riley Street to U.S. 50, where it becomes Scott Road. It is a four lane urban arterial road between Riley Street and Oak Avenue Parkway. It is a five lane urban arterial road between Oak Avenue Parkway and Clarksville Road – Scholar Road. It is a six lane arterial road between Clarksville Road – Scholar Road and U.S. 50.

Folsom Boulevard

Folsom Boulevard is a four lane east-west arterial road that extends from the City of Sacramento to Greenback Lane, where it becomes Folsom Auburn Road. In the City of Folsom, between U.S. 50 and Greenback Lane, it has a generally north-south alignment.

Oak Avenue Parkway

Oak Avenue Parkway is a north-south arterial that extends from Willow Creek Drive to Iron Point Road. It is a four lane urban arterial road between Willow Creek Drive and Blue Ravine Road. It is a six lane urban arterial road between Blue Ravine Road and Riley Street. It is a four lane urban arterial road between Riley Street and Iron Point Road.

Broadstone Parkway

Broadstone Parkway is a four lane east-west arterial that extends from Iron Point Road to Empire Ranch Road. It has six through lanes at the East Bidwell Street intersection.

Empire Ranch Road

Empire Ranch Road is a four lane north-south arterial that extends from East Natoma Street (it continues north as Sophia Parkway in El Dorado County) to Iron Point Road.

Iron Point Road

Iron Point Road is an east-west arterial that extends from Folsom Boulevard to the El Dorado County Line. It is a six lane urban arterial road between Folsom Boulevard and Black Diamond Road. It is a four lane urban arterial road between Black Diamond Road and Prairie City Road. Iron Point Road is a six lane urban arterial road between Prairie City Road and Buckingham Way. It is a four lane urban arterial road between Buckingham Way and Broadstone Parkway. Iron Point Road is a six lane urban arterial road between Broadstone Parkway and Carpenter Hill Road. It is a four lane urban arterial road between Carpenter Hill Road and the El Dorado County Line.

Sunrise Boulevard

Sunrise Boulevard is a north-south arterial that extends from I-80 in Placer County to Grant Line Road. It is a six lane urban arterial road from north of Greenback Lane to Douglas Road. It is a five lane urban arterial road between Douglas Road and Kiefer Road. It is a two lane rural road between Douglas Road and Grant Line Road.

Hazel Boulevard

Hazel Boulevard is a north-south arterial that extends from the Placer county line (where it continues north as Sierra College Boulevard) to Folsom Boulevard. It is a four lane urban arterial road from Sierra College Boulevard to Gold Country Boulevard. It is a six lane urban arterial road between Gold Country Boulevard and U.S. 50. It is a four lane urban arterial road between U.S. 50 and Folsom Boulevard.

Grant Line Road

Grant Line Road is a southwest-northeast two lane rural road that extends from State Route 99 freeway in Elk Grove to White Rock Road.

El Dorado Hills Boulevard

El Dorado Hills Boulevard is an El Dorado County north-south arterial that extends from Green Valley Road, where it continues as Salmon Falls Road, to U.S. 50, where it continues as Latrobe Road. It is a six lane urban arterial road between Serrano Parkway and U.S. 50.

Latrobe Road

Latrobe Road is an El Dorado County north-south arterial that extends from U.S. 50, where it continues as El Dorado Hills Boulevard, to State Route 16. It is a six lane urban arterial road between U.S. 50 and White Rock Road. Latrobe Road is a four lane urban arterial road between White Rock Road and Suncastr Lane. It is a two lane urban road from Suncastr Lane to Investment Boulevard and a two lane rural road south of Investment Boulevard.

EXISTING TRAFFIC VOLUMES

DKS Associates conducted traffic counts in June 2006 and in November 2007, to determine a.m. and p.m. peak-period intersection turning volumes in the project study area. Average daily traffic (ADT) counts collected by Sacramento County between 2005 and 2007 were used. Freeway traffic count data was gathered from previous studies, including the Easton Glenborough Specific Plan EIR and the U.S. 50 Auxiliary Lanes Project Study Report (PSR). Traffic counts were gathered for all roadway segments and intersections in the project study area. The existing intersection volumes are shown in Exhibits 3A.15-2 through 3A.15-6. ADT volumes for existing roadways are presented in Exhibit 3A.15-7. Freeway volumes are illustrated in Exhibit 3A.15-8.

EXISTING TRANSIT SERVICE

Sacramento Regional Transit (RT) operates bus and light-rail transit (LRT) service in Sacramento County. The City of Folsom provides local bus transit within the City. El Dorado County Transit provides commuter bus transit. The existing transit services near the SPA are described below and are shown in Exhibit 3A.15-9.

Fixed-Route Bus Service

There is no regular fixed route bus service in the project area. Fixed-route bus service is provided north of the SPA. Folsom Stage Line Route 10 provides service along Iron Point Road between Folsom Boulevard and East Bidwell Street. El Dorado County Transit's Iron Point Connector operates along U.S. 50 and Iron Point Road during weekday peak periods only. The following describes these individual routes in greater detail.

- ▶ **Folsom Stage Line Route 10** provides service between the intersection of Main Street and Madison Avenue, and the Iron Point Road light-rail station. Weekday service is provided between 6:41 a.m. and 9:08 p.m. on a 60-minute headway. ("Headway" is the amount of time between buses. For example, if a bus on the same route arrives at a given stop every 60 minutes, it is operating on a 60-minute headway.) No Saturday, Sunday or holiday service is provided.
- ▶ **El Dorado County Transit's Iron Point Connector** provides fixed-route service between Placerville and the Iron Point Road light-rail station on weekdays only. The route operates between 5:40 a.m. and 7:27 p.m. on a 120-minute headway. No Saturday, Sunday or holiday service is provided.

Light-Rail Transit Service

LRT service is provided from downtown Sacramento along the Folsom Boulevard / U.S. 50 corridor to the Historic Folsom light-rail station, with stops at Glenn Drive, Iron Point Road, Hazel Avenue and Sunrise Boulevard in the project vicinity. During peak periods, service runs every half hour east of the Sunrise Boulevard

station and every 15 minutes west of the Sunrise Boulevard station. The trains run from 5:00 AM to 7:00 PM east of the Sunrise Boulevard station and 5:00 AM to 12:00 AM west of the Sunrise Boulevard station.

EXISTING BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN SYSTEM

There are no existing bicycle or pedestrian facilities in the project area. There is a sidewalk on the south side of White Rock Road just east of the El Dorado County line. All City of Folsom roadways in the study have sidewalks, and all City of Folsom major streets have bike lanes.

EXISTING TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

Existing operations of roadways, intersections, freeway facilities, and bicycle/pedestrian facilities in the project study area are discussed below.

Analysis Methodology

The operations of roadway facilities are described in terms of level of service (LOS). LOS is a qualitative description of traffic flow based on factors such as speed, travel time, delay, freedom to maneuver, volume, density, and capacity. Six levels are defined, from LOS A, as the best operating conditions, to LOS F, or the worst operating conditions. LOS E represents “at-capacity” operations. When volumes exceed capacity, stop-and-go conditions result and operations are designated as LOS F.

Level of Service Standards

For roadways within the City of Folsom’s existing boundaries (north of U.S. 50), LOS C is considered the minimum acceptable operating condition. For roadways within the project boundaries (south of U.S. 50), LOS D conditions can be considered acceptable if improvements required to meet LOS C exceeds the City’s “normally accepted maximum” improvements.

For roadways under the jurisdiction of Sacramento County, LOS E is considered the minimum acceptable operating condition within the Urban Service Area. Outside the Urban Service Area, LOS D is considered the minimum acceptable operating condition.

For roadways under the jurisdiction of the City of Rancho Cordova, LOS D is considered the minimum acceptable operating condition.

For roadways under the jurisdiction of El Dorado County, LOS E is considered the minimum acceptable operating condition.

The standards for Caltrans’ facilities in the study area are detailed in the U.S. 50 Corridor System Management Plan (CSMP) and the SR 16 Route Concept Report. The 20-Year Concept LOS for U.S. 50 in the study area is LOS F, because improvements necessary to improve the LOS to E are not feasible due to environmental, right-of-way, financial, and other constraints. For SR 16, LOS E is considered the minimum acceptable operating condition.

Signalized Intersections

Signalized intersections in the City of Folsom and in El Dorado County were analyzed using the methodology contained in Chapter 16 of the *Highway Capacity Manual* (Transportation Research Board 2000) consistent with the El Dorado County Guidelines. The LOS rating is based on the average control delay expressed in seconds per vehicle, as shown in Table 3A.15-2.

Table 3A.15-2 Definitions of Intersection Levels of Service				
Level of Service	Description	Unsignalized Intersection Control Delay (sec/veh)	Signalized Intersection Control Delay (sec/veh)	Signalized Intersection Volume-to-Capacity Ratio
A	Represents free flow. Individual users are virtually unaffected by others in the traffic stream.	≤ 10.0	≤ 10.0	≤ 0.60
B	Stable flow, but the presence of other users in the traffic stream begins to be noticeable.	10.1—15.0	10.1—20.0	0.61—0.70
C	Stable flow, but the beginning of the range of flow in which the operation of individual users becomes significantly affected by interactions with others in the traffic stream.	15.1—25.0	20.1—35.0	0.71—0.80
D	Represents high-density, but stable flow.	25.1—35.0	35.1—55.0	0.81—0.90
E	Represents operating conditions at or near the capacity level.	35.1—50.0	55.1—80.0	0.91—1.00
F	Represents forced or breakdown flow.	> 50.0	> 80.0	> 1.00

Note: sec/veh = seconds per vehicle
Sources: Transportation Research Board 1980, 2000

Signalized intersections in Sacramento County and in the City of Rancho Cordova were analyzed using the methodology contained in *Interim Materials on Highway Capacity* (Circular 212) (Transportation Research Board 1980), consistent with the Sacramento County Guidelines. This methodology determines the intersection LOS by comparing the critical volume to capacity (V/C) ratio at the intersection to the thresholds shown in last column of Table 3A.15-2. Because the County Guidelines specify higher capacities (based on field measurements) than those originally published in Circular 212, the capacities at signalized intersections were increased as follows:

- ▶ Four or more critical-phase operations: from 1,375 to 1,500 vehicles per lane per hour
- ▶ Three critical-phase operations: from 1,425 to 1,550 vehicles per lane per hour
- ▶ Two critical-phase operations: from 1,500 to 1,650 vehicles per lane per hour

Unsignalized (Stop-Controlled) Intersections

For unsignalized (four-way stop-controlled and side-street stop-controlled) intersections, the LOS analysis was conducted using the methodology contained in Chapter 17 of the *Highway Capacity Manual* (Transportation Research Board 2000). The LOS rating is based on the control delay expressed in seconds per vehicle. At two-way or side-street stop-controlled intersections, LOS is calculated for the stopped movements (worst movement reported and evaluated), not for the intersection as a whole. For approaches composed of a single lane, the control delay is computed as the average of all movements in that lane. At all-way stop-controlled intersections, LOS is based on the average delay experienced on all approaches. Table 3A.15-2 summarizes the relationship between delay and LOS for unsignalized intersections.

Roadway Segments

Roadway segments were analyzed by comparing the ADT volume to daily volume thresholds. Table 3A.15-3 displays the daily volume thresholds for various facility types. These thresholds were used as guidelines to determine the need for new or upgraded facilities. In general, analysis of intersection operations provides a more realistic assessment of traffic conditions on a road than analysis of roadway segments.

**Table 3A.15-3
Daily Volume Thresholds for Roadway Segments¹**

Facility Type	Number of Lanes	Daily Volume Threshold (Level of Service)				
		LOS A	LOS B	LOS C	LOS D	LOS E
Residential	2	600	1,200	2,000	3,000	4,500
Residential local road with frontage	2	1,600	3,200	4,800	6,400	8,000
Residential local road without frontage	2	6,000	7,000	8,000	9,000	10,000
Secondary road, low access control	2	9,000	10,000	12,000	13,500	15,000
	4	18,000	21,000	24,000	27,000	30,000
Secondary road, moderate access control	6	27,000	31,500	36,000	40,500	45,000
	2	10,800	12,600	14,400	16,200	18,000
Secondary road, high access control	4	21,600	25,200	28,800	32,400	36,000
	6	32,400	37,800	43,200	48,600	54,000
Rural, two-lane highway	2	12,000	14,000	16,000	18,000	20,000
	4	24,000	28,000	32,000	36,000	40,000
Rural, two-lane road, paved shoulders	6	36,000	42,000	48,000	54,000	60,000
	2	2,400	4,800	7,900	13,500	22,900
Rural, two-lane road, no shoulders	2	2,200	4,300	7,100	12,200	20,000
Expressway ²	2	1,800	3,600	5,900	10,100	17,000
	6	24,300	39,720	56,700	72,900	81,000

Note: LOS = level of service
¹ County of Sacramento General Plan Update DEIR, 2009.
² Based on capacities in the Rancho Cordova's General Plan EIR.
Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009.

Freeway Mainline Segments

A freeway mainline segment analysis was conducted based on a regular lane capacity of 2,200 vehicles per hour per lane and a calculated auxiliary lane capacity. This methodology was chosen because it is the analysis methodology typically used to evaluate development impacts to state freeways within the region, and is based on values calibrated to match observations by Caltrans. The freeway mainline capacity has been utilized in various studies in the U.S. 50 Corridor, including the U.S. 50 Major Investment Study (1997). The auxiliary lane capacity for each individual auxiliary lane was calculated based on the length and weaving volume using the methodology from the Traffic Operations Report for U.S. 50 Auxiliary Lane Project (2007). The process in that study was based on the weaving analysis in Chapter 24 of the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM), modified to estimate capacity of auxiliary lanes over 2,500 feet. Table 3A.15-4 summarizes the relationship between volume to capacity ratio and LOS for freeway mainline segments.

Freeway Ramp Merge, Diverge, and Weave Analysis

Freeway ramp junctions (merge / diverge) and weaving area analyses were conducted at area interchanges using the 2000 Highway Capacity Software package. The software is consistent with the methodologies contained in Chapters 24 and 25 of the *Highway Capacity Manual* (Transportation Research Board 2000). This methodology was chosen because it is the analysis methodology typically used by Caltrans for analysis of freeway-ramp merge, diverge, and weave maneuvers and because it correlates the LOS to the expected density of vehicles in passenger cars per mile per lane. Table 3A.15-5 summarizes the relationship between density and LOS for freeway ramp junctions and weaving areas.

Table 3A.15-4 Definitions of Freeway Mainline Segment Levels of Service	
Level of Service	Volume/Capacity ¹
A	< 0.32
B	> 0.32 and < 0.53
C	> 0.53 and < 0.74
D	> 0.74 and < 0.90
E	> 0.90 and < 1.00
F	> 1.00

Note: Volume/Capacity = Volume to Capacity ratio
Source: Transportation Research Board,2000

Table 3A.15-5 Definitions of Freeway Ramp Merge / Diverge and Weaving Levels of Service		
Level of Service	Merge / Diverge Density (pc/mi/l _n) ¹	Freeway Weaving Segment Density (pc/mi/l _n) ¹
A	≤ 10.0	≤ 10.0
B	> 10.0 – 20.0	> 10.0 – 20.0
C	> 20.0 – 28.0	> 20.0 – 28.0
D	> 28.0 – 35.0	> 28.0 – 35.0
E	> 35.0	> 35.0
F	Demand exceeds capacity	Demand exceeds capacity

Note: pc/mi/l_n = passenger cars per mile per lane
Source: Transportation Research Board,2000

City of Folsom

Study Intersections

The existing peak-hour traffic volumes, traffic control, and intersection lane configurations shown in Exhibit 3A.15-2 were used to calculate LOS at the study intersections. Table 3A.15-6 summarizes intersection LOS under existing conditions in the City of Folsom.

The following intersections operate at an unacceptable LOS D, LOS E or LOS F during both the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours:

- ▶ Folsom Boulevard / Blue Ravine Road
- ▶ Prairie City Road / White Rock Road

The following intersections operate at an unacceptable LOS D, LOS E or LOS F during only the a.m. or p.m. peak traffic hour:

- ▶ Sibley Street / Blue Ravine Road
- ▶ East Bidwell Street / Iron Point Road

**Table 3A.15-6
Intersection Levels of Service — Existing Conditions – City of Folsom**

Intersection	Control	A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
		Delay ¹	LOS	Delay	LOS
1. Folsom Boulevard / Blue Ravine Road	Signalized	35.6	D	74.7	E
2. Sibly Street / Blue Ravine Road	Signalized	41.4	D	28.5	C
3. Oak Avenue Parkway / Blue Ravine Road	Signalized	25.2	C	28.4	C
4. Empire Ranch Road / Natoma Street	All-way stop	9.7	A	10.3	B
5. Oak Avenue Parkway / Riley Street	Signalized	24.8	C	26.2	C
6. Oak Avenue Parkway / East Bidwell Street	Signalized	24.6	C	29.5	C
7. Nesmith Court / East Bidwell Street	Signalized	12.3	B	12.6	B
8. Scholar Way / East Bidwell Street	Signalized	14.1	B	11.1	B
9. Power Center Drive / East Bidwell Street	Signalized	11.6	B	21.5	C
10. Broadstone Parkway / East Bidwell Street	Signalized	19.7	B	24.1	C
11. Empire Ranch Road / Broadstone Parkway	All-way stop	9.2	A	9.1	A
12. Oak Avenue Parkway / Haverhill Drive	Signalized	22.8	C	16.1	B
13. Oak Avenue Parkway / Halidon Way	Signalized	19.2	B	16.1	B
14. Folsom Boulevard / Iron Point Road	Signalized	27.6	C	19.2	B
15. Prairie City Road / Iron Point Road	Signalized	29.1	C	33.6	C
16. Grover Road / Iron Point Road	Signalized	20.2	C	9.0	A
17. McAdoo Drive / Iron Point Road	Signalized	21.3	C	13.8	B
18. Oak Avenue Parkway / Iron Point Road	Signalized	29.8	C	13.4	B
19. Rowberry Drive / Iron Point Road	Signalized	14.5	B	14.7	B
20. Broadstone Parkway / Iron Point Road	Signalized	22.2	C	20.2	C
21. East Bidwell Street / Iron Point Road	Signalized	31.7	C	45.0	D
22. Cavitt Road / Iron Point Road	Signalized	16.2	B	19.0	B
23. Serpa Way / Iron Point Road	Signalized	19.9	A	25.2	A
24. Empire Ranch Road / Iron Point Road	All-way stop	9.3	A	10.7	B
25. Prairie City Road / High School	Signalized	21.8	C	16.0	B
26. East Bidwell Street / Placerville Drive	Side-street stop	0.0	A	0.0	A
27. Prairie City Road / White Rock Road	All-way stop	51.4	F	99.6	F
28. Scott Road (West) / White Rock Road	Side-street stop	15.0	B	18.0	C
29. Scott Road (East) / White Rock Road	All-way stop	17.1	C	23.9	C
30. Placerville Road / White Rock Road	Side-street stop	11.9	B	16.6	C

Notes:

LOS = level of service

¹ Worst-case delay reported for unsignalized, side-street-stop intersections; average intersection delay reported for signalized and all-way-stop intersections. Delays are reported in seconds per vehicle.

Bold indicate deficiency.

Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

Sacramento County

Study Intersections

Table 3A.15-7 summarizes intersection LOS under existing conditions in Sacramento County.

The following intersections operate at an unacceptable LOS F during only the p.m. peak traffic hour:

- ▶ Hazel Avenue / Gold Country Boulevard
- ▶ Grant Line Road / White Rock Road

Table 3A.15-7 Intersection Levels of Service — Existing Conditions – Sacramento County					
Intersection	Control	A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
		V/C ¹ or Delay ²	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS
1. Hazel Avenue / Gold Country Boulevard	Signalized	0.69	B	1.01	F
2. Hazel Avenue / Folsom Boulevard	Signalized	0.61	B	0.87	D
3. Grant Line Road / White Rock Road	Side-street stop	43.5	E	355.5	F
4. Grant Line Road / Sunrise Boulevard	Signalized	0.80	D	0.79	C

Notes:
 LOS = level of service; V/C = volume-to-capacity
¹ V/C ratio is shown for signalized intersections.
² Worst-case delay reported for unsignalized, side-street-stop intersections; average intersection delay reported for all-way-stop intersections. Delays are reported in seconds per vehicle.
Bold indicates deficiency.
 Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

Roadway Segments

Table 3A.15-8 presents the existing conditions analysis for Sacramento County roadway segments in the project study area.

The following roadway segments operate at an unacceptable LOS F (or LOS E outside the Urban Limit Line):

- ▶ Hazel Avenue between Greenback Lane and Gold Country Boulevard
- ▶ Jackson Road between Grant Line Road and Dillard Road (outside the Urban Limit Line)

City of Rancho Cordova

Study Intersections

Table 3A.15-9 summarizes intersection LOS under existing conditions in the City of Rancho Cordova.

All of the intersections operate at an acceptable LOS D or better during both the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hour.

**Table 3A.15-8
Roadway Levels of Service — Existing Conditions – Sacramento County**

Roadway Segment	Existing Conditions			
	Lanes	Volume	V/C	LOS
1. Folsom Boulevard—Sunrise Boulevard to Mercantile Drive	4	19,900	0.55	A
2. Folsom Boulevard—Mercantile Drive to Hazel Avenue	4	14,900	0.41	A
3. Folsom Boulevard—Hazel Avenue to Aerojet Road	4	13,700	0.38	A
4. Folsom Boulevard—Aerojet Road to U.S. 50	4	17,600	0.49	A
5. Grant Line Road—White Rock Road to Douglas Road	2	9,600	0.56	D
6. Grant Line Road—Douglas Road to Keifer Boulevard	2	8,800	0.38	D
7. Grant Line Road—Keifer Boulevard to Jackson Highway (SR 16)	2	7,700	0.34	C
8. Grant Line Road—Jackson Highway (SR 16) to Sunrise Boulevard	2	6,300	0.28	C
9. Hazel Avenue—Greenback Lane to Madison Avenue	4	38,300	1.06	F
10. Hazel Avenue—Madison Avenue to Curragh Downs Drive	4	46,300	1.29	F
11. Hazel Avenue—Curragh Downs Drive to Gold Country Boulevard	4	49,900	1.25	F
12. Hazel Avenue—Gold Country Boulevard to U.S. 50 westbound ramp	6	53,900	0.90	D
13. Jackson Highway (SR 16)—Grant Line Road to Dillard Road	2	14,300	0.62	E
14. Jackson highway (SR 16)—Dillard Road to Stone House Road	2	12,100	0.53	D
15. Prairie City Road—U.S. 50 eastbound ramp to Easton Valley Parkway	2	5,900	0.35	D
16. Prairie City Road—Easton Valley Parkway to White Rock Road	2	5,900	0.35	D
17. Scott Road (West)—White Rock Road to Latrobe Road	2	2,100	0.12	B
18. Stonehouse Road—Latrobe Road to Jackson Highway (SR 16)	2	1,800	0.11	B
19. Sunrise Boulevard—Jackson Highway to Grant Line Road	2	13,300	0.58	D
20. White Rock Road—Fitzgerald Road to Grant Line Road	2	4,100	0.24	C
21. White Rock Road—Grant Line Road to Prairie City Road	2	11,500	0.68	E
22. White Rock Road—Prairie City Road to Scott Road (West)	2	7,600	0.45	D
23. White Rock Road—Scott Road (West) to Oak Avenue Parkway	2	7,600	0.45	D
24. White Rock Road—Oak Avenue Parkway to Scott Road (East)	2	7,600	0.45	D
25. White Rock Road—Scott Road (East) to Placerville Road	2	5,700	0.34	C
26. White Rock Road—Placerville Road to Empire Ranch Road	2	6,800	0.40	D
27. White Rock Road—Empire Ranch Road to Carson Crossing Road	2	6,800	0.40	D

Notes: LOS = level of service; SR = State Route; U.S. 50 = U.S. Highway 50; V/C = volume-to-capacity
Bold indicates deficiency.
Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

Table 3A.15-9 Intersection Levels of Service — Existing Conditions – City of Rancho Cordova					
Intersection	Control	A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
		V/C ¹ or Delay ²	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS
1. Sunrise Boulevard / White Rock Road	Signalized	0.65	B	0.71	C
2. Fitzgerald Road / White Rock Road	All-way stop	14.7	B	16.4	C
3. Sunrise Boulevard / Douglas Road	Signalized	0.78	C	0.68	B
4. Grant Line Road / Douglas Road	Side-street stop	23.8	C	18.2	C
5. Grant Line Road / Kiefer Boulevard	All-way stop	11.7	B	14.4	B

Notes:
LOS = level of service; V/C = volume-to-capacity
¹ V/C ratio is shown for signalized intersections.
² Worst-case delay reported for unsignalized, side-street-stop intersections; average intersection delay reported for all-way-stop intersections. Both delays are reported in seconds per vehicle.
Bold indicates deficiency.
Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

Roadway Segments

Table 3A.15-10 presents the existing conditions analysis for City of Rancho Cordova roadway segments in the project study area.

The following roadway segments operate at an unacceptable LOS E or LOS F:

- ▶ Sunrise Boulevard between the U.S. 50 eastbound ramps and White Rock Road
- ▶ Sunrise Boulevard between the Kiefer Road and State Route 16

Table 3A.15-10 Roadway Levels of Service — Existing Conditions – City of Rancho Cordova				
Roadway Segment	Existing Conditions			
	Lanes	Volume	V/C	LOS
1. Douglas Road—Sunrise Boulevard to Grant Line Road	2	2,300	0.13	A
2. Sunrise Boulevard—U.S. 50 eastbound ramps to Folsom Boulevard	6	61,500	1.14	F
3. Sunrise Boulevard—Folsom Boulevard to White Rock Road	6	53,700	0.99	E
4. Sunrise Boulevard—White Rock Road to Douglas Road	4	25,100	0.70	B
5. Sunrise Boulevard—Douglas Road to Kiefer Boulevard	4	20,000	0.56	A
6. Sunrise Boulevard—Kiefer Boulevard to SR 16	2	20,000	1.11	F
7. White Rock Road—Zinfandel Drive to Sunrise Boulevard	6	21,100	0.39	A
8. White Rock Road—Sunrise Boulevard to Fitzgerald Road	4	6,000	0.33	A
9. White Rock Road—Fitzgerald Road to Grant Line Road	2	4,100	0.24	C

Notes:
LOS = level of service; SR = State Route; U.S. 50 = U.S. Highway 50; V/C = volume-to-capacity
Bold indicates deficiency.
Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

El Dorado County

Study Intersections

Table 3A.15-11 summarizes intersection LOS under existing conditions in El Dorado County.

The following intersection operates at an unacceptable LOS F during only the p.m. peak traffic hour:

- ▶ White Rock Road / Windfield Way

Table 3A.15-11 Intersection Levels of Service — Existing Conditions – El Dorado County					
Intersection	Control	A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
		Delay ¹	LOS	Delay	LOS
1. White Rock Road / Carson Crossing Road	Side-street stop	13.7	B	16.5	C
2. White Rock Road / Stonebriar Drive	Signalized	20.6	C	14.8	B
3. White Rock Road / Windfield Way	Side-street stop	43.9	E	73.1	F
4. White Rock Road / Latrobe Road	Signalized	22.7	C	31.8	C
5. White Rock Road / Valley View Parkway	Signalized	16.6	B	23.5	C
6. El Dorado Hills Blvd / Serrano Parkway	Signalized	32.1	C	25.4	C
7. El Dorado Hills Blvd / Saratoga Way	Signalized	21.6	C	53.3	D
8. El Dorado Hills Blvd / Park Drive	Signalized	11.6	B	13.1	B
9. Latrobe Road / Town Center Boulevard	Signalized	14.6	B	40.1	D

Notes:
 LOS = level of service; U.S. 50 = U.S. Highway 50
¹ Worst-case delay reported for unsignalized, side-street-stop intersections; average intersection delay reported for signalized and all-way-stop intersections. Both delays are reported in seconds per vehicle.
Bold indicates deficiency.
 Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

Caltrans Facilities

Study Intersections

Table 3A.15-12 summarizes intersection LOS under existing conditions on Caltrans facilities.

The following intersection operates at an unacceptable LOS F during both the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours:

- ▶ Hazel Avenue / Tributary - WB U.S. 50 ramps

The following intersection operates at an unacceptable LOS F during only the a.m. peak traffic hour:

- ▶ Grant Line Road / Jackson Highway (State Route 16)

The following intersection operates at an unacceptable LOS F during only the p.m. peak traffic hour:

- ▶ Hazel Avenue / EB U.S. 50 ramps

**Table 3A.15-12
Intersection Levels of Service — Existing Conditions – Caltrans**

Intersection	Control	A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
		Delay ¹	LOS	Delay	LOS
1. Hazel Avenue / Tributary - WB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	>80.0 ²	F	>80.0 ²	F
2. Hazel Avenue / EB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	21.6	C	>80.0 ²	F
3. Folsom Boulevard / WB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	8.8	A	9.0	A
4. Folsom Boulevard / EB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	21.7	C	34.2	C
5. Prairie City Road / WB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	20.7	C	12.8	B
6. Prairie City Road / EB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	17.7	B	17.3	B
7. East Bidwell Street / WB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	19.8	B	24.2	C
8. East Bidwell Street / EB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	18.0	B	17.4	B
9. El Dorado Hills Blvd / WB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	42.9	D	25.1	C
10. El Dorado Hills Blvd / EB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	35.7	D	33.3	C
11. Sunrise Boulevard / Jackson Highway	Signalized	58.4	E	39.8	D
12. Grant Line Road / Jackson Highway	Signalized	87.1	F	76.0	E

Notes:

LOS = level of service; SR = State Route; U.S. 50 = U.S. Highway 50;

¹ Average intersection delay reported in seconds per vehicle.

² Operations are worse at these ramp terminal intersections than reflected in the LOS analysis. LOS is based on vehicles that get through the intersections. Because of upstream and downstream congestion, fewer cars get through the intersection, which yields a better LOS.

Bold indicates deficiency.

Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

Analyses of Freeway Mainline Segments

The results of the analyses of freeway mainline segments are summarized in Table 3A.15-13.

The following mainline freeway segments operate at an unacceptable LOS F:

- ▶ Eastbound U.S. 50
 - Folsom Boulevard to Prairie City Road—p.m. peak hour only
 - Prairie City Road to E. Bidwell Street—Scott Road—p.m. peak hour only
 - El Dorado Hills Boulevard—Latrobe Road to Bass Lake Grade—p.m. peak hour only
- ▶ Westbound U.S. 50
 - El Dorado Hills Boulevard to E. Bidwell Street—a.m. peak hour only
 - Prairie City Road to Folsom Boulevard—a.m. peak hour only
 - Hazel Avenue to Sunrise Boulevard—a.m. peak hour only

Analyses of Freeway-Ramp Merge, Diverge, and Weave Maneuvers

The results of the analyses of freeway-ramp merge, diverge, and weave maneuvers are summarized in Table 3A.15-14.

The merge, diverge, and weave maneuvers for the following on- and off-ramps are operating at LOS F, where demand exceeds capacity based on *Highway Capacity Manual* (HCM) methodology:

- ▶ Eastbound U.S. 50
 - Hazel Avenue direct off-ramp — p.m. peak hour only
 - Folsom Boulevard on-ramp — p.m. peak hour only
 - Prairie City Road off-ramp — p.m. peak hour only
 - Prairie City Road flyover on-ramp — p.m. peak hour only
 - E. Bidwell Street - Scott Road direct off-ramp — p.m. peak hour only
 - El Dorado Hills Boulevard - Latrobe Road on-ramp — p.m. peak hour only

- ▶ Westbound U.S. 50
 - El Dorado Hills Boulevard - Latrobe Road off-ramp — a.m. peak hour only
 - El Dorado Hills Boulevard - Latrobe Road on-ramp— a.m. peak hour only
 - E. Bidwell Street - Scott Road direct off-ramp— a.m. peak hour only
 - E. Bidwell Street - Scott Road direct on-ramp— a.m. peak hour only
 - Prairie City Road direct off-ramp— a.m. peak hour only
 - Folsom Boulevard off-ramp— a.m. peak hour only
 - Hazel Avenue direct on-ramp— a.m. peak hour only

**Table 3A.15-13
Levels of Service for Freeway Mainline Segments — Existing Conditions**

Segment	A.M. Peak		P.M. Peak	
	V/C ¹	LOS	V/C ¹	LOS
Eastbound U.S. 50				
Zinfandel Drive to Sunrise Boulevard	0.72	C	0.99	E
Sunrise Boulevard to Hazel Avenue	0.64	C	0.94	E
Hazel Avenue to Folsom Boulevard	0.72	C	0.96	E
Folsom Boulevard to Prairie City Road	0.67	C	1.12	F
Prairie City Road to E. Bidwell Street—Scott Road	0.66	C	1.04	F
E. Bidwell Street—Scott Road to El Dorado Hills Boulevard—Latrobe Road	0.50	B	0.80	D
El Dorado Hills Boulevard—Latrobe Road to Bass Lake Grade	0.63	C	1.06	F
Bass Lake Grade to Bass Lake Road	0.46	B	0.78	D
Westbound U.S. 50				
Bass Lake Road to El Dorado Hills Boulevard—Latrobe Road	0.94	E	0.49	B
El Dorado Hills Boulevard—Latrobe Road to E. Bidwell Street—Scott Road	1.04	F	0.61	C
E. Bidwell Street—Scott Road to Prairie City Road	0.92	E	0.57	C
Prairie City Road to Folsom Boulevard	1.03	F	0.73	C
Folsom Boulevard to Hazel Avenue	0.88	D	0.62	C
Hazel Avenue to Sunrise Boulevard	1.01	F	0.84	D
Sunrise Boulevard to Zinfandel Drive	0.95	E	0.67	C

Notes:

LOS = level of service; U.S. 50 = U.S. Highway 50

¹ Capacity based on 2,200 vehicles per hour per lane (vphpl) for freeway lanes, 1,600 vphpl for auxiliary lanes

Bold indicates deficiency.

Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

**Table 3A.15-14
Levels of Service for Freeway-Ramp Merge, Diverge, and Weave Maneuvers — Existing Conditions**

Ramp	Merge, Diverge, or Weave Maneuvers	A.M. Peak		P.M. Peak	
		Density ¹	LOS	Density ¹	LOS
Eastbound U.S. 50					
Hazel Avenue off-ramp	Diverge	14.2	B	27.1	C (F)²
Hazel Avenue on-ramp – Aerojet off-ramp	Weave	22.1	C	30.0	D
Folsom Boulevard off-ramp	Diverge	NA	NA	NA	NA
Folsom Boulevard on-ramp	Merge	29.0	D	45.8	F
Prairie City Road off-ramp	Diverge	29.9	D	48.5	F
Prairie City Road direct on-ramp	Merge	26.6	C	39.1	E
Prairie City Road flyover on-ramp	Merge	22.1	C	36.2	F
E. Bidwell Street - Scott Road direct off-ramp	Diverge	19.1	B	32.9	F
E. Bidwell Street - Scott Road loop on-ramp	Merge	NA	NA	NA	NA
E. Bidwell Street - Scott Road direct on-ramp	Merge	14.0	B	22.8	C
Latrobe Road direct off-ramp	Diverge	27.5	C	34.9	D
El Dorado Hills Boulevard loop off-ramp	Diverge	NA	NA	NA	NA
El Dorado Hills Boulevard - Latrobe Road on-ramp	Merge	28.4	D	43.3	F
Westbound U.S. 50					
El Dorado Hills Boulevard - Latrobe Road off-ramp	Diverge	41.2	F	23.7	C
El Dorado Hills Boulevard - Latrobe Road on-ramp	Merge	41.7	F	25.6	C
E. Bidwell Street - Scott Road direct off-ramp	Diverge	30.8	F	16.7	B
E. Bidwell Street - Scott Road loop on-ramp	Merge	30.3	D	19.6	B
E. Bidwell Street - Scott Road direct on-ramp	Merge	30.1	F	17.2	B
Prairie City Road direct off-ramp	Diverge	40.4	F	26.1	C
Prairie City Road loop on-ramp	Merge	37.9	E	25.9	C
Prairie City Road direct on-ramp	Merge	36.8	F	25.6	C
Folsom Boulevard off-ramp	Diverge	43.0	F	32.6	D
Folsom Boulevard on-ramp	Merge	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hazel Avenue direct off-ramp	Diverge	16.9	B	11.2	B
Hazel Avenue loop on-ramp	Merge	21.8	C	14.3	B
Hazel Avenue direct on-ramp	Merge	35.5	F	23.6	C

Notes:

LOS = level of service; NA = not applicable – a lane drops at an off-ramp or adds at an on-ramp; U.S. 50 = U.S. Highway 50

¹ Density in passenger cars per mile per lane.

² LOS F by observation, caused by downstream bottleneck.

Shaded areas indicate deficiency where calculation indicates that demand exceeds capacity.

Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

3A.15.2 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

FEDERAL PLANS, POLICIES, REGULATIONS, AND LAWS

There are no Federal plans, policies, regulations, or laws related to traffic and transportation that apply to the project or alternatives under consideration. Federal regulations that apply to traffic and transportation are administered by Caltrans and local jurisdictions.

STATE PLANS, POLICIES, REGULATIONS, AND LAWS

Caltrans policies are applicable to the project and alternatives under consideration and are summarized in Caltrans' *Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies* (Caltrans 2002). These guidelines identify circumstances under which Caltrans believes that a traffic impact study would be required, information that Caltrans believes should be included in the study, analysis scenarios, and guidance on acceptable analysis methodologies.

The standards for Caltrans' facilities in the study area are detailed in the U.S. 50 Corridor System Management Plan (CSMP) and the SR 16 Transportation Concept Report.

The U.S. 50 CSMP has been developed to plan and manage transportation in the corridor across modes and jurisdictional boundaries. The CSMP outlines a foundation to support the partnership based, integrated corridor management of all travel modes (transit, cars, trucks, bicycles) and infrastructure (rail tracks, roads, highways, information systems, bike routes), to provide mobility in the most efficient and effective manner possible. This approach brings facility operations and transportation service provision together with capital projects into a coordinated system management strategy that focuses on high demand travel corridors such as U.S. 50. The 20-Year Concept LOS for U.S. 50 in the study area is LOS F, because improvements necessary to improve the LOS to E are not feasible due to environmental, right-of-way, financial, and other constraints.

According to the SR 16 Transportation Concept Report, SR 16 in the project study area has a concept LOS E.

REGIONAL AND LOCAL PLANS, POLICIES, REGULATIONS, AND LAWS

Metropolitan Transportation Plan for 2035 (MTP 2035)

The MTP 2035 (SACOG 2007) is a long-range planning document for identifying and programming roadway improvements throughout the Sacramento region based on projections for growth in population, housing and jobs. Federal law requires the MTP to conform to air quality goals for the region, satisfy financial constraints such that all proposed projects can be reasonably funded, and undergo extensive public review. State law further requires the MTP process include careful environmental analysis and review.

City of Folsom General Plan

Goals and policies of the City General Plan relating to traffic and transportation that the City has found to be applicable to the project are listed below:

GOAL 17: To develop a comprehensive transportation / circulation system which includes as a minimum:

1. Freeways, highways, and/or expressways designed to route through-traffic away from Folsom's neighborhoods.
2. Arterial roads which provide access among Folsom's neighborhoods, major cross-town links, and links between Folsom and adjacent communities.

3. Additional crossing(s) over the American River.
 4. Pathways and designated route for bicycle and pedestrian traffic.
 5. Designated routes for commercial vehicles.
 6. The protection of residential neighborhoods from through-traffic.
 7. Public transportation routes.
- ▶ **Policy 17.1:** The City shall plan for an integrated circulation system which provides for travel by private vehicles, commercial vehicle routes, a public transportation system, and for pedestrian and bicycle routes.
 - ▶ **Policy 17.2:** The City should establish a hierarchy of roads consisting of the following:
 1. **Freeways or limited access highways.** Such roads shall be grade separated at each intersection with another road. The major purpose of such roads is to route traffic around Folsom, with as few interruptions to the surface street system as possible. U.S. Highway 50 currently meets the definition of a freeway. The City has made a firm commitment that a new freeway would not bisect the city.
 2. **Expressways.** Allow for moderate- to high-speed travel within the City. The purpose of an expressway is to carry cross-town traffic from other communities or between neighborhoods within the City. An expressway may contain some grade-separated intersections, but this type of road would be mainly a surface street. Expressways should be located to allow for controlled intersections spaced at one-half mile intervals or more. Only arterial and collector roads should intersect with an expressway.
 3. **Arterial roads (or major streets).** Serve to connect neighborhoods within the City and the City with surrounding communities. Arterials would normally define the boundaries of neighborhoods, not provide internal access to a neighborhood.
 4. **Collector (or secondary) roads.** Serve to route traffic from local streets within a neighborhood to an arterial road. Collector streets would not normally serve as “through” roads for more than one area, but would circulate throughout a neighborhood.
 5. **Local (or tertiary) roads.** Serve a portion of a neighborhood only and route traffic to a collector street.
 6. **Street-ends (cul-de-sacs, dead end streets, etc.).** Limited in length and serve only a few residences.
 - ▶ **Policy 17.3:** Arterial roads serving new developments shall be aligned with arterial roads whenever possible.
 - ▶ **Policy 17.9:** The City should plan for the expansion of future public transit routes (bus and fixed rail service).
 1. Transit routes should coincide with major destinations for employment and shopping, the location of major institutions, concentrations of multifamily housing, and other land uses likely to attract public transit ridership.
 2. The City should preserve existing railroad rights-of-way for their potential future use as public transit routes.
 3. Bus routes should follow major roads with service to residential neighborhoods via collector streets.
 - ▶ **Policy 17.10:** The City should develop and maintain a bikeway and pedestrian master plan that links residential developments with sources of employment, public open space, parks, schools, neighborhood

shopping areas, the central commercial district, other major recreational destinations, and adjoining communities.

1. The City should ensure that new residential developments incorporate pedestrian and bicycle paths or routes when there are nearby schools, parks, public open spaces, sources of employment or other destinations for such travel. Such paths or routes should be designed so that schools and parks accessible to area residents. Pedestrian / bicycle over- and under-crossings may be provided when necessary to cross arterial roads or expressways.
 3. The City should establish and maintain an internal pathway system that links parks sources of employment and public open spaces using right-of-way and parkways.
 4. Where on-street bikeways are not feasible, the City should provide for Class I off-street bikeways.
 5. The City should endeavor to provide routes for recreational travel, providing access to important recreational areas of the City, including Folsom Lake.
- ▶ **Policy 17.16:** The City shall designate locations for park and ride lots and adopt standards for their development. Several such lots are designated on the Plan Map and dedication of land for each site shall be required as part of the approval process for developing of adjoining parcels.
 - ▶ **Policy 17.17:** The City should strive to achieve at least a traffic Level of Service “C” throughout the City. During the course of the Plan buildout it may occur that temporary higher Level of Service results where roadway improvements have not been adequately phased as development proceeds. However, this situation will be minimized based on annual traffic studies as approved by the City of Folsom and Monitoring programs. Resolution No. 3798.
 - ▶ **Policy 17.18:** The City will work with the California Department of Transportation in planning for and funding freeway interchange improvements and additional interchanges along U.S. Highway 50. A specific study should be prepared by the City to determine the required phasing of construction of freeway and interchange improvements based upon buildout of land uses designated on the Plan Map.
 - ▶ **Policy 17.19:** Because the Traffic Studies upon which this Circulation Element are based shows various intersections which will not achieve Level of Service “C”, the City should adopt a mandatory TSM program that applies to existing as well as future development and will ensure the assumed reduction in peak hour trips. Prior to adoption of the Program by the City, all discretionary development permits issued by the City should require the applicants to participate in the TSM program when enacted. Specific Studies should be conducted to determine the most desirable methods for achieving the required level of trip reduction.
 - ▶ **Policy 17.22:** The City shall require a minimum two lane arterial roads be installed adjacent to or in the vicinity of new subdivision.

The city plans to update the General Plan following the adoption of this Specific Plan.

The Specific Plan proposes an amended Level of Service policy within the project area (south of U.S. 50) as follows:

The City should strive to achieve at least a traffic Level of Service “C” within the Folsom South of U.S. 50 Specific Plan. For roadways and intersections within the Specific Plan, LOS “D” conditions may be considered on a case by case basis if improvements required to meet LOS “C” exceeds the “normally accepted maximum” improvements established by the City. Complete Streets principles require that streets and intersections be designed with all transportation modes in mind, and that the road widths, delays, and safety impacts to pedestrians and bicycles make larger roadways and intersections

incompatible with this philosophy. Coupled with the limited reduction in vehicular delay that such improvements would provide, the City has determined that the benefits of excessively wide roadways and intersections do not outweigh the impacts to the community. Therefore, “normally accepted maximum” improvements on arterial roadways include three through-lanes in each direction; and at intersections includes two left-turn lanes, three through-lanes and one right-turn lane on an approach.

Policy 17.17 will not change within the City of Folsom’s existing boundaries (north of U.S. 50).

Sacramento County General Plan

Goals and policies of the Sacramento County General Plan relating to traffic and transportation that the Sacramento County has found to be applicable to the project are listed below:

- ▶ **Policy CI-2** Sacramento County shall conduct land use and transportation planning with a regional perspective.
- ▶ **Policy CI-10;** Sacramento County shall promote and support the network of Transportation Corridors as designated on the Transportation Plan accompanying this Element.
- ▶ **Policy CI-14:** Sacramento County shall utilize design and development standards which support travel by transit, walking, bicycling, and clean alternative fuel and low emission vehicles.
- ▶ **Policy CI-21:** Incorporate preferential consideration for buses and private HOV’s at strategic congestion points (such as bridges and on-ramps) directed at discouraging drive-alone commuting.
- ▶ **Policy CI-22:** Sacramento County shall apply the following Level of Service (LOS) standards for planning roads in the unincorporated area:
 - Rural collectors: LOS D
 - Urban area roads: LOS E

and may proceed with additional capacity projects within the scope of the adopted Transportation Plan when the Board of Supervisors has determined that the implementation of all feasible measures which will reduce travel demand in the affected corridor will not provide the target level of service.

- ▶ **Policy CI-24:** Sacramento County shall support a program to develop a regional network of High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes throughout the urban area that includes provisions to designate existing mixed flow lanes for HOV use.

Sacramento County is in the process of updating the Sacramento County General Plan.

City of Rancho Cordova General Plan

Goals and policies of the City of Rancho Cordova General Plan relating to traffic and transportation that the City of Rancho Cordova has found to be applicable to the project are listed below:

- ▶ **Policy C.1.2:** Seek to maintain operations on all roadways and intersections at Level of Service D or better at all times, including peak travel times, unless maintaining this Level of Service would, in the City’s judgment, be infeasible and/or conflict with the achievement of other goals. Congestion in excess of Level of Service D may be accepted in these cases, provided that provisions are made to improve traffic flow and/or promote non-vehicular transportation as part of a development project or a City-initiated project.

- ▶ **Policy C.1.11:** As part of major individual roadway enhancement project (e.g., intersection redesign, signalization of previously un-signalized intersection), enhance and upgrade pedestrian and bicycle facilities within one-quarter mile of the project.
- ▶ **Policy C.2.6:** Provide on-street bike lanes along all connector roadways and on local and major roadways when necessary to provide for interconnected routes. On-street bike routes may be provided on local, connector, and major roadways as deemed necessary by the City.

El Dorado County General Plan

Goals and policies of the El Dorado County General Plan relating to traffic and transportation that El Dorado County has found to be applicable to the project are listed below:

- ▶ **TC-1:** To plan for and provide a unified, coordinated, and cost-efficient countywide road and highway system that ensures the safe, orderly, and efficient movement of people and goods.
- ▶ **TC-X:** To coordinate planning and implementation of roadway improvements with new development to maintain adequate level of service on County roads.
- ▶ **TC-Xd:** Level of Service (LOS) for County-maintained roads and state highways within the unincorporated areas of the county shall not be worse than LOS E in the Community Regions or LOS D in the Rural Centers and Rural Regions except as specified in Table TC-2 or, after December 31, 2008, Table TC-3. The volume to capacity ratio of the roadway segments listed in Tables TC-2 and TC-3 as applicable shall not exceed the ratio specified in that Table. Level of Service will be defined in the latest edition of the Highway Capacity manual (Transportation Research Board, National Research Council) and calculated using the methodologies contained in that manual. Analysis periods shall be based on the professional judgment of the Department of Transportation which shall consider periods including, but not limited to, Weekday Average Daily Traffic (ADT), AM Peak Hour, and PM Peak hour traffic volumes.
- ▶ **TC-Xe:** For the purpose of this Transportation and Circulation Element, “worsen” is defined as any of the following number of project trips using a road facility at the time of issuance of a use and occupancy permit for the development project:
 - A 2 percent increase in traffic during the a.m. peak hour, p.m. peak hour, or daily, or
 - The addition of 100 or more daily trips,
 - The addition of 10 or more trips during the a.m. peak hour or the p.m. peak hour.
- ▶ **TC-4c:** The County shall give priority to bikeways that will serve population centers and destinations of greatest demand and to bikeways that close gaps in the existing bikeway system.
- ▶ **TC-4d:** The County shall develop and maintain a program to construct bikeways, in conjunction with road projects, consistent with the County’s *Bikeway Master Plan*, taking into account available funding for construction and maintenance.
- ▶ **TC-4f:** The County Shall sign and stripe Class II bicycle routes, in accordance with the County’s *Bikeway Master Plan*, on roads shown on Figure TC-1, when road width, safety, and operational conditions permit safe bicycle operation.

3A.15.3 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND MITIGATION MEASURES

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Roadway Facilities

Because the project and development alternatives under consideration would cause traffic impacts on roadways that are under state, County, and City jurisdictions, this analysis was conducted using a combination of policies and guidelines. The City of Folsom identifies LOS C as its minimum standard for intersection operations within its existing boundaries (north of U.S. 50). For roadways within the project boundaries (south of U.S. 50), LOS D conditions can be considered acceptable if improvements required to meet LOS C exceeds the City's "normally accepted maximum" improvements. Sacramento County identifies LOS E as the minimum acceptable standard for intersection and roadway operations in the project vicinity (except for LOS D outside the Urban Limit Line). The City of Rancho Cordova identifies LOS D as its minimum standard for intersection and roadway operations. El Dorado County identifies LOS E as the minimum acceptable standard for intersection operations in the project vicinity. For state-controlled facilities, thresholds presented in the State's Corridor System Management Plan or Route Concept Report were applied. (The concept service level for SR 16 is LOS E. The concept service level for U.S. 50 is LOS F. For this study, LOS E is applied to U.S. 50 as a conservative approach for identifying impacts).

Signalized Intersections

Based on the Circulation Element/Plan of the City of Folsom General Plan, the Sacramento County Guidelines, the Circulation Element/Plan of the City of Rancho Cordova General Plan, and the El Dorado County DOT traffic impact study protocols and procedures, a signalized-intersection impact at a study intersection is considered significant if the addition of project-generated traffic under the Proposed Project or alternatives under consideration would cause:

- ▶ a signalized intersection operating at an acceptable LOS C or better in Folsom to degrade to an unacceptable LOS D, LOS E or LOS F; for intersections within the project boundaries (south of U.S. 50), LOS D conditions can be considered acceptable if improvements required to meet LOS C exceeds the City's "normally accepted maximum" improvements
- ▶ an increase in the delay of 5 or more seconds at a signalized intersection in Folsom operating at an unacceptable level (LOS D, E or LOS F);
- ▶ a signalized intersection operating at an acceptable LOS D or better in Rancho Cordova to degrade to an unacceptable LOS E or LOS F;
- ▶ a signalized intersection operating at an acceptable LOS E or better in Sacramento County to degrade to an unacceptable LOS F; or
- ▶ an increase in the V/C ratio of more than 0.05 at a signalized intersection in Rancho Cordova or Sacramento County operating at an unacceptable level (LOS E or LOS F in Rancho Cordova, or LOS F in Sacramento County);
- ▶ a signalized intersection operating at an acceptable LOS E or better in El Dorado County Community Region (El Dorado Hills) to degrade to an unacceptable LOS F, or add significantly more traffic to a signalized intersection operating at an unacceptable LOS F (2% increase, or 10 or more peak hour trips).
- ▶ a signalized intersection operating at an acceptable LOS E or better at a State Highway interchange (U.S. 50) to degrade to an unacceptable LOS F, or add more traffic to a signalized intersection operating at an unacceptable LOS F (1 or more peak hour trips).

Unsignalized Intersections

Based on the Circulation Element/Plan of the City of Folsom General Plan, the Sacramento County Guidelines, the Circulation Element/Plan of the City of Rancho Cordova General Plan, and the El Dorado County DOT traffic impact study protocols and procedures, an unsignalized-intersection impact at a study intersection is considered significant if the addition of project-generated traffic under the Proposed Project or alternatives under consideration would cause:

- ▶ a unsignalized intersection operating at an acceptable LOS C or better in Folsom to degrade to an unacceptable LOS D, LOS E or LOS F;
- ▶ an unsignalized intersection in Rancho Cordova operating at an acceptable LOS D or better to degrade to an unacceptable LOS E or LOS F;
- ▶ an unsignalized intersection in Sacramento County and inside the Urban Limit Line operating at an acceptable LOS E or better to degrade to an unacceptable LOS F; or outside the Urban Limit Line operating at an acceptable LOS D or better to degrade to an unacceptable LOS E or F; or
- ▶ an increase of 5 seconds or more of control delay at an unsignalized intersection operating at an unacceptable level (LOS D, E or LOS F in Folsom, LOS E or LOS F in Rancho Cordova, or LOS F in Sacramento County).
- ▶ a unsignalized intersection operating at an acceptable LOS E or better in El Dorado County Community Region (El Dorado Hills) to degrade to an unacceptable LOS F, or add significantly more traffic to a signalized intersection operating at an unacceptable LOS F (2% increase, or 10 or more peak hour trips).

Roadway Segments

Based on the Sacramento County Guidelines and the LOS policy in the Circulation Element/Plan of the City of Rancho Cordova General Plan, a roadway-segment impact is considered significant if the addition of project-generated traffic under the Proposed Project or alternatives under consideration would cause:

- ▶ a roadway segment in Rancho Cordova operating at an acceptable LOS D or better to degrade to an unacceptable LOS E or LOS F;
- ▶ a roadway segment in Sacramento County and in the Urban Limit Line operating at an acceptable LOS E or better to degrade to an unacceptable LOS F; or a roadway segment in Sacramento County and outside the Urban Limit Line operating at an acceptable LOS D or better to degrade to an unacceptable LOS E or F;
- ▶ an increase in the volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio of more than 0.05 on a roadway segment in Rancho Cordova or Sacramento County operating an unacceptable level (LOS E or LOS F in the Rancho Cordova, or LOS F in Sacramento County inside the Urban Limit Line; or LOS E or F in Sacramento County outside the Urban Limit Line.

Freeway Segments

Based on the Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies and the Corridor System Management Plan, a freeway-segment impact is considered significant if the addition of project-generated traffic under the Proposed Project or alternatives under consideration would:

- ▶ cause a facility operating at an acceptable level (LOS E) to deteriorate to an unacceptable level (LOS F), or
- ▶ increase the volume to capacity ratio by 1% or more on a freeway segment that is operating at an unacceptable level (LOS F).

Freeway Ramp Merge, Diverge, and Weave

Based on the Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies and the Corridor System Management Plan, a freeway ramp merge / diverge / weave impact is considered significant if the addition of project-generated traffic under the Proposed Project or alternatives under consideration would:

- ▶ cause a facility operating at an acceptable level (LOS E) to deteriorate to an unacceptable level (LOS F), or
- ▶ increase the density by 0.1 passenger cars per mile per lane or more at a freeway location that is operating at an unacceptable level (LOS F).

Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Transit Facilities

Bicycle facilities include Class I (off-street facilities), Class II (on-street bicycle lanes identified with signage and markings), and Class III (on-street bicycle routes identified by signage). Pedestrian facilities are composed of paths, sidewalks, and pedestrian crossings. Transit facilities include shuttle services, bus service, BRT, and light-rail facilities.

A bicycle, pedestrian, or transit-facility impact is considered significant if the Proposed Project or alternatives under consideration would do any of the following:

- ▶ eliminate or adversely affect an existing bikeway, pedestrian facility, or transit facility in a way that would discourage its use;
- ▶ interfere with the implementation of a planned bikeway, planned pedestrian facility or be in conflict with any future transit facility;
- ▶ result in unsafe conditions for bicyclists or pedestrians, including unsafe bicycle/pedestrian, bicycle/motor vehicle, pedestrian/motor vehicle, transit/bicycle, transit/pedestrian, or transit/motor vehicle conflict; or
- ▶ result in demands to transit facilities greater than available capacity.

The Specific Plan implements General Plan policy 17.13 by incorporating bikeways and lanes. Because the proposed specific plan is consistent with the City's General Plan, the project is expected to have less-than-significant impacts on pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities.

ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

The study roadway segments, intersections, and freeway facilities identified for inclusion in this analysis were developed in consultation with City of Folsom, City of Rancho Cordova, Sacramento County, El Dorado County and Caltrans staff members.

Analysis Scenarios

As described previously in this section, the following scenarios were reviewed at a full and equal level of quantitative analysis:

- ▶ Existing conditions – No Project (NP)
- ▶ Existing conditions – No USACE Permit (NCP) Alternative
- ▶ Existing conditions – Proposed Project (PP) Alternative
- ▶ Existing conditions – Resource Impact Minimization (RIM) Alternative
- ▶ Existing conditions – Centralized Development (CD) Alternative
- ▶ Existing conditions – Reduced Hillside Development (RHD) Alternative

- ▶ Cumulative conditions – No Project (NP) Alternative
- ▶ Cumulative conditions – No USACE Permit (NCP) Alternative
- ▶ Cumulative conditions – Proposed Project (PP) Alternative
- ▶ Cumulative conditions – Resource Impact Minimization (RIM) Alternative
- ▶ Cumulative conditions – Centralized Development (CD) Alternative
- ▶ Cumulative conditions – Reduced Hillside Development (RHD) Alternative

Existing Scenario Land Use

Within the SPA, land use represents the particular alternative being analyzed. For analysis purposes, the Existing No Project Alternative assumes no change in the project area land use from existing conditions (no additional development). In this manner, the Existing No Project Alternative is the same as existing conditions, and comparison to the build alternatives provides a conservative analysis. The No Project Alternative would entail development under the existing AG-80 zoning, which could include up to 44 individual rural residences. However, this traffic conditions associated with this level of development would be very similar to existing conditions for purposes of CEQA impact analysis.

Cumulative Land Use

As discussed previously, the project is anticipated to be completed (built-out) by the year 2030. Land use for the cumulative scenarios is based on the following sources:

- ▶ SACOG forecasts – Throughout the region, the starting point for the 2030 land use forecasts is taken from SACOG land use forecasts. Growth to the year 2030 was proportionately calculated from existing land use inventories and SACOG year 2035 forecasts. Unless otherwise replaced as discussed below, these year 2030 estimates are used throughout the region.
- ▶ SPA – Within the SPA, land use represents the particular alternative being analyzed. While the Cumulative No Project Alternative includes development under the existing AG-80 zoning which could include up to 44 individual rural residences, no additional development was assumed in the transportation analysis for the no project scenario. This provides a conservative comparison to the build alternatives.
- ▶ City of Folsom – Year 2030 land use forecasts within the City of Folsom were derived from the City’s General Plan.
- ▶ City of Rancho Cordova – Year 2030 land use forecasts within the City of Rancho Cordova were derived from the City’s General Plan.
- ▶ El Dorado Hills – Within the El Dorado Hills District of El Dorado County, year 2025 forecasts from the El Dorado County General Plan were utilized. Year 2025 is the horizon year of the El Dorado County General Plan.
- ▶ Sacramento County – Within the area of the Easton / Glenborough development, year 2030 forecasts were derived from the pertinent Specific Plan. For the Cordova Hills area, a forecast of year 2030 development was estimated based upon an unapproved Phase I plan.
- ▶ Rock Quarries – In the year 2030, three rock quarries south of the site are assumed to be fully operational. These quarries are discussed in further detail later in this section.

Existing Scenarios Roadway Networks

The roadway system associated with the project and alternatives was added to the existing roadway system for analysis purposes. The Proposed Project and the build alternatives all include improvements to the Prairie City

Road and East Bidwell Street (Scott Road) interchanges to serve the higher volumes created by the project. They would also include a new extension of Rowberry Drive south across U.S. 50 to Easton Valley Parkway. The Proposed Project and the build alternatives all include the construction of the Oak Avenue Parkway and Empire Ranch Road interchange to provide access to U.S. 50. These interchanges would be fully constructed with auxiliary lanes to the next interchange in both directions, because Caltrans would likely require the auxiliary lanes as part of the new interchanges. The Proposed Project and the build alternatives all include widening White Rock Road to five lanes, with two eastbound and three westbound lanes, between Prairie City Road and Carson Crossing Road. They all also include widening Prairie City Road to six lanes between U.S. 50 and the community park, and widening Prairie City Road to four lanes between the community park and White Rock Road. Exhibit 3A.15-10 shows the assumed roadway network for the existing scenarios with the Proposed Project or build alternative.

Cumulative Scenarios Roadway Networks

The roadway system associated with the Proposed Project and alternatives was added to the cumulative roadway system for analysis purposes. The Proposed Project and the build alternatives all include improvements to the Prairie City Road, Oak Avenue Parkway, East Bidwell Street (Scott Road) and Empire Ranch Road interchanges to serve the higher volumes created by the project. They would also include a new extension of Rowberry Drive south across U.S. 50 to Easton Valley Parkway. The Proposed Project and the build alternatives all include widening White Rock Road to five lanes, with two eastbound and three westbound lanes, between Prairie City Road and Carson Crossing Road. They all also include widening Prairie City Road to six lanes between U.S. 50 and the community park, and widening Prairie City Road to six lanes between the community park and White Rock Road.

Outside the immediate project environs, regional roadways assumed for the cumulative scenarios are consistent with improvements identified in the MTP 2035 (Tier I), depending on the assumed year of completion. Roadway improvements identified in the City's CIP (to be completed before year 2030) were incorporated into the Cumulative Conditions analysis for facilities within the City's current city limit boundary. This assumes that the City's CIP will be fully funded by Year 2030.

Cumulative regional roadway improvements include:

- ▶ HOV lanes on U.S. 50 between Watt Avenue and Sunrise Boulevard
- ▶ Auxiliary lanes on U.S. 50 between Sunrise Boulevard and Prairie City Road
- ▶ HOV, truck climbing and auxiliary lanes on U.S. 50 between El Dorado Hills Boulevard – Latrobe Road and Greenstone Road
- ▶ Iron Point Road widened to six lanes from Folsom Boulevard to East Bidwell Street
- ▶ East Bidwell Street to six lanes from Blue Ravine Road to U.S. 50
- ▶ Hazel Avenue widened to six lanes from Madison Avenue to U.S. 50
- ▶ A six lane Hazel Avenue extended from Folsom Boulevard to Easton Valley Parkway
- ▶ A six lane Easton Valley Parkway built between Rancho Cordova Parkway and Prairie City Road
- ▶ Rancho Cordova Parkway built from a new U.S. 50 interchange to Grant Line Road
- ▶ Grant Line Road widened to four lanes

- ▶ Douglas Road widened to six lanes
- ▶ International Drive extended as a six lane road to White Rock Road east of Rancho Cordova Parkway
- ▶ Numerous new roads in Rancho Cordova
- ▶ White Rock Road widened to four lanes from Rancho Cordova Parkway to U.S. 50 at the new Silva Valley interchange
- ▶ A four lane Saratoga Road extended to Iron Point Road

Exhibit 3A.15-11 shows the assumed roadway network for Cumulative (2030) Conditions and shows the roadway network identified in the City General Plan and the City’s CIP.

Travel Forecasts

Impacts on the roadway system for existing and cumulative 2030 conditions were determined by forecasting the increase in daily and peak-hour traffic volumes that would occur with implementation of the project and alternatives. A modified version of the 2008 SACMET regional travel demand forecasting (TDF) model was used to develop daily and a.m. and p.m. peak-hour traffic volume forecasts for the study roadways and intersections. A TDF model is a tool that assigns trips generated by the various land uses to the surrounding roadway network based on the locations of trip attractions and productions. To accomplish this task, the TDF incorporates several types of data, including detailed land use; trip generation characteristics of specific land use types; mode choice propensity based upon user and trip characteristics; roadway, pedestrian, and transit networks; and census information. Using the TDF model for the Folsom South of U.S. 50 Annexation project allowed reasonably foreseeable planned development projects and fully funded roadway improvement projects to be systematically incorporated into traffic forecasting efforts. This approach uses the best available technical tools in the region to develop future forecasts for the project study area.

Within the study environs, the TDF model was modified to improve its local forecasting abilities. Large traffic analysis zones (TAZs) associated with SACOG’s regional model were split into smaller zones to better replicate planned travel access patterns, and additional roadway links were added to represent existing and planned roadways.

Cumulative Rock Quarry Truck Traffic

Three rock quarries are proposed for the area south of the SPA, in unincorporated Sacramento County. While Teichert has an existing quarry on Grant Line Road south of White Rock Road, there are currently no quarries south of the SPA. All three proposed rock quarries are expected to be in full operation by the year 2030. The only study of the potential impact of these rock quarry operations that is currently available is the Teichert Quarry Environmental Impact Report. Truck trips generated by these projects, as described by the Teichert Quarry EIR, were added to the forecasted cumulative volumes because these projects are considered reasonably foreseeable. There would not usually be any quarry trucks operating in the PM peak hour; therefore, these truck trips were added to the cumulative daily and AM peak hour volumes. More information about the truck traffic assumption is included later in this section.

Cumulative Transit Conditions

The cumulative transit assumptions are based on a modified version of the transit system in SACOG’s 2035 MTP model. Regional Transit’s Folsom Light rail line is assumed to have passing tracks added allowing for 15 minute frequency to the Historic Folsom Station. Regional Transit would add several new bus lines to serve the developed area of Easton-Glenborough and southern Rancho Cordova, including Westborough, Rio Del Oro and

Sunridge. Folsom Stage Lines is assumed to add another route by 2030. El Dorado County would add a local El Dorado Hills route.

It is also assumed that the three transit agencies would work together to connect the communities with two new multijurisdictional bus lines. One would run on Folsom Boulevard, Iron Point Road and Saratoga Road. A second would run on White Rock Road. This future transit network, which is assumed to exist without the project, is shown on Exhibit 3A.15-12.

The Proposed Project or any build alternative is assumed to add additional transit services, as shown on Exhibit 3A.15-13. This includes the extension of the BRT system operating on Easton Valley Parkway, from the Hazel Light Rail Station to Prairie City Road, through the project to White Rock Road. The Proposed Project or any build alternative would provide a local circulatory bus within the project area. The City of Folsom would extend or reroute its bus lines to connect the SPA to the current City of Folsom north of U.S. 50. It is likely that RT would extend some of its local Easton-Glenborough lines into the SPA. It is also likely that the interagency White Rock Road bus would be rerouted to pass through the SPA.

Vehicle-Trip Generation Estimates

Table 3A.15-15 summarizes the vehicle-trip generation of the Proposed Project and the build alternatives, based upon cumulative (year 2030) conditions (build-out). Trip generation is shown for the a.m. and p.m. peak hours, as well as on a daily basis.

Table 3A.15-15				
Folsom South of U.S. 50 Annexation Area Vehicle-Trip Generation Summary				
Development		Total Vehicle Trips ¹		
		A.M. Peak Hour	P.M. Peak Hour	Daily
Proposed Project Specific Plan buildout	Total trips ²	14,300	18,500	202,900
	Internal trips ³	3,100	4,000	44,000
	External trips ⁴	11,200	14,500	158,900
No USACE Permit Alternative buildout	Total trips ²	11,300	15,000	163,400
	Internal trips ³	2,000	2,700	29,300
	External trips ⁴	9,300	12,300	134,100
Resource Impact Minimization Alternative buildout	Total trips ²	11,300	14,700	160,700
	Internal trips ³	2,200	2,900	31,200
	External trips ⁴	9,100	11,800	129,500
Centralized Development Alternative buildout	Total trips ²	13,500	17,500	191,200
	Internal trips ³	2,700	3,600	39,000
	External trips ⁴	10,800	13,900	152,200
Reduced Hillside Development Alternative buildout	Total trips ²	15,800	19,900	218,500
	Internal trips ³	3,500	4,500	49,800
	External trips ⁴	12,300	15,400	168,700

**Table 3A.15-15
Folsom South of U.S. 50 Annexation Area Vehicle-Trip Generation Summary**

Development	Total Vehicle Trips ¹		
	A.M. Peak Hour	P.M. Peak Hour	Daily
Notes: ¹ Trip summary based from the SACMET travel demand forecasting (TDF) model. ² Represents total vehicle trips generated including trips internal to a traffic analysis zone (TAZ) and trips from one TAZ to another TAZ within the Folsom South of U.S. 50 Annexation area. ³ Represents total vehicle trips generated including trips internal to a traffic analysis zone (TAZ) and trips from one TAZ to another TAZ within the Folsom South of U.S. 50 Annexation area. ⁴ Represents vehicle trips external to the SPA (trips outside of the Folsom South of U.S. 50 Annexation site). Does not include trips from one TAZ to another TAZ within the Folsom South of U.S. 50 Annexation area. Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009			

Traffic Volume Forecasts

The travel demand model assigned the vehicle trips to the roadway network for each alternative under the existing and cumulative conditions. Existing scenario traffic volume forecasts (peak hour intersection volumes, freeway volumes, and daily segment volumes) are illustrated in Exhibits 3A.15-2 through 3A.15-8, and in Exhibits 3A.15-14 through 3A.15-53. Cumulative scenario traffic volume forecasts (peak hour intersection volumes, freeway volumes, and daily segment volumes) are illustrated in Exhibits 3A.15-54 through 3A.15-100.

IMPACT ANALYSIS

Program level impacts and mitigation measures are presented together in the section below. Impacts that would occur under each alternative development scenario are identified as follows: NP (No Project), NCP (No USACE Permit), PP (Proposed Project/Action), RIM (Resource Impact Minimization), CD (Centralized Development), and RHD (Reduced Hillside Development). The impacts for each alternative are compared relative to the PP at the end of each impact conclusion (i.e., similar, greater, lesser).

EXISTING PLUS PROJECT SCENARIOS

The Proposed Project and the build alternatives would cause significant impacts in the City of Folsom, Sacramento County, the City of Rancho Cordova, and El Dorado County and to Caltrans facilities. Tables 3A.15-16 through 3A.15-24 summarize the results of the analyses. There are feasible mitigation measures for all of the impacts; however, the impacts outside of Folsom can only be mitigated with the cooperation of the affected agency. There would be less impacts with the No USACE Permit and the Resource Impact Minimization Alternatives than with the Proposed Project.

Exhibits 3A.15-14 through 19, 3A.15-22 through 27, 3A.15-30 through 35, 3A.15-38 through 43, and 3A.15-46 through 51 present peak-hour traffic volumes, lane configurations, and traffic control under the Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, Reduced Hillside Development, and No USACE Permit alternatives, respectively. Exhibits 3A.15-20, 3A.15-28, 3A.15-36, 3A.15-44, and 3A.15-52 compare ADT volumes under Baseline No Project (NP) conditions with those under the Proposed Project (PP), Resource Impact Minimization (RIM), Centralized Development (CD), Reduced Hillside Development (RHD), and No USACE Permit (NCP) alternatives, respectively. Exhibits 3A.15-21, 3A.15-29, 3A.15-37, 3A.15-45, and 3A.15-53 compare present freeway peak-hour traffic volumes and lane configurations under the Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, Reduced Hillside Development, and No USACE Permit alternatives, respectively.

**Table 3A.15-16
Intersection Levels of Service — Existing Plus Project Conditions – City of Folsom**

Intersection	Control	No Project Alternative				Proposed Project Alternative				No USACE Permit Alternative				Resource Impact Minimization				Centralized Development				Reduced Hillside Development			
		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
		Delay ¹	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS
1. Folsom Blvd / Blue Ravine Road	Signalized	35.6	D	74.7	E	40.2	D	81.2	F	40.7	D	81.7	F	43.4	D	86.3	F	39.9	D	94.6	F	39.4	D	83.1	F
2. Sibly Street / Blue Ravine Road	Signalized	41.4	D	28.5	C	52.9	D	28.6	C	45.3	D	28.5	C	42.3	D	28.2	C	56.1	E	28.5	C	61.2	E	28.5	C
3. Oak Avenue Parkway / Blue Ravine Road	Signalized	25.2	C	28.4	C	25.3	C	28.6	C	25.4	C	28.3	C	25.3	C	28.2	C	25.5	C	28.6	C	25.3	C	28.7	C
4. Empire Ranch Road / Natoma Street	All-way stop	9.7	A	10.3	B	19.1	C	19.3	C	18.4	C	19.4	C	17.2	C	18.0	C	18.0	C	18.8	C	19.9	C	20.1	C
5. Oak Avenue Parkway / Riley Street	Signalized	24.8	C	26.2	C	21.8	C	25.1	C	21.6	C	24.7	C	21.7	C	24.7	C	22.0	C	24.8	C	22.4	C	25.2	C
6. Oak Avenue Parkway / East Bidwell Street	Signalized	24.6	C	29.5	C	27.2	C	30.7	C	27.1	C	30.7	C	27.0	C	30.7	C	27.2	C	30.8	C	27.1	C	30.6	C
7. Nesmith Court / East Bidwell Street	Signalized	12.3	B	12.6	B	12.2	B	12.6	B	12.3	B	12.6	B	12.4	B	12.5	B	12.2	B	12.6	B	12.1	B	12.6	B
8. Scholar Way / East Bidwell Street	Signalized	14.1	B	11.1	B	11.9	B	12.8	B	11.8	B	12.9	B	11.9	B	13.0	B	11.6	B	12.9	B	11.8	B	12.7	B
9. Power Center Drive / East Bidwell Street	Signalized	11.6	B	21.5	C	7.5	A	20.5	C	7.1	A	20.2	C	7.3	A	20.3	C	7.4	A	20.5	C	7.6	A	20.4	C
10. Broadstone Parkway / East Bidwell Street	Signalized	19.7	B	24.1	C	22.5	C	26.9	C	21.2	C	26.6	C	21.7	C	26.3	C	22.3	C	26.7	C	23.2	C	27.4	C
11. Empire Ranch Road / Broadstone Parkway	All-way stop	9.2	A	9.1	A	12.9	B	13.2	B	12.8	B	13.2	B	12.6	B	12.9	B	12.7	B	13.0	B	13.1	B	13.4	B
12. Oak Avenue Parkway / Haverhill Drive	Signalized	22.8	C	16.1	B	18.4	B	9.6	A	18.3	B	9.8	A	18.8	B	9.9	A	17.9	B	9.7	A	18.2	B	9.7	A
13. Oak Avenue Parkway / Halidon Way	Signalized	19.2	B	16.1	B	17.2	B	13.5	B	17.1	B	13.7	B	17.3	B	13.6	B	17.1	B	13.6	B	17.4	B	13.7	B
14. Folsom Blvd / Iron Point Road	Signalized	27.6	C	19.2	B	29.8	C	22.6	C	27.1	C	22.3	C	28.5	C	19.1	B	27.8	C	21.4	C	29.1	C	21.9	C
15. Prairie City Road / Iron Point Road	Signalized	29.1	C	33.6	C	31.4	C	30.0	C	29.4	C	29.8	C	30.2	C	29.9	C	31.0	C	30.3	C	31.4	C	30.7	C
16. Grover Road / Iron Point Road	Signalized	20.2	C	9.0	A	19.4	B	9.7	A	20.6	C	10.0	B	19.9	B	10.1	B	19.4	B	10.1	B	18.7	B	9.8	A
17. McAdoo Drive / Iron Point Road	Signalized	21.3	C	13.8	B	23.5	C	17.2	B	23.9	C	17.1	B	23.7	C	16.9	B	23.6	C	16.8	B	23.7	C	16.7	B
18. Oak Avenue Parkway / Iron Point Road	Signalized	29.8	C	13.4	B	31.6	C	33.6	C	31.6	C	34.0	C	31.3	C	33.6	C	31.7	C	34.5	C	31.7	C	34.6	C
19. Rowberry Drive / Iron Point Road	Signalized	14.5	B	14.7	B	26.4	C	25.3	C	24.2	C	20.6	C	25.3	C	20.1	C	26.1	C	21.5	C	26.5	C	21.5	C
20. Broadstone Parkway / Iron Point Road	Signalized	22.2	C	20.2	C	20.2	C	19.3	B	20.2	C	19.2	B	20.2	C	19.1	B	19.9	B	19.1	B	20.2	C	19.1	B
21. East Bidwell Street / Iron Point Road	Signalized	31.7	C	45.0	D	20.6	C	38.6	D	20.0	B	37.0	D	19.5	B	37.0	D	20.2	C	37.5	D	20.1	C	40.0	D
22. Cavitt Road / Iron Point Road	Signalized	16.2	B	19.0	B	23.7	C	20.1	C	23.1	C	20.1	C	23.1	C	20.2	C	23.0	C	20.4	C	22.9	C	20.0	C
23. Serpa Way / Iron Point Road	Signalized	19.9	A	25.2	A	25.3	C	27.0	C	25.0	C	26.8	C	25.3	C	26.8	C	26.1	C	26.7	C	26.1	C	26.7	C
24. Empire Ranch Road / Iron Point Road	All-way stop ²	9.3	A	10.7	B	18.4	B	18.3	B	17.4	B	17.8	B	17.9	B	17.9	B	16.7	B	15.6	B	17.0	B	18.5	B
25. Prairie City Road / High School	Signalized	21.8	C	16.0	B	24.7	C	16.5	B	23.7	C	16.2	B	23.8	C	16.1	B	24.5	C	16.1	B	24.6	C	16.7	B
26. East Bidwell Street / Placerville Road	Signalized	0.0	A	0.0	A	11.3	B	10.0	A	7.9	A	9.9	A	8.3	A	10.0	A	7.8	A	10.0	A	9.5	A	10.0	B
27. Prairie City Road / White Rock Road	All-way stop ²	51.4	F	99.6	F	19.1	B	19.2	B	18.4	B	19.1	B	19.0	B	19.4	B	18.6	B	19.9	B	18.9	B	19.4	B
28. Scott Road (West) / White Rock Road	Side-street stop	15.0	B	18.0	C	14.0	B	28.7	D	13.5	B	26.2	D	13.5	B	26.4	D	13.7	B	28.6	D	13.5	B	28.1	D
29. Scott Road (East) / White Rock Road	All-way stop ²	17.1	C	23.9	C	20.1	C	22.6	C	19.8	B	22.6	C	19.4	B	22.3	C	20.2	C	23.1	C	20.3	C	23.4	C
30. Placerville Road / White Rock Road	Side-street stop ²	11.9	B	16.6	C	11.3	B	13.3	B	8.3	A	12.6	B	11.4	B	12.4	B	10.4	B	12.9	B	11.3	B	12.5	B
31. Empire Ranch Road / North Road	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	13.1	B	20.3	C	14.5	B	24.3	C	11.9	B	21.4	C	14.4	B	25.0	C	16.9	B	25.1	C
32. Prairie City Road / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	20.3	C	19.2	B	20.2	C	17.8	B	20.2	C	18.5	B	19.5	B	18.1	B	19.9	B	18.5	B
33. Oak Avenue Parkway / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	27.9	C	25.7	C	26.9	C	23.0	C	27.1	C	22.8	C	27.9	C	25.1	C	28.5	C	25.9	C
34. Rowberry Drive / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	16.6	B	17.0	B	15.5	B	16.8	B	12.8	B	16.0	B	14.4	B	17.6	B	16.6	B	19.9	B
35. 1st Street / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	19.8	B	19.8	B	24.7	C	24.8	C	26.2	C	24.2	C	26.5	C	25.4	C	26.6	C	25.7	C
36. 2nd Street / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	22.9	C	25.2	C	24.8	C	25.3	C	24.6	C	25.3	C	23.7	C	24.7	C	23.1	C	24.3	C
37. 3rd Street / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	25.2	C	28.3	C	17.3	B	21.6	C	20.0	B	22.2	C	19.6	B	22.6	C	18.2	B	22.4	C

**Table 3A.15-16
Intersection Levels of Service — Existing Plus Project Conditions – City of Folsom**

Intersection	Control	No Project Alternative				Proposed Project Alternative				No USACE Permit Alternative				Resource Impact Minimization				Centralized Development				Reduced Hillside Development			
		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
		Delay ¹	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS
38. Scott Road (East) / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	27.9	C	37.6	D	29.2	C	33.4	C	28.9	C	31.6	C	30.7	C	36.9	D	31.8	C	38.6	D
39. 4 th Street / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	23.5	C	26.0	C	26.3	C	26.8	C	25.1	C	27.4	C	27.2	C	28.3	C
40. Placerville Road / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	29.3	C	29.6	C	14.9	B	13.9	B	14.6	B	12.7	B	14.8	B	12.0	B	15.8	B	12.7	B
41. Hillside Drive / Easton Valley Parkway	Side-street stop	NA	NA	NA	NA	19.4	C	23.7	C	17.7	C	19.9	C	17.2	C	18.7	C	19.2	C	21.1	C	25.0	C	30.0	D
42. Empire Ranch Road / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	21.1	C	25.6	C	21.9	C	24.7	C	22.7	C	25.6	C	11.5	B	14.0	B	20.9	C	25.2	C
43. Prairie City Road / Middle Road	Side-street stop	NA	NA	NA	NA	12.3	B	12.2	B	11.7	B	11.2	B	12.1	B	11.8	B	12.3	B	12.2	B	12.1	B	11.9	B
44. Oak Avenue Parkway / Middle Road	Side-street stop	NA	NA	NA	NA	24.5	C	30.7	D	16.7	C	18.1	C	16.1	C	18.3	C	22.4	C	26.2	D	29.2	D	35.4	E
45. Scott Road (East) / Street "B"	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	24.7	C	29.5	C	25.8	C	27.3	C	28.2	C	30.7	C	29.3	C	31.5	C	31.1	C	31.8	C
46. East Road / Street "B"	All-way stop	NA	NA	NA	NA	17.1	C	17.2	C	10.0	A	12.4	B	11.8	B	16.6	C	11.3	B	16.1	C	14.5	B	21.1	C
47. Prairie City Road / Street "A"	Side-street stop	NA	NA	NA	NA	16.7	C	19.2	C	15.4	C	16.7	C	17.0	C	20.1	C	18.4	C	22.2	C	17.5	C	21.4	C
48. Oak Avenue Parkway / Street "A"	All-way stop	NA	NA	NA	NA	14.0	B	14.4	B	11.3	B	11.5	B	11.4	B	11.6	B	13.3	B	13.9	B	14.8	B	15.2	C
49. West Road / Street "A"	All-way stop	NA	NA	NA	NA	10.8	B	10.0	A	9.2	A	9.2	A	9.5	A	10.1	B	11.8	B	11.7	B	16.0	C	13.5	B
50. Scott Road (East) / Street "A"	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	31.5	C	28.5	C	26.9	C	22.4	C	30.2	C	29.6	C	31.6	C	29.0	C	33.0	C	31.6	C
51. East Road / Street "A"	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	10.1	B	9.9	A	8.2	A	8.1	A	10.1	B	9.7	A	11.1	B	10.6	B	11.4	B	11.0	B
52. Placerville Road / Street "A"	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	10.7	B	11.2	B	9.4	A	9.9	A	10.2	B	10.6	B	9.2	A	9.8	A	10.0	B	10.6	B
53. Empire Ranch Road / Street "A"	Side-street stop	NA	NA	NA	NA	10.5	B	12.5	B	10.1	B	11.6	B	10.5	B	11.8	B	8.9	A	9.5	A	10.0	B	11.5	B
54. Scott Road (East) / South Road	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	28.6	C	26.7	C	25.9	C	24.6	C	25.6	C	25.2	C	28.7	C	27.0	C	30.1	C	29.1	C
55. Oak Avenue Parkway / White Rock Road	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	15.8	B	18.0	B	14.5	B	17.2	B	14.3	B	16.3	B	14.5	B	17.5	B	14.5	B	17.9	B
56. Empire Ranch Road / White Rock Road	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	6.1	A	8.4	A	5.9	A	7.8	A	6.3	A	8.2	A	1.8	A	5.1	A	4.3	A	7.8	A

Notes: LOS = level of service; U.S. 50 = U.S. Highway 50; V/C = volume-to-capacity; Blank = intersection does not exist under this alternative
¹ Average intersection delay reported for signalized intersections, worst-case delay reported for unsignalized, side-street-stop intersections; average intersection delay reported for all-way-stop intersections. All delays are reported in seconds per vehicle.
² Intersection signalized as part of proposed project
Bold indicates deficiency. Shaded areas indicate impact.
 Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

**Table 3A.15-17
Intersection Levels of Service — Existing Plus Project Conditions – Sacramento County**

Intersection	Control	No Project Alternative				Proposed Project Alternative				No USACE Permit Alternative				Resource Impact Minimization				Centralized Development				Reduced Hillside Development			
		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
		V/C ¹ or Delay ²	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS		
1. Hazel Avenue / Gold Country Boulevard	Signalized	0.69	B	1.01	F	0.74	C	1.05	F	0.73	C	1.06	F	0.72	C	1.03	F	0.73	C	1.06	F	0.74	C	1.05	F
2. Hazel Avenue / Folsom Boulevard	Signalized	0.61	B	0.87	D	0.65	B	0.98	E	0.62	B	1.01	F	0.64	B	0.95	E	0.62	B	1.00	F	0.64	B	0.99	E
3. Grant Line Road / White Rock Road	Side-street stop	43.5	E	355.5	F	68.3	F	679.0	F	57.9	F	632.5	F	78.7	F	642.9	F	62.6	F	670.5	F	61.1	F	668.8	F
4. Grant Line Road / Sunrise Boulevard	Signalized	0.80	D	0.79	C	0.84	D	0.81	D	0.83	D	0.83	D	0.83	D	0.82	D	0.83	D	0.83	D	0.84	D	0.82	D

Notes: LOS = level of service; V/C = volume-to-capacity
¹ V/C ratio is shown for signalized intersections. Delay is shown for unsignalized intersections.
² Average intersection delay reported in seconds per vehicle.
Bold indicates deficiency. Shaded areas indicate impact.
 Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

**Table 3A.15-18
Roadway Segment Levels of Service—Existing Plus Project Conditions - Sacramento County**

Roadway Segment	Lanes	No Project Alternative			Proposed Project Alternative			No USACE Permit Alternative			Resource Impact Minimization			Centralized Development			Reduced Hillside Development		
		Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS
1. Folsom Boulevard — Sunrise Blvd to Mercantile Drive	4	19,900	0.55	A	20,000	0.56	A	19,500	0.54	A	19,900	0.55	A	19,700	0.55	A	20,100	0.56	A
2. Folsom Boulevard — Mercantile Drive to Hazel Avenue	4	14,900	0.41	A	14,900	0.41	A	14,500	0.40	A	15,000	0.42	A	14,900	0.41	A	14,900	0.41	A
3. Folsom Boulevard — Hazel Avenue to Aerojet Road	4	13,700	0.38	A	14,900	0.41	A	15,000	0.42	A	14,900	0.41	A	14,900	0.41	A	15,000	0.42	A
4. Folsom Boulevard — Aerojet Road to U.S. 50	4	17,600	0.49	A	20,100	0.56	A	19,900	0.55	A	19,900	0.55	A	19,900	0.55	A	20,100	0.56	A
5. Grant Line Road — White Rock Road to Douglas Road	2	9,600	0.56	D	12,400	0.73	E	12,300	0.72	E	11,900	0.70	E	12,400	0.73	E	12,200	0.72	E
6. Grant Line Road — Douglas Road to Keifer Boulevard	2	8,800	0.38	D	10,100	0.44	D	10,000	0.44	D	9,600	0.42	D	10,100	0.44	D	9,900	0.43	D
7. Grant Line Road — Keifer Boulevard to Jackson Road (SR 16)	2	7,700	0.34	C	10,000	0.44	D	9,900	0.43	D	9,400	0.41	D	10,100	0.44	D	10,200	0.45	D
8. Grant Line Road — Jackson Highway (SR 16) to Sunrise Boulevard	2	6,300	0.28	C	8,500	0.37	D	8,400	0.37	D	8,100	0.35	D	8,500	0.37	D	8,600	0.38	D
9. Hazel Avenue — Greenback Lane to Madison Avenue	4	38,300	1.06	F	39,600	1.10	F	39,200	1.09	F	39,400	1.09	F	39,200	1.09	F	39,500	1.10	F
10. Hazel Avenue — Madison Avenue to Curragh Downs Drive	4	46,300	1.29	F	48,200	1.34	F	47,700	1.33	F	47,500	1.32	F	48,100	1.34	F	48,100	1.34	F
11. Hazel Avenue — Curragh Downs Drive to Gold Country Boulevard	4	49,900	1.25	F	52,900	1.32	F	52,800	1.32	F	52,300	1.31	F	53,000	1.33	F	53,000	1.33	F
12. Hazel Avenue — Gold Country Boulevard to U.S. 50 westbound ramp	6	53,900	0.90	D	57,900	0.97	E	57,700	0.96	E	57,100	0.95	E	58,000	0.97	E	58,000	0.97	E
13. Jackson Highway (SR 16) — Grant Line Road to Dillard Road	2	14,300	0.62	E	13,700	0.60	E	13,800	0.60	E	13,800	0.60	E	13,700	0.60	E	13,700	0.60	E
14. Jackson Highway (SR 16) — Dillard Road to Stone House Road	2	12,100	0.53	D	11,900	0.52	D	11,800	0.52	D	11,900	0.52	D	11,800	0.52	D	11,800	0.52	D
15. Prairie City Road — U.S. 50 eastbound ramp to Easton Valley Parkway	2 (6)	5,900	0.35	D	25,200	0.49	D	22,300	0.44	D	22,700	0.45	D	27,700	0.54	D	28,100	0.55	D
16. Prairie City Road — Easton Valley Parkway to White Rock Road	2 (4)	5,900	0.35	D	15,600	0.46	D	14,700	0.43	D	15,700	0.46	D	16,500	0.49	D	16,100	0.47	D
17. Scott Road (West) — White Rock Road to Latrobe Road	2	2,100	0.12	B	3,800	0.22	C	3,700	0.22	C	3,600	0.21	C	3,800	0.22	C	3,800	0.22	C
18. Stone House Road — Latrobe Road to Jackson Highway (SR 16)	2	1,800	0.11	B	2,600	0.15	B	2,500	0.15	B	2,400	0.14	B	2,600	0.15	B	2,500	0.15	B
19. Sunrise Boulevard — Jackson Highway (SR 16) to Grant Line Road	2	13,300	0.58	D	13,400	0.59	D	13,500	0.59	E	13,500	0.59	E	13,500	0.59	E	13,600	0.59	E
20. White Rock Road — Fitzgerald Road to Grant Line Road	2	4,100	0.24	C	4,900	0.29	C	4,700	0.28	C	4,800	0.28	C	4,900	0.29	C	5,000	0.29	C
21. White Rock Road — Grant Line Road to Prairie City Road	2	11,500	0.68	E	15,500	0.91	E	15,100	0.89	E	14,900	0.88	E	15,400	0.91	E	15,300	0.90	E
22. White Rock Road — Prairie City Road to Scott Road (West)	2 (5)	7,600	0.45	D	10,500	0.21	A	9,500	0.19	A	9,700	0.19	A	9,800	0.20	A	9,900	0.20	A
23. White Rock Road — Scott Road (West) to Oak Avenue Parkway	2 (5)	7,600	0.45	D	11,900	0.24	A	10,800	0.22	A	10,800	0.22	A	11,200	0.22	A	11,200	0.22	A
24. White Rock Road — Oak Avenue Parkway to Scott Road (East)	2 (5)	7,600	0.45	D	11,500	0.23	A	10,900	0.22	A	11,000	0.22	A	11,200	0.22	A	11,500	0.23	A
25. White Rock Road — Scott Road (East) to Placerville Road	2 (5)	5,700	0.34	C	8,900	0.18	A	8,800	0.18	A	8,600	0.17	A	8,700	0.17	A	8,900	0.18	A
26. White Rock Road — Placerville Road to Empire Ranch Road	2 (5)	6,800	0.40	D	12,200	0.24	A	11,100	0.22	A	11,800	0.24	A	12,400	0.25	A	12,700	0.25	A
27. White Rock Road — Empire Ranch Road to Carson Crossing Road	2 (5)	6,800	0.40	D	13,900	0.28	A	12,800	0.26	A	13,500	0.27	A	13,300	0.27	A	14,100	0.28	A

Notes: LOS = level of service; SR = State Route; U.S. 50 = U.S. Highway 50; V/C = volume-to-capacity
Lanes: existing (project or alternative)
Bold indicates deficiency. Shaded areas indicate impact.
Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

**Table 3A.15-19
Intersection Levels of Service — Existing Plus Project Conditions – City of Rancho Cordova**

Intersection	Control	No Project Alternative				Proposed Project Alternative				No USACE Permit Alternative				Resource Impact Minimization				Centralized Development				Reduced Hillside Development			
		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
		V/C ¹ or Delay ²	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS
1. Sunrise Blvd / White Rock Road	Signalized	0.65	B	0.71	C	0.66	B	0.71	C	0.65	B	0.71	C	0.67	B	0.70	C	0.65	B	0.71	C	0.65	B	0.71	C
2. Fitzgerald Road / White Rock Road	All-way stop	14.7	B	16.4	C	17.4	C	18.6	C	16.5	C	31.0	D	17.3	C	18.8	C	17.8	C	18.0	C	18.5	C	19.5	C
3. Sunrise Blvd / Douglas Road	Signalized	0.78	C	0.68	B	0.79	C	0.69	B	0.79	C	0.69	B	0.78	C	0.68	B	0.79	C	0.69	B	0.79	C	0.69	B
4. Grant Line Road / Douglas Road	Side-street stop	23.8	C	18.2	C	28.4	D	30.3	D	30.8	D	31.0	D	23.7	C	28.5	D	30.2	D	31.3	D	26.9	D	30.2	D
5. Grant Line Road / Kiefer Blvd	All-way stop	11.7	B	14.4	B	18.7	C	21.8	C	18.4	C	21.6	C	17.2	C	19.9	C	19.4	C	22.4	C	19.8	C	22.4	C

Notes: LOS = level of service; V/C = volume-to-capacity
¹ V/C ratio is shown for signalized intersections. Delay is shown for unsignalized intersections.
² Worst-case delay reported for unsignalized, side-street-stop intersections; average intersection delay reported for all-way-stop intersections. Both delays are reported in seconds per vehicle.
Bold indicates deficiency. Shaded areas indicate impact.
 Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

**Table 3A.15-20
Roadway Segment Levels of Service — Existing Plus Project Conditions - City of Rancho Cordova**

Roadway Segment	Lanes	No Project Alternative			Proposed Project Alternative			No USACE Permit Alternative			Resource Impact Minimization			Centralized Development			Reduced Hillside Development		
		Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS
1. Douglas Road — Sunrise Blvd to Grant Line Road	2	2,300	0.13	A	2,700	0.15	A	2,600	0.14	A	2,600	0.14	A	2,700	0.15	A	2,700	0.15	A
2. Sunrise Blvd — U.S. 50 EB ramps to Folsom Blvd	6	61,500	1.14	F	61,700	1.14	F	61,900	1.15	F	61,500	1.14	F	61,700	1.14	F	61,500	1.14	F
3. Sunrise Blvd — Folsom Blvd to White Rock Road	6	53,700	0.99	E	53,300	0.99	E	53,300	0.99	E	53,100	0.98	E	53,300	0.99	E	53,100	0.98	E
4. Sunrise Blvd — White Rock Road to Douglas Road	4	25,100	0.70	B	24,500	0.68	B	24,700	0.69	B	24,700	0.69	B	24,500	0.68	B	24,500	0.68	B
5. Sunrise Blvd — Douglas Road to Kiefer Blvd	4	20,000	0.56	A	19,300	0.54	A	19,400	0.54	A	19,500	0.54	A	19,400	0.54	A	19,300	0.54	A
6. Sunrise Boulevard — Kiefer Blvd to Jackson Highway (SR 16)	2	20,000	1.11	F	19,500	1.08	F	19,700	1.09	F	19,700	1.09	F	19,600	1.09	F	19,600	1.09	F
7. White Rock Road — Zinfandel Drive to Sunrise Blvd	6	21,100	0.39	A	21,000	0.39	A	21,000	0.39	A	21,300	0.39	A	21,000	0.39	A	21,000	0.39	A
8. White Rock Road — Sunrise Blvd to Fitzgerald Road	2	6,000	0.33	A	6,800	0.38	A	6,600	0.37	A	6,700	0.37	A	6,800	0.38	A	7,000	0.39	A
9. White Rock Road — Fitzgerald Road to Grant Line Road	2	4,100	0.24	C	4,900	0.29	C	4,700	0.28	C	4,800	0.28	C	4,900	0.29	C	5,000	0.29	C

Notes: LOS = level of service; SR = State Route; U.S. 50 = U.S. Highway 50; V/C = volume-to-capacity
¹ Not expected to be a through roadway for baseline conditions.
² Assumed to have high access control.
Bold indicates deficiency. Shaded areas indicate impact.
 Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

**Table 3A.15-21
Intersection Levels of Service — Existing Plus Project Conditions – El Dorado County**

Intersection	Control	No Project Alternative				Proposed Project Alternative				No USACE Permit Alternative				Resource Impact Minimization				Centralized Development				Reduced Hillside Development			
		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
		Delay ¹	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS
1. White Rock Road / Carson Crossing Road	Side-street stop	13.7	B	16.5	C	28.3	D	42.3	E	25.5	D	39.6	E	26.9	D	39.8	E	26.8	D	40.6	E	29.2	D	43.5	E
2. White Rock Road / Stonebriar Drive	Signalized	20.6	C	14.8	B	18.5	B	20.3	C	18.8	B	19.5	B	18.4	B	20.0	B	18.5	B	19.9	B	18.4	B	20.7	C
3. White Rock Road / Windfield Way	Side-street stop	43.9	E	73.1	F	38.6	E	290.5	F	33.0	D	229.6	F	36.3	E	404.5	F	33.9	D	250.1	F	37.6	E	319.0	F
4. White Rock Road / Latrobe Road	Signalized	22.7	C	31.8	C	28.6	C	31.9	C	29.2	C	31.6	C	29.4	C	31.7	C	29.4	C	31.8	C	29.6	C	31.7	C
5. White Rock Road / Valley View Parkway	Signalized	16.6	B	23.5	C	17.2	B	22.5	C	16.8	B	22.4	C	16.8	B	22.4	C	16.7	B	22.4	C	16.7	B	22.4	C
6. El Dorado Hills Blvd / Serrano Parkway	Signalized	32.1	C	25.4	C	31.5	C	25.5	C	31.6	C	25.4	C	31.5	C	25.4	C	31.5	C	25.4	C	31.5	C	25.4	C
7. El Dorado Hills Blvd / Saratoga Way	Signalized	21.6	C	53.3	D	22.8	C	52.6	D	22.7	C	52.7	D	22.7	C	52.9	D	22.7	C	52.1	D	22.8	C	53.1	D
8. El Dorado Hills Blvd / Park Drive	Signalized	11.6	B	13.1	B	11.4	B	12.9	B	11.5	B	12.9	B	11.5	B	12.9	B	11.5	B	12.9	B	11.4	B	12.9	B
9. Latrobe Road / Town Center Blvd	Signalized	14.6	B	40.1	D	15.9	B	63.1	E	15.9	B	64.6	E	16.0	B	40.3	D	15.9	B	64.2	E	15.9	B	62.4	E

Notes: LOS = level of service;
¹ Worst-case delay reported for unsignalized, side-street-stop intersections; average intersection delay reported for all-way-stop intersections. Both delays are reported in seconds per vehicle.
Bold indicates deficiency. Shaded areas indicate impact.
 Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

**Table 3A.15-22
Intersection Levels of Service — Existing Plus Project Conditions – Caltrans**

Intersection	Control	No Project Alternative				Proposed Project Alternative				No USACE Permit Alternative				Resource Impact Minimization				Centralized Development				Reduced Hillside Development			
		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
		Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS
1. Hazel Avenue / Tributary - WB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	> 80 ¹	F	> 80	F	> 83.6 ²	F	> 83.8 ²	F	> 82.7 ²	F	> 84.2 ²	F	> 82.1 ²	F	> 81.3 ²	F	> 82.8 ²	F	> 83.3 ²	F	> 83.9 ²	F	> 83.6 ²	F
2. Hazel Avenue / EB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	21.6	C	> 80	F	20.2	C	> 82.5 ²	F	20.6	C	> 82.9 ²	F	20.6	C	> 83.1 ²	F	20.4	C	> 82.3 ²	F	20.4	C	> 83.8 ²	F
3. Folsom Blvd / WB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	8.8	A	9.0	A	7.9	A	10.3	B	8.0	A	10.0	B	7.9	A	10.0	A	7.6	A	10.3	B	7.8	A	10.4	B
4. Folsom Blvd / EB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	21.7	C	34.2	C	45.6	D	94.4	F	43.3	D	83.1	F	47.8	D	81.1	F	48.8	D	81.4	F	44.5	D	78.7	E
5. Prairie City Road / WB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	20.7	C	12.8	B	30.0	C	15.3	B	27.5	C	15.6	B	27.5	C	14.1	B	29.6	C	14.8	B	29.9	C	14.9	B
6. Prairie City Road / EB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	17.7	B	17.3	B	15.7	B	14.8	B	15.8	B	15.4	B	15.7	B	16.9	B	15.6	B	15.6	B	15.7	B	15.5	B
7. East Bidwell Street / WB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	19.8	B	24.2	C	20.5	C	21.1	C	19.9	B	21.1	C	19.7	B	20.8	C	20.7	C	20.5	C	21.0	C	21.5	C
8. East Bidwell Street / EB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	18.0	B	17.4	B	14.5	B	18.1	B	13.9	B	16.2	B	13.3	B	16.5	B	13.8	B	16.6	B	13.8	B	17.0	B
9. El Dorado Hills Blvd / WB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	42.9	D	25.1	C	48.9	D	28.6	C	50.6	D	28.8	C	48.3	D	27.8	C	50.2	D	28.4	C	49.4	D	28.2	C
10. El Dorado Hills Blvd / EB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	35.7	D	33.3	C	27.7	C	16.1	B	34.6	C	29.0	C	34.3	C	29.3	C	34.3	C	30.1	C	34.3	C	29.5	C
11. Sunrise Blvd / Jackson Highway (SR16)	Signalized	58.4	E	39.8	D	62.7	E	39.9	D	62.2	E	42.1	D	61.4	E	41.4	D	63.9	E	42.1	D	64.8	E	41.7	D
12. Grant Line Road / Jackson Highway (SR16)	Signalized	87.1	F	76.0	E	123.6	F	103.3	F	119.8	F	101.9	F	117.2	F	99.9	F	126.4	F	105.8	F	134.0	F	108.2	F
13. Oak Avenue Parkway / WB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	10.2	B	7.1	A	8.2	A	5.2	A	6.9	A	5.5	A	10.0	A	5.7	A	9.4	A	6.6	A
14. Oak Avenue Parkway / EB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	18.5	B	19.6	B	18.7	B	20.3	C	18.3	B	20.3	C	18.7	B	19.7	B	18.4	B	19.7	B
15. Empire Ranch Road / WB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	14.7	B	12.8	B	14.6	B	12.4	B	13.9	B	12.2	B	14.5	B	13.2	B	15.6	B	12.9	B
16. Empire Ranch Road / EB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	15.9	B	18.7	B	16.1	B	18.8	B	15.6	B	18.8	B	14.9	B	19.1	B	15.7	B	18.9	B

Notes: LOS = level of service; Blank = intersection does not exist under this alternative
¹ LOS F by observation, accurate delay cannot be calculated.
² Calculated increase in delay.
Bold indicates deficiency. Shaded areas indicate impact.
 Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

**Table 3A.15-23
Freeway Mainline Levels of Service — Existing Plus Project Conditions - Caltrans**

Freeway Segment	No Project Alternative				Proposed Project Alternative				No USACE Permit Alternative				Resource Impact Minimization				Centralized Development				Reduced Hillside Development							
	A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour					
	V/C ¹	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS				
EASTBOUND U.S. 50																												
1. Zinfandel Drive to Sunrise Blvd	0.72	C	0.99	E	0.76	D	1.03	F	0.76	D	1.02	F	0.75	D	1.02	F	0.76	D	1.02	F	0.76	D	1.03	F	0.76	D	1.03	F
2. Sunrise Blvd to Hazel Avenue	0.64	C	0.94	E	0.69	C	1.00	E	0.69	C	0.99	E	0.68	C	0.98	E	0.70	C	0.99	E	0.69	C	0.99	E	0.69	C	0.99	E
3. Hazel Avenue to Folsom Blvd	0.72	C	0.96	E	0.82	D	1.07	F	0.81	D	1.04	F	0.79	D	1.03	F	0.83	D	1.04	F	0.82	D	1.06	F	0.82	D	1.06	F
4. Folsom Blvd to Prairie City Road	0.67	C	1.12	F	0.89	D	1.27	F	0.88	D	1.25	F	0.85	D	1.25	F	0.90	D	1.25	F	0.90	E	1.27	F	0.90	E	1.27	F
5. Prairie City Road to Oak Avenue Parkway					0.65	C	0.94	E	0.66	C	0.92	E	0.64	C	0.92	E	0.65	C	0.92	E	0.65	C	0.92	E	0.66	C	0.93	E
6. Oak Avenue Parkway to E. Bidwell Street - Scott Road	0.66	C	1.04	F	0.55	C	0.81	D	0.55	C	0.78	D	0.54	C	0.78	D	0.54	C	0.78	D	0.55	C	0.80	D	0.55	C	0.80	D
7. E. Bidwell Street - Scott Road to Empire Ranch Road					0.53	C	0.88	D	0.53	B	0.88	D	0.52	B	0.87	D	0.52	B	0.87	D	0.53	C	0.88	D	0.53	C	0.88	D
8. Empire Ranch Road to El Dorado Hills Blvd – Latrobe Rd	0.50	B	0.80	D	0.55	C	0.84	D	0.55	C	0.84	D	0.54	C	0.83	D	0.54	C	0.84	D	0.55	C	0.85	D	0.55	C	0.85	D
9. El Dorado Hills Blvd – Latrobe Road to Bass Lake Grade	0.63	C	1.06	F	0.66	C	1.09	F	0.66	C	1.08	F	0.66	C	1.08	F	0.66	C	1.09	F	0.67	C	1.09	F	0.67	C	1.09	F
10. Bass Lake Grade to Bass Lake Road	0.46	B	0.78	D	0.49	B	0.81	D	0.48	B	0.80	D	0.49	B	0.80	D	0.49	B	0.81	D	0.49	B	0.81	D	0.49	B	0.81	D
WESTBOUND U.S. 50																												
11. Bass Lake Road to El Dorado Hills Blvd – Latrobe Road	0.94	E	0.49	B	0.97	E	0.53	B	0.96	E	0.52	B	0.96	E	0.52	B	0.97	E	0.53	B	0.96	E	0.53	B	0.96	E	0.53	B
12. El Dorado Hills Blvd – Latrobe Rd to Empire Ranch Rd					0.83	D	0.51	B	0.83	D	0.50	B	0.82	D	0.50	B	0.83	D	0.50	B	0.83	D	0.51	B	0.83	D	0.51	B
13. Empire Ranch Road to E. Bidwell Street - Scott Road	1.04	F	0.61	C	0.81	D	0.52	B	0.81	D	0.51	B	0.80	D	0.50	B	0.80	D	0.50	B	0.81	D	0.52	B	0.81	D	0.52	B
14. E. Bidwell Street - Scott Road to Oak Avenue Parkway					0.71	C	0.47	B	0.70	C	0.46	B	0.70	C	0.45	B	0.70	C	0.47	B	0.70	C	0.47	B	0.70	C	0.47	B
15. Oak Avenue Parkway to Prairie City Road	0.92	E	0.57	C	0.79	D	0.60	C	0.77	D	0.61	C	0.78	D	0.59	C	0.77	D	0.61	C	0.78	D	0.61	C	0.78	D	0.61	C
16. Prairie City Road to Folsom Blvd	1.03	F	0.73	C	1.14	F	0.92	E	1.12	F	0.91	E	1.13	F	0.87	D	1.12	F	0.92	E	1.13	F	0.92	E	1.13	F	0.92	E
17. Folsom Blvd to Hazel Avenue	0.88	D	0.62	C	0.95	E	0.73	C	0.93	E	0.74	C	0.94	E	0.70	C	0.94	E	0.73	C	0.95	E	0.73	C	0.95	E	0.73	C
18. Hazel Avenue to Sunrise Blvd	1.01	F	0.84	D	1.02	F	0.92	E	1.02	F	0.92	E	1.03	F	0.90	E	1.03	F	0.92	E	1.02	F	0.93	E	1.02	F	0.93	E
19. Sunrise Blvd to Zinfandel Drive	0.95	E	0.67	C	0.97	E	0.71	C	0.96	E	0.71	C	0.97	E	0.70	C	0.95	E	0.72	C	0.96	E	0.71	C	0.96	E	0.71	C

Notes: LOS = level of service; NA = not applicable; U.S. 50 = U.S. Highway 50; V/C = volume-to-capacity
¹ Capacity based on 2200 vphpl for freeway lanes, 1600 vphpl for auxiliary lanes.
Bold indicates deficiency. Shaded areas indicate impact.
 Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

**Table 3A.15-24
Merge/Diverge/Weave Levels of Service — Existing Plus Project Conditions - Caltrans**

Freeway Ramp	Merge, Diverge, or Weave Maneuver	No Project Alternative				Proposed Project Alternative				No USACE Permit Alternative				Resource Impact Minimization				Centralized Development				Reduced Hillside Development			
		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
		Density ¹	LOS ²	Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS
EASTBOUND U.S. 50																									
1. Hazel Avenue off-ramp	Diverge	14.2	B	27.1	C	15.1	B	28.2	D	15.3	B	27.8	C	14.9	B	27.9	C	15.4	B	27.9	C	15.2	B	28.1	D
2. Hazel Avenue on-ramp – Aerojet off-ramp	Weave	22.1	C	30.0	D	27.0	C	33.8	D	26.7	C	32.7	D	25.2	C	32.5	D	26.9	C	33.5	D	26.8	C	33.8	D
3. Folsom Blvd off-ramp	Diverge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
4. Folsom Blvd on-ramp	Merge	29.0	D	45.8	F	37.6	E	51.8	F	37.2	E	50.7	F	35.8	E	50.9	F	37.7	E	50.9	F	37.8	E	51.7	F
5. Prairie City Road off-ramp	Diverge	29.9	D	48.5	F	39.4	E	54.9	F	38.9	E	53.9	F	37.4	E	54.1	F	39.5	E	54.1	F	39.6	E	54.9	F
6. Prairie City Road direct on-ramp	Merge	26.6	C	39.1	F	34.1	D	46.1	F	34.2	D	45.0	F	33.2	D	45.1	F	33.9	D	44.8	F	34.1	D	45.7	F
7. Prairie City Road flyover on-ramp	Merge	22.1	C	36.2	F	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
8. Prairie City Rd on-ramp to Oak Avenue Parkway off-ramp	Weave	NA	NA	NA	NA	29.1	D	48.2	F	29.7	D	47.0	F	28.3	D	46.6	F	29.3	D	46.3	F	29.4	D	47.1	F
9. Oak Avenue Parkway loop on-ramp	Merge	NA	NA	NA	NA	26.6	C	39.1	F	26.4	C	38.1	F	26.0	C	38.1	F	25.9	C	37.7	F	26.0	C	38.4	F
10. Oak Avenue Parkway direct on-ramp	Merge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
11. E. Bidwell Street - Scott Road direct off-ramp	Diverge	19.1	B	32.9	F	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
12. E. Bidwell Street - Scott Road loop on-ramp	Merge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
13. E. Bidwell Street - Scott Road direct on-ramp	Merge	14.0	B	22.8	C	15.6	B	27.4	C	15.4	B	27.4	C	15.0	B	26.7	C	15.3	B	27.2	C	15.8	B	27.5	C
14. Empire Ranch Road direct off-ramp	Diverge	NA	NA	NA	NA	18.7	B	27.0	C	18.7	B	27.0	C	18.3	B	26.6	C	18.3	B	26.6	C	18.8	B	27.1	C
15. Empire Ranch Road loop on-ramp	Merge	NA	NA	NA	NA	17.7	B	24.0	C	17.7	B	24.0	C	17.6	B	23.9	C	17.8	B	24.1	C	17.7	B	23.8	C
16. Empire Ranch Road direct on-ramp	Merge	NA	NA	NA	NA	18.3	B	26.4	C	18.1	B	26.1	C	17.9	B	25.9	C	17.9	B	26.0	C	18.4	B	26.5	C
17. Latrobe Road direct off-ramp	Diverge	27.5	C	34.9	D	28.7	D	36.3	E	28.6	D	36.1	E	28.4	D	35.9	E	28.4	D	36.1	E	28.7	D	36.3	E
18. El Dorado Hills Blvd loop off-ramp	Diverge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
19. El Dorado Hills Blvd - Latrobe Road on-ramp	Merge	28.4	D	43.3	F	29.6	D	44.5	F	29.4	D	44.4	F	29.4	D	44.2	F	29.5	D	44.5	F	29.7	D	44.5	F
WESTBOUND U.S. 50																									
20. El Dorado Hills Blvd Latrobe Road off-ramp	Diverge	41.2	F	23.7	C	42.4	F	25.2	C	42.2	F	25.0	C	42.0	F	24.9	C	42.3	F	25.1	C	42.3	F	25.2	C
21. El Dorado Hills Blvd Latrobe Road on-ramp	Merge	41.7	F	25.6	C	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
22. Empire Ranch Road direct off-ramp	Diverge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
23. Empire Ranch Road loop on-ramp	Merge	NA	NA	NA	NA	35.8	F	24.4	C	35.6	F	23.9	C	35.4	F	23.7	C	34.8	F	23.2	C	35.4	F	24.3	C
24. Empire Ranch Road direct on-ramp	Merge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
25. E. Bidwell Street - Scott Road direct off-ramp	Diverge	30.8	F	16.7	B	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
26. E. Bidwell Street - Scott Road loop on-ramp	Merge	30.3	D	19.6	B	36.4	E	25.0	C	35.4	E	24.5	C	35.6	E	24.1	C	35.5	E	24.9	C	36.0	E	25.0	C
27. E. Bidwell Street - Scott Road direct on-ramp	Merge	30.1	F	17.2	B	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
28. Oak Avenue Parkway off-ramp	Diverge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
29. Oak Avenue Parkway loop on-ramp	Merge	NA	NA	NA	NA	35.5	F	25.2	C	34.4	F	25.3	C	34.7	F	24.3	C	34.4	F	25.4	C	35.0	F	25.4	C
30. Oak Avenue Parkway direct on-ramp to Prairie City Road direct off-ramp	Weave	NA	NA	NA	NA	38.1	E	25.9	C	40.3	E	26.2	C	37.7	E	24.7	C	40.2	E	26.0	C	37.4	E	25.8	C
31. Prairie City Road direct off-ramp	Diverge	40.4	F	26.1	C	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
32. Prairie City Road loop on-ramp	Merge	37.9	E	25.9	C	45.3	F	36.7	E	44.6	F	36.3	E	44.9	F	34.9	D	44.7	F	37.1	E	45.1	F	36.8	E
33. Prairie City Road direct on-ramp	Merge	36.8	F	25.6	C	40.8	F	32.5	D	40.2	F	32.1	D	40.5	F	30.7	D	40.3	F	32.9	F	40.7	F	32.7	D
34. Folsom Blvd off-ramp	Diverge	43.0	F	32.6	D	47.4	F	40.3	E	46.8	F	39.9	E	47.1	F	38.3	E	46.9	F	40.6	F	47.3	F	40.4	F
35. Folsom Blvd on-ramp	Merge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
36. Hazel Avenue direct off-ramp	Diverge	16.9	B	11.2	B	19.4	B	15.2	B	18.7	B	15.2	B	18.8	B	13.8	B	18.8	B	14.9	B	19.2	B	14.9	B
37. Hazel Avenue loop on-ramp	Merge	21.8	C	14.3	B	23.3	C	17.0	B	23.1	C	17.0	B	23.2	C	16.3	B	23.1	C	16.9	B	23.2	C	17.2	B
38. Hazel Avenue direct on-ramp	Merge	35.5	F	23.6	C	35.8	F	25.9	C	35.7	F	26.0	C	36.0	F	25.4	C	35.9	F	25.9	C	35.7	F	26.2	C

Notes: LOS = level of service; NA = not applicable – a lane drops at off ramp or adds at on ramp; U.S. 50 = U.S. Highway 50; Blank = ramp does not exist under this alternative

¹ Density in passenger cars per mile per lane for merge/diverge analysis only.

² LOS computed using Highway Capacity Software (HCS) 2000 software for the merge/diverge/weave analysis consistent with *Highway Capacity Manual* (HCM) 2000 methodologies.

³ Where an auxiliary lane begins at an on ramp (as an add lane) or where a auxiliary lane end at an off ramp (as an add lane)

Shaded areas indicate impact where calculation indicates that demand exceeds capacity.

Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

IMPACT **Increases to Peak-Hour and Daily Traffic Volumes, Resulting in Unacceptable Levels of Service.**
3A.15-1 *Implementation of development of the Project or build alternatives would cause an increase in a.m. peak-hour, p.m. peak-hour, and/or daily traffic volumes on area roadways, resulting in unacceptable LOS and warranting the need for improvements such as traffic signals and additional lanes.*

NP

Under the Existing No Project Alternative, no development beyond what currently exists is assumed. No off-site water facilities would be constructed. No new trips are generated under this scenario; therefore, there are no intersection, roadway segment, freeway mainline, or ramp merge / diverge / weaving area impacts. These impacts are less than those associated with the Proposed Project.

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

The sub-impacts and mitigation measures discussed below are specific to individual locations. These locations include only those intersections, roadways, freeway segments and freeway ramps where significant, direct impacts would occur.

Project Participation in Funding Transportation Improvements

- a Within the project boundaries and the eastern half of Prairie City Road, the Applicant shall construct all feasible physical improvements necessary and available to reduce the severity of the project’s significant transportation-related impacts, which may be subject to fee credits and/or reimbursement, coordinated by the City, from other fee-paying development projects if available with respect to roads or other facilities that would also serve those non-project fee-paying development projects. Funding of improvements on the perimeter of the project boundaries will be shared with other development/jurisdictions.
- b Outside the project boundaries, the Applicant shall be responsible for the project’s fair share of feasible physical improvements necessary and available to reduce the severity of the project’s significant transportation-related impacts within the City of Folsom, in other jurisdictions and on State facilities, based on “cumulative plus project conditions.” For purposes of this measure, “cumulative plus project conditions” refers to development authorized under the project as well as development consistent with approved general plans, specific plans, and other entitlements in the City and other jurisdictions. In cases where the project’s fair share contribution is identified, the share will be based on the project’s relative contribution to traffic growth under “cumulative plus project conditions.” The project’s contribution toward such improvements may take any, or some combination, of the following forms:
 - 1. Construction of roads, road improvements, or other transportation facilities outside the boundaries of the project, subject in some instances to fee credit against other improvements necessitated by the project or future reimbursement, coordinated by the City, from other fee-paying development projects if available where the roads or improvements at issue would also serve those non-project fee paying development projects;
 - 2. The payment of impact fees to the City of Folsom in amounts that constitute the project’s fair share contributions to the construction of transportation facilities to be built or improved within the City, consistent with the City’s Capital Improvement Program (“CIP”);
 - 3. The payment of other adopted regional impact fees that would provide improvements to roadways, intersections and/or interchanges that are affected by multiple jurisdictions, except where the project applicant’s payments of other fees or construction of improvements within the City of Folsom creates credit against the payment of regional impact fees;

4. The payment of impact fees to the City of Folsom in amounts that constitute the project's fair share contributions to the construction of transportation facilities and/or improvements within affected jurisdictions outside of Folsom, which payments to the City of Folsom and transmittal of fees to other agencies would occur through one or more enforceable agreements provided that for each required improvement, there is a reasonable mitigation plan that ensures that (i) the fees collected from the project will be used for their intended purposes, and (ii) the improvements will actually be built within a reasonable period of time, and
 5. The payment of impact fees to the City of Folsom in amounts that constitute the project's fair share contributions to the construction of transportation facilities and/or improvements on federal or state highways or freeways needed in part because of the project, to be made available to the California Department of Transportation ("Caltrans") if and when Caltrans and the City of Folsom enter into an enforceable agreement consistent with state law provided that, for each required improvement, Caltrans has a reasonable mitigation plan that ensures that (i) the fees collected from the project will be used for their intended purposes, and (ii) the improvements will actually be built within a reasonable period of time.
- c In pursuing a single agreement or multiple agreements with any jurisdictions outside of the City of Folsom that will be affected by traffic from the project in order to effectuate proposed mitigation measures for improvements outside the City of Folsom, the City will seek to negotiate in good faith with these other jurisdictions to enter into fair and reasonable arrangements with the intention of achieving, within a reasonable time period after approval of the project's, commitments for (i) the provision of adequate "fair share" mitigation payments from the project for out-of-jurisdiction traffic impacts and impacts on federal and state freeways and highways, and (ii) reciprocal payments from regional development projects to the City of Folsom to address cumulative "fair share" mitigation payments towards federal and state freeways and highways for transportation-related facilities and/or improvements within the City of Folsom necessitated by the development within the region. It is intended that these agreements shall permit the participating agencies flexibility in providing cross-jurisdictional credits and reimbursements consistent with the general "fair share" mitigation standard, and require an updated model run incorporating the best available information in order to obtain the most accurate, up-to-date impact assessment feasible and to generate the most accurate, up-to-date estimates of regional fair share contributions. Best efforts should be made to secure funding from federal, state and regional sources. These agreements, moreover, should also include provisions that allow for periodic updates to the traffic modeling on which fair share payment calculations depend in order to account for (i) newly approved projects cumulatively contributing to transportation-related impacts and that therefore should contribute to the funding of necessary improvements (ii) additional physical improvements necessitated in whole or in part by newly approved projects, (iii) changing cost calculations for the construction of needed improvements based on changes in the costs of materials, labor, and other inputs.
- d If transportation improvements required to be constructed as mitigation are constructed prior to project implementation, the project will pay its fair share portion (as defined and explained in subsection [b] above) for those improvements prior to building permit issuance.
- e In considering individual projects within the project area (e.g., small-lot tentative subdivision maps or similar discretionary non-residential approvals), the City of Folsom shall identify required improvements, and shall base its calculations for such projects' fair share payments, based on the most recent traffic modeling (i.e., modeling that accounts for (i) newly approved projects cumulatively contributing to transportation-related impacts and that therefore should contribute to the funding of necessary improvements, (ii) additional physical improvements necessitated in whole or in part by newly approved projects, and (iii) changing cost calculations for the construction of needed improvements based on changes in the costs of materials, labor, and other inputs).

The requirement that the Applicant participate in funding transportation improvements outside the City of Folsom would mitigate or substantially lessen the project's significant impact on roadways outside of the City but those

impacts would remain **significant and unavoidable**. This conclusion in part reflects the fact that, even with the installation of proposed improvements, some impacts (addressed specifically below under specific impact categories) will still remain significant because acceptable levels of service will not be achieved. This conclusion also reflects the reality, however, that successful implementation of some of the proposed improvements will require the cooperation of third party agencies (Sacramento and El Dorado Counties, the City of Rancho Cordova, and Caltrans) over which the City of Folsom has no control. For this latter reason, the City of Folsom is conservatively acknowledging the possibility that, despite its own commitment to work with these other agencies, mutually acceptable accommodation may not be reached. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2), though, the City of Folsom concludes that these other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the mitigation.

CITY OF FOLSOM

IMPACT **Unacceptable LOS at the Folsom Boulevard/Blue Ravine Road Intersection (Intersection 1).** *Project 3A.15-1a or build alternative traffic would cause signalized intersection operations at the Folsom Boulevard/Blue Ravine Road intersection to deteriorate with an increase in delay of more than 5 seconds during either or both a.m./p.m. peak hours.*

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

This intersection operates at an unacceptable LOS D or worse during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours under existing conditions. Delay would increase by more than 5 seconds and **significantly impact** intersection operations during either or both a.m./p.m. peak hours under the project and all build alternatives. The impacts of the build alternatives would be similar to that of the project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1a: The Applicant Shall Pay a Fair Share to Fund the Construction of Improvements to the Folsom Boulevard/Blue Ravine Road Intersection (Intersection 1).

To ensure that the Folsom Boulevard/Blue Ravine Road intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, the eastbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of two left-turn lanes, one through lane, and one right-turn lane. The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other appropriate and reliable mechanism paid for by applicant, to reduce the impacts to the Folsom Boulevard/Blue Ravine Road intersection (Intersection 1).

Implementation: City of Folsom Public Works Department.

Timing: A phasing analysis shall be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine when the improvement should be implemented and when fair share funding should be paid.

Enforcement: City of Folsom Public Works Department

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1a would reduce the significant impact at Intersection 1 under the project and all build alternatives to a **less-than-significant** level. Implementation of the mitigation measure will reduce the a.m. delay to less than five seconds above the existing condition, and reduce the p.m. delay to less than the existing condition.

IMPACT **Unacceptable LOS at the Sibley Street/ Blue Ravine Road Intersection (Intersection 2).** *Project or build*
3A.15-1b *alternative traffic would cause signalized intersection operations at the Sibley Street/Blue Ravine Road*
intersection to deteriorate with an increase in delay of more than 5 seconds during the a.m. peak hour.

NCP, RIM

The impact at this intersection under the No USACE Permit and Resource Impact Minimization alternatives is **less than significant**. This impact is less than that associated with the project.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

PP, CD, RHD

This intersection operates at an unacceptable LOS D during the a.m. peak hour and at an acceptable LOS C during the p.m. peak hour under existing conditions. Delay would increase by more than 5 seconds and **significantly impact** intersection operations during the a.m. peak hour under the Proposed Project, Centralized Development and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives. The impacts of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1b: The Applicant Shall Pay a Fair Share to Fund the Construction of Improvements at the Sibley Street/Blue Ravine Road Intersection (Intersection 2).

To ensure that the Sibley Street/Blue Ravine Road intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, the northbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane. The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other appropriate and reliable mechanism paid for by applicant, to reduce the impacts to the Sibley Street/Blue Ravine Road intersection (Intersection 2).

Implementation: City of Folsom Public Works Department.

Timing: A phasing analysis shall be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine when the improvement should be implemented and when fair share funding should be paid.

Enforcement: City of Folsom Public Works Department

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1b would reduce the significant impact on Intersection 2 under the Proposed Project, Centralized Development, Reduced Hillside Development alternatives to a **less-than-significant** level.

IMPACT **Unacceptable LOS at the Scott Road (West)/White Rock Road Intersection (Intersection 28).**
3A.15-1c *Unsignalized intersection operations at Scott Road (West)/White Rock Road would degrade to LOS D*
during the p.m. peak hour.

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

This intersection operates at an acceptable LOS C during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours under existing conditions. Unsignalized intersection operations at Scott Road (West)/White Rock Road would degrade to LOS D during the p.m. peak hour under the project and all build alternatives. This is a **significant impact**. The impacts of these alternatives would be similar to that of the project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1c: The Applicant Shall Fund and Construct Improvements to the Scott Road (West)/White Rock Road Intersection (Intersection 28).

To ensure that the Scott Road (West)/White Rock Road intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, a traffic signal must be installed. The applicant shall fund and construct these improvements.

Implementation: City of Folsom Public Works Department.

Timing: A phasing analysis shall be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine when the improvement should be implemented.

Enforcement: City of Folsom Public Works Department

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1c would reduce the significant impact on Intersection 28 under the project and all build alternatives to a **less-than-significant** level. Implementation of the mitigation measure will restore the LOS to the existing LOS C condition.

IMPACT 3A.15-1d LOS D at the Scott Road (East)/Easton Valley Parkway Intersection (Intersection 38). *Signalized intersection operations at Scott Road (East)/Easton Valley Parkway would operate at LOS D during the p.m. peak hour.*

NCP, RIM

This intersection would operate at LOS C conditions under the No USACE Permit and Resource Impact Minimization alternatives is **less than significant**. The impacts of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

PP, CD, RHD

This intersection does not currently exist; however, signalized intersection operations at Scott Road (East)/Easton Valley Parkway would operate at LOS D during the p.m. peak hour under the Proposed Project, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives.

The Specific Plan proposes an amended Level of Service policy within the project area (south of U.S. 50) as follows

The City should strive to achieve at least a traffic Level of Service “C” within the Folsom South of U.S. 50 Specific Plan. For roadways and intersections within the Specific Plan, LOS “D” conditions may be considered on a case by case basis if improvements required to meet LOS “C” exceeds the “normally accepted maximum” improvements established by the City. Complete Streets principles require that streets and intersections be designed with all transportation modes in mind, and that the road widths, delays, and safety impacts to pedestrians and bicycles make larger roadways and intersections incompatible with this philosophy. Coupled with the limited reduction in vehicular delay that such improvements would provide, the City has determined that the benefits of excessively wide roadways and intersections do not outweigh the impacts to the community. Therefore, “normally accepted maximum” improvements on arterial roadways include three through-lanes in each direction; and at intersections includes two left-turn lanes, three through-lanes and one right-turn lane on an approach.

The number of travel lanes on the Scott Road (East)/Easton Valley Parkway intersection approaches would be at the “normally accepted maximum” levels with the project. Thus LOS “D” conditions would be acceptable at this intersection

The impact at this intersection is **less than significant**. The impacts of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

IMPACT **Unacceptable LOS at the Hillside Drive/Easton Valley Parkway Intersection (Intersection 41).**
3A.15-1e *Unsignalized intersection operations at Hillside Drive/Easton Valley Parkway would be at LOS D during both a.m. and p.m. peak hours.*

NCP, PP, RIM, CD

The impact at this intersection under the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, and Centralized Development alternatives is **less than significant**. The impact of these alternatives is similar to that associated with the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

RHD

This intersection does not exist currently exist; however, unsignalized intersection operations at Hillside Drive/Easton Valley Parkway would operate at unacceptable LOS D during both a.m. and p.m. peak hours under the Reduced Hillside Development alternative. This impact is greater than the impact of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1e: Fund and Construct Improvements to the Hillside Drive/Easton Valley Parkway Intersection (Intersection 41).

To ensure that the Hillside Drive/Easton Valley Parkway intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, the eastbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of one dedicated left turn lane and two through lanes, and the westbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of two through lanes and one dedicated right-turn lane. The applicant shall fund and construct these improvements.

Implementation: City of Folsom Public Works Department.

Timing: A phasing analysis shall be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine when the improvement should be implemented.

Enforcement: City of Folsom Public Works Department

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1e would reduce the significant impact on Intersection 41 under the Reduced Hillside Development alternative to a **less-than-significant** level. Implementation of the mitigation measure will improve operations to a LOS C or better condition.

IMPACT **Unacceptable LOS at the Oak Avenue Parkway/Middle Road Intersection (Intersection 44).**
3A.15-1f *Unsignalized intersection operations at Oak Avenue Parkway/Middle Road would operate at unacceptable LOS D during either or both a.m./p.m. peak hours.*

NCP, RIM

There is no impact at this intersection under the No USACE Permit and Resource Impact Minimization alternatives. This impact is less than that associated with the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

PP, CD, RHD

This intersection does not exist currently exist; however, unsignalized intersection operations at Oak Avenue Parkway/Middle Road would operate at unacceptable LOS D during either or both a.m./p.m. peak hours under the Proposed Project, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives. This is a **significant impact**. The impacts of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1f: Fund and Construct Improvements to the Oak Avenue Parkway/Middle Road Intersection (Intersection 44).

To ensure that the Oak Avenue Parkway/Middle Road intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, control all movements with a stop sign. The applicant shall fund and construct these improvements.

Implementation: City of Folsom Public Works Department.

Timing: A phasing analysis shall be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine when the improvement should be implemented.

Enforcement: City of Folsom Public Works Department

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1f would reduce the significant impact on Intersection 44 under the Reduced Hillside Development alternative to a **less-than-significant** level. Implementation of the mitigation measure will improve operations to a LOS C or better condition.

SACRAMENTO COUNTY INTERSECTIONS

Off-Site Elements

IMPACT **Unacceptable LOS at the Hazel Avenue/Gold Country Blvd Intersection (Sacramento County**
3A.15-1g **Intersection 1).** *Signalized intersection operations at Hazel Avenue/Gold Country Boulevard would deteriorate, with the volume-to-capacity ratio increasing by more than 0.05 during the p.m. peak hour.*

NCP, PP, RIM, RHD

The impact at this intersection under the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives would be **less than significant**. The impact of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

This intersection operates at an acceptable LOS B during the a.m. peak hour and at an unacceptable LOS F during the p.m. peak hour under existing conditions. Signalized intersection operations at Hazel Avenue/Gold Country Boulevard would deteriorate, with the v/c ration increasing by more than 0.05 during the p.m. peak hour under the Centralized Development alternative. To ensure that the Hazel Boulevard/Gold Country Boulevard intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, the planned widening of Hazel Avenue to six lanes from the Curragh Downs Drive intersection to the Gold Country Boulevard intersection is required. This will create a third receiving lane northbound and improve the northbound lane utilization; therefore, increasing the intersection capacity. Construction of the Hazel Avenue widening project, from Highway 50 to Curragh Downs Drive, has begun and is expected to be completed before the first phase of the project alternative is built. Thus this impact would be **less than significant**. The impact of this alternative would be greater than that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

IMPACT Unacceptable LOS at the Hazel Avenue/Folsom Blvd Intersection (Sacramento County Intersection
3A.15-1h 2). *Signalized intersection operations at Hazel Avenue/Folsom Boulevard would deteriorate, with the volume-to-capacity ratio increasing by more than 0.05 during the p.m. peak hour.*

NCP, CD

This intersection operates at an acceptable LOS D or better during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours under existing conditions. Signalized intersection operations at Hazel Avenue/Folsom Boulevard would deteriorate under the No USACE Permit and Centralized Development alternatives to LOS F during the p.m. peak hour. This is a **significant impact**. The impact of these alternatives is greater than the impact of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1h: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts to the Hazel Avenue/Folsom Boulevard Intersection (Sacramento County Intersection 2).

To ensure that the Hazel Avenue/Folsom Boulevard intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, this intersection must be grade separated including “jug handle” ramps. No at grade improvement is feasible. Grade separating and extended (south) Hazel Avenue with improvements to the U.S. 50 / Hazel Avenue interchange is a mitigation measure for the approved Easton-Glenbrough Specific Plan development project. The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements to the agency responsible for improvements, based on a program established by that agency to reduce the impacts to the Hazel Avenue/Folsom Boulevard intersection (Sacramento County Intersection 2).

Implementation: Sacramento County Public Works Department and Caltrans.

Timing: A phasing analysis shall be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine when the improvement should be implemented.

Enforcement: Sacramento County Public Works Department and Caltrans

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1h would reduce the significant impact at the Hazel Avenue/Folsom Boulevard Intersection under development of the No USACE Permit and Centralized Development alternatives to a less-than-significant level.

Until Sacramento County and Caltrans implements the improvements, the impact would be classified as significant but eventually would be reduced to a less-than-significant level once those improvements are constructed. Implementation of the mitigation measure will improve p.m. operations to a LOS D condition.

As discussed above, the requirement that the Applicant participate in funding these transportation improvements that are located outside the City of Folsom would mitigate or substantially lessen the project's significant impact on this intersection but the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**. This conclusion reflects the reality that successful implementation the proposed improvements will require the cooperation of Sacramento County and Caltrans, over which the City of Folsom has no control. For this reason, the City of Folsom is conservatively acknowledging the possibility that, despite its own commitment to work with these other agencies, mutually acceptable accommodation may not be reached. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2), though, the City of Folsom concludes that these other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the mitigation.

PP, RIM, RHD

The impact at this intersection under the Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives is **less than significant**. The impact of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

IMPACT **Unacceptable LOS at the Grant Line Road/White Rock Road Intersection (Sacramento County**
3A.15-1i **Intersection 3).** *Delay at the unsignalized Grant Line Road/White Rock Road intersection would increase*
delay by more than 5 seconds during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

This intersection operates at an acceptable LOS E during the a.m. peak hour and at an unacceptable LOS F during the p.m. peak hour under existing conditions. With the Proposed Project and build alternatives, the intersection would operate at LOS F during the a.m. peak hour, and delay would increase by more than 5 seconds during the p.m. peak hour. This would be a **significant impact**. The impact of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1i: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on the Grant Line Road/White Rock Road Intersection and to White Rock Road widening between the Rancho Cordova City limit to Prairie City Road (Sacramento County Intersection 3).

Improvements must be made to ensure that the Grant Line Road/White Rock Road intersection operates at an acceptable LOS. The currently County proposed White Rock Road widening project will widen and realign White Rock Road from the Rancho Cordova City limit to the El Dorado County line (this analysis assumes that the Proposed Project and build alternatives will widen White Rock Road to five lanes from Prairie City road to the El Dorado County Line). This widening includes improvements to the Grant Line Road intersection and realigning White Rock Road to be the through movement. The improvements include two eastbound through lanes, one eastbound right turn lane, two northbound left turn lanes, two northbound right turn lanes, two westbound left turn lanes and two westbound through lanes. This improvement also includes the signalization of the White Rock Road and Grant Line Road intersection. With implementation of this improvement, the intersection would operate at an acceptable LOS A. The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements to the agency responsible for improvements, based on a program established by that agency to reduce the impacts to the Grant Line Road/White Rock Road intersection (Sacramento County Intersection 3).

Implementation: Sacramento County Public Works Department.

Timing: Before project build out. Design of the White Rock Road widening to four lanes, from Grant Line Road to Prairie City Road, with intersection improvements has begun, and because this widening project is environmentally cleared and fully funded, it's construction is expected to be complete before the first phase of the Proposed Project or alternative is built.

Enforcement: Sacramento County Public Works Department

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1i would reduce the significant impact on the Grant Line Road/White Rock Road Intersection under development of the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives to a less-than-significant level.

Until Sacramento County implements the improvements, the impact would be classified as significant but eventually would be reduced to a less-than-significant level once those improvements are constructed. Implementation of the mitigation measure will improve operations to a LOS A condition.

As discussed above, the requirement that the Applicant participate in funding these transportation improvements that are located outside the City of Folsom would mitigate or substantially lessen the project's significant impact on this intersection but the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**. This conclusion reflects the reality that successful implementation the proposed improvements will require the cooperation of Sacramento County, over which the City of Folsom has no control. For this reason, the City of Folsom is conservatively acknowledging the possibility that, despite its own commitment to work with these other agencies, mutually acceptable accommodation may not be reached. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2), though, the City of Folsom concludes that these other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the mitigation.

SACRAMENTO COUNTY ROADWAY SEGMENTS

Off-Site Elements

IMPACT 3A.15-1j	Unacceptable LOS on Hazel Avenue between Madison Avenue and Curragh Downs Drive (Sacramento County Roadway Segment 10). <i>The volume-to-capacity ratio on this LOS F segment would increase by more than 0.05 with project-related traffic.</i>
--------------------	--

NCP, RIM

The impact on this roadway segment under the No USACE Permit and Resource Impact Minimization alternatives is less than significant. The impact of these alternatives is less than that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

PP, CD, RHD

The volume-to-capacity ratio on this LOS F segment would increase by more than 0.05 under the Proposed Project, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside alternatives. This is a **significant impact**. The impact of these alternatives is similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1j: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on Hazel Avenue between Madison Avenue and Curragh Downs Drive (Roadway Segment 10).

To ensure that Hazel Avenue operates at an acceptable LOS between Curragh Downs Drive and Gold Country Boulevard, Hazel Avenue must be widened to six lanes. This improvement is part of the County adopted Hazel Avenue widening project. The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements to the agency responsible for improvements, based on a program established by that agency to reduce the impacts to Hazel Avenue between Madison Avenue and Curragh Downs Drive (Sacramento County Roadway Segment 10).

Implementation: Sacramento County Public Works Department.

Timing: Before project build out. Construction of phase two of the Hazel Avenue widening, from Madison Avenue to Curragh Downs Drive, is expected to be completed by year 2013, before the first phase of the Proposed Project or alternative is complete.

Enforcement: Sacramento County Public Works Department

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1j would reduce the significant impact on Hazel Avenue between Madison Avenue and Curragh Downs Drive under development of the Proposed Project, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development Alternatives to a less-than-significant level.

Until Sacramento County implements the improvement, the impact would be classified as significant but eventually would be reduced to a less-than-significant level once those improvements are constructed. Implementation of the mitigation measure will improve operations to a LOS D condition.

As discussed above, the requirement that the Applicant participate in funding these transportation improvements that are located outside the City of Folsom would mitigate or substantially lessen the project's significant impact on this roadway segment but the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**. This conclusion reflects the reality that successful implementation the proposed improvements will require the cooperation of Sacramento County, over which the City of Folsom has no control. For this reason, the City of Folsom is conservatively acknowledging the possibility that, despite its own commitment to work with these other agencies, mutually acceptable accommodation may not be reached. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2), though, the City of Folsom concludes that these other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the mitigation.

IMPACT 3A.15-1k Unacceptable LOS on Hazel Avenue between Curragh Downs Drive and Gold Country Boulevard (Sacramento County Roadway Segment 11). *Operations on this roadway segment would deteriorate, with an increase in the volume-to-capacity ratio of this LOS F segment by more than 0.05 under the project and all build alternatives.*

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

Operations on this roadway segment would deteriorate, with an increase in the volume-to-capacity ratio on this LOS F segment by more than 0.05 under the Proposed Project and all build alternatives. To ensure that Hazel Avenue operates at an acceptable LOS between Curragh Downs Drive and Gold Country Boulevard, Hazel Avenue must be widened to six lanes. Construction of phase one of the Hazel Avenue widening, from Highway 50 to Curragh Downs Drive, has begun and is expected to be completed before the first phase of the Proposed Project or alternative is built. Thus this impact is **less than significant**. The impact of these alternatives is similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

CITY OF RANCHO CORDOVA INTERSECTIONS

All of the study intersections located in the City of Rancho Cordova operate at an acceptable LOS D or better during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours under the Proposed Project and all build alternatives. As there are no significantly impacted intersections when evaluated with the City of Rancho Cordova standards, no mitigation is necessary.

CITY OF RANCHO CORDOVA ROADWAY SEGMENTS

Three of the nine study roadway segments located in the City of Rancho Cordova currently and would continue to operate deficiently at an unacceptable LOS E or F during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours under all development alternatives; however, the volume-to-capacity increases under the Proposed Project and all build alternatives are less than 0.05, which is considered to be a less-than significant impact. As there are no significantly impacted roadway segments under all development alternatives when evaluated with the City of Rancho Cordova standards, no mitigation is necessary.

EL DORADO COUNTY INTERSECTIONS

Off-Site Elements

IMPACT **Unacceptable LOS at the White Rock Road/Windfield Way Intersection (El Dorado County**
3A.15-11 **Intersection 3).** *Unsignalized intersection operations at White Rock Road/Windfield Way would degrade as the delay would increase by more than 5 seconds under unacceptable LOS F conditions during the p.m. peak traffic hour.*

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

Unsignalized intersection operations at the White Rock Road/Windfield Way intersection would degrade as the delay would increase by more than 5 seconds under unacceptable LOS F conditions during the p.m. peak traffic hour with project-related traffic under the Proposed Project and all build alternatives. This is a **significant impact**. The impact of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-11: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on the White Rock Road/Windfield Way Intersection (El Dorado County Intersection 3).

To ensure that the White Rock Road/Windfield Way intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, the intersection must be signalized and separate northbound left and right turn lanes must be striped. The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements to the agency responsible for improvements, based on a program established by that agency to reduce the impacts to the White Rock Road/Windfield Way intersection (El Dorado County Intersection 3).

Implementation: El Dorado County Department of Transportation.

Timing: Before project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which project phase the improvement should be built.

Enforcement: El Dorado County Department of Transportation

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-11 would reduce the significant impact on the White Rock Road/Windfield Way Intersection to a less-than-significant level by improving intersection LOS under

development of the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives to a less-than-significant level.

Until El Dorado County implements the improvement, the impact would be classified as significant but eventually would be reduced to a less-than-significant level once those improvements are constructed. Implementation of the mitigation measure will improve operations to a LOS C condition.

As discussed above, the requirement that the Applicant participate in funding these transportation improvements that are located outside the City of Folsom would mitigate or substantially lessen the project's significant impact on this intersection but the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**. This conclusion reflects the reality that successful implementation the proposed improvements will require the cooperation of El Dorado County, over which the City of Folsom has no control. For this reason, the City of Folsom is conservatively acknowledging the possibility that, despite its own commitment to work with these other agencies, mutually acceptable accommodation may not be reached. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2), though, the City of Folsom concludes that these other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the mitigation.

CALTRANS INTERSECTIONS

Off-Site Elements

IMPACT Unacceptable LOS at the Hazel Avenue/U.S. 50 Westbound Ramps Intersection (Caltrans
3A.15-1m Intersection 1). *Signalized intersection operations at Hazel Avenue/U.S. 50 westbound ramps would degrade as the delay increases with the addition of project or alternative traffic.*

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

Signalized intersection operations at Hazel Avenue/U.S. 50 westbound ramps operates at LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hour. With the addition of Proposed Project or alternative traffic, the delay would increase under the Proposed Project and all build alternatives. To ensure that the Hazel Avenue/U.S. 50 westbound ramps intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, the planned widening of Hazel Avenue to six lanes from the Curragh Downs Drive intersection to the Gold Country Boulevard intersection is required. Currently northbound p.m. peak hour traffic backs up into the Hazel Avenue/U.S. 50 westbound ramps intersection from the lane drop north of the Gold Country Boulevard intersection. The planned widening of Hazel Avenue to six lanes from the Madison Avenue intersection to the Gold Country Boulevard intersection would remove this downstream bottleneck and improve operations at this intersection to LOS C conditions. Construction of the Hazel Avenue widening project, from U.S. 50 to Curragh Downs Drive, has begun and is expected to be completed before the first phase of the project is built. Thus this impact is **less-than-significant**. The impact of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

IMPACT Unacceptable LOS at the Hazel Avenue/U.S. 50 Eastbound Ramps Intersection (Caltrans Intersection
3A.15-1n 2). *Signalized intersection operations at Hazel Avenue/U.S. 50 eastbound ramps would degrade as the delay would increase during the p.m. peak hour.*

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

Signalized intersection operations at Hazel Avenue/U.S. 50 eastbound ramps would operate at LOS F during the p.m. peak traffic hour, and the addition of Proposed Project or alternative traffic would increase the delay at the

intersection (by 2% or more) in the p.m. peak hour, which would increase the likelihood that vehicles on the eastbound off-ramp may backup on to the U.S. 50 mainline. To ensure that the Hazel Avenue/U.S. 50 eastbound ramps intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, the planned widening of Hazel Avenue to six lanes from the Curragh Downs Drive intersection to the Gold Country Boulevard intersection is required. Currently northbound p.m. peak hour traffic backs up into the Hazel Avenue/U.S. 50 eastbound ramps intersection from the lane drop north of the Gold Country Boulevard intersection. The planned widening of Hazel Avenue to six lanes from the Madison Avenue intersection to the Gold Country Boulevard intersection would remove this downstream bottleneck and improve operations at this intersection to LOS C conditions. Construction of the Hazel Avenue widening project, from U.S. 50 to Curragh Downs Drive, has begun and is expected to be completed before the first phase of the project is built. Thus this impact is **less than significant**. The impact of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

IMPACT 3A.15-10 Unacceptable LOS at the Folsom Boulevard/U.S. 50 Eastbound Ramps Intersection (Caltrans Intersection 4). *The signalized intersection of Folsom Boulevard/U.S. 50 eastbound ramps would degrade from an acceptable LOS C to an unacceptable LOS F during the p.m. peak traffic hour with project-related traffic.*

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

The signalized intersection of Folsom Boulevard/U.S. 50 eastbound ramps would degrade from an acceptable LOS C to an unacceptable LOS F during the p.m. peak traffic hour under the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives. This is a **significant** impact. The impact of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-10: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on Eastbound U.S. 50 as an alternative to improvements at the Folsom Boulevard/U.S. 50 Eastbound Ramps Intersection (Caltrans Intersection 4).

- ▶ Congestion on eastbound U.S. 50 is causing vehicles to use Folsom Boulevard as an alternate parallel route until they reach U.S. 50, where they must get back on the freeway due to the lack of a parallel route. It is preferred to alleviate the congestion on U.S. 50 than to upgrade the intersection at the end of this reliever route.
- ▶ To ensure that the Folsom Boulevard/U.S. 50 eastbound ramps intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, auxiliary lanes should be added to eastbound U.S. 50 from Hazel Avenue to east of Folsom Boulevard. This was recommended in the Traffic Operations Analysis Report for the U.S. 50 Auxiliary Lane Project. The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements to the agency responsible for improvements, based on a program established by that agency to reduce the impacts to the Folsom Boulevard/U.S. 50 Eastbound Ramps intersection (Caltrans Intersection 4).

Implementation: Caltrans

Timing: Before project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which project phase the improvement should be built.

Enforcement: Caltrans

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1o would reduce the significant impact on the Folsom Boulevard/U.S. 50 eastbound ramp intersection to a less-than-significant level by improving intersection LOS under development of the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives.

Until Caltrans implements the improvements, the impact would be classified as significant but eventually would be reduced to a less-than-significant level once those improvements are constructed. Implementation of the mitigation measure will improve operations to a LOS C condition.

As discussed above, the requirement that the Applicant participate in funding these transportation improvements that are located outside the City of Folsom's control would mitigate or substantially lessen the project's significant impact on this intersection but the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**. This conclusion reflects the reality that successful implementation the proposed improvements will require the cooperation of Caltrans, over which the City of Folsom has no control. For this reason, the City of Folsom is conservatively acknowledging the possibility that, despite its own commitment to work with these other agencies, mutually acceptable accommodation may not be reached. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2), though, the City of Folsom concludes that these other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the mitigation.

IMPACT **Unacceptable LOS at the Grant Line Road/ State Route 16 Intersection (Caltrans Intersection 12).** *The*
3A.15-1p *signalized intersection of Grant Line Road/State Route 16 would experience an increase in delay during the*
a.m. peak traffic hour and degrade to an unacceptable LOS F during the p.m. peak traffic hour.

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

The signalized intersection of Grant Line Road/State Route 16 would experience an increase in delay under unacceptable LOS F conditions during the a.m. peak traffic hour, and degrade from an acceptable LOS E to an unacceptable LOS F during the p.m. peak traffic hour under the Proposed Project and all build alternatives. This is a **significant** impact. The impact of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1p: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on the Grant Line Road/ State Route 16 Intersection (Caltrans Intersection 12).

To ensure that the Grant Line Road/State Route 16 intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, the northbound and southbound approaches must be reconfigured to consist of one left-turn lane and one shared through/right-turn lane. Protected left-turn signal phasing must be provided on the northbound and southbound approaches. Improvements to the Grant Line Road/State Route 16 intersection are contained within the County Development Fee Program, and are scheduled for Measure A funding.

- ▶ Improvements to this intersection must be implemented by Caltrans, Sacramento County, and the City of Rancho Cordova.

The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements to the agency responsible for improvements, based on a program established by that agency to reduce the impacts to the Grant Line Road/SR 16 intersection (Caltrans Intersection 12).

Implementation: Caltrans, Sacramento County Department of Transportation and the City of Rancho Cordova Department of Public Works

Timing: Before project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which project phase the improvement should be built.

Enforcement: Caltrans, Sacramento County Department of Transportation and the City of Rancho Cordova Department of Public Works

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1p would reduce the significant impact on Grant Line Road/State Route 16 intersection to a less-than-significant level by improving intersection LOS under development of the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives.

Until Caltrans, Rancho Cordova, and Sacramento County implement the improvements, the impact would be classified as significant but would be reduced to a less-than-significant level once those improvements are constructed. Implementation of the mitigation measure will improve operations to a LOS C condition.

As discussed above, the requirement that the Applicant participate in funding these transportation improvements that are located outside the City of Folsom's control would mitigate or substantially lessen the project's significant impact on this intersection but the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**. This conclusion reflects the reality that successful implementation the proposed improvements will require the cooperation of Caltrans, Sacramento County and the City of Rancho Cordova, over which the City of Folsom has no control. For this reason, the City of Folsom is conservatively acknowledging the possibility that, despite its own commitment to work with these other agencies, mutually acceptable accommodation may not be reached. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2), though, the City of Folsom concludes that these other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the mitigation.

CALTRANS FREEWAY SEGMENTS

Off-Site Elements

IMPACT Unacceptable LOS on Eastbound U.S. 50 between Zinfandel Drive and Sunrise Boulevard (Freeway
3A.15-1q Segment 1). *This freeway segment would degrade to an unacceptable LOS F during the p.m. peak hour.*

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

This freeway segment would degrade from an acceptable LOS E to an unacceptable LOS F during the p.m. peak hour under the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives. This is a **significant** impact. The impact of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1q: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on Eastbound U.S. 50 between Zinfandel Drive and Sunrise Boulevard (Freeway Segment 1).

To ensure that Eastbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS between Zinfandel Drive and Sunrise Boulevard, a bus-carpool (HOV) lane must be constructed. This improvement is currently planned as part of the Sacramento 50 Bus-Carpool Lane and Community Enhancements Project. The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements to the agency responsible for improvements, based on a program established by that agency to reduce the impacts to Eastbound U.S. 50 between Zinfandel Drive and Sunrise Boulevard (Freeway Segment 1).

Implementation: Caltrans

Timing: Before project build out. Construction of the Sacramento 50 Bus-Carpool Lane and Community Enhancements Project is expected to be completed by year 2013, before the first phase of the Proposed Project or alternative is complete.

Enforcement: Caltrans

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1q would reduce the significant impact on Eastbound U.S. 50 between Zinfandel Drive and Sunrise Boulevard to a less-than-significant level by improving freeway segment LOS under development of the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives.

Until Caltrans implements the improvements, the impact would be classified as significant but would be reduced to a less-than-significant level once those improvements are constructed.. Implementation of the mitigation measure will improve operations to a LOS E condition.

As discussed above, the requirement that the Applicant participate in funding these transportation improvements that are located outside the City of Folsom's control would mitigate or substantially lessen the project's significant impact on this intersection but the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**. This conclusion reflects the reality that successful implementation the proposed improvements will require the cooperation of Caltrans, over which the City of Folsom has no control. For this reason, the City of Folsom is conservatively acknowledging the possibility that, despite its own commitment to work with these other agencies, mutually acceptable accommodation may not be reached. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2), though, the City of Folsom concludes that these other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the mitigation.

IMPACT Unacceptable LOS on Eastbound U.S. 50 between Hazel Avenue and Folsom Boulevard (Freeway
3A.15-1r **Segment 3)**. *This freeway segment would degrade to an unacceptable LOS F during the p.m. peak hour with project-related traffic.*

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

This freeway segment would degrade from an acceptable LOS E to an unacceptable LOS F during the p.m. peak hour under the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives. This is a **significant** impact. The impact of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1r: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on Eastbound U.S. 50 between Hazel Avenue and Folsom Boulevard (Freeway Segment 3).

To ensure that Eastbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS between Hazel Avenue and Folsom Boulevard, an auxiliary lane must be constructed. This improvement was recommended in the Traffic Operations Analysis Report for the U.S. 50 Auxiliary Lane Project. This improvement is included in the proposed 50 Corridor Mobility Fee Program. The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements to the agency responsible for improvements, based on a program established by that agency to reduce the impacts to Eastbound U.S. 50 between Hazel Avenue and Folsom Boulevard (Freeway Segment 3).

Implementation: Caltrans

Timing: Before project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed to determine during which project phase the improvement should be built.

Enforcement: Caltrans

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1r would reduce the significant impact on Eastbound U.S. 50 between Hazel Avenue and Folsom Boulevard to a less-than-significant level by improving freeway segment LOS

under development of the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives.

Until Caltrans implements the improvement, the impact would be classified as significant but would be reduced to a less-than-significant level once those improvements are constructed. Implementation of the mitigation measure will improve operations to a LOS D condition.

As discussed above, the requirement that the Applicant participate in funding these transportation improvements that are located outside the City of Folsom's control would mitigate or substantially lessen the project's significant impact on this intersection but the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**. This conclusion reflects the reality that successful implementation the proposed improvements will require the cooperation of Caltrans, over which the City of Folsom has no control. For this reason, the City of Folsom is conservatively acknowledging the possibility that, despite its own commitment to work with these other agencies, mutually acceptable accommodation may not be reached. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2), though, the City of Folsom concludes that these other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the mitigation.

IMPACT **Unacceptable LOS on Eastbound U.S. 50 between Folsom Boulevard and Prairie City Road (Freeway**
3A.15-1s **Segment 4). *This freeway segment would degrade to an unacceptable LOS F during the p.m. peak hour***
and would experience an increase in the volume to capacity ratio under unacceptable LOS F conditions
during the p.m. peak hour.

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

This freeway segment would experience an increase in the volume-to-capacity ratio under unacceptable LOS F conditions during the p.m. peak hour with project-related traffic under the Proposed Project and all build alternatives. This is a **significant** impact. The impact of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1s: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on Eastbound U.S. 50 between Folsom Boulevard and Prairie City Road (Freeway Segment 4).

To ensure that Eastbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS between Folsom Boulevard and Prairie City Road, an auxiliary lane must be constructed. This improvement was recommended in the Traffic Operations Analysis Report for the U.S. 50 Auxiliary Lane Project. This improvement is included in the proposed 50 Corridor Mobility Fee Program. The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other appropriate and reliable mechanism paid for by applicant, to reduce the impacts to Eastbound U.S. 50 between Folsom Boulevard and Prairie City Road (Freeway Segment 4).

Implementation: Caltrans

Timing: Before project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which project phase the improvement should be built.

Enforcement: Caltrans

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1s would reduce the significant impact on Eastbound U.S. 50 between Folsom Boulevard and Prairie City Road to a less-than-significant level by improving freeway segment LOS under development of the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives.

Until Caltrans implements the improvement, the impact would be classified as significant but eventually would be reduced to a less-than-significant level once those improvements are constructed. Implementation of the mitigation measure will improve operations to a LOS E condition.

As discussed above, the requirement that the Applicant participate in funding these transportation improvements that are located outside the City of Folsom's control would mitigate or substantially lessen the project's significant impact on this intersection but the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**. This conclusion reflects the reality that successful implementation the proposed improvements will require the cooperation of Caltrans, over which the City of Folsom has no control. For this reason, the City of Folsom is conservatively acknowledging the possibility that, despite its own commitment to work with these other agencies, mutually acceptable accommodation may not be reached. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2), though, the City of Folsom concludes that these other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the mitigation.

IMPACT **Unacceptable LOS on Eastbound U.S. 50 between El Dorado Hills Boulevard – Latrobe Road and**
3A.15-1t **Bass Lake Grade (Freeway Segment 9).** *This freeway segment would experience an increase in the*
volume to capacity ratio under unacceptable LOS F conditions during the p.m. peak.

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

This freeway segment would experience an increase in the volume to capacity ratio under unacceptable LOS F conditions during the p.m. peak hour under the project and all build alternatives. To ensure that Eastbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS between El Dorado Hills Boulevard – Latrobe Road and Bass Lake Grade, the truck climbing lane and the bus-carpool (HOV) lane must be extended. Construction on this improvement has begun and is expected to be complete by the end of 2010, before the first phase of the Proposed Project or alternative is built. Thus this impact is **less than significant**. The impact of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

IMPACT **Unacceptable LOS on Westbound U.S. 50 between Prairie City Road and Folsom Boulevard**
3A.15-1u **(Freeway Segment 16).** *This freeway segment would experience an increase in the volume to capacity*
ratio under unacceptable LOS F conditions during the a.m. peak hour.

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

This freeway segment would experience an increase in the volume-to-capacity ratio under unacceptable LOS F conditions during the a.m. peak hour with project-related traffic under the Proposed Project and all build alternatives. This is a **significant** impact. The impact of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1u: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on Westbound U.S. 50 between Prairie City Road and Folsom Boulevard (Freeway Segment 16).

To ensure that Westbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS between Prairie City Road and Folsom Boulevard, an auxiliary lane must be constructed. This improvement was recommended in the Traffic Operations Analysis Report for the U.S. 50 Auxiliary Lane Project. This improvement is included in the proposed 50 Corridor Mobility Fee Program. The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other appropriate and reliable mechanism paid

for by applicant, to reduce the impacts to Westbound U.S. 50 between Prairie City Road and Folsom Boulevard (Freeway Segment 16).

Implementation: Caltrans

Timing: Before project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which project phase the improvement should be built.

Enforcement: Caltrans

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1u would reduce the significant impact on Westbound U.S. 50 between Prairie City Road and Folsom Boulevard to a less-than-significant level by improving freeway segment LOS under development of the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives.

Until Caltrans implements the improvement, the impact would be classified as significant but eventually would be reduced to a less-than-significant level once those improvements are constructed. Implementation of the mitigation measure will improve operations to LOS D.

As discussed above, the requirement that the Applicant participate in funding these transportation improvements that are located outside the City of Folsom's control would mitigate or substantially lessen the project's significant impact on this intersection but the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**. This conclusion reflects the reality that successful implementation the proposed improvements will require the cooperation of Caltrans, over which the City of Folsom has no control. For this reason, the City of Folsom is conservatively acknowledging the possibility that, despite its own commitment to work with these other agencies, mutually acceptable accommodation may not be reached. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2), though, the City of Folsom concludes that these other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the mitigation.

IMPACT **Unacceptable LOS on Westbound U.S. 50 between Hazel Avenue and Sunrise Boulevard (Freeway**
3A.15-1v **Segment 18).** *This freeway segment would experience an increase in the volume to capacity ratio under*
unacceptable LOS F conditions during the a.m. peak hour.

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

This freeway segment would experience an increase in the volume-to-capacity ratio under unacceptable LOS F conditions during the a.m. peak hour with project-related traffic under the Proposed Project and all build alternatives. This is a **significant** impact. The impact of this alternative would be greater than that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1v: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on Westbound U.S. 50 between Hazel Avenue and Sunrise Boulevard (Freeway Segment 18).

To ensure that Westbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS between Hazel Avenue and Sunrise Boulevard, an auxiliary lane must be constructed. This improvement was recommended in the Traffic Operations Analysis Report for the U.S. 50 Auxiliary Lane Project, and included in the proposed Rancho Cordova Parkway interchange project. Improvements to this freeway segment must be implemented by Caltrans. The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements to the agency responsible for improvements, based on a program established by that agency to reduce the impacts to Westbound U.S. 50 between Hazel Avenue and Sunrise Boulevard (Freeway Segment 18).

Implementation: Caltrans

Timing: Before project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which project phase the improvement

Enforcement: Caltrans

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1v would reduce the significant impact on Eastbound U.S. 50 between Hazel Avenue and Sunrise Boulevard to a less-than-significant level by improving freeway segment LOS under development of the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives.

Until Caltrans implements the improvement, the impact would be classified as significant, but would be reduced to a less-than-significant level once those improvements are constructed. Implementation of the mitigation measure will improve operations to LOS D.

As discussed above, the requirement that the Applicant participate in funding these transportation improvements that are located outside the City of Folsom's control would mitigate or substantially lessen the project's significant impact on this intersection but the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**. This conclusion reflects the reality that successful implementation the proposed improvements will require the cooperation of Caltrans, over which the City of Folsom has no control. For this reason, the City of Folsom is conservatively acknowledging the possibility that, despite its own commitment to work with these other agencies, mutually acceptable accommodation may not be reached. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2), though, the City of Folsom concludes that these other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the mitigation.

CALTRANS FREEWAY RAMP MERGE, DIVERGE AND WEAVING SECTIONS

Off-Site Elements

IMPACT Unacceptable LOS at the U.S. 50 Eastbound / Folsom Boulevard Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge 4). *This*
3A.15-1w *freeway merge would experience an increase in density under unacceptable LOS F conditions during the*
p.m. peak hour.

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

This freeway merge would experience an increase in density under unacceptable LOS F conditions during the p.m. peak hour under the Proposed Project and all build alternatives. This is a **significant** impact. The impact of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1w: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on U.S. 50 Eastbound / Folsom Boulevard Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge 4).

To ensure that Eastbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS at the Folsom Boulevard merge, an auxiliary lane from the Folsom Boulevard merge to the Prairie City Road diverge must be constructed. This improvement was recommended in the Traffic Operations Analysis Report for the U.S. 50 Auxiliary Lane Project. This improvement is included in the proposed 50 Corridor Mobility Fee Program. The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements to the agency responsible for improvements, based on a program established by that agency to reduce the impacts to the U.S. 50 Eastbound/Folsom Boulevard Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge 4).

Implementation: Caltrans

Timing: Before project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which project phase the improvement should be built.

Enforcement: Caltrans

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1w would reduce the significant impact on the U.S. 50 Eastbound / Folsom Boulevard Ramp Merge to a less-than-significant level by improving freeway merge LOS under development of the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives.

Until Caltrans implements the improvement, the impact would be classified as significant, but would be reduced to a less-than-significant level once those improvements are constructed. Implementation of the mitigation measure will improve operations to a LOS D condition.

As discussed above, the requirement that the Applicant participate in funding these transportation improvements that are located outside the City of Folsom's control would mitigate or substantially lessen the project's significant impact on this intersection but the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**. This conclusion reflects the reality that successful implementation the proposed improvements will require the cooperation of Caltrans, over which the City of Folsom has no control. For this reason, the City of Folsom is conservatively acknowledging the possibility that, despite its own commitment to work with these other agencies, mutually acceptable accommodation may not be reached. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2), though, the City of Folsom concludes that these other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the mitigation.

IMPACT **Unacceptable LOS at the U.S. 50 Eastbound / Prairie City Road Diverge (Freeway Diverge 5). This**
3A.15-1x *freeway diverge would experience an increase in density under unacceptable LOS F conditions during the*
p.m. peak hour.

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

This freeway diverge would experience an increase in density under unacceptable LOS F conditions during the p.m. peak hour under the Proposed Project and all build alternatives. This is a **significant** impact. The impact of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1x: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on U.S. 50 Eastbound / Prairie City Road Diverge (Freeway Diverge 5).

To ensure that Eastbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS at the Prairie City Road off-ramp diverge, an auxiliary lane from the Folsom Boulevard merge must be constructed. This improvement was recommended in the Traffic Operations Analysis Report for the U.S. 50 Auxiliary Lane Project. This auxiliary lane improvement is included in the proposed 50 Corridor Mobility Fee Program. The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other appropriate and reliable mechanism paid for by applicant, to reduce the impacts to the U.S. 50 Eastbound/Prairie City Road diverge (Freeway Diverge 5).

Implementation: Caltrans

Timing: Before project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which project phase the improvement should be built.

Enforcement: Caltrans

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1x would reduce the significant impact on the U.S. 50 Eastbound / Prairie City Road Diverge to a less-than-significant level by eliminating the diverge movement from the freeway mainline under development of the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives.

Until Caltrans implements the improvement, the impact would be classified as significant but eventually would be reduced to a less-than-significant level once those improvements are constructed. Implementation of the mitigation measure will improve operations to an acceptable condition. With the elimination of the diverge movement there is no specific LOS for the mitigated condition.

As discussed above, the requirement that the Applicant participate in funding these transportation improvements that are located outside the City of Folsom's control would mitigate or substantially lessen the project's significant impact on this intersection but the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**. This conclusion reflects the reality that successful implementation the proposed improvements will require the cooperation of Caltrans, over which the City of Folsom has no control. For this reason, the City of Folsom is conservatively acknowledging the possibility that, despite its own commitment to work with these other agencies, mutually acceptable accommodation may not be reached. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2), though, the City of Folsom concludes that these other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the mitigation.

IMPACT **Unacceptable LOS at the U.S. 50 Eastbound / Prairie City Road Merge (Freeway Merge 6).** *This freeway*
3A.15-1y *merge would degrade to an unacceptable LOS F during the p.m. peak hour.*

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

This freeway merge would degrade from an acceptable LOS E to an unacceptable LOS F during the p.m. peak hour under the Proposed Project and all build alternatives. This is a **significant** impact. The impact of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1y: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on U.S. 50 Eastbound / Prairie City Road Direct Merge (Freeway Merge 6).

To ensure that Eastbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS at the Prairie City Road on-ramp direct merge, an auxiliary lane to the East Bidwell Street – Scott Road diverge must be constructed. This auxiliary lane improvement is included in the proposed 50 Corridor Mobility Fee Program. The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other appropriate and reliable mechanism paid for by applicant, to reduce the impacts to the U.S. 50 Eastbound/Prairie City Road direct merge (Freeway Merge 6).

Implementation: Caltrans

Timing: Before project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which project phase the improvement should be built.

Enforcement: Caltrans

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1y would reduce the significant impact on the U.S. 50 Eastbound / Prairie City Road Direct Merge to a less-than-significant level by eliminating the merge movement from the

freeway mainline under development of the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives.

Until Caltrans implements the improvement, the impact would be classified as significant but would be reduced to a less-than-significant level once those improvements are constructed. Implementation of the mitigation measure will improve operations to an acceptable condition. With the elimination of the direct merge movement there is no specific LOS for the mitigated condition.

As discussed above, the requirement that the Applicant participate in funding these transportation improvements that are located outside the City of Folsom’s control would mitigate or substantially lessen the project’s significant impact on this intersection but the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**. This conclusion reflects the reality that successful implementation the proposed improvements will require the cooperation of Caltrans, over which the City of Folsom has no control. For this reason, the City of Folsom is conservatively acknowledging the possibility that, despite its own commitment to work with these other agencies, mutually acceptable accommodation may not be reached. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2), though, the City of Folsom concludes that these other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the mitigation.

IMPACT Unacceptable LOS at the U.S. 50 Eastbound / Prairie City Road Flyover On-Ramp to Oak Avenue
3A.15-1z Parkway Off-Ramp Weave (Freeway Weave 8). *This new freeway weave would operate an unacceptable LOS F during the p.m. peak hour.*

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

This new freeway weave would operate an unacceptable LOS F during the p.m. peak hour under the Proposed Project and all build alternatives. This is a **significant** impact. The impact of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1z: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on U.S. 50 Eastbound / Prairie City Road Flyover On-Ramp to Oak Avenue Parkway Off-Ramp Weave (Freeway Weave 8).

To ensure that Eastbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS at the Prairie City Road flyover on-ramp to Oak Avenue Parkway off-ramp weave, an improvement acceptable to Caltrans should be implemented to eliminate the unacceptable weaving conditions. Such an improvement may involve a “braided ramp”. The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other appropriate and reliable mechanism paid for by applicant, to reduce the impacts to the U.S. 50 Eastbound/Prairie City Road flyover on-ramp to Oak Avenue Parkway off-ramp weave (Freeway Weave 8).

Implementation: Caltrans

Timing: Before project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which project phase the improvement should be built.

Enforcement: Caltrans

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1z would reduce the significant impact on the U.S. 50 Eastbound / Prairie City Road Flyover On-Ramp to Oak Avenue Parkway Off-Ramp Weave to a less-than-significant level by improving intersection LOS under development of the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives.

Until Caltrans implements the improvement, the impact would be classified as significant but would be reduced to a less-than-significant level once those improvements are constructed. Implementation of the mitigation measure will improve operations to a LOS D condition.

As discussed above, the requirement that the Applicant participate in funding these transportation improvements that are located outside the City of Folsom's control would mitigate or substantially lessen the project's significant impact on this intersection but the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**. This conclusion reflects the reality that successful implementation the proposed improvements will require the cooperation of Caltrans, over which the City of Folsom has no control. For this reason, the City of Folsom is conservatively acknowledging the possibility that, despite its own commitment to work with these other agencies, mutually acceptable accommodation may not be reached. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2), though, the City of Folsom concludes that these other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the mitigation.

IMPACT **Unacceptable LOS at the U.S. 50 Eastbound / Oak Avenue Parkway Loop Merge (Freeway Merge 9).**
3A.15-1aa *This new freeway merge would operate an unacceptable LOS F during the p.m. peak.*

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

This new freeway merge would operate an unacceptable LOS F during the p.m. peak hour under the Proposed Project and all build alternatives. This is a **significant** impact. The impact of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1aa: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on U.S. 50 Eastbound / Oak Avenue Parkway Loop Merge (Freeway Merge 9).

To ensure that Eastbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS at the Oak Avenue Parkway loop merge, an auxiliary lane to the East Bidwell Street – Scott Road diverge must be constructed. This auxiliary lane improvement is included in the proposed 50 Corridor Mobility Fee Program. The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other appropriate and reliable mechanism paid for by applicant, to reduce the impacts to the U.S. 50 Eastbound/Oak Avenue Parkway loop merge (Freeway Merge 9).

Implementation: Caltrans

Timing: Before project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which project phase the improvement should be built.

Enforcement: Caltrans

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1aa would reduce the significant impact on the U.S. 50 Eastbound / Oak Avenue Parkway Loop Merge to a less-than-significant level by improving intersection LOS under development of the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives.

Until Caltrans implements the improvement, the impact would be classified as significant but eventually would be reduced to a less-than-significant level once those improvements are constructed. Implementation of the mitigation measure will improve operations to a LOS C condition.

As discussed above, the requirement that the Applicant participate in funding these transportation improvements that are located outside the City of Folsom's control would mitigate or substantially lessen the project's

significant impact on this intersection but the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**. This conclusion reflects the reality that successful implementation the proposed improvements will require the cooperation of Caltrans, over which the City of Folsom has no control. For this reason, the City of Folsom is conservatively acknowledging the possibility that, despite its own commitment to work with these other agencies, mutually acceptable accommodation may not be reached. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2), though, the City of Folsom concludes that these other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the mitigation.

IMPACT **Unacceptable LOS at the U.S. 50 Eastbound / El Dorado Hills Boulevard – Latrobe Road Merge**
3A.15-1bb **(Freeway Merge 19). *This freeway merge would experience an increase in density under unacceptable LOS F conditions during the p.m. peak hour.***

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

This freeway merge would experience an increase in density under unacceptable LOS F conditions during the p.m. peak hour under the Proposed Project and all build alternatives. To ensure that Eastbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS at the El Dorado Hills Boulevard – Latrobe Road Merge, a truck climbing lane and a bus-carpool (HOV) lane must be constructed to the Bass Lake Grade truck climbing lane. Construction on this improvement has begun and is expected to be complete by the end of 2010, before the first phase of the Proposed Project or alternative is built. Thus this impact is **less-than-significant** impact. The impact of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

IMPACT **Unacceptable LOS at the U.S. 50 Westbound / El Dorado Hills Boulevard Diverge (Freeway Diverge**
3A.15-1cc **20). *This freeway diverge would experience an increase in density under unacceptable LOS F conditions during the a.m. peak hour.***

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

This freeway diverge would experience an increase in density under unacceptable LOS F conditions during the a.m. peak hour with under the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives. To ensure that Westbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS at the El Dorado Hills Boulevard Diverge, a bus-carpool (HOV) lane from the Bass Lake Road merge must be constructed. This improvement is currently under construction. Construction on this improvement has begun and is expected to be complete before the first phase of the Proposed Project or alternative is built. Thus this impact is **less-than-significant** impact. The impact of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

IMPACT **Unacceptable LOS at the U.S. 50 Westbound / Empire Ranch Road Loop Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge**
3A.15-1dd **23). *This freeway merge would operate at an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. peak hour.***

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

This new freeway merge would operate at an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. peak hour under the Proposed Project and all build alternatives. This is a **significant** impact. The impact of this alternative would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1dd: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on U.S. 50 Westbound / Empire Ranch Road Loop Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge 23).

To ensure that Westbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS, the northbound Empire Ranch Road loop on ramp should start the westbound auxiliary lane that ends at the East Bidwell Street – Scott Road off ramp. The slip on ramp from southbound Empire Ranch Road would merge into this extended auxiliary lane. Improvements to this freeway segment must be implemented by Caltrans. The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other appropriate and reliable mechanism paid for by applicant, to reduce the impacts to the U.S. 50 Westbound/Empire Ranch Road loop ramp merge (Freeway Merge 23).

Implementation: Caltrans

Timing: Before project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which project phase the improvement should be built.

Enforcement: Caltrans

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1dd would reduce the significant impact on the U.S. 50 Westbound / Empire Ranch Road Loop Ramp Merge to a less-than-significant level by eliminating the merge movement from the freeway mainline under development of the Proposed Project and all the build alternatives.

Until Caltrans implements the improvement, the impact would be classified as significant but would be reduced to a less-than-significant level once those improvements are constructed. Implementation of the mitigation measure will improve operations to an acceptable condition. With the elimination of the direct merge movement there is no specific LOS for the mitigated condition.

As discussed above, the requirement that the Applicant participate in funding these transportation improvements that are located outside the City of Folsom’s control would mitigate or substantially lessen the project’s significant impact on this intersection but the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**. This conclusion reflects the reality that successful implementation the proposed improvements will require the cooperation of Caltrans, over which the City of Folsom has no control. For this reason, the City of Folsom is conservatively acknowledging the possibility that, despite its own commitment to work with these other agencies, mutually acceptable accommodation may not be reached. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2), though, the City of Folsom concludes that these other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the mitigation.

IMPACT **Unacceptable LOS at the U.S. 50 Westbound / Oak Avenue Parkway Loop Ramp Merge (Freeway**
3A.15-1ee **Merge 29). This freeway merge would operate at an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. peak hour.**

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

This new freeway merge would operate at an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. peak hour under the Proposed Project and all build alternatives. This is a **significant** impact. The impact of this alternative would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1ee: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on U.S. 50 Westbound / Oak Avenue Parkway Loop Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge 29).

To ensure that Westbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS, the northbound Oak Avenue Parkway loop on ramp should start the westbound auxiliary lane that ends at the Prairie City Road off ramp. The

slip on ramp from southbound Oak Avenue Parkway would merge into this extended auxiliary lane. Improvements to this freeway segment must be implemented by Caltrans. The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other appropriate and reliable mechanism paid for by applicant, to reduce the impacts to the U.S. 50 Westbound/Oak Avenue Parkway loop ramp merge (Freeway Merge 29).

Implementation: Caltrans

Timing: Before project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which project phase the improvement should be built.

Enforcement: Caltrans

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1ee would reduce the significant impact on the U.S. 50 Westbound / Oak Avenue Parkway Loop Ramp Merge to a less-than-significant level by eliminating the merge movement from the freeway mainline under development of the Proposed Project and all the build alternatives.

Until Caltrans implements the improvement, the impact would be classified as significant but would be reduced to a less-than-significant level once those improvements are constructed. Implementation of the mitigation measure will improve operations to an acceptable condition. With the elimination of the direct merge movement there is no specific LOS for the mitigated condition. As discussed above, the requirement that the Applicant participate in funding these transportation improvements that are located outside the City of Folsom's control would mitigate or substantially lessen the project's significant impact on this intersection but the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**. This conclusion reflects the reality that successful implementation the proposed improvements will require the cooperation of Caltrans, over which the City of Folsom has no control. For this reason, the City of Folsom is conservatively acknowledging the possibility that, despite its own commitment to work with these other agencies, mutually acceptable accommodation may not be reached. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2), though, the City of Folsom concludes that these other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the mitigation.

IMPACT **Unacceptable LOS at the U.S. 50 Westbound / Prairie City Road Loop Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge**
3A.15-1ff **32). This freeway merge would degrade to an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. peak hour.**

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

This freeway merge would degrade from an acceptable LOS E to an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. peak hour under the Proposed Project and all of the build alternatives. This is a **significant** impact. The impact of this alternative would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1ff: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on U.S. 50 Westbound / Prairie City Road Loop Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge 32).

To ensure that Westbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS at the Prairie City Road loop ramp merge, an auxiliary lane to the Folsom Boulevard off ramp diverge must be constructed. This auxiliary lane improvement is included in the proposed 50 Corridor Mobility Fee Program. The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other appropriate and reliable mechanism paid for by applicant, to reduce the impacts to the U.S. 50 Westbound/Prairie City Road Loop Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge 32).

Implementation: Caltrans

Timing: Before project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which project phase the improvement should be built.

Enforcement: Caltrans

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1ff would reduce the significant impact on the U.S. 50 Westbound / Prairie City Road Loop Ramp Merge to a less-than-significant level by eliminating the merge movement from the freeway mainline under development of the Proposed Project and all of the build alternatives.

Until Caltrans implements the improvement, the impact would be classified as significant but would be reduced to a less-than-significant level once those improvements are constructed. Implementation of the mitigation measure will improve operations to an acceptable condition. With the elimination of the direct merge movement there is no specific LOS for the mitigated condition.

As discussed above, the requirement that the Applicant participate in funding these transportation improvements that are located outside the City of Folsom's control would mitigate or substantially lessen the project's significant impact on this intersection but the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**. This conclusion reflects the reality that successful implementation the proposed improvements will require the cooperation of Caltrans, over which the City of Folsom has no control. For this reason, the City of Folsom is conservatively acknowledging the possibility that, despite its own commitment to work with these other agencies, mutually acceptable accommodation may not be reached. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2), though, the City of Folsom concludes that these other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the mitigation.

IMPACT **Unacceptable LOS at the U.S. 50 Westbound / Prairie City Road Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge 33).** *This 3A.15-1gg* *freeway merge would experience an increase in density under unacceptable LOS F conditions during the a.m. peak hour.*

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

This freeway merge would experience an increase in density under unacceptable LOS F conditions during the a.m. peak hour under the Proposed Project and all of the build alternatives. This is a **significant** impact. The impact of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1gg: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on U.S. 50 Westbound / Prairie City Road Direct Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge 33).

To ensure that Westbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS at the Prairie City Road direct ramp merge, an auxiliary lane to the Folsom Boulevard off ramp diverge must be constructed. This auxiliary lane improvement is included in the proposed 50 Corridor Mobility Fee Program. The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other appropriate and reliable mechanism paid for by applicant, to reduce the impacts to the U.S. 50 Westbound/Prairie City Road direct ramp merge (Freeway Merge 33).

Implementation: Caltrans

Timing: Before project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which project phase the improvement should be built.

Enforcement: Caltrans

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1gg would reduce the significant impact the U.S. 50 Westbound / Prairie City Road Direct Ramp Merge to a less-than-significant level by improving freeway merge LOS under development of the Proposed Project and all build alternatives.

Until Caltrans implements the improvement, the impact would be classified as significant but would be reduced to a less-than-significant level once those improvements are constructed. Implementation of the mitigation measure will improve operations to a LOS C.

As discussed above, the requirement that the Applicant participate in funding these transportation improvements that are located outside the City of Folsom's control would mitigate or substantially lessen the project's significant impact on this intersection but the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**. This conclusion reflects the reality that successful implementation the proposed improvements will require the cooperation of Caltrans, over which the City of Folsom has no control. For this reason, the City of Folsom is conservatively acknowledging the possibility that, despite its own commitment to work with these other agencies, mutually acceptable accommodation may not be reached. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2), though, the City of Folsom concludes that these other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the mitigation.

IMPACT **Unacceptable LOS at the U.S. 50 Westbound / Folsom Boulevard Diverge (Freeway Diverge 34).** *This 3A.15-1hh freeway diverge would experience an increase in density under unacceptable LOS F conditions during the a.m. peak hour, and degrade from an acceptable LOS D to an unacceptable LOS F during the p.m. peak hour.*

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

This freeway diverge would experience an increase in density under unacceptable LOS F conditions during the a.m. peak hour under the Proposed Project and all build alternatives, and degrade from an acceptable LOS D to an unacceptable LOS F during the p.m. peak hour under the Centralized Development, Reduced Hillside Development alternatives. This is a **significant** impact. The impact of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1hh: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on U.S. 50 Eastbound / Folsom Boulevard Diverge (Freeway Diverge 34).

To ensure that Westbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS at the Folsom Boulevard Diverge, an auxiliary lane from the Prairie City Road loop ramp merge must be constructed. Improvements to this freeway segment must be implemented by Caltrans. This auxiliary lane improvement is included in the proposed 50 Corridor Mobility Fee Program. The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other appropriate and reliable mechanism paid for by applicant, to reduce the impacts to the U.S. 50 Eastbound / Folsom Boulevard diverge (Freeway Diverge 34).

Implementation: Caltrans

Timing: Before project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which project phase the improvement should be built.

Enforcement: Caltrans

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1hh would reduce the significant impact on the U.S. 50 Eastbound / Folsom Boulevard Diverge to a less-than-significant level by improving intersection LOS under development of

the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives.

Until Caltrans implements the improvement, the impact would be classified as significant but would be reduced to a less-than-significant level once those improvements are constructed. Implementation of the mitigation measure will improve operations to a LOS B.

As discussed above, the requirement that the Applicant participate in funding these transportation improvements that are located outside the City of Folsom's control would mitigate or substantially lessen the project's significant impact on this intersection but the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**. This conclusion reflects the reality that successful implementation the proposed improvements will require the cooperation of Caltrans, over which the City of Folsom has no control. For this reason, the City of Folsom is conservatively acknowledging the possibility that, despite its own commitment to work with these other agencies, mutually acceptable accommodation may not be reached. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2), though, the City of Folsom concludes that these other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the mitigation.

IMPACT **Unacceptable LOS at the U.S. 50 Westbound / Hazel Avenue Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge 38).** *This*
3A.15-1ii *freeway merge would experience an increase in density under unacceptable LOS F conditions during the*
a.m. peak hour.

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

This freeway merge would experience an increase in density under unacceptable LOS F conditions during the a.m. peak hour under the Proposed Project and all of the build alternatives. This is a **significant** impact. The impact of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1ii: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on U.S. 50 Westbound / Hazel Avenue Direct Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge 38).

To ensure that Westbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS at the Hazel Avenue direct ramp merge, an auxiliary lane to the Sunrise Boulevard off ramp diverge must be constructed. This auxiliary lane improvement is included in the proposed 50 Corridor Mobility Fee Program. The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements to the agency responsible for improvements, based on a program established by that agency to reduce the impacts to the U.S. 50 Westbound/Hazel Avenue direct ramp merge (Freeway Merge 38).

Implementation: Caltrans

Timing: Before project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which project phase the improvement should be built.

Enforcement: Caltrans

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-1ii would reduce the significant impact the U.S. 50 Westbound / Hazel Avenue Direct Ramp Merge to a less-than-significant level by eliminating the merge movement from the freeway mainline under development of the Proposed Project and all build alternatives.

Until Caltrans implements the improvement, the impact would be classified as significant but would be reduced to a less-than-significant level once those improvements are constructed. Implementation of the mitigation measure

will improve operations to an acceptable condition. With the elimination of the direct merge movement there is no specific LOS for the mitigated condition.

As discussed above, the requirement that the Applicant participate in funding these transportation improvements that are located outside the City of Folsom’s control would mitigate or substantially lessen the project’s significant impact on this intersection but the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**. This conclusion reflects the reality that successful implementation the proposed improvements will require the cooperation of Caltrans, over which the City of Folsom has no control. For this reason, the City of Folsom is conservatively acknowledging the possibility that, despite its own commitment to work with these other agencies, mutually acceptable accommodation may not be reached. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2), though, the City of Folsom concludes that these other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the mitigation.

IMPACT *Increased Demand for Single-Occupant Automobile Travel in the Project Area. Project implementation*
3A.15-2 *would increase demand for single-occupant automobile travel on area roadways and intersections causing roadway and intersection impacts.*

On-Site and Off-Site Elements

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

The project would add significant traffic to area roadways and intersections, increasing the demand for single-occupant automobile travel on area roadways and intersections, causing roadway and intersection impacts under all five development alternatives. This increase is considered a **significant** impact. The impacts of the alternatives are similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-2a: Develop Commercial Support Services and Mixed-use Development Concurrent with Housing Development, and Develop and Provide Options for Alternative Transportation Modes.

The project applicant(s) for all project phases shall develop commercial and mixed-use development concurrent with housing development, to the extent feasible in light of market realities and other considerations, to internalize vehicle trips. Pedestrian and bicycle facilities shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the City Public Works Department. To further minimize impacts from the increased demand on area roadways and intersections, the project applicant(s) for all project phases shall develop and implement safe and secure bicycle parking at schools and commercial centers to promote alternative transportation uses and reduce the volume of single-occupancy vehicles using area roadways and intersections.

Implementation: City of Folsom and Applicant(s)

Timing: Before approval of improvement plans for all project phases.

Enforcement: City of Folsom Public Works Department.

The project applicant(s) for all project phases shall participate in capital improvements and operating funds for transit service to increase the percent of travel by transit. The project’s fair-share participation and the associated timing of the improvements and service shall be identified in the project conditions of approval and/or the project’s development agreement. Improvements and service shall be coordinated, as necessary, with Folsom Stage Lines and Sacramento RT.

Implementation: City of Folsom, Regional Transit, and Applicant(s)

Timing: As a condition of project approval and/or as a condition of the development agreement for all project phases.

Enforcement: City of Folsom Public Works Department.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-2b: Participate in the City's Transportation System Management Fee Program.

The project applicant(s) for all project phases shall pay an appropriate amount into the City's existing Transportation System Management Fee Program to reduce the number of single-occupant automobile travel on area roadways and intersections.

Implementation: City of Folsom and Applicant(s)

Timing: Concurrent with construction for all project phases.

Enforcement: City of Folsom Public Works Department.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-2c: Participate with the 50 Corridor Transportation Management Association.

The project applicant(s) for all project phases shall join and participate with the 50 Corridor Transportation Management Association to reduce the number of single-occupant automobile travel on area roadways and intersections.

Implementation: 50 Corridor Transportation Management Association and Applicant(s)

Timing: Concurrent with construction for all project phases.

Enforcement: City of Folsom Public Works Department.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-2a would reduce the demand of the single-occupant vehicle on area roadways and intersections. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 3A.15-2b and 3A.15-2c would promote usage of alternative transportation modes and increase the supply of these modes. Although the mitigation measures have the potential to substantially reduce the number of single-occupant vehicles, the project would continue to add single-occupant vehicles in the area and the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**.

CUMULATIVE SCENARIOS

This section addresses impacts of the project under cumulative (2030) conditions. Impacts are identified when the project's incremental contribution is "cumulatively considerable" and thus is considered significant. Tables 3A.15-25 through 3A.15-33 summarize the results of the analyses.

Exhibits 3A.15-61 through 66, 3A.15-69 through 74, 3A.15-77 through 82, 3A.15-85 through 90, and 3A.15-93 through 98 present peak-hour traffic volumes, lane configurations, and traffic control under the Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, Reduced Hillside Development, and No USACE Permit alternatives, respectively. Exhibits 3A.15-67, 3A.15-75, 3A.15-83, 3A.15-91 and 3A.15-99 compare ADT volumes under Baseline No Project conditions with those under the Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, Reduced Hillside Development, and No USACE Permit alternatives, respectively. Exhibits 3A.15-68, 3A.15-76, 3A.15-84, 3A.15-92, and 3A.15-100 compare present freeway peak-hour traffic volumes and lane configurations under the Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, Reduced Hillside Development, and USACE Permit alternatives, respectively.

IMPACT **Potential Impacts Associated with the City's Transportation Impact Fee Program.** *The City of Folsom has a transportation impact fee program to implement roadway facilities (those identified in the City General Plan for implementation before Year 2030) within the city limits. However, this fee program does not cover the new roadway facilities that will be needed due to the Proposed Project or alternative.*

3A.15-3

On-Site and Off-Site Elements

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

The City's fee transportation impact fee program does not cover the South of U.S. 50 area, or improvements within the existing City that will only be needed because of the Proposed Project or alternative. Measure W, passed by the City of Folsom voters, requires that all improvements required by the South of U.S. 50 Specific Plan be fully funded by the development in the SPA. Therefore, cumulative impacts identified require additional funding (beyond the current fee program) to mitigate the impacts. This is considered a **significant** impact. The impacts of the alternatives are similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-3: Pay Full Cost of Identified Improvements that Are Not Funded by the City's Fee Program.

In accordance with Measure W, the project applicant(s) for all project phases shall fully fund improvements only required because of the Specific Plan.

Implementation: City of Folsom and Applicant(s)

Timing: As a condition of project approval and/or as a condition of the development agreement for all project phases.

Enforcement: City of Folsom Public Works Department.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-3 requires project applicants to fully fund all improvements only required by the Proposed Project or alternative. However, because ultimate funding of the improvements cannot be guaranteed and the City cannot guarantee implementation of the identified measures, the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**. If the City is able to ultimately fully fund the fee program through fair-share contributions or external funding sources, the impact would be classified as significant in the short term but would be reduced to a less-than-significant level in the long term.

IMPACT **Increases to Peak-Hour and Daily Traffic Volumes, Resulting in Unacceptable Levels of Service, under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.** *Implementation of the Proposed Project (or alternatives) and other reasonably foreseeable development would cause an increase in a.m. peak traffic hour, p.m. peak traffic hour, and/or daily traffic volumes on area roadways, resulting in unacceptable LOS and warranting the need for improvements such as traffic signals and additional lanes under cumulative (2030) conditions.*

3A.15-4

NP

Under the Cumulative No Project Alternative, no development beyond what currently exists is assumed. No off-site water facilities would be constructed under this scenario. No new trips are generated in the SPA under this scenario; therefore, there are no intersection, roadway segment, freeway mainline, or ramp merge / diverge / weaving area impacts by definition. These impacts are less than those associated with the Proposed Project.

The following sub-impacts and mitigation measures are specific to individual locations. These locations include only those intersections, roadways, freeway segments and freeway ramps where significant, direct impacts would occur.

**Table 3A.15-25
Intersection Levels of Service — Cumulative (2030) Conditions — City of Folsom**

Intersection	Control	No Project				Proposed Project				No USACE Permit Alternative				Resource Impact Minimization				Centralized Development				Reduced Hillside Development			
		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
		Delay ¹	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS
1. Folsom Blvd / Blue Ravine Road	Signalized	49.4	D	64.0	E	49.5	D	64.4	E	50.2	D	63.7	E	49.9	D	63.8	E	50.3	D	64.1	E	49.5	D	64.0	E
2. Sibley Street / Blue Ravine Road	Signalized	48.0	D	30.3	C	55.0	D	30.1	C	52.4	D	30.4	C	52.5	D	30.0	C	54.8	D	30.3	C	55.1	E	30.0	C
3. Oak Avenue Parkway / Blue Ravine Road	Signalized	35.1	D	37.2	D	35.9	D	37.7	D	35.6	D	37.6	D	35.7	D	37.4	D	35.9	D	37.7	D	35.9	D	37.6	D
4. Empire Ranch Road / Natoma Street	Signalized	10.2	B	8.8	A	24.9	C	9.3	A	25.7	C	9.3	A	24.6	C	9.1	A	25.2	C	9.1	A	25.3	C	9.3	A
5. Oak Avenue Parkway / Riley Street	Signalized	19.7	B	24.7	C	19.6	B	24.8	C	19.5	B	24.2	C	19.6	B	24.4	C	19.7	B	24.4	C	19.7	B	24.6	C
6. Oak Avenue Parkway / East Bidwell Street	Signalized	30.4	C	40.8	D	32.2	C	48.6	D	31.9	C	48.1	D	32.0	C	47.4	D	32.1	C	48.8	D	32.1	C	49.2	D
7. Nesmith Court / East Bidwell Street	Signalized	23.5	C	54.8	D	24.7	C	62.6	E	24.2	C	62.2	E	24.3	C	60.9	E	24.4	C	62.8	E	24.7	C	61.6	E
8. Scholar Way / East Bidwell Street	Signalized	12.6	B	14.3	B	12.4	B	16.2	B	12.6	B	15.0	B	12.5	B	14.6	B	12.6	B	15.6	B	12.6	B	16.8	B
9. Power Center Drive / East Bidwell Street	Signalized	8.1	A	18.8	B	7.0	A	17.7	B	7.1	A	18.1	B	7.0	A	18.0	B	7.1	A	18.2	B	7.2	A	17.8	B
10. Broadstone Parkway / East Bidwell Street	Signalized	27.1	C	31.5	C	28.2	C	33.1	C	27.7	C	32.9	C	27.6	C	32.9	C	28.0	C	33.0	C	28.2	C	33.1	C
11. Empire Ranch Road / Broadstone Parkway	Signalized	20.1	C	21.7	C	19.9	B	24.4	C	20.5	C	24.0	C	20.2	C	24.0	C	20.1	C	24.1	C	20.7	C	25.3	C
12. Oak Avenue Parkway / Haverhill Drive	Signalized	16.7	B	9.7	A	15.0	B	8.8	A	15.2	B	8.8	A	15.2	B	8.8	A	14.9	B	8.7	A	14.9	B	8.7	A
13. Oak Avenue Parkway / Halidon Way	Signalized	13.9	B	11.5	B	14.6	B	12.9	B	14.3	B	12.7	B	14.3	B	12.6	B	14.6	B	12.9	B	14.8	B	13.1	B
14. Folsom Blvd / Iron Point Road	Signalized	21.1	C	26.3	C	20.3	C	30.3	C	20.3	C	30.6	C	20.4	C	29.7	C	20.4	C	30.1	C	20.7	C	29.6	C
15. Prairie City Road / Iron Point Road	Signalized	24.8	C	32.3	C	24.9	C	30.6	C	24.7	C	30.1	C	24.7	C	30.3	C	25.1	C	30.4	C	25.2	C	30.6	C
16. Grover Road / Iron Point Road	Signalized	19.6	B	11.5	B	18.8	B	11.2	B	19.1	B	11.3	B	19.1	B	11.3	B	18.5	B	11.3	B	17.5	B	11.0	B
17. McAdoo Drive / Iron Point Road	Signalized	22.3	C	15.1	B	20.8	C	16.7	B	21.1	C	16.7	B	21.0	C	16.7	B	20.9	C	16.7	B	20.7	C	16.7	B
18. Oak Avenue Parkway / Iron Point Road	Signalized	31.4	C	44.0	D	32.6	C	40.4	D	32.7	C	39.6	D	32.2	C	39.4	D	33.1	C	41.1	D	33.3	C	41.0	D
19. Rowberry Drive / Iron Point Road	Signalized	10.0	A	9.7	A	27.1	C	32.0	C	25.0	C	28.1	C	25.2	C	27.7	C	25.8	C	29.1	C	26.2	C	29.2	C
20. Broadstone Parkway / Iron Point Road	Signalized	18.1	B	20.4	C	18.2	B	20.2	C	18.2	B	20.3	C	18.3	B	20.3	C	18.6	B	20.5	C	18.7	B	20.7	C
21. East Bidwell Street / Iron Point Road	Signalized	26.6	C	60.6	E	29.7	C	77.0	E	29.6	C	76.2	E	29.3	C	75.4	E	30.0	C	81.4	F	30.2	C	83.0	F
22. Cavitt Road / Iron Point Road	Signalized	14.8	B	21.5	C	12.9	B	21.6	C	13.3	B	21.6	C	13.4	B	21.6	C	12.8	B	21.5	C	12.8	B	21.5	C
23. Serpa Way / Iron Point Road	Signalized	24.2	C	39.2	D	24.3	C	43.7	D	24.1	C	43.6	D	24.2	C	43.5	D	24.3	C	44.3	D	24.4	C	45.6	D
24. Empire Ranch Road / Iron Point Road	Signalized	80.5	F	60.7	E	82.2	F	79.9	E	73.2	E	76.1	E	68.3	E	71.3	E	72.7	E	71.4	E	84.2	F	84.2	F
25. Prairie City Road / High School	Signalized	34.8	C	24.3	C	34.8	C	25.8	C	34.7	C	25.8	C	34.8	C	25.7	C	34.6	C	25.6	C	34.9	C	25.7	C
26. East Bidwell Street / Placerville Road	Signalized	446.2	F	1328.8	F	145.3	F	965.6	F	194.2	F	1053.7	F	213.9	F	1025.8	F	233.3	F	1179.4	F	306.0	F	1209.8	F
27. Prairie City Road / White Rock Road	Signalized	61.8	E	26.4	C	40.6	D	24.8	C	37.2	D	23.8	C	39.2	D	24.1	C	40.8	D	24.4	C	41.8	D	24.1	C
28. Scott Road (West) / White Rock Road	Signalized	37.2	D	9.8	A	36.0	D	10.2	B	34.4	C	10.2	B	34.1	C	9.9	A	34.6	C	10.3	B	35.1	D	10.4	B
29. Scott Road (East) / White Rock Road	Signalized	63.9	E	27.2	C	35.6	D	22.1	C	35.1	D	21.4	C	35.4	D	21.6	C	35.4	D	22.3	C	36.5	D	22.9	C
30. Placerville Road / White Rock Road	Side-street stop ²	0.0	A	21.4	C	11.7	B	9.7	A	10.5	B	9.1	A	11.8	B	9.4	A	11.0	B	9.5	A	11.6	B	9.2	A
31. Empire Ranch Road / North Road	Signalized					10.6	B	18.3	B	13.6	B	23.3	C	11.4	B	19.5	B	14.5	B	25.4	C	15.2	B	24.6	C
32. Prairie City Road / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized	14.2	B	18.5	B	32.1	C	32.6	C	29.6	C	31.5	C	29.0	C	31.0	C	32.3	C	32.7	C	32.6	C	32.6	C
33. Oak Avenue Parkway / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized					37.3	D	30.3	C	33.1	C	29.7	C	32.1	C	30.0	C	37.5	D	30.2	C	37.1	D	30.6	C
34. Rowberry Drive / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized					21.2	C	24.7	C	21.3	C	22.7	C	19.9	B	21.7	C	20.6	C	22.9	C	22.9	C	24.8	C
35. 1st Street / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized					18.9	B	19.2	B	24.6	C	25.6	C	25.9	C	25.2	C	27.1	C	26.6	C	27.3	C	27.1	C
36. 2nd Street / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized					25.0	C	28.6	C	23.8	C	26.5	C	22.2	C	24.1	C	22.3	C	24.1	C	22.5	C	24.0	C
37. 3rd Street / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized					24.6	C	26.2	C	21.0	C	20.7	C	23.2	C	22.6	C	23.0	C	21.9	C	22.5	C	22.8	C
38. Scott Road (East) / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized					31.2	C	41.2	D	31.0	C	34.4	C	29.0	C	32.5	C	32.4	C	37.6	D	33.3	C	39.1	D
39. Placerville Road / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized					31.4	C	31.0	C	23.6	C	23.1	C	23.5	C	22.5	C	23.7	C	22.7	C	24.9	C	22.0	C
40. 4th Street / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized					na	na	na	na	24.4	C	24.6	C	28.7	C	21.6	C	26.5	C	25.3	C	28.8	C	25.9	C

**Table 3A.15-25
Intersection Levels of Service — Cumulative (2030) Conditions – City of Folsom**

Intersection	Control	No Project				Proposed Project				No USACE Permit Alternative				Resource Impact Minimization				Centralized Development				Reduced Hillside Development			
		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
		Delay ¹	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS
41. Hillside Drive / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized					16.1	B	16.4	B	13.7	B	14.5	B	13.9	B	14.9	B	16.6	B	17.1	B	15.2	B	16.4	B
42. Empire Ranch Road / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized					23.5	C	27.9	C	20.3	C	25.2	C	19.9	B	24.7	C	7.1	A	16.1	B	19.7	B	25.7	C
43. Prairie City Road / Middle Road	Signalized					8.1	A	11.0	B	5.5	A	10.0	A	6.2	A	9.7	A	7.2	A	10.6	B	10.2	B	11.2	B
44. Oak Avenue Parkway / Middle Road	Signalized					16.6	B	22.3	C	11.9	B	19.9	B	10.9	B	19.9	B	14.6	B	20.8	C	17.8	B	22.0	C
45. Scott Road (East) / Street "B"	Signalized					22.0	C	26.0	C	25.4	C	27.0	C	29.8	C	29.7	C	30.1	C	32.0	C	31.3	C	31.8	C
46. East Road / Street "B"	Signalized					24.6	C	24.3	C	14.0	B	15.1	B	21.1	C	21.3	C	24.1	C	22.3	C	25.4	C	23.8	C
47. Prairie City Road / Street "A"	Signalized					8.9	A	9.6	A	8.2	A	8.8	A	9.2	A	9.7	A	11.4	B	12.2	B	11.0	B	12.0	B
48. Oak Avenue Parkway / Street "A"	Signalized					24.6	C	27.6	C	21.3	C	27.1	C	22.0	C	26.9	C	25.8	C	28.8	C	26.9	C	29.0	C
49. 2 nd Street / Street "A"	Signalized					18.0	B	18.4	B	19.2	B	19.1	B	20.9	C	22.2	C	21.3	C	22.2	C	22.7	C	23.4	C
50. Scott Road (East) / Street "A"	Signalized					22.9	C	22.2	C	19.2	B	19.2	B	26.9	C	26.2	C	27.6	C	26.0	C	30.4	C	29.5	C
51. East Road / Street "A"	Signalized					9.7	A	9.8	A	8.3	A	8.3	A	9.8	A	9.8	A	10.9	B	10.6	B	11.6	B	11.3	B
52. Placerville Road / Street "A"	Signalized					25.7	C	26.5	C	20.1	C	20.2	C	23.2	C	24.1	C	19.2	B	18.1	B	24.4	C	24.7	C
53. Empire Ranch Road / Street "A"	Signalized					14.9	B	14.1	B	13.5	B	12.7	B	15.4	B	13.7	B	4.4	A	4.6	A	12.1	B	11.3	B
54. Scott Road (East) / South Road	Signalized					18.8	B	20.7	C	14.7	B	18.8	B	16.1	B	19.0	B	19.1	B	21.1	C	22.7	C	23.8	C
55. Oak Avenue Parkway / White Rock Road	Signalized					27.3	C	27.1	C	24.6	C	27.4	C	24.2	C	27.0	C	26.0	C	29.6	C	26.3	C	28.3	C
56. Empire Ranch Road / White Rock Road	Signalized					28.9	C	17.7	B	24.3	C	18.0	B	24.9	C	19.0	B	23.5	C	17.7	B	25.1	C	19.1	B

Notes: LOS = level of service; U.S. 50 = U.S. Highway 50; V/C = volume-to-capacity; Blank = intersection does not exist under this alternative
¹ Average intersection delay reported for all-way-stop intersections; worst-case delay reported for unsignalized, side-street-stop intersections; average intersection delay reported for all-way-stop intersections. All delays are reported in seconds per vehicle.
² Intersection signalized with the proposed project.
Bold indicates deficiency. Shaded areas indicate impact.
Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

**Table 3A.15-26
Intersection Levels of Service — Cumulative (2030) Conditions – Sacramento County**

Intersection	Control	No Project				Proposed Project				No USACE Permit Alternative				Resource Impact Minimization				Centralized Development				Reduced Hillside Development			
		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
		V/C ¹ or Delay ²	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS
1. Hazel Avenue / Gold Country Blvd	Signalized	0.98	E	1.25	F	0.99	E	1.27	F	0.99	E	1.27	F	0.99	E	1.26	F	1.00	F	1.27	F	1.00	E	1.27	F
2. Hazel Avenue / Folsom Blvd	Signalized	0.78	C	0.81	D	0.76	C	0.83	D	0.77	C	0.84	D	0.77	C	0.83	D	0.76	C	0.84	D	0.76	C	0.84	D
3. Grant Line Road / White Rock Road	Signalized	0.96	E	0.90	D	1.03	F	0.97	E	1.03	F	0.97	E	1.02	F	0.97	E	1.04	F	0.97	E	1.04	F	0.97	E
4. Grant Line Road / Sunrise Blvd	Signalized	0.82	D	0.69	B	0.82	D	0.70	C	0.82	D	0.71	C	0.82	D	0.70	C	0.82	D	0.71	C	0.82	D	0.70	C
5. Hazel Avenue / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized	0.41	A	0.68	B	0.45	A	0.71	C	0.44	A	0.71	C	0.45	A	0.70	C	0.45	A	0.72	C	0.45	A	0.73	C
6. Aerojet Road / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized	0.32	A	0.59	A	0.40	A	0.76	C	0.39	A	0.74	C	0.38	A	0.74	C	0.40	A	0.75	C	0.41	A	0.76	C
7. Alabama Avenue / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized	0.33	A	0.31	A	0.40	A	0.37	A	0.38	A	0.38	A	0.39	A	0.38	A	0.39	A	0.39	A	0.40	A	0.40	A
8. Glenborough Road / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized	0.29	A	0.35	A	0.40	A	0.50	A	0.38	A	0.48	A	0.38	A	0.48	A	0.39	A	0.49	A	0.40	A	0.50	A

Notes: LOS = level of service; V/C = volume-to-capacity
¹ V/C ratio is shown for signalized intersections. Delay is shown for unsignalized intersections.
² Average intersection delay reported in seconds per vehicle.
Bold indicates deficiency. Shaded areas indicate impact.
Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

**Table 3A.15-27
Roadway Segment Levels of Service — Cumulative (2030) Conditions - Sacramento County**

Roadway Segment	Lanes	No Project			Proposed Project			No USACE Permit Alternative			Resource Impact Minimization			Centralized Development			Reduced Hillside Development		
		Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS
1. Folsom Blvd — Sunrise Blvd to Mercantile Drive	4	31,900	0.89	D	32,000	0.89	D	32,100	0.89	D	31,900	0.89	D	32,100	0.89	D	32,000	0.89	D
2. Folsom Blvd — Mercantile Drive to Hazel Avenue	4	22,700	0.63	B	23,200	0.64	B	23,000	0.64	B	23,100	0.64	B	23,200	0.64	B	23,200	0.64	B
3. Folsom Blvd — Hazel Avenue to Aerojet Road	4	8,000	0.22	A	8,900	0.25	A	8,700	0.24	A	8,600	0.24	A	8,800	0.24	A	8,800	0.24	A
4. Folsom Blvd — Aerojet Road to U.S. 50	4	26,300	0.73	C	25,400	0.71	C	25,300	0.70	C	25,300	0.70	C	25,400	0.71	C	25,500	0.71	C
5. Grant Line Road — White Rock Road to Centennial Road	4	57,600	1.44	F	65,100	1.63	F	64,800	1.62	F	64,100	1.60	F	65,000	1.63	F	65,000	1.63	F
6. Grant Line Road — Centennial Road to Douglas Road	4	55,500	1.39	F	62,000	1.55	F	61,800	1.55	F	61,100	1.53	F	62,000	1.55	F	62,000	1.55	F
7. Grant Line Road — Douglas Road to Keifer Blvd	4	57,000	1.58	F	60,800	1.69	F	60,700	1.69	F	60,400	1.68	F	60,800	1.69	F	60,800	1.69	F
8. Grant Line Road — Keifer Boulevard to Jackson Highway (SR 16)	4	37,600	1.04	F	39,500	1.10	F	39,400	1.09	F	39,100	1.09	F	39,400	1.09	F	39,400	1.09	F
9. Grant Line Road — Jackson Highway (SR 16) to Sunrise Boulevard	4	37,000	1.03	F	38,600	1.07	F	38,600	1.07	F	38,400	1.07	F	38,600	1.07	F	38,600	1.07	F
10. Hazel Avenue — Greenback Lane to Madison Avenue	6	56,300	1.04	F	56,800	1.05	F	56,900	1.05	F	57,000	1.06	F	57,000	1.06	F	57,000	1.06	F
11. Hazel Avenue — Madison Avenue to Curragh Downs Drive	6	76,700	1.42	F	78,900	1.46	F	78,700	1.46	F	78,200	1.45	F	78,900	1.46	F	78,800	1.46	F
12. Hazel Avenue — Curragh Downs Drive to Gold Country Blvd	6	88,000	1.47	F	91,300	1.52	F	91,000	1.52	F	90,600	1.51	F	91,300	1.52	F	91,200	1.52	F
13. Hazel Avenue — Gold Country Blvd to U.S. 50 westbound ramp	6	91,100	1.52	F	94,800	1.58	F	94,400	1.57	F	94,100	1.57	F	95,000	1.58	F	94,800	1.58	F
14. Jackson Highway (SR 16) — Grant Line Road to Dillard Road	2	13,200	0.58	D	12,900	0.56	D	12,900	0.56	D	12,900	0.56	D	12,800	0.56	D	12,900	0.56	D
15. Jackson Highway (SR 16) — Dillard Road to Stone House Road	2	16,400	0.72	E	16,500	0.72	E	16,500	0.72	E	16,500	0.72	E	16,500	0.72	E	16,500	0.72	E
16. Prairie City Road — U.S. 50 eastbound ramp to Easton Valley Parkway	4 - 6	35,700	0.99	E	39,500	0.73	C	37,000	0.69	B	36,900	0.68	B	41,000	0.76	C	41,100	0.76	C
17. Prairie City Road — Easton Valley Parkway to White Rock Road	2 - 4	25,100	1.39	F	37,200	1.03	F	37,100	1.03	F	37,700	1.05	F	38,400	1.07	F	38,100	1.06	F
18. Scott Road (West) — White Rock Road to Latrobe Road	2	3,900	0.23	C	5,700	0.34	C	5,700	0.34	C	5,600	0.33	C	5,800	0.34	C	5,800	0.34	C
19. Stonehouse Road — Latrobe Road to Jackson Highway (SR 16)	2	5,700	0.34	C	7,400	0.44	D	7,300	0.43	D	7,200	0.42	D	7,400	0.44	D	7,400	0.44	D
20. Sunrise Boulevard — Jackson Highway (SR 16) to Grant Line Road	6	22,300	0.62	B	22,500	0.63	B	22,500	0.63	B	22,500	0.63	B	22,500	0.63	B	22,500	0.63	B
21. White Rock Road — Villagio Parkway to Grant Line Road	4	15,800	0.44	A	19,900	0.55	A	19,400	0.54	A	19,600	0.54	A	19,800	0.55	A	20,000	0.56	A
22. White Rock Road — Grant Line Road to Prairie City Road	4	74,300	1.86	F	85,800	2.15	F	85,000	2.13	F	84,500	2.11	F	85,700	2.14	F	85,900	2.15	F
23. White Rock Road — Prairie City Road to Scott Road (West)	4 - 5	67,100	1.68	F	69,800	1.40	F	67,900	1.36	F	67,800	1.36	F	68,500	1.37	F	68,900	1.38	F
24. White Rock Road — Scott Road (West) to Oak Avenue Parkway	4 - 5	52,400	1.31	F	56,500	1.13	F	54,600	1.09	F	54,200	1.08	F	55,200	1.10	F	55,500	1.11	F
25. White Rock Road — Oak Avenue Parkway to Scott Road (East)	4 - 5	52,400	1.31	F	59,800	1.20	F	59,000	1.18	F	59,000	1.18	F	59,400	1.19	F	59,600	1.19	F
26. White Rock Road — Scott Road (East) to Placerville Road	4 - 5	29,500	0.74	C	30,300	0.61	B	29,400	0.59	A	29,300	0.59	A	29,900	0.60	A	30,600	0.61	B
27. White Rock Road — Placerville Road to Empire Ranch Road	4 - 5	34,500	0.86	D	38,000	0.76	C	38,000	0.76	C	38,300	0.77	C	39,800	0.80	C	40,300	0.81	D
28. White Rock Road — Empire Ranch Road to Carson Crossing Road	6	34,500	0.86	D	49,300	0.99	E	48,900	0.98	E	49,500	0.99	E	50,300	1.01	F	51,300	1.03	F
29. Hazel Avenue — Folsom Blvd connector to Easton Valley Parkway	6	17,600	0.33	A	19,000	0.35	A	18,500	0.34	A	18,600	0.34	A	18,800	0.35	A	19,000	0.35	A
30. Easton Valley Parkway — Hazel Avenue to Aerojet Road	6	31,300	0.58	A	34,200	0.63	B	33,700	0.62	B	33,600	0.62	B	34,200	0.63	B	34,300	0.64	B
31. Easton Valley Parkway — Aerojet Road to Alabama Avenue	6	19,600	0.36	A	27,300	0.51	A	26,100	0.48	A	26,100	0.48	A	27,100	0.50	A	27,500	0.51	A
32. Easton Valley Parkway — Alabama Avenue to Glenborough Road	6	15,400	0.29	A	23,700	0.44	A	22,400	0.41	A	22,400	0.41	A	23,400	0.43	A	23,900	0.44	A
33. Easton Valley Parkway — Glenborough Road to Prairie City Road	0 - 4	16,700	0.31	A	28,000	0.52	A	26,500	0.49	A	26,500	0.49	A	27,800	0.51	A	28,300	0.52	A

Notes: LOS = level of service; SR = State Route; U.S. 50 = U.S. Highway 50; V/C = volume-to-capacity
Lanes: Cumulative No Project – Cumulative Plus Project (or alternative)
Bold indicates deficiency. Shaded areas indicate impact.
Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

**Table 3A.15-28
Intersection Levels of Service — Cumulative (2030) Conditions – City of Rancho Cordova**

Intersection	Control	No Project		Proposed Project				No USACE Permit Alternative				Resource Impact Minimization				Centralized Development				Reduced Hillside Development					
		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
		V/C ¹ or Delay ²	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS
1. Sunrise Blvd / White Rock Road	Signalized	0.63	B	0.68	B	0.67	B	0.67	B	0.64	B	0.65	B	0.64	B	0.66	B	0.63	B	0.67	B	0.63	B	0.67	B
2. Fitzgerald Road / White Rock Road	Signalized	0.32	A	0.34	A	0.31	A	0.33	A	0.31	A	0.33	A	0.31	A	0.33	A	0.31	A	0.33	A	0.31	A	0.33	A
3. Sunrise Blvd / Douglas Road	Signalized	0.65	B	0.81	D	0.71	C	0.80	C	0.71	C	0.80	D	0.69	B	0.81	D	0.69	B	0.81	D	0.70	B	0.79	C
4. Grant Line Road / Douglas Road	Signalized	0.72	C	0.61	B	0.76	C	0.64	B	0.76	C	0.64	B	0.75	C	0.63	B	0.76	C	0.64	B	0.76	C	0.64	B
5. Grant Line Road / Kiefer Road	Signalized	0.85	D	0.63	B	0.86	D	0.65	B	0.86	D	0.65	B	0.86	D	0.64	B	0.86	D	0.65	B	0.86	D	0.64	B
6. Rancho Cordova Parkway / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized	0.72	C	0.99	E	0.70	C	0.96	E	0.71	C	0.96	E	0.70	B	0.97	E	0.70	C	0.96	E	0.70	B	0.96	E
7. Rancho Cordova Parkway / White Rock Road	Signalized	1.01	F	0.87	D	1.02	F	0.87	D	1.01	F	0.86	D	1.01	F	0.87	D	1.00	F	0.87	D	1.02	F	0.87	D
8. International Drive / White Rock Road	Signalized	0.45	A	0.66	B	0.44	A	0.70	B	0.44	A	0.69	B	0.44	A	0.69	B	0.44	A	0.69	B	0.44	A	0.69	B
9. Rio Del Oro Parkway / White Rock Road	Signalized	0.52	A	0.36	A	0.54	A	0.37	A	0.54	A	0.36	A	0.54	A	0.37	A	0.54	A	0.37	A	0.55	A	0.37	A
10. Villagio Parkway / White Rock Road	Signalized	0.35	A	0.44	A	0.41	A	0.53	A	0.40	A	0.52	A	0.40	A	0.52	A	0.41	A	0.52	A	0.41	A	0.53	A
11. Sunrise Blvd / International Drive	Signalized	0.74	C	0.72	C	0.75	C	0.69	B	0.74	C	0.70	C	0.75	C	0.71	C	0.76	C	0.70	B	0.74	C	0.69	B
12. Villagio Parkway / Americanos Road	Signalized	0.58	A	0.56	A	0.58	A	0.63	B	0.57	A	0.63	B	0.57	A	0.61	B	0.57	A	0.62	B	0.57	A	0.63	B
13. Grant Line Road / Centennial Road	Signalized	0.84	D	0.67	B	0.89	D	0.74	C	0.89	D	0.74	C	0.88	D	0.73	C	0.89	D	0.74	C	0.89	D	0.74	C
14. Villagio Parkway / Rancho Cordova Parkway	Signalized	0.65	C	0.54	C	0.68	C	0.53	C	0.68	C	0.52	C	0.67	C	0.53	C	0.67	C	0.52	C	0.68	C	0.53	C
15. Rancho Cordova Parkway / Douglas Road	Signalized	0.49	A	0.77	C	0.50	A	0.76	C	0.50	A	0.76	C	0.50	A	0.76	C	0.50	A	0.76	C	0.50	A	0.77	C
16. Americanos Blvd / Douglas Road	Signalized	0.59	A	0.78	C	0.49	C	0.68	C	0.49	C	0.68	C	0.49	C	0.68	C	0.49	C	0.68	C	0.49	C	0.68	C
17. Grant Line Road / Chrysanthy Blvd	Signalized	0.87	D	0.64	B	0.90	D	0.65	B	0.90	D	0.65	B	0.89	D	0.65	B	0.90	D	0.65	B	0.90	D	0.65	B
18. Grant Line Road / Rancho Cordova Parkway	Signalized	0.53	A	0.39	A	0.55	A	0.41	A	0.55	A	0.41	A	0.54	A	0.40	A	0.55	A	0.41	A	0.55	A	0.41	A

Notes:
LOS = level of service; V/C = volume-to-capacity
¹ V/C ratio is shown for signalized intersections. Delay is shown for unsignalized intersections.
² Worst-case delay reported for unsignalized, side-street-stop intersections; average intersection delay reported for all-way-stop intersections. Both delays are reported in seconds per vehicle.
Bold indicates deficiency. Shaded areas indicate impact.
Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

**Table 3A.15-29
Roadway Segment Levels of Service — Cumulative (2030) Conditions - City of Rancho Cordova**

Roadway Segment	Lanes	No Project			Proposed Project			No USACE Permit Alternative			Resource Impact Minimization			Centralized Development			Reduced Hillside Development		
		Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS
1. Douglas Road — Sunrise Blvd to Villagio Parkway	6	30,100	0.56	A	29,700	0.55	A	30,000	0.56	A	29,800	0.55	A	29,800	0.55	A	29,900	0.55	A
2. Douglas Road — Villagio Parkway to Rancho Cordova Parkway	6	25,200	0.47	A	24,400	0.45	A	24,500	0.45	A	24,600	0.46	A	24,500	0.45	A	24,500	0.45	A
3. Douglas Road — Rancho Cordova Parkway to Americanos Road	6	13,900	0.26	A	13,300	0.25	A	13,300	0.25	A	13,500	0.25	A	13,400	0.25	A	13,400	0.25	A
4. Douglas Road — Americanos Road to Grant Line Road	6	15,300	0.28	A	15,200	0.28	A	15,200	0.28	A	15,400	0.29	A	15,200	0.28	A	15,300	0.28	A
5. Sunrise Blvd — U.S. 50 eastbound ramps to Folsom Blvd	8	79,300	1.10	F	79,200	1.10	F	79,100	1.10	F	79,200	1.10	F	78,900	1.10	F	78,900	1.10	F
6. Sunrise Blvd — Folsom Blvd to White Rock Road	6	49,900	0.92	E	49,400	0.91	E	49,400	0.91	E	49,400	0.91	E	49,400	0.91	E	49,400	0.91	E
7. Sunrise Blvd — White Rock Road to Douglas Road	6	34,200	0.63	B	33,500	0.62	B	33,700	0.62	B	33,600	0.62	B	33,600	0.62	B	33,600	0.62	B
8. Sunrise Blvd — Douglas Road to Keifer Blvd	6	35,500	0.66	B	35,600	0.66	B	35,700	0.66	B	35,500	0.66	B	35,700	0.66	B	35,600	0.66	B
9. Sunrise Boulevard — Keifer Boulevard to Jackson Highway (SR 16)	6	23,100	0.43	A	23,200	0.43	A	23,200	0.43	A	23,100	0.43	A	23,100	0.43	A	23,100	0.43	A
10. White Rock Road — Zinfandel Drive to Sunrise Boulevard	4	9,400	0.17	A	9,300	0.17	A	9,400	0.17	A	9,100	0.17	A	9,000	0.17	A	9,200	0.17	A
11. White Rock Road — Sunrise Blvd to Rancho Cordova Parkway	6	36,800	0.68	B	36,200	0.67	B	35,900	0.66	B	36,200	0.67	B	36,100	0.67	B	36,000	0.67	B
12. White Rock Road — Rancho Cordova Parkway to International Drive	6	13,900	0.39	A	13,500	0.38	A	13,300	0.37	A	13,400	0.37	A	13,500	0.38	A	13,500	0.38	A
13. White Rock Road — International Drive to Rio Del Oro Parkway	6	12,400	0.34	A	13,700	0.38	A	13,400	0.37	A	13,600	0.38	A	13,600	0.38	A	13,700	0.38	A
14. White Rock Road — Rio Del Oro Parkway to Villagio Parkway	4	10,200	0.28	A	12,200	0.34	A	11,700	0.33	A	12,000	0.33	A	12,100	0.34	A	12,300	0.34	A
15. White Rock Road — Villagio Parkway to Grant Line Road	4	15,800	0.44	A	19,900	0.55	A	19,400	0.54	A	19,600	0.54	A	19,800	0.55	A	20,000	0.56	A
16. Easton Valley Parkway — Rancho Cordova Parkway to Hazel Avenue	6	39,000	0.72	C	38,800	0.72	C	54,000	0.72	C	38,700	0.72	C	38,800	0.72	C	38,800	0.72	C
17. Rancho Cordova Parkway — Easton Valley Parkway to International Drive	6	51,100	0.95	E	49,600	0.92	E	54,000	0.92	E	49,500	0.92	E	49,600	0.92	E	49,700	0.92	E
18. Rancho Cordova Parkway — International Drive to White Rock Road	6	41,400	0.77	C	40,800	0.76	C	54,000	0.75	C	40,700	0.75	C	40,700	0.75	C	40,800	0.76	C
19. International Drive — White Rock Road to Americanos Parkway	6	17,900	0.33	A	18,900	0.35	A	54,000	0.35	A	18,800	0.35	A	18,900	0.35	A	18,900	0.35	A
20. International Drive — Americanos Parkway to Rancho Cordova Parkway	6	33,600	0.62	B	34,000	0.63	B	54,000	0.63	B	34,100	0.63	B	33,900	0.63	B	34,000	0.63	B
21. International Drive — Rancho Cordova Parkway to Sunrise Blvd	6	31,700	0.59	A	31,700	0.59	A	54,000	0.59	A	31,900	0.59	A	31,800	0.59	A	31,900	0.59	A
22. Villagio Parkway — White Rock Road to Americanos Parkway	2	5,700	0.32	A	7,800	0.43	A	18,000	0.43	A	7,600	0.42	A	7,700	0.43	A	7,800	0.43	A
23. Villagio Parkway — Americanos Parkway to Rancho Cordova Parkway	2	10,700	0.59	A	11,900	0.66	B	18,000	0.66	B	11,800	0.66	B	11,800	0.66	B	11,800	0.66	B
24. Villagio Parkway — Rancho Cordova Parkway to Douglas Road	2	12,200	0.68	B	13,000	0.72	C	18,000	0.73	C	12,900	0.72	C	12,900	0.72	C	13,000	0.72	C

Notes: LOS = level of service; SR = State Route; U.S. 50 = U.S. Highway 50; V/C = volume-to-capacity
¹ Not expected to be a through roadway for baseline conditions.
² Assumed to have high access control.
Bold indicates deficiency. Shaded areas indicate impact.
Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

**Table 3A.15-30
Intersection Levels of Service — Cumulative (2030) Conditions – El Dorado County**

Intersection	Control	No Project				Proposed Project				No USACE Permit Alternative				Resource Impact Minimization				Centralized Development				Reduced Hillside Development			
		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
		Delay ¹	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS
1. White Rock Road / Carson Crossing Road	Signalized	27.7	C	22.6	C	100.8	F	35.1	D	90.5	F	42.9	D	96.3	F	46.8	D	95.2	F	48.0	D	97.2	F	48.3	D
2. White Rock Road / Stonebriar Drive	Signalized	15.4	B	11.2	B	15.1	B	10.4	B	15.8	B	10.5	B	15.5	B	10.5	B	15.4	B	10.4	B	15.0	B	10.3	B
3. White Rock Road / Windfield Way	Signalized	23.9	C	29.6	C	24.5	C	31.3	C	24.5	C	33.4	C	24.4	C	31.6	C	23.5	C	32.3	C	23.8	C	34.0	C
4. White Rock Road / Latrobe Road	Signalized	40.1	D	32.0	C	37.4	D	29.9	C	38.0	D	30.0	C	37.2	D	30.1	C	37.1	D	30.2	C	37.4	D	30.3	C
5. White Rock Road / Valley View Parkway	Signalized	35.3	D	81.1	F	42.6	D	65.5	E	43.1	D	66.0	E	45.0	D	62.5	E	42.7	D	64.8	E	46.6	D	63.5	E
6. El Dorado Hills Blvd / Serrano Parkway	Signalized	48.2	D	25.6	C	35.9	D	26.2	C	36.7	D	26.2	C	36.0	D	26.1	C	36.6	D	26.2	C	36.5	D	26.0	C
7. El Dorado Hills Blvd / Saratoga Way	Signalized	42.5	D	40.2	D	30.5	C	43.5	D	31.0	C	42.8	D	30.6	C	42.4	D	31.4	C	42.1	D	32.7	C	42.3	D
8. El Dorado Hills Blvd / Park Drive	Signalized	30.7	C	29.5	C	24.7	C	27.2	C	24.8	C	26.9	C	24.4	C	26.6	C	24.3	C	27.1	C	24.9	C	27.1	C
9. Latrobe Road / Town Center Blvd	Signalized	35.0	D	95.5	F	34.0	C	77.5	E	34.4	C	77.1	E	34.1	C	74.3	E	34.3	C	76.6	E	34.1	C	76.6	E

Notes: LOS = level of service;
Bold indicates deficiency. Shaded areas indicate impact.
 Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

**Table 3A.15-31
Intersection Levels of Service — Cumulative (2030) Conditions – Caltrans**

Intersection	Control	No Project				Proposed Project				No USACE Permit Alternative				Resource Impact Minimization				Centralized Development				Reduced Hillside Development			
		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
		Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS
1. Hazel Avenue / Tributary - WB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	28.7	C	94.1	F	44.0	D	102.3	F	41.9	D	102.1	F	42.9	D	100.1	F	46.1	D	105.8	F	46.0	D	102.8	F
2. Hazel Avenue / EB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	43.8	D	152.4	F	36.5	D	147.3	F	37.0	D	146.6	F	37.5	D	150.6	F	36.0	D	148.2	F	35.6	D	145.5	F
3. Folsom Blvd / WB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	8.4	A	13.3	B	6.3	A	10.7	B	6.2	A	10.8	B	6.2	A	10.8	B	6.3	A	10.8	B	6.2	A	10.7	B
4. Folsom Blvd / EB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	30.5	C	39.1	D	26.8	C	29.8	C	25.0	C	26.3	C	25.0	C	26.4	C	25.1	C	26.3	C	25.1	C	26.2	C
5. Prairie City Road / WB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	30.0	C	30.2	C	37.2	D	12.9	B	38.8	D	12.8	B	38.6	D	12.6	B	36.9	D	12.1	B	35.8	D	12.1	B
6. Prairie City Road / EB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	22.2	C	15.9	B	21.2	C	13.3	B	21.3	C	13.2	B	21.6	C	13.6	B	21.5	C	13.9	B	21.9	C	13.5	B
7. East Bidwell Street / WB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	19.9	B	22.7	C	28.1	C	22.5	C	27.3	C	21.3	C	26.9	C	21.7	C	29.0	C	21.4	C	31.3	C	21.7	C
8. East Bidwell Street / EB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	20.3	C	23.6	C	17.1	B	20.7	C	17.5	B	20.7	C	17.0	B	20.4	C	17.7	B	21.4	C	17.7	B	21.4	C
9. El Dorado Hills Blvd / WB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	30.7	C	29.5	C	24.7	C	27.2	C	24.8	C	26.9	C	24.4	C	26.6	C	24.3	C	27.1	C	24.3	C	27.1	C
10. El Dorado Hills Blvd / EB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	4.4	A	5.0	A	3.8	A	4.2	A	3.8	A	4.1	A	3.8	A	4.1	A	3.7	A	4.2	A	3.7	A	4.0	A
11. Sunrise Boulevard / Jackson Highway (SR 16)	Signalized	29.4	C	29.9	C	29.2	C	30.3	C	29.4	C	30.3	C	29.3	C	30.2	C	29.2	C	30.2	C	29.3	C	30.2	C
12. Grant Line Road / Jackson Highway (SR 16)	Signalized	25.7	C	26.3	C	24.2	C	26.2	C	24.2	C	26.2	C	24.2	C	26.2	C	24.2	C	26.2	C	24.1	C	26.2	C
13. Oak Avenue Parkway / WB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	17.9	B	11.7	B	16.5	B	10.9	B	16.0	B	10.8	B	18.6	B	12.3	B	18.9	B	12.5	B
14. Oak Avenue Parkway / EB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	27.3	C	27.4	C	27.6	C	27.4	C	26.9	C	27.3	C	28.0	C	28.4	C	27.7	C	28.1	C
15. Empire Ranch Road / WB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	14.7	B	15.8	B	14.7	B	15.8	B	14.7	B	15.7	B	15.6	B	16.7	B	15.4	B	15.9	B
16. Empire Ranch Road / EB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	15.8	B	19.2	B	15.2	B	18.8	B	15.5	B	18.9	B	14.8	B	19.3	B	16.2	B	18.5	B
17. Silva Valley Road / WB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	39.4	D	25.5	C	39.5	D	25.3	C	35.3	D	22.9	C	34.9	C	23.6	C	36.7	D	24.7	C	38.4	D	25.1	C
18. Silva Valley Road / EB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	4.9	A	19.3	B	8.1	A	23.3	C	8.0	A	22.8	C	7.9	A	22.7	C	8.2	A	23.4	C	8.5	A	23.6	C

Notes: LOS = level of service; Blank = intersection does not exist under this alternative
Bold indicates deficiency. Shaded areas indicate impact.
 Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

**Table 3A.15-32
Freeway Mainline Levels of Service — Cumulative (2030) Conditions - Caltrans**

Freeway Segment	No Project				Proposed Project				No USACE Permit Alternative				Resource Impact Minimization				Centralized Development				Reduced Hillside Development			
	A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
	V/C	LOS ²	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS
EASTBOUND U.S. 50																								
Zinfandel Drive to Sunrise Blvd	1.04	F	1.15	F	1.07	F	1.17	F	1.07	F	1.17	F	1.06	F	1.17	F	1.07	F	1.17	F	1.07	F	1.17	F
Sunrise Blvd to Rancho Cordova Parkway	0.87	D	1.02	F	0.91	E	1.05	F	0.91	E	1.05	F	0.90	D	1.05	F	0.92	E	1.05	F	0.91	E	1.05	F
Rancho Cordova Parkway to Hazel Avenue	1.03	F	1.15	F	1.08	F	1.18	F	1.08	F	1.18	F	1.06	F	1.18	F	1.08	F	1.19	F	1.08	F	1.19	F
Hazel Avenue to Folsom Blvd	0.90	D	0.88	D	0.95	E	1.00	E	0.95	E	0.99	E	0.93	E	0.99	E	0.96	E	1.00	E	0.96	E	1.00	E
Folsom Blvd to Prairie City Road	0.92	E	1.10	F	1.01	F	1.15	F	1.01	F	1.14	F	0.98	E	1.14	F	1.02	F	1.15	F	1.02	F	1.15	F
Prairie City Road to Oak Avenue Parkway	1.11	F	1.17	F	1.22	F	1.19	F	1.23	F	1.17	F	1.20	F	1.17	F	1.23	F	1.17	F	1.23	F	1.19	F
Oak Avenue Parkway to E. Bidwell Street - Scott Road	0.80	D	0.96	E	0.83	D	0.98	E	0.83	D	0.97	E	0.81	D	0.96	E	0.83	D	0.98	E	0.83	D	1.00	E
E. Bidwell Street - Scott Road to Empire Ranch Road	0.77	D	1.00	E	0.86	D	1.05	F	0.86	D	1.04	F	0.85	D	1.03	F	0.86	D	1.04	F	0.87	D	1.04	F
Empire Ranch Road to El Dorado Hills Blvd – Latrobe Road	0.71	C	0.87	D	0.72	C	0.89	D	0.72	C	0.88	D	0.72	C	0.88	D	0.73	C	0.89	D	0.73	C	0.89	D
El Dorado Hills Blvd – Latrobe Road to Silva Valley Road	0.61	C	0.79	D	0.64	C	0.82	D	0.63	C	0.81	D	0.63	C	0.81	D	0.64	C	0.82	D	0.64	C	0.82	D
Silva Valley Road to Bass Lake Road	0.81	D	0.95	E	0.84	D	0.97	E	0.83	D	0.96	E	0.84	D	0.96	E	0.84	D	0.97	E	0.85	D	0.97	E
WESTBOUND U.S. 50																								
Bass Lake Road to Silva Valley Road	0.95	E	0.70	C	0.96	E	0.70	C	0.96	E	0.69	C	0.96	E	0.69	C	0.97	E	0.69	C	0.97	E	0.70	C
Silva Valley Road to El Dorado Hills Blvd – Latrobe Road	0.92	E	0.63	C	0.89	D	0.61	C	0.89	D	0.62	C	0.89	D	0.62	C	0.89	D	0.61	C	0.90	D	0.62	C
El Dorado Hills Blvd – Latrobe Road to Empire Ranch Road	1.08	F	0.84	D	1.06	F	0.82	D	1.06	F	0.81	D	1.05	F	0.80	D	1.05	F	0.81	D	1.07	F	0.82	D
Empire Ranch Road to E. Bidwell Street - Scott Road	0.86	D	0.65	C	0.98	E	0.80	D	0.98	E	0.80	D	0.98	E	0.80	D	0.97	E	0.79	D	0.99	E	0.80	D
E. Bidwell Street - Scott Road to Oak Avenue Parkway	0.74	C	0.58	C	0.79	D	0.75	D	0.77	D	0.75	D	0.77	D	0.74	D	0.78	D	0.76	D	0.78	D	0.77	D
Oak Avenue Parkway to Prairie City Road	1.17	F	1.02	F	1.13	F	1.02	F	1.11	F	1.01	F	1.11	F	1.00	E	1.11	F	1.03	F	1.11	F	1.02	F
Prairie City Road to Folsom Blvd	0.94	E	0.88	D	0.98	E	0.95	E	0.96	E	0.95	E	0.97	E	0.93	E	0.97	E	0.96	E	0.98	E	0.95	E
Folsom Blvd to Hazel Avenue	0.92	E	0.82	D	0.97	E	0.89	D	0.95	E	0.89	D	0.96	E	0.87	D	0.96	E	0.90	E	0.97	E	0.89	D
Hazel Avenue to Rancho Cordova Parkway	1.05	F	1.08	F	1.07	F	1.11	F	1.06	F	1.11	F	1.07	F	1.10	F	1.06	F	1.11	F	1.06	F	1.11	F
Rancho Cordova Parkway to Sunrise Blvd	1.01	F	1.04	F	1.03	F	1.08	F	1.02	F	1.08	F	1.03	F	1.07	F	1.02	F	1.09	F	1.02	F	1.08	F
Sunrise Blvd to Zinfandel Drive	1.03	F	0.93	E	1.04	F	0.95	E	1.03	F	0.95	E	1.04	F	0.94	E	1.04	F	0.95	E	1.04	F	0.95	E

Notes:
LOS = level of service; NA = not applicable; U.S. 50 = U.S. Highway 50; V/C = volume-to-capacity
¹ Capacity based on 2200 vphpl for freeway lanes, 1600 vphpl for auxiliary lanes.
Bold indicates deficiency where calculation indicates that demand exceeds capacity. Shaded areas indicate impact.
Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

**Table 3A.15-33
Merge/Diverge/Weave Levels of Service — Cumulative (2030) Conditions - Caltrans**

Freeway Ramp	Merge, Diverge, or Weave Maneuver	No Project				Proposed Project				No USACE Permit Alternative				Resource Impact Minimization				Centralized Development				Reduced Hillside Development			
		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
		Density ¹	LOS ²	Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS
EASTBOUND U.S. 50																									
Hazel Avenue off-ramp	Diverge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hazel Avenue on-ramp – Aerojet off-ramp	Weave	32.4	D	29.9	D	36.2	E	36.1	E	36.2	E	35.5	E	35.1	E	35.6	E	36.8	E	36.2	E	36.6	E	36.1	E
Folsom Blvd off-ramp	Diverge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Folsom Blvd on-ramp	Merge	27.1	C	30.6	D	30.3	D	32.0	D	30.3	D	31.7	D	29.4	D	31.8	D	30.5	D	32.0	D	30.4	D	32.1	D
Prairie City Road off-ramp	Diverge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Prairie City Road direct on-ramp	Merge	45.7	F	44.9	F	49.4	F	52.3	F	49.6	F	52.0	F	48.7	F	51.6	F	49.9	F	51.6	F	49.8	F	52.6	F
Prairie City Road flyover on-ramp Oak Avenue Parkway off-ramp	Weave	42.9	E	44.9	F	50.9	F	52.3	F	51.9	F	52.0	F	50.3	F	51.6	F	52.0	F	51.6	F	51.9	F	52.6	F
Oak Avenue Parkway loop on-ramp	Merge	36.1	F	43.5	F	37.4	F	41.9	F	37.2	F	41.0	F	36.5	F	40.9	F	36.5	F	40.9	F	37.2	F	41.2	F
Oak Avenue Parkway direct on-ramp	Merge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
E. Bidwell Street - Scott Road direct off-ramp	Diverge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
E. Bidwell Street - Scott Road loop on-ramp	Merge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
E. Bidwell Street - Scott Road direct on-ramp	Merge	20.5	C	26.6	C	24.1	C	29.7	D	23.9	C	29.1	D	23.8	C	28.9	D	24.1	C	29.3	D	24.5	C	29.3	D
Empire Ranch Road direct off-ramp	Diverge	23.1	C	26.9	C	26.1	C	28.7	D	26.0	C	28.4	D	25.9	C	28.3	D	26.0	C	28.3	D	26.5	C	28.5	D
Empire Ranch Road loop on-ramp	Merge	26.8	C	31.2	D	26.2	C	30.1	D	26.3	C	29.7	D	26.3	C	29.7	D	26.5	C	30.1	D	26.4	C	30.0	D
Empire Ranch Road direct on-ramp	Merge	24.8	C	28.8	D	25.9	C	30.3	D	25.8	C	29.9	D	25.8	C	29.8	D	25.8	C	30.1	D	26.2	C	30.6	D
El Dorado Hills Blvd - Latrobe Road off-ramp	Diverge	35.5	E	38.2	E	35.5	E	38.3	E	35.6	E	37.9	E	35.6	E	37.9	E	35.7	E	38.2	E	35.8	E	38.4	E
El Dorado Hills Blvd Latrobe Road on-ramp	Merge	21.7	C	27.3	C	22.1	C	27.9	C	21.9	C	28.0	C	21.9	C	27.8	C	22.1	C	28.0	D	22.3	C	28.1	D
Silva Valley Road direct off-ramp	Diverge	20.3	C	26.6	C	21.0	C	27.5	C	20.8	C	27.4	C	20.9	C	27.4	C	21.0	C	27.6	C	21.3	C	27.7	C
Silva Valley Road loop on-ramp	Merge	21.3	C	23.7	C	22.4	C	24.0	C	21.8	C	24.2	C	21.6	C	24.2	C	21.6	C	24.5	C	22.0	C	24.7	C
Silva Valley Road direct on-ramp	Merge	23.4	C	28.2	D	23.8	C	28.7	D	23.8	C	28.5	D	24.0	C	28.4	D	24.0	C	28.6	D	24.2	C	28.6	D
WESTBOUND U.S. 50																									
Silva Valley Road direct off-ramp	Diverge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Silva Valley Road loop on-ramp	Merge	31.6	D	26.6	C	32.9	D	27.3	C	32.9	D	27.7	C	32.8	D	27.5	C	32.9	D	27.4	C	33.1	D	27.7	C
Silva Valley Road direct on-ramp	Merge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
El Dorado Hills Blvd - Latrobe Road off-ramp	Diverge	15.5	B	10.7	B	15.7	B	10.8	B	15.8	B	10.9	B	15.6	B	10.9	B	15.7	B	10.9	B	15.8	B	10.9	B
El Dorado Hills Blvd - Latrobe Road on-ramp	Merge	30.0	D	25.8	C	31.1	D	26.7	C	31.0	D	26.6	C	30.9	D	26.2	C	31.0	D	26.6	C	31.4	D	26.8	C
Empire Ranch Road direct off-ramp	Diverge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Empire Ranch Road loop on-ramp	Merge	NA	NA	NA	NA	38.9	F	32.3	D	38.8	F	32.5	D	38.9	F	32.2	D	38.3	F	31.9	D	38.7	F	32.4	D
Empire Ranch Road direct on-ramp	Merge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
E. Bidwell Street - Scott Road direct off-ramp	Diverge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
E. Bidwell Street - Scott Road loop on-ramp	Merge	38.0	F	29.4	D	37.3	E	33.7	D	36.4	E	33.3	D	36.6	E	32.9	D	36.8	E	33.9	D	37.1	E	34.1	D
E. Bidwell Street - Scott Road direct on-ramp	Merge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Oak Avenue Parkway direct off-ramp	Diverge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Oak Avenue Parkway loop on-ramp	Merge	NA	NA	NA	NA	36.3	F	32.4	D	35.5	F	31.9	D	35.6	F	31.5	D	35.7	F	32.5	D	35.8	F	32.4	D
Oak Avenue Parkway direct on-ramp Prairie City Road direct off-ramp	Weave	52.8	F	47.7	F	42.3	E	38.7	E	41.3	E	38.3	E	41.5	E	37.5	E	41.4	E	39.1	E	41.5	E	38.7	E
Prairie City Road loop on-ramp	Merge	47.6	F	41.6	F	51.1	F	47.3	F	50.1	F	46.8	F	50.6	F	46.0	F	50.8	F	47.3	F	51.0	F	47.3	F
Prairie City Road direct on-ramp	Merge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Folsom Blvd off-ramp	Diverge	15.2	B	15.1	B	16.0	B	16.4	B	15.4	B	16.5	B	15.7	B	15.9	B	15.7	B	16.8	B	15.9	B	16.5	B
Folsom Blvd on-ramp	Merge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hazel Avenue direct off-ramp	Diverge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hazel Avenue loop on-ramp	Merge	29.6	D	24.8	C	30.4	D	26.7	C	29.8	D	26.7	C	30.1	D	26.0	C	30.0	D	26.7	C	30.1	D	26.6	C
Hazel Avenue direct on-ramp	Merge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Notes: LOS = level of service; NA = not applicable – a lane drops at off ramp or adds at on ramp; U.S. 50 = U.S. Highway 50; Blank = ramp does not exist under this alternative

¹ Density in passenger cars per mile per lane for merge/diverge analysis only.

² LOS computed for the merge/diverge/weave analysis consistent with *Highway Capacity Manual* (HCM) 2000 methodologies.

³ Where an auxiliary lane begins at an on ramp (as an add lane) or where an auxiliary lane end at an off ramp (as an add lane)

Bold indicates deficiency where calculation indicates that demand exceeds capacity. Shaded areas indicate impact.

Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

City of Folsom

On-Site and Off-Site Elements

IMPACT 3A.15-4a Unacceptable LOS at the Sibley Street/Blue Ravine Road Intersection (Folsom Intersection 2) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions. *This signalized intersection would degrade to an unacceptable level of service D or E with an increase of five or more seconds of delay during the a.m. peak traffic hour under cumulative (2030) conditions.*

NCP, RIM

The impact at this intersection is **less than significant** under the No USACE Permit and Resource Impact Minimization alternatives. The impacts of these alternatives are less than that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

PP, CD, RHD

This signalized intersection would degrade from an unacceptable level of service D to an unacceptable level of service D or E with an increase of five or more seconds of delay during the a.m. peak traffic hour with traffic from the Proposed Project, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives under cumulative (2030) conditions. This would be a **significant** impact. The impacts of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4a: The Applicant Shall Pay a Fair Share to Fund the Construction of Improvements to the Sibley Street/Blue Ravine Road Intersection (Folsom Intersection 2).

To ensure that the Sibley Street/Blue Ravine Road intersection operates at a LOS D with less than the Cumulative No Project delay, the northbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of two left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one dedicated right-turn lane. The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other appropriate and reliable mechanism paid for by applicant, to reduce the impacts to the Sibley Street/Blue Ravine Road intersection (Folsom Intersection 2).

Implementation: City of Folsom Public Works Department.

Timing: Before project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which project phase the improvement should be built.

Enforcement: City of Folsom Public Works Department

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4a would reduce the significant impact on Folsom Intersection 2 under cumulative (2030) conditions to a **less-than-significant** level, by enabling the intersection to operate at a LOS D with less than the Cumulative No Project delay.

IMPACT 3A.15-4b Unacceptable LOS at the Oak Avenue Parkway/East Bidwell Street Intersection (Folsom Intersection 6) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions. *This signalized intersection would degrade to an unacceptable level of service D with an increase of five or more seconds of delay during the p.m. peak traffic hours under cumulative (2030) conditions.*

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

This signalized intersection would degrade from an unacceptable level of service D to an unacceptable level of service D with an increase of five or more seconds of delay during the p.m. peak traffic hours with traffic associated with the Proposed Project and all build alternatives under cumulative (2030) conditions. The impacts of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4b: The Applicant Shall Pay a Fair Share to Fund the Construction of Improvements to the Oak Avenue Parkway/East Bidwell Street Intersection (Folsom Intersection 6).

To ensure that the Oak Avenue Parkway/East Bidwell Street intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, the eastbound (East Bidwell Street) approach must be reconfigured to consist of two left-turn lanes, four through lanes and a right-turn lane, and the westbound (East Bidwell Street) approach must be reconfigured to consist of two left-turn lanes, four through lanes, and a right-turn lane. It is against the City of Folsom policy to have eight lane roads because of the impacts to non motorized traffic and adjacent development; therefore, this improvement is infeasible.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4b would reduce the significant impact on Folsom Intersection 6 under the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives under cumulative (2030) conditions to a less-than-significant level; however, identified improvement is against the City of Folsom policy because of the impacts to non motorized traffic; therefore, the improvement would not be implemented. Given these conditions the impact is **significant-and-unavoidable**.

IMPACT 3A.15-4c Unacceptable LOS at the East Bidwell Street/Nesmith Court Intersection (Folsom Intersection 7) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions. *Project or build alternative traffic would increase delay at this deficient intersection by more than 5 seconds during the p.m. peak traffic hour under cumulative (2030) conditions.*

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

This signalized intersection would operate at an unacceptable LOS E during the p.m. peak traffic hours with or without project traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions. Project traffic would increase delay at this intersection by more than 5 seconds during the p.m. peak traffic hours under all the Proposed Project and all of the build alternatives. The impacts of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-7c: The Applicant Shall Pay a Fair Share to Fund the Construction of Improvements to the East Bidwell Street/Nesmith Court Intersection (Folsom Intersection 7).

To ensure that the East Bidwell Street/College Street intersection operates at acceptable LOS C or better, the westbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of one left-turn lane, one left-through lane, and two dedicated right-turn lanes. The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other appropriate and reliable mechanism paid for by applicant, to reduce the impacts to the East Bidwell Street/Nesmith Court intersection (Folsom Intersection 7).

Implementation: City of Folsom Public Works Department.

Timing: Before project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which project phase the improvement should be built.

Enforcement: City of Folsom Public Works Department

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4c would reduce the significant impact on Folsom Intersection 7 under the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives under cumulative (2030) conditions to a **less-than-significant** level, by enabling this intersection to operate at an acceptable LOS C.

IMPACT 3A.15-4d Unacceptable LOS at the East Bidwell Street /Iron Point Road Intersection (Folsom Intersection 21) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions. *This signalized intersection would degrade to an unacceptable LOS F during the p.m. peak traffic hours under the proposed project and all of the build alternatives under cumulative (2030) conditions.*

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

This signalized intersection would degrade from an unacceptable LOS E to an unacceptable LOS F during the p.m. peak traffic hours under the Proposed Project and all of the build alternatives under cumulative (2030) conditions. The impacts of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4d: The Applicant Shall Pay a Fair Share to Fund the Construction of Improvements to the East Bidwell Street/Iron Point Road Intersection (Folsom Intersection 21).

To ensure that the East Bidwell Street /Iron Point Road intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, the northbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of two left-turn lanes, four through lanes and a right-turn lane, and the southbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of two left-turn lanes, four through lanes and a right-turn lane. It is against the City of Folsom policy to have eight lane roads because of the impacts to non motorized traffic and adjacent development; therefore, this improvement is infeasible.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4d would reduce the significant impact on Folsom Intersection 21 from the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives under cumulative (2030) conditions to a less-than-significant level; however, identified improvement is against the City of Folsom policy because of the impacts to non motorized traffic; therefore, the improvement would not be implemented. Given these conditions the impact is **significant-and-unavoidable**.

IMPACT 3A.15-4e Unacceptable LOS at the Serpa Way/ Iron Point Road Intersection (Folsom Intersection 23) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions. *Traffic increases would increase the delay at this deficient intersection by more than 5 seconds under cumulative (2030) conditions.*

NCP, PP, RIM

The impact at this intersection under the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, and Resource Impact Minimization alternative would be **less than significant**. The impacts of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

CD, RHD

This signalized intersection would operate at an unacceptable LOS D during the p.m. peak traffic hour without project traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions. Project traffic would increase the delay at this intersection by more than 5 seconds under the Centralized Development and Reduced Hillside Development Alternatives. The impacts of these alternatives would be greater than that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4e: The Applicant Shall Pay a Fair Share to Fund the Construction of Improvements to the Serpa Way/ Iron Point Road Intersection (Folsom Intersection 23).

To improve LOS at the Serpa Way/ Iron Point Road intersection, the northbound approaches must be restriped to consist of one left-turn lane, one shared left-through lanes, and one right-turn lane. The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other appropriate and reliable mechanism paid for by applicant, to reduce the impacts to the Serpa Way/Iron Point Road Intersection (Folsom Intersection 23).

Implementation: City of Folsom Public Works Department.

Timing: Before project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which project phase the improvement should be build.

Enforcement: City of Folsom Public Works Department

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4e would reduce the significant impact on Folsom Intersection 23 from the Centralized Development and Reduced Hillside Development Alternatives under cumulative (2030) conditions to a **less-than-significant** level, by enabling this intersection to operate at an acceptable LOS C.

IMPACT 3A.15-4f Unacceptable LOS at the Empire Ranch Road / Iron Point Road Intersection (Folsom Intersection 24) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions. *During the p.m. peak traffic hour, this intersection would operate at LOS E or F with an increase in delay of 5 or more seconds under cumulative (2030) conditions.*

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

Addition of traffic associated with the Proposed Project and build alternatives would cause this intersection to operate at LOS E or F during the p.m. peak hour with an increase in delay of 5 seconds or greater. This is a **significant impact**. The impacts of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4f: The Applicant Shall Pay a Fair Share to Fund the Construction of Improvements to the Empire Ranch Road / Iron Point Road Intersection (Folsom Intersection 24).

To ensure that the Empire Ranch Road / Iron Point Road intersection operates at a LOS D or better, all of the following improvements are required:

- ▶ The eastbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and a right-turn lane.
- ▶ The westbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of two left-turn lanes, one through lane, and a through-right lane.

- ▶ The northbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and a right-turn lane.
- ▶ The southbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, and a right-turn lane.

The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other appropriate and reliable mechanism paid for by applicant, to reduce the impacts to the Empire Ranch Road/Iron Point Road Intersection (Folsom Intersection 24).

Implementation: City of Folsom Public Works Department.

Timing: Before project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which project phase the improvement should be built.

Enforcement: City of Folsom Public Works Department

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4f would reduce the significant impact on Folsom Intersection 24 from the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives under cumulative (2030) conditions to a **less-than-significant** level, by allowing this intersection to operate at a LOS D or better.

IMPACT 3A.15-4g Unacceptable LOS at the Oak Avenue Parkway / Easton Valley Parkway Intersection (Folsom Intersection 33) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions. *This new signalized intersection would operate at an unacceptable LOS D during the a.m. peak traffic hour with the addition of proposed project and alternative traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions.*

NCP, RIM

Under the No USACE Permit and Resource Impact Minimization alternatives, the impact at this intersection is **less than significant**. The impacts of these alternatives would be less than that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

PP, CD, RHD

This new signalized intersection would operate at an unacceptable LOS D during the a.m. peak traffic hour with the addition of Proposed Project, Centralized Development and Reduced Hillside Development alternative traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions. This is a **significant impact**. The impacts of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4g: The Applicant Shall Fund and Construct Improvements to the Oak Avenue Parkway / Easton Valley Parkway Intersection (Folsom Intersection 33).

To ensure that the Oak Avenue Parkway / Easton Valley Parkway intersection operates at an acceptable LOS the southbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and two right-turn lanes. The applicant shall fund and construct these improvements.

Implementation: City of Folsom Public Works Department.

Timing: Before project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which project phase the improvement should be built.

Enforcement: City of Folsom Public Works Department

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4g would reduce the significant impact on Folsom Intersection 33 from the Proposed Project, Centralized Development and Reduced Hillside Development Alternatives under cumulative (2030) conditions to a **less-than-significant** level, by allowing this intersection to operate at an acceptable LOS C.

IMPACT 3A.15-4h LOS D at the Scott Road (East)/Easton Valley Parkway Intersection (Intersection 38) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions. *This new signalized intersection would operate at LOS D during the p.m. peak traffic hour with project traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions.*

NCP, RIM

This intersection would operate at LOS C conditions under the No USACE Permit and Resource Impact Minimization alternatives. This impact is **less than significant**. The impacts of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

PP, CD, RHD

This new signalized intersection would operate at LOS D during the p.m. peak traffic hour with the Proposed Project, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives cumulative (2030) conditions.

The Specific Plan proposes an amended Level of Service policy within the project area (south of U.S. 50) as follows

The City should strive to achieve at least a traffic Level of Service “C” within the Folsom South of U.S. 50 Specific Plan. For roadways and intersections within the Specific Plan, LOS “D” conditions may be considered on a case by case basis if improvements required to meet LOS “C” exceeds the “normally accepted maximum” improvements established by the City. Complete Streets principles require that streets and intersections be designed with all transportation modes in mind, and that the road widths, delays, and safety impacts to pedestrians and bicycles make larger roadways and intersections incompatible with this philosophy. Coupled with the limited reduction in vehicular delay that such improvements would provide, the City has determined that the benefits of excessively wide roadways and intersections do not outweigh the impacts to the community. Therefore, “normally accepted maximum” improvements on arterial roadways include three through-lanes in each direction; and at intersections includes two left-turn lanes, three through-lanes and one right-turn lane on an approach.

The number of travel lanes on the Scott Road (East)/Easton Valley Parkway intersection approaches would be at the “normally accepted maximum” levels. Thus LOS “D” conditions would be acceptable at this intersection

This impact is **less than significant**. The impacts of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

SACRAMENTO COUNTY INTERSECTIONS

Off-Site Elements

IMPACT Unacceptable LOS at the Grant Line Road/White Rock Road Intersection (Sacramento County
3A.15-4i Intersection 3) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions. *This signalized intersection would degrade to an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. peak traffic hours under cumulative (2030) conditions.*

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

This signalized intersection would degrade from an acceptable LOS E to an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. peak traffic hours under the Proposed Project and all of the build alternatives under cumulative (2030) conditions. This is a **significant** impact. The impacts of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4i: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on the Grant Line Road/White Rock Road Intersection (Sacramento County Intersection 3).

To ensure that the Grant Line Road/White Rock Road intersection operates at an acceptable LOS E or better this intersection should be replaced by some type of grade separated intersection or interchange.

Improvements to this intersection are identified in the Sacramento County's Proposed General Plan. Implementation of these improvements would assist in reducing traffic impacts on this intersection by providing acceptable operation. Intersection improvements must be implemented by Sacramento County. The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements to the agency responsible for improvements, based on a program established by that agency to reduce the impacts to the Grant Line Road/White Rock Road Intersection (Sacramento County Intersection 3).

Implementation: Sacramento County Department of Transportation.

Timing: Before project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which project phase the improvement should be built.

Enforcement: Sacramento County Department of Transportation.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4i would reduce the significant impact on the Grant Line Road/White Rock Road intersection from the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives under cumulative (2030) conditions to a less-than-significant level, by allowing this intersection to operate at an acceptable LOS E or better.

If Sacramento County implements the improvements, the impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

As discussed above, the requirement that the Applicant participate in funding these transportation improvements that are located outside the City of Folsom would mitigate or substantially lessen the project's significant impact on this intersection but the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**. This conclusion reflects the reality that successful implementation the proposed improvements will require the cooperation of Sacramento County, over which the City of Folsom has no control. For this reason, the City of Folsom is conservatively acknowledging the possibility that, despite its own commitment to work with these other agencies, mutually acceptable accommodation may not be reached. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision

(a)(2), though, the City of Folsom concludes that these other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the mitigation.

SACRAMENTO COUNTY ROADWAYS

Off-Site Elements

IMPACT Unacceptable LOS on Grant Line Road between White Rock Road and Kiefer Boulevard (Sacramento
3A.15-4j County Roadway Segments 5-7) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions. *Operating conditions of these
deficient roadway segments would deteriorate and the V/C ratio would increase by more than 0.05 with
project traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions.*

NCP, PP, NFA, RIM, CD

Operation of these roadway segments would operate at an unacceptable LOS F with or without the Proposed Project or alternative, and the V/C ratio would increase by more than 0.05 with project and build alternative traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions. This is a **significant** impact. The impacts of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4j: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on Grant Line Road between White Rock Road and Kiefer Boulevard (Sacramento County Roadway Segments 5-7).

To improve operation on Grant Line Road between White Rock Road and Kiefer Boulevard, this roadway segment must be widened to six lanes. This improvement is proposed in the Sacramento County and the City of Rancho Cordova General Plans; however, it is not in the 2035 MTP. Improvements to this roadway segment must be implemented by Sacramento County and the City of Rancho Cordova.

The identified improvement would more than offset the impacts specifically related to the Folsom South of U.S. 50 project on this roadway segment. The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements to the agency responsible for improvements, based on a program established by that agency to reduce the impacts to Grant Line Road between White Rock Road and Kiefer Boulevard (Sacramento County Roadway Segments 5-7).

Implementation: Sacramento County Department of Transportation.

Timing: Before project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which project phase the improvement should be built.

Enforcement: Sacramento County Department of Transportation.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4j would reduce the significant impact on Grant Line Road between White Rock Road and Kiefer Boulevard from the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives under cumulative (2030) conditions, by offsetting impacts of project traffic. The resulting mitigated LOS is F but the V/C ratio is less than the No Project condition.

If Sacramento County and the City of Rancho Cordova implement the improvement, the impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

As discussed above, the requirement that the Applicant participate in funding these transportation improvements that are located outside the City of Folsom would mitigate or substantially lessen the project's significant impact

on this intersection but the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**. This conclusion reflects the reality that successful implementation the proposed improvements will require the cooperation of Sacramento County and the City of Rancho Cordova, over which the City of Folsom has no control. For this reason, the City of Folsom is conservatively acknowledging the possibility that, despite its own commitment to work with these other agencies, mutually acceptable accommodation may not be reached. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2), though, the City of Folsom concludes that these other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the mitigation.

IMPACT **Unacceptable LOS on Grant Line Road between Kiefer Boulevard and Jackson Highway**
3A.15-4k **(Sacramento County Roadway Segment 8) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.** *Operating conditions of this deficient roadway segment would degrade by increasing the V/C by 0.05 with increased traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions.*

NCP, PP, CD, RHD

This roadway segment would operate at an unacceptable LOS F with an increase of V/C ratio of 0.05 or greater under the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives under cumulative (2030) conditions. This is a **significant** impact. The impacts of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4k: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on Grant Line Road between Kiefer Boulevard and Jackson Highway (Sacramento County Roadway Segment 8).

To improve operation on Grant Line Road between Kiefer Boulevard Jackson Highway, this roadway segment could be widened to six lanes. This improvement is proposed in the Sacramento County and the City of Rancho Cordova General Plans; however, it is not in the 2035 MTP. Improvements to this roadway segment must be implemented by Sacramento County and the City of Rancho Cordova.

The identified improvement would more than offset the impacts specifically related to the Folsom South of U.S. 50 project on this roadway segment. The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements to the agency responsible for improvements, based on a program established by that agency to reduce the impacts to Grant Line Road between Kiefer Boulevard and Jackson Highway (SR 16) (Sacramento County Roadway Segment 8).

Implementation: Sacramento County Department of Transportation.

Timing: Before project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which project phase the improvement should be built.

Enforcement: Sacramento County Department of Transportation.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4k would reduce the significant impact on Grant Line Road between Kiefer Boulevard and Jackson Highway from the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives under cumulative (2030) conditions, by improving operations to LOS C.

If Sacramento County and the City of Rancho Cordova implement the improvement, the impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

As discussed above, the requirement that the Applicant participate in funding these transportation improvements that are located outside the City of Folsom would mitigate or substantially lessen the project's significant impact

on this intersection but the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**. This conclusion reflects the reality that successful implementation the proposed improvements will require the cooperation of Sacramento County and the City of Rancho Cordova, over which the City of Folsom has no control. For this reason, the City of Folsom is conservatively acknowledging the possibility that, despite its own commitment to work with these other agencies, mutually acceptable accommodation may not be reached. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2), though, the City of Folsom concludes that these other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the mitigation.

RIM

There is a **less-than-significant** impact on this roadway segment under the Resource Impact Minimization alternative. This impact is less than that associated with the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure: No mitigation measures are required.

IMPACT 3A.15-4I Unacceptable LOS on Hazel Avenue between Curragh Downs Drive and U.S. 50 Westbound Ramps (Sacramento County Roadway Segment s 12-13) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions. *Operation of these deficient roadway segments degrade with the V/C ratio increasing by more than 0.05 with project and alternative traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions.*

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

Operation of these roadway segments would operate at an unacceptable LOS F with or without the project or alternative, and the V/C ratio would increase by more than 0.05 with project and build alternative traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions. This is a **significant impact**. The impacts of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4I: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on Hazel Avenue between Curragh Downs Drive and U.S. 50 Westbound Ramps (Sacramento County Roadway Segment s 12-13).

To improve operation on Hazel Avenue between Curragh Downs Drive and the U.S. 50 westbound ramps, this roadway segment could be widened to eight lanes. This improvement is inconsistent with Sacramento County's general plan because the county's policy requires a maximum roadway cross section of six lanes.

Analysis shown later indicates that improvements at the impacted intersection in this segment can be mitigated (see Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4p). Improvements to impacted intersections on this segment will improve operations on this roadway segment and, therefore; mitigate this segment impact. The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements to the agency responsible for improvements, based on a program established by that agency to reduce the impacts to Hazel Avenue between Curragh Downs Drive and U.S. 50 Westbound Ramps (Sacramento County Roadway Segments 12-13).

Implementation: Sacramento County Department of Transportation.

Timing: Before project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which project phase the improvement should be built.

Enforcement: Sacramento County Department of Transportation.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4l would reduce the significant impact on Hazel Avenue between Curragh Downs Drive and U.S. 50 Westbound Ramps from the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives under cumulative (2030) conditions, by offsetting impacts of project traffic. The mitigated intersection LOS is shown later in this section.

If Sacramento County and Caltrans implements the intersection improvement, the impact would be reduced to a less than significant.

As discussed above, the requirement that the Applicant participate in funding these transportation improvements that are located outside the City of Folsom would mitigate or substantially lessen the project's significant impact on this intersection but the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**. This conclusion reflects the reality that successful implementation the proposed improvements will require the cooperation of Sacramento County and Caltrans, over which the City of Folsom has no control. For this reason, the City of Folsom is conservatively acknowledging the possibility that, despite its own commitment to work with these other agencies, mutually acceptable accommodation may not be reached. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2), though, the City of Folsom concludes that these other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the mitigation.

IMPACT **Unacceptable LOS on White Rock Road between Grant Line Road and Prairie City Road**
3A.15-4m **(Sacramento County Roadway Segment 22) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.** *Operation of this roadway segment would degrade this LOS F segment by increasing the V/C ratio by more than 0.05 with project and alternative traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions.*

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

The addition of traffic on this roadway segment already operating at an unacceptable LOS F would increase the V/C ratio by more than 0.05 with project and build alternative traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions. This is a **significant** impact. The impacts of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4m: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on White Rock Road between Grant Line Road and Prairie City Road (Sacramento County Roadway Segment 22).

To improve operation on White Rock Road between Grant Line Road and Prairie City Road, this roadway segment must be widened to six lanes. This improvement is included in the 2035 MTP but is not included in the Sacramento County General Plan. Improvements to this roadway segment must be implemented by Sacramento County.

The identified improvement would more than offset the impacts specifically related to the Folsom South of U.S. 50 project on this roadway segment. However, because of other development in the region that would substantially increase traffic levels, this roadway segment would continue to operate at an unacceptable LOS F even with the capacity improvements identified to mitigate Folsom South of U.S. 50 impacts. The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements to the agency responsible for improvements, based on a program established by that agency to reduce the impacts to White Rock Road between Grant Line Road and Prairie City Road (Sacramento County Roadway Segment 22).

Implementation: Sacramento County Department of Transportation.

Timing: Before project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which project phase the improvement should be built.

Enforcement: Sacramento County Department of Transportation.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4m would reduce the significant impact on White Rock Road between Grant Line Road and Prairie City Road from the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives under cumulative (2030) conditions to a less-than-significant level, by offsetting impacts of project traffic. The resulting mitigated LOS is F but the V/C ratio is less than the No Project condition.

If Sacramento County implements the improvement, the impact would be reduced to less than significant.

As discussed above, the requirement that the Applicant participate in funding these transportation improvements that are located outside the City of Folsom would mitigate or substantially lessen the project's significant impact on this intersection but the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**. This conclusion reflects the reality that successful implementation the proposed improvements will require the cooperation of Sacramento County, over which the City of Folsom has no control. For this reason, the City of Folsom is conservatively acknowledging the possibility that, despite its own commitment to work with these other agencies, mutually acceptable accommodation may not be reached. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2), though, the City of Folsom concludes that these other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the mitigation.

IMPACT **Unacceptable LOS on White Rock Road between Empire Ranch Road and Carson Crossing Road**
3A.15-4n **(Sacramento County Roadway Segment 28) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions.** *Operating conditions on this roadway segment would deteriorate from an acceptable LOS D to an unacceptable LOS F with the Centralized Development , Reduced Hillside Development alternative under cumulative (2030) conditions, and deteriorate from an acceptable LOS D to an unacceptable LOS E with the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, and Resource Impact Minimization alternatives under cumulative (2030) conditions.*

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

Operation of this roadway segment would deteriorate from an acceptable LOS D to an unacceptable LOS F with the Centralized Development and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives under cumulative (2030) conditions, and deteriorate from an acceptable LOS D to an unacceptable LOS E with the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, and Resource Impact Minimization alternatives under cumulative (2030) conditions. This is a **significant** impact. The impacts of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4n: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on White Rock Road between Empire Ranch Road and Carson Crossing Road (Sacramento County Roadway Segment 28).

To improve operation on White Rock Road between Empire Ranch Road and Carson Crossing Road, this roadway segment must be widened to six lanes. Improvements to this roadway segment must be implemented by Sacramento County. The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements to the agency responsible for improvements, based on a program established by that agency to reduce the impacts to White Rock Road between Empire Ranch Road and Carson Crossing Road (Sacramento County Roadway Segment 28).

Implementation: Sacramento County Department of Transportation.

Timing: Before project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which project phase the improvement should be built.

Enforcement: Sacramento County Department of Transportation.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4n would reduce the significant impact on White Rock Road between Empire Ranch Road and Carson Crossing Road from the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives under cumulative (2030) conditions to a less-than-significant level, by improving operations to LOS A.

If Sacramento County implements the improvement, the impact would be reduced to less than significant.

As discussed above, the requirement that the Applicant participate in funding these transportation improvements that are located outside the City of Folsom would mitigate or substantially lessen the project's significant impact on this intersection but the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**. This conclusion reflects the reality that successful implementation the proposed improvements will require the cooperation of Sacramento County, over which the City of Folsom has no control. For this reason, the City of Folsom is conservatively acknowledging the possibility that, despite its own commitment to work with these other agencies, mutually acceptable accommodation may not be reached. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2), though, the City of Folsom concludes that these other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the mitigation.

CITY OF RANCHO CORDOVA INTERSECTIONS

There are no impacts to any City of Rancho Cordova intersections under cumulative (2030) conditions.

CITY OF RANCHO CORDOVA ROADWAYS

There are no impacts to any City of Rancho Cordova roadways under cumulative (2030) conditions.

EL DORADO COUNTY INTERSECTIONS

Off-Site Elements

IMPACT 3A.15-4o Unacceptable LOS at the White Rock Road / Carson Crossing Road Intersection (El Dorado County 1) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions. *This signalized intersection would degrade to an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. peak traffic hour under cumulative (2030) conditions.*

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

This signalized intersection would degrade from an acceptable LOS C to an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. peak traffic hour under the Proposed Project and all of the build alternatives under cumulative (2030) conditions. This is a **significant** impact. The impacts of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4o: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on the White Rock Road / Carson Crossing Road Intersection (El Dorado County 1).

To ensure that the White Rock Road / Carson Crossing Road intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, the eastbound right turn lane must be converted into a separate free right turn lane, or double right. Improvements to this intersection must be implemented by El Dorado County. The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements to the agency responsible for improvements, based on a

program established by that agency to reduce the impacts to the White Rock Road/Carson Crossing Road Intersection (El Dorado County 1).

Implementation: El Dorado County Department of Public Works.

Timing: Before project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which project phase the improvement should be built.

Enforcement: El Dorado County Department of Public Works.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4o would reduce the significant impact on the White Rock Road / Carson Crossing Road intersection from the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives under cumulative (2030) conditions to a less-than-significant level, by allowing this intersection to operate at an acceptable LOS C.

If El Dorado County implements the improvement, the impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

As discussed above, the requirement that the Applicant participate in funding these transportation improvements that are located outside the City of Folsom would mitigate or substantially lessen the project's significant impact on this intersection but the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**. This conclusion reflects the reality that successful implementation the proposed improvements will require the cooperation of El Dorado County, over which the City of Folsom has no control. For this reason, the City of Folsom is conservatively acknowledging the possibility that, despite its own commitment to work with these other agencies, mutually acceptable accommodation may not be reached. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2), though, the City of Folsom concludes that these other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the mitigation.

CALTRANS INTERSECTIONS

Off-Site Elements

IMPACT 3A.15-4p Unacceptable LOS at the Hazel Avenue/U.S. 50 Westbound Ramps Intersection (Caltrans Intersection 1) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions. *This signalized intersection would degrade from an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours with an increase in the delay at this intersection during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours by more than 5 seconds under cumulative (2030) conditions.*

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

This signalized intersection would operate at an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours with or without project and alternative traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions. Project and build alternative traffic would increase the delay at this intersection during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours by more than 5 seconds. This is a **significant impact**. The impacts of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4p: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on the Hazel Avenue/U.S. 50 Westbound Ramps Intersection (Caltrans Intersection 1).

To ensure that the Hazel Avenue/U.S. 50 westbound ramps intersection operates at an acceptable LOS, the westbound approach must be reconfigured to consist of one dedicated left turn lane, one shared left-through lane and three dedicated right-turn lanes. Improvements to this intersection must be implemented

by Caltrans and Sacramento County. The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements to the agency responsible for improvements, based on a program established by that agency to reduce the impacts to the Hazel Avenue/U.S. 50 Westbound Ramps Intersection (Caltrans Intersection 1)

Implementation: California Department of Transportation.

Timing: Before project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which project phase the improvement should be built.

Enforcement: California Department of Transportation.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4p would reduce the significant impact on the Hazel Avenue/U.S. 50 Westbound Ramps Intersection from the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives under cumulative (2030) conditions to a less-than-significant level, by reducing the intersection delay below Cumulative No Project levels. The resulting mitigated LOS is F but the V/C ratio is less than the No Project condition.

If Caltrans and Sacramento County implements the improvements, the impact would be reduced to less than significant.

As discussed above, the requirement that the Applicant participate in funding these transportation improvements that are located outside the City of Folsom would mitigate or substantially lessen the project's significant impact on this intersection but the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**. This conclusion reflects the reality that successful implementation the proposed improvements will require the cooperation of Caltrans and Sacramento County, over which the City of Folsom has no control. For this reason, the City of Folsom is conservatively acknowledging the possibility that, despite its own commitment to work with these other agencies, mutually acceptable accommodation may not be reached. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2), though, the City of Folsom concludes that these other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the mitigation.

CALTRANS FREEWAY SEGMENTS

Off-Site Elements

IMPACT Unacceptable LOS on Eastbound U.S. 50 between Zinfandel Drive and Sunrise Boulevard (Freeway
3A.15-4q Segment 1) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions. *Project traffic would increase on this LOS F freeway
segment under cumulative (2030) conditions.*

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

This freeway segment would operate at an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours with or without project and all alternatives traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions. Project and alternative traffic would increase at this freeway segment volume under all build alternatives. This is a **significant** impact. The impacts of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4q: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on Eastbound U.S. 50 between Zinfandel Drive and Sunrise Boulevard (Freeway Segment 1).

To ensure that Eastbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS between Zinfandel Drive and Sunrise Boulevard, an additional eastbound lane could be constructed. This improvement is not consistent with

the Concept Facility in Caltrans State Route 50 Corridor System Management Plan; therefore, it is not likely to be implemented by Caltrans by 2030.

Construction of the Capitol South East Connector, including widening White Rock Road and Grant Line Road to six lanes with limited access, could divert some traffic from U.S. 50 and partially mitigate the project's impact. The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements to the agency responsible for improvements, based on a program established by that agency to reduce the impacts to Eastbound U.S. 50 between Zinfandel Drive and Sunrise Boulevard (Freeway Segment 1).

Implementation: Capitol Southeast Connector Joint Powers Authority.

Timing: Before project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which project phase the improvement should be built.

Enforcement: Capitol Southeast Connector Joint Powers Authority.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4q would partially reduce the significant impact on Eastbound U.S. 50 between Zinfandel Drive and Sunrise Boulevard from the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives under cumulative (2030) conditions. A mitigated LOS cannot be calculated because the design of the Capitol South East Connector is not known at this time; therefore, it is not known how much traffic would be diverted off of U.S. 50 and what LOS that reduced U.S. 50 volume would produce.

As discussed above, the requirement that the Applicant participate in funding these transportation improvements that are located outside the City of Folsom would mitigate or substantially lessen the project's significant impact on this intersection but the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**. This conclusion reflects the reality that successful implementation of the proposed improvements will require the cooperation of Capital Southeast, the City of Rancho Cordova and Sacramento County, over which the City of Folsom has no control. For this reason, the City of Folsom is conservatively acknowledging the possibility that, despite its own commitment to work with these other agencies, mutually acceptable accommodation may not be reached. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2), though, the City of Folsom concludes that these other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the mitigation.

IMPACT 3A.15-4r Unacceptable LOS on Eastbound U.S. 50 between Rancho Cordova Parkway and Hazel Avenue (Freeway Segment 3) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions. *Project traffic would increase on this LOS F freeway segment under cumulative (2030) conditions.*

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

This freeway segment would operate at an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours with or without project and all alternatives traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions. Project and alternative traffic would increase at this freeway segment under all build alternatives. This is a **significant** impact. The impacts of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4r: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on Eastbound U.S. 50 between Rancho Cordova Parkway and Hazel Avenue (Freeway Segment 3).

To ensure that Eastbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS between Rancho Cordova Parkway and Hazel Avenue, an additional eastbound lane could be constructed. This improvement is not consistent with the Concept Facility in Caltrans State Route 50 Corridor System Management Plan; therefore, it is not likely to be implemented by Caltrans by 2030.

Construction of the Capitol South East Connector, including widening White Rock Road and Grant Line Road to six lanes with limited access, could divert some traffic off of U.S. 50 and partially mitigate the project's impact. The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements to the agency responsible for improvements, based on a program established by that agency to reduce the impacts to Eastbound U.S. 50 between Rancho Cordova Parkway and Hazel Avenue (Freeway Segment 3).

Implementation: Capitol Southeast Connector Joint Powers Authority.

Timing: Before project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which project phase the improvement should be built.

Enforcement: Capitol Southeast Connector Joint Powers Authority.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4r would partially reduce significant impact on Eastbound U.S. 50 between Rancho Cordova Parkway and Hazel Avenue from the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives under cumulative (2030) conditions. A mitigated LOS cannot be calculated because the design of the Capitol South East Connector is not known at this time; therefore, it is not known how much traffic would be diverted off of U.S. 50 and what LOS that reduced U.S. 50 volume would produce.

As discussed above, the requirement that the Applicant participate in funding these transportation improvements that are located outside the City of Folsom would mitigate or substantially lessen the project's significant impact on this intersection but the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**. This conclusion reflects the reality that successful implementation of the proposed improvements will require the cooperation of Capital Southeast, the City of Rancho Cordova and Sacramento County, over which the City of Folsom has no control. For this reason, the City of Folsom is conservatively acknowledging the possibility that, despite its own commitment to work with these other agencies, mutually acceptable accommodation may not be reached. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2), though, the City of Folsom concludes that these other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the mitigation.

IMPACT 3A.15-4s Unacceptable LOS on Eastbound U.S. 50 between Folsom Boulevard and Prairie City Road (Freeway Segment 5) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions. *This freeway segment would deteriorate from LOS E to LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours with project and build alternative traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions.*

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

Traffic associated with the project and build alternatives would deteriorate operating conditions on this segment from LOS E to F during both the a.m. and p.m. peak hours under cumulative (2030) conditions. This is a **significant** impact. The impacts of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4s: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on Eastbound U.S. 50 between Folsom Boulevard and Prairie City Road (Freeway Segment 5).

To ensure that Eastbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS between Folsom Boulevard and Prairie City Road, the eastbound auxiliary lane should be converted to a mixed flow lane that extends to and drops at the Oak Avenue Parkway off ramp (see mitigation measure 3A.15-4t). Improvements to this freeway segment must be implemented by Caltrans. This improvement is not consistent with the Concept Facility in Caltrans State Route 50 Corridor System Management Plan; therefore, it is not likely to be implemented by Caltrans by 2030.

Construction of the Capitol South East Connector, including widening White Rock Road and Grant Line Road to six lanes with limited access, could divert some traffic off of U.S. 50 and partially mitigate the project's impact.

The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other appropriate and reliable mechanism paid for by applicant, to reduce the impacts to Eastbound U.S. 50 between Folsom Boulevard and Prairie City Road (Freeway Segment 5).

Implementation: Capitol Southeast Connector Joint Powers Authority.

Timing: Before project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which project phase the improvement should be built.

Enforcement: Capitol Southeast Connector Joint Powers Authority.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4s would partially reduce the significant impact on Eastbound U.S. 50 between Folsom Boulevard and Prairie City Road from the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives under cumulative (2030) conditions. A mitigated LOS cannot be calculated because the design of the Capitol South East Connector is not known at this time; therefore, it is not known how much traffic would be diverted off of U.S. 50 and what LOS that reduced U.S. 50 volume would produce.

As discussed above, the requirement that the Applicant participate in funding these transportation improvements that are located outside the City of Folsom would mitigate or substantially lessen the project's significant impact on this intersection but the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**. This conclusion reflects the reality that successful implementation of the proposed improvements will require the cooperation of Capital Southeast, the City of Rancho Cordova and Sacramento County, over which the City of Folsom has no control. For this reason, the City of Folsom is conservatively acknowledging the possibility that, despite its own commitment to work with these other agencies, mutually acceptable accommodation may not be reached. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2), though, the City of Folsom concludes that these other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the mitigation.

IMPACT 3A.15-4t Unacceptable LOS on Eastbound U.S. 50 between Prairie City Road and Oak Avenue Parkway (Freeway Segment 6) under Cumulative (2030) Conditions. *This freeway segment would degrade to an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. peak traffic hour with project and build alternative traffic, and this deficient freeway segment (LOS F) would experience higher volumes during the p.m. peak traffic hour with the addition of traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions.*

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

This freeway segment would degrade from an acceptable LOS E to an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. peak traffic hour with the project and all build alternatives traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions. This freeway segment would operate at an unacceptable LOS F during the p.m. peak traffic hour with or without the project and all but one build alternative under cumulative (2030) conditions. This is a **significant** impact. The impacts of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4t: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on Eastbound U.S. 50 between Prairie City Road and Oak Avenue Parkway (Freeway Segment 6).

To ensure that Eastbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS between Prairie City Road and Oak Avenue Parkway, the northbound Prairie City Road slip on ramp should merge with the eastbound

auxiliary lane that extends to and drops at the Oak Avenue Parkway off ramp (see Mitigation Measures 3A.15-4u, v and w), and the southbound Prairie City Road flyover on ramp should be braided over the Oak Avenue Parkway off ramp and start an extended full auxiliary lane to the East Bidwell Street – Scott Road off ramp. Improvements to this freeway segment must be implemented by Caltrans. The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other appropriate and reliable mechanism paid for by applicant, to reduce the impacts to Eastbound U.S. 50 between Prairie City Road and Oak Avenue Parkway (Freeway Segment 6).

Implementation: California Department of Transportation.

Timing: Before project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which project phase the improvement should be built.

Enforcement: California Department of Transportation.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4t would reduce the significant impact on Eastbound U.S. 50 between Prairie City Road and Oak Avenue Parkway from the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives under cumulative (2030) conditions to a less-than-significant level, by allowing this freeway segment to operate at an acceptable LOS. With the proposed mitigated design this freeway segment will operate at LOS F but with a lower traffic density than under the No Project condition.

If Caltrans implements the improvements, the impact would be reduced to less than significant.

As discussed above, the requirement that the Applicant participate in funding these transportation improvements that are located outside the City of Folsom would mitigate or substantially lessen the project's significant impact on this intersection but the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**. This conclusion reflects the reality that successful implementation the proposed improvements will require the cooperation of Caltrans, over which the City of Folsom has no control. For this reason, the City of Folsom is conservatively acknowledging the possibility that, despite its own commitment to work with these other agencies, mutually acceptable accommodation may not be reached. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2), though, the City of Folsom concludes that these other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the mitigation.

CALTRANS FREEWAY RAMP MERGE, DIVERGE AND WEAVING SECTIONS

Off-Site Elements

IMPACT **Unacceptable LOS at the U.S. 50 Eastbound / Prairie City Road Slip Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge 6).**
3A.15-4u *Project and alternative traffic would increase at this LOS F freeway merge during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours with project and build alternative traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions.*

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

This freeway merge would operate at an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours with or without project and all alternatives traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions. Project and alternative traffic would increase at this freeway merge under all build alternatives. This is a **significant** impact. The impacts of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4u: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on the U.S. 50 Eastbound / Prairie City Road Slip Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge 6).

To ensure that Eastbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS, the northbound Prairie City Road slip on ramp should start the eastbound auxiliary lane that extends to and drops at the Oak Avenue Parkway off ramp (see mitigation measure 3A.15-4u, w and x), and the southbound Prairie City Road flyover on ramp should be braided over the Oak Avenue Parkway off ramp and start an extended full auxiliary lane to the East Bidwell Street – Scott Road off ramp. Improvements to this freeway segment must be implemented by Caltrans. The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other appropriate and reliable mechanism paid for by applicant, to reduce the impacts to the U.S. 50 Eastbound/Prairie City Road slip ramp merge (Freeway Merge 6).

Implementation: California Department of Transportation.

Timing: Before project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which project phase the improvement should be build.

Enforcement: California Department of Transportation.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4u would reduce the significant impact on the U.S. 50 Eastbound / Prairie City Road Slip Ramp Merge from the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives under cumulative (2030) conditions to a less-than-significant level, by allowing this merge to operate at an acceptable LOS. With the proposed mitigated design this merge segment will no longer exist, and be replaced with a weaving segment that will operate at LOS F but with a lower traffic density than under the No Project condition.

If Caltrans implements the improvements, the impact would be reduced to less than significant.

As discussed above, the requirement that the Applicant participate in funding these transportation improvements that are located outside the City of Folsom would mitigate or substantially lessen the project’s significant impact on this intersection but the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**. This conclusion reflects the reality that successful implementation the proposed improvements will require the cooperation of Caltrans, over which the City of Folsom has no control. For this reason, the City of Folsom is conservatively acknowledging the possibility that, despite its own commitment to work with these other agencies, mutually acceptable accommodation may not be reached. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2), though, the City of Folsom concludes that these other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the mitigation.

IMPACT **Unacceptable LOS at the U.S. 50 Eastbound / Prairie City Road Flyover On Ramp to Oak Avenue**
3A.15-4v **Parkway Off Ramp Weave (Freeway Weave 7).** *Project and alternative traffic would increase at this LOS F freeway weave during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours with project and build alternative traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions.*

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

This freeway weave would operate at an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours with or without project and all alternatives traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions. Project and alternative traffic would increase at this freeway weave under all build alternatives. This is a **significant** impact. The impacts of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4v: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on the U.S. 50 Eastbound / Prairie City Road Flyover On Ramp to Oak Avenue Parkway Off Ramp Weave (Freeway Weave 7).

To ensure that Eastbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS, the northbound Prairie City Road slip on ramp should start the eastbound auxiliary lane that extends to and drops at the Oak Avenue Parkway off ramp (see mitigation measure 3A.15-4u, v and x), and the southbound Prairie City Road flyover on ramp should be braided over the Oak Avenue Parkway off ramp and start an extended full auxiliary lane to the East Bidwell Street – Scott Road off ramp. Improvements to this freeway segment must be implemented by Caltrans. The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other appropriate and reliable mechanism paid for by applicant, to reduce the impacts to the U.S. 50 Eastbound/Prairie City Road Flyover On Ramp to Oak Avenue Parkway Off Ramp Weave (Freeway Weave 7).

Implementation: California Department of Transportation.

Timing: Before project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which project phase the improvement should be built.

Enforcement: California Department of Transportation.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4v would reduce the significant impact on Freeway Weave 7 from the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives under cumulative (2030) conditions to a less-than-significant level, by allowing this merge to operate at an acceptable LOS. With the proposed mitigated design this weaving segment will no longer exist, and be replaced with a weaving segment that will operate at LOS F but with a lower traffic density than under the No Project condition.

If Caltrans implements the improvements, the impact would be reduced to less than significant.

As discussed above, the requirement that the Applicant participate in funding these transportation improvements that are located outside the City of Folsom would mitigate or substantially lessen the project's significant impact on this intersection but the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**. This conclusion reflects the reality that successful implementation the proposed improvements will require the cooperation of Caltrans, over which the City of Folsom has no control. For this reason, the City of Folsom is conservatively acknowledging the possibility that, despite its own commitment to work with these other agencies, mutually acceptable accommodation may not be reached. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2), though, the City of Folsom concludes that these other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the mitigation.

IMPACT 3A.15-4w Unacceptable LOS at the U.S. 50 Eastbound / Oak Avenue Parkway Loop Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge 8). *Project and alternative traffic would increase at this LOS F freeway merge during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours with project traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions.*

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

This freeway merge would operate at an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours with or without project and all alternatives traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions. Project and alternative traffic would increase at this freeway merge under all build alternatives. This is a **significant** impact. The impacts of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4w: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on U.S. 50 Eastbound / Oak Avenue Parkway Loop Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge 8).

To ensure that Eastbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS, the southbound Oak Avenue Parkway loop on ramp should merge with the eastbound auxiliary lane that starts at the southbound Prairie City Road braided flyover on ramp and ends at the East Bidwell Street – Scott Road off ramp (see mitigation measure 3A.15-4u, v and w). Improvements to this freeway segment must be implemented by Caltrans. The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other appropriate and reliable mechanism paid for by applicant, to reduce the impacts to U.S. 50 Eastbound/Oak Avenue Parkway Loop Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge 8).

Implementation: California Department of Transportation.

Timing: Before project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which project phase the improvement should be built.

Enforcement: California Department of Transportation.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4w would reduce the significant impact on Freeway Merge 8 from the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives under cumulative (2030) conditions to a less-than-significant level, by allowing this merge to operate at LOS C.

If Caltrans implements the improvements, the impact would be reduced to less than significant.

As discussed above, the requirement that the Applicant participate in funding these transportation improvements that are located outside the City of Folsom would mitigate or substantially lessen the project's significant impact on this intersection but the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**. This conclusion reflects the reality that successful implementation the proposed improvements will require the cooperation of Caltrans, over which the City of Folsom has no control. For this reason, the City of Folsom is conservatively acknowledging the possibility that, despite its own commitment to work with these other agencies, mutually acceptable accommodation may not be reached. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2), though, the City of Folsom concludes that these other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the mitigation.

IMPACT 3A.15-4x Unacceptable LOS at the U.S. 50 Westbound / Empire Ranch Road Loop Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge 27). *This freeway merge would degrade to an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours with the project and build alternative traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions.*

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

This freeway merge would degrade from an acceptable LOS D to an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours with the project and all build alternatives traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions. This is a **significant** impact. The impacts of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4x: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on U.S. 50 Westbound / Empire Ranch Road Loop Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge 27).

To ensure that Westbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS, the northbound Empire Ranch Road loop on ramp should start the westbound auxiliary lane that ends at the East Bidwell Street – Scott Road

off ramp. The slip on ramp from southbound Empire Ranch Road slip ramp would merge into this extended auxiliary lane. Improvements to this freeway segment must be implemented by Caltrans. The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other appropriate and reliable mechanism paid for by applicant, to reduce the impacts to the U.S. 50 Westbound/Empire Ranch Road loop ramp merge (Freeway Merge 27).

Implementation: California Department of Transportation.

Timing: Before project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which project phase the improvement should be built.

Enforcement: California Department of Transportation.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4x would reduce the significant impact on Freeway Merge 27 from the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives under cumulative (2030) conditions to a less-than-significant level, by allowing this on ramp to enter into its own lane and eliminating the direct merge to the freeway mainline. With the elimination of the direct merge movement there is no specific LOS for the mitigated condition.

If Caltrans implements the improvements, the impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

As discussed above, the requirement that the Applicant participate in funding these transportation improvements that are located outside the City of Folsom would mitigate or substantially lessen the project's significant impact on this intersection but the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**. This conclusion reflects the reality that successful implementation the proposed improvements will require the cooperation of Caltrans, over which the City of Folsom has no control. For this reason, the City of Folsom is conservatively acknowledging the possibility that, despite its own commitment to work with these other agencies, mutually acceptable accommodation may not be reached. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2), though, the City of Folsom concludes that these other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the mitigation.

IMPACT 3A.15-4y Unacceptable LOS at the U.S. 50 Westbound / Prairie City Road Loop Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge 35). *Project and alternative traffic would increase at this LOS F freeway merge during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours with project and build alternative traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions.*

NCP, PP, RIM, CD, RHD

This freeway merge would operate at an unacceptable LOS F during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic hours with or without project and all alternatives traffic under cumulative (2030) conditions. Project and alternative traffic would increase at this freeway merge under all build alternatives. This is a **significant** impact. The impacts of these alternatives would be similar to that of the Proposed Project.

Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4y: Participate in Fair Share Funding of Improvements to Reduce Impacts on U.S. 50 Westbound / Prairie City Road Loop Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge 35).

To ensure that Westbound U.S. 50 operates at an acceptable LOS, the northbound Prairie City Road loop on ramp should start the westbound auxiliary lane that continues beyond the Folsom Boulevard off ramp. The slip on ramp from southbound Prairie City Road slip ramp would merge into this extended auxiliary lane. Improvements to this freeway segment must be implemented by Caltrans. The applicant shall pay its proportionate share of funding of improvements, as may be determined by a nexus study or other

appropriate and reliable mechanism paid for by applicant, to reduce the impacts to the U.S. 50 Westbound/Prairie City Road Loop Ramp Merge (Freeway Merge 35).

Implementation: California Department of Transportation.

Timing: Before project build out. A phasing analysis should be performed prior to approval of the first subdivision map to determine during which project phase the improvement should be built.

Enforcement: California Department of Transportation.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-4y would reduce the significant impact on Freeway Merge 35 from the No USACE Permit, Proposed Project, Resource Impact Minimization, Centralized Development, and Reduced Hillside Development alternatives under cumulative (2030) conditions to a less-than-significant level, by allowing this on ramp to enter into its own lane and eliminating the direct merge to the freeway mainline. There is no specific resulting mitigated merge LOS because with the on ramp entering its own exclusive lane at the beginning of an auxiliary lane there is no longer a merge.

If Caltrans implements the improvements, the impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

As discussed above, the requirement that the Applicant participate in funding these transportation improvements that are located outside the City of Folsom would mitigate or substantially lessen the project's significant impact on this intersection but the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**. This conclusion reflects the reality that successful implementation of the proposed improvements will require the cooperation of Caltrans, over which the City of Folsom has no control. For this reason, the City of Folsom is conservatively acknowledging the possibility that, despite its own commitment to work with these other agencies, mutually acceptable accommodation may not be reached. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(2), though, the City of Folsom concludes that these other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the mitigation.

MITIGATED TRANSPORTATION NETWORK

While the mitigation measures detailed in this document are effective at reducing the level of significance of many transportation impacts, congested conditions would remain in the vicinity of the project, due to the traffic associated with the project as well as extensive development in the site environs and throughout the region. Each mitigation measure address a specific deficiency. However, on a system wide basis, these individual measures are unable to fully mitigate the impacts of the Proposed Project or build alternatives.

As an alternative method of project mitigation, a mitigated transportation network has been developed to address anticipated travel demand in the project area on a systematic basis, rather than a location-by-location approach. The intent is to provide a balanced transportation system, providing efficient movement of people and goods in the study area. Some of the network includes facilities that are not currently identified in area General Plans or in the 2035 MTP, but which would contribute to effectively accommodating anticipated travel demand.

The proposed network includes many improvements intended to systematically mitigate project impacts. The mitigation elements inside the City of Folsom could be implemented by the City. Roadway improvements outside the City of Folsom's jurisdiction would need to be implemented by others. The list of improvements assumed in the mitigated transportation network includes:

- ▶ Sibley Street/Blue Ravine Road - Add second northbound left turn lane
- ▶ East Bidwell Street/Nesmith Court - Add second westbound right turn lane

- ▶ Serpa Way/Iron Point Road - Restripe northbound lane as shared left through lane
- ▶ Empire Ranch Road/Iron Point Road - Add a second northbound and southbound left turn lane
- ▶ Oak Avenue Parkway/Easton Valley Parkway - Add second southbound right turn lane
- ▶ Oak Avenue Parkway/Easton Valley Parkway - Add second southbound right turn lane
- ▶ Oak Avenue Parkway/White Rock Road - Add second southbound right turn lane
- ▶ Empire Ranch Road/White Rock Road - Add second eastbound right turn lane
- ▶ White Rock Road/ Grant Line Road - Grade separation
- ▶ White Rock Road - Grant Line Road to Carson Crossing Road - Widened to six lanes
- ▶ Grant Line Road - White Rock Road to Jackson Highway (SR 16) - Widened to six lanes
- ▶ Empire Ranch Road - White Rock Road to Carson Crossing Road – extend as new four lane road
- ▶ “Truck Road” from Grant Line Road to Scott Road (East) – Add a new two lane road (for rock quarry trucks).
- ▶ Eastbound U.S. 50 - Prairie City Road to Oak Avenue Parkway – braid Oak Avenue Parkway off-ramp with southbound Prairie City Road flyover on-ramp
- ▶ Eastbound U.S. 50 - Prairie City Road to Oak Avenue Parkway – add auxiliary lane from the northbound Prairie City Road slip on-ramp to the Oak Avenue Parkway off-ramp
- ▶ Eastbound U.S. 50 - Oak Avenue Parkway to Scott Road– extend auxiliary lane from Scott Road/ East Bidwell Street off-ramp back to the southbound Prairie City Road flyover on-ramp
- ▶ Westbound U.S. 50 - Empire Ranch Road to Scott Road - extend auxiliary lane from the Scott Road/East Bidwell Street off-ramp back to the northbound Empire Ranch Road loop on-ramp
- ▶ Westbound U.S. 50 - Prairie City Road to Folsom Blvd - extend auxiliary lane from the Folsom Blvd off-ramp is back to the northbound Prairie City Road loop on-ramp

A map of the improvements is shown in Exhibit 3A.15-101. The improvements to eastbound U.S. 50 should be built together as a package. The widening of White Rock Road is included in the 2035 MTP, but not in the Sacramento County General Plan. The widening of Grant Line Road is planned in the Sacramento County General Plan, but not included in the 2035 MTP. Both are in the Sacramento County Roadway Impact Fee Program. The extension of Empire Ranch Road south from White Rock Road to Golden Foothills Parkway, in the El Dorado Hills Business Park, is currently being planned by the El Dorado County / City of Folsom Joint Powers Authority but it is not on the Sacramento County General Plan Circulation diagram.

MITIGATED NETWORK ANALYSIS CONCLUSIONS

Exhibits 3A.15-102 through 3A.15-109 illustrate traffic volumes associated with the development of the project and the mitigated network. Tables 3A.15-34 through 3A.15-42 summarize how the mitigated transportation network would improve the level of service for the proposed project and eliminate most impacts. The widening of White Rock Road diverts traffic off of U.S. 50, and improves the freeway Level of Service.

Table 3A.15-34 Intersection Levels of Service — Cumulative (2030) Conditions — City of Folsom — With Mitigated Transportation Network													
Intersection	Control	No Project						Proposed Project					
		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
		Delay ¹	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS
1. Folsom Blvd / Blue Ravine Road	Signalized	49.4	D	64.0	E	49.5	D	64.4	E	50.1	D	63.7	E
2. Sibley Street / Blue Ravine Road	Signalized	48.0	D	30.3	C	55.0	D	30.1	C	36.0	D	29.3	C
3. Oak Avenue Parkway / Blue Ravine Road	Signalized	35.1	D	37.2	D	35.9	D	37.7	D	35.8	D	37.5	D
4. Empire Ranch Road / Natoma Street	Signalized	10.2	B	8.8	A	24.9	C	9.3	A	24.2	C	9.0	A
5. Oak Avenue Parkway / Riley Street	Signalized	19.7	B	24.7	C	19.6	B	24.8	C	19.8	B	25.2	C
6. Oak Avenue Parkway / East Bidwell Street	Signalized	30.4	C	40.8	D	32.2	C	48.6	D	32.3	C	48.2	D
7. Nesmith Court / East Bidwell Street	Signalized	23.5	C	54.8	D	24.7	C	62.6	E	24.4	C	28.2	C
8. Scholar Way / East Bidwell Street	Signalized	12.6	B	14.3	B	12.4	B	16.2	B	12.4	B	16.7	B
9. Power Center Drive / East Bidwell Street	Signalized	8.1	A	18.8	B	7.0	A	17.7	B	7.1	A	18.3	B
10. Broadstone Parkway / East Bidwell Street	Signalized	27.1	C	31.5	C	28.2	C	33.1	C	27.8	C	32.9	C
11. Empire Ranch Road / Broadstone Parkway	Signalized	20.1	C	21.7	C	19.9	B	24.4	C	19.7	B	24.2	C
12. Oak Avenue Parkway / Haverhill Drive	Signalized	16.7	B	9.7	A	15.0	B	8.8	A	15.0	B	8.7	A
13. Oak Avenue Parkway / Halidon Way	Signalized	13.9	B	11.5	B	14.6	B	12.9	B	14.6	B	13.0	B
14. Folsom Blvd / Iron Point Road	Signalized	21.1	C	26.3	C	20.3	C	30.3	C	19.4	B	29.2	C
15. Prairie City Road / Iron Point Road	Signalized	24.8	C	32.3	C	24.9	C	30.6	C	24.9	C	30.4	C
16. Grover Road / Iron Point Road	Signalized	19.6	B	11.5	B	18.8	B	11.2	B	18.9	B	11.9	B
17. McAdoo Drive / Iron Point Road	Signalized	22.3	C	15.1	B	20.8	C	16.7	B	20.9	C	16.9	B
18. Oak Avenue Parkway / Iron Point Road	Signalized	31.4	C	44.0	D	32.6	C	40.4	D	32.5	C	39.9	D
19. Rowberry Drive / Iron Point Road	Signalized	10.0	A	9.7	A	27.1	C	32.0	C	27.1	C	32.0	C
20. Broadstone Parkway / Iron Point Road	Signalized	18.1	B	20.4	C	18.2	B	20.2	C	18.5	B	20.2	C
21. East Bidwell Street / Iron Point Road	Signalized	26.6	C	60.6	E	29.7	C	77.0	E	29.4	C	81.8	F
22. Cavitt Road / Iron Point Road	Signalized	14.8	B	21.5	C	12.9	B	21.6	C	12.9	B	21.5	C
23. Serpa Way / Iron Point Road	Signalized	24.2	C	39.2	D	24.3	C	43.7	D	25.8	C	51.0	D
24. Empire Ranch Road / Iron Point Road	Signalized	80.5	F	60.7	E	82.2	F	79.9	E	46.9	D	50.6	D
25. Prairie City Road / High School	Signalized	34.8	C	24.3	C	34.8	C	25.8	C	34.3	C	25.3	C
26. East Bidwell Street / Placerville Road	Signalized	446.2	F	1,328.8	F	145.3	F	965.6	F	136.1	F	995.9	F
27. Prairie City Road / White Rock Road	Signalized	61.8	E	26.4	C	40.6	D	24.8	C	34.2	C	74.0	E
28. Scott Road (West) / White Rock Road	Signalized	37.2	D	9.8	A	36.0	D	10.2	B	13.1	B	8.9	A
29. Scott Road (East) / White Rock Road	Signalized	63.9	E	27.2	C	35.6	D	22.1	C	28.0	C	22.1	C
30. Placerville Road / White Rock Road	Side-street stop ²	0.0	A	21.4	C	11.7	B	9.7	A	12.7	B	10.5	B
31. Empire Ranch Road / North Road	Signalized					10.6	B	18.3	B	10.7	B	18.0	B

**Table 3A.15-34
Intersection Levels of Service — Cumulative (2030) Conditions – City of Folsom – With Mitigated Transportation Network**

Intersection	Control	No Project						Proposed Project						Proposed Project With Mitigated Transportation Network					
		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		LOS		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		LOS		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		LOS	
		Delay ¹	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS
32. Prairie City Road / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized	14.2	B	18.5	B	32.1	C	32.6	C	31.9	C	34.3	C						
33. Oak Avenue Parkway / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	37.3	D	30.3	C	30.3	C	28.0	C						
34. Rowberry Drive / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	21.2	C	24.7	C	21.8	C	25.3	C						
35. 1 st Street / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	18.9	B	19.2	B	19.5	B	19.2	B						
36. 2 nd Street / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	25.0	C	28.6	C	25.7	C	29.9	C						
37. 3 rd Street / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	24.6	C	26.2	C	24.1	C	26.8	C						
38. Scott Road (East) / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	31.2	C	41.2	D	30.8	C	41.5	D						
39. Placerville Road / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	31.4	C	31.0	C	0.8	A	0.9	A						
40. 4 th Street / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	31.5	C	31.2	C						
41. Hillside Drive / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	16.1	B	16.4	B	16.2	B	17.0	B						
42. Empire Ranch Road / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	23.5	C	27.9	C	23.7	C	27.1	C						
43. Prairie City Road / Middle Road	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	8.1	A	11.0	B	8.9	A	9.1	A						
44. Oak Avenue Parkway / Middle Road	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	16.6	B	22.3	C	16.2	B	19.6	B						
45. Scott Road (East) / Street "B"	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	22.0	C	26.0	C	24.1	C	27.1	C						
46. East Road / Street "B"	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	24.6	C	24.3	C	24.7	C	24.2	C						
47. Prairie City Road / Street "A"	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	8.9	A	9.6	A	9.0	A	8.6	A						
48. Oak Avenue Parkway / Street "A"	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	24.6	C	27.6	C	25.0	C	28.7	C						
49. 2 nd Street / Street "A"	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	18.0	B	18.4	B	17.9	B	18.3	B						
50. Scott Road (East) / Street "A"	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	22.9	C	22.2	C	23.4	C	21.4	C						
51. East Road / Street "A"	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	9.7	A	9.8	A	9.8	A	9.8	A						
52. Placerville Road / Street "A"	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	25.7	C	26.5	C	25.1	C	25.8	C						
53. Empire Ranch Road / Street "A"	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	14.9	B	14.1	B	14.2	B	12.7	B						
54. Scott Road (East) / South Road	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	18.8	B	20.7	C	19.1	B	20.3	C						
55. Oak Avenue Parkway / White Rock Road	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	27.3	C	27.1	C	30.9	C	24.6	C						
56. Empire Ranch Road / White Rock Road	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	28.9	C	17.7	B	32.4	C	28.4	C						

Notes: LOS = level of service; U.S. 50 = U.S. Highway 50; V/C = volume-to-capacity; Blank = intersection does not exist under this alternative
¹ Average intersection delay reported for all-way-stop intersections; worst-case delay reported for unsignalized, side-street-stop intersections; average intersection delay reported for all-way-stop intersections. All delays are reported in seconds per vehicle.
² Intersection signalized with the proposed project.
Bold indicates deficiency. Shaded areas indicate impact.
 Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

**Table 3A.15-35
Intersection Levels of Service — Cumulative (2030) Conditions – Sacramento County – With Mitigated Transportation Network**

Intersection	No Project				Proposed Project				Proposed Project With Mitigated Transportation Network				
	A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		
	LOS	V/C or Delay ¹	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	
1. Hazel Avenue / Gold Country Blvd	Signalized	0.98	E	1.25	F	0.99	E	1.27	F	1.09	F	1.39	F
2. Hazel Avenue / Folsom Blvd	Signalized	0.78	C	0.81	D	0.76	C	0.83	D	0.83	D	0.90	E
3. Grant Line Road / White Rock Road	Signalized	0.96	E	0.90	D	1.03	F	0.97	E	Converted to Interchange			
4. Grant Line Road / Sunrise Blvd	Signalized	0.82	D	0.69	B	0.82	D	0.70	C	0.91	E	0.81	D
5. Hazel Avenue / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized	0.41	A	0.68	B	0.45	A	0.71	C	0.49	A	0.77	C
6. Aerojet Road / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized	0.32	A	0.59	A	0.40	A	0.76	C	0.42	A	0.81	D
7. Alabama Avenue / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized	0.33	A	0.31	A	0.40	A	0.37	A	0.43	A	0.39	A
8. Glenborough Road / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized	0.29	A	0.35	A	0.40	A	0.50	A	0.43	A	0.53	A

Notes: LOS = level of service; V/C = volume-to-capacity
¹ V/C ratio is shown for signalized intersections. Delay is shown for unsignalized intersections.
² Average intersection delay reported in seconds per vehicle.
Bold indicates deficiency. Shaded areas indicate impact.
 Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

Table 3A.15-36

Roadway Segment Levels of Service — Cumulative (2030) Conditions - Sacramento County – With Mitigated Transportation Network

Roadway Segment	Lanes	No Project			Proposed Project			Proposed Project With Mitigated Transportation Network		
		Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS
1. Folsom Blvd — Sunrise Blvd to Mercantile Drive	4	31,900	0.89	D	32,000	0.89	D	31,700	0.88	D
2. Folsom Blvd — Mercantile Drive to Hazel Avenue	4	22,700	0.63	B	23,200	0.64	B	22,700	0.63	B
3. Folsom Blvd — Hazel Avenue to Aerojet Road	4	8,000	0.22	A	8,900	0.25	A	8,500	0.24	A
4. Folsom Blvd — Aerojet Road to U.S. 50	4	26,300	0.73	C	25,400	0.71	C	25,400	0.71	C
5. Grant Line Road—White Rock Road to Century Road	4	57,600	1.44	F	65,100	1.63	F	60,200	1.00	F
6. Grant Line Road—Century Road to Douglas Road	4	55,500	1.39	F	62,000	1.55	F	71,500	1.19	F
7. Grant Line Road—Douglas Road to Kiefer Road	4	57,000	1.58	F	60,800	1.69	F	70,100	1.17	F
8. Grant Line Road—Kiefer Road to SR Jackson Road (SR16)	4	37,600	1.04	F	39,500	1.10	F	43,300	0.72	C
9. Grant Line Road — Jackson Road (SR16) to Sunrise Blvd	4	37,000	1.03	F	38,600	1.07	F	40,900	1.02	F
10. Hazel Avenue — Greenback Lane to Madison Avenue	6	56,300	1.04	F	56,800	1.05	F	57,000	1.06	F
11. Hazel Avenue — Madison Avenue to Curragh Downs Drive	6	76,700	1.42	F	78,900	1.46	F	79,000	1.46	F
12. Hazel Avenue — Curragh Downs Drive to Gold Country Blvd ¹	6	88,000	1.47	F	91,300	1.52	F	91,400	1.52	F
13. Hazel Avenue — Gold Country Blvd to U.S. 50 westbound ramp	6	91,100	1.52	F	94,800	1.58	F	94,900	1.58	F
14. Jackson Highway (SR 16) — Grant Line Road to Dillard Road	2	13,200	0.58	D	12,900	0.56	D	12,800	0.56	D
15. Jackson Highway (SR 16) — Dillard Road to Rancho Murrieta Parkway	2	16,400	0.72	E	16,500	0.72	E	15,900	0.69	E
16. Prairie City Road —U.S. 50 eastbound ramp to Easton Valley Parkway	4 - 6	35,700	0.99	E	39,500	0.73	C	41,200	0.76	C
17. Prairie City Road —Easton Valley Parkway to White Rock Road	2 - 4	25,100	1.39	F	37,200	1.03	F	40,600	1.13	F
18. Scott Road (West) — White Rock Road to Latrobe Road	2	3,900	0.23	C	5,700	0.34	C	5,100	0.30	C
19. Stone House Road — Latrobe Road to Jackson Highway (SR 16)	2	5,700	0.34	C	7,400	0.44	D	6,900	0.41	D
20. Sunrise Boulevard — Jackson Highway (SR 16) to Grant Line Road	6	22,300	0.62	B	22,500	0.63	B	22,800	0.63	B
21. White Rock Road — Ranch Cordova City Limit to Grant Line Road	4	15,800	0.44	A	19,900	0.55	A	23,500	0.65	B
22. White Rock Road—Grant Line Road to Prairie City Road	4	74,300	1.86	F	85,800	2.15	F	80,200	1.34	F
23. White Rock Road —Prairie City Road to Scott Road (West)	4 - 5	67,100	1.68	F	69,800	1.40	F	59,800	1.00	E
24. White Rock Road —Scott Road (West) to Oak Avenue Parkway	4 - 5	52,400	1.31	F	56,500	1.13	F	56,600	0.94	E
25. White Rock Road — Oak Avenue Parkway to Scott Road (East)	4 - 5	52,400	1.31	F	59,800	1.20	F	58,200	0.97	E
26. White Rock Road — Scott Road (East) to Placerville Road	4 - 5	29,500	0.74	C	30,300	0.61	B	37,300	0.62	B
27. White Rock Road — Placerville Road to Empire Ranch Road	4 - 5	34,500	0.86	D	38,000	0.76	C	46,900	0.78	C
28. White Rock Road — Empire Ranch Road to Carson Crossing Road	6	34,500	0.86	D	49,300	0.99	E	24,500	0.41	A
29. Hazel Avenue — Folsom Boulevard connector to Easton Valley Parkway	6	17,600	0.33	A	19,000	0.35	A	18,800	0.35	A
30. Easton Valley Parkway — Hazel Avenue to Aerojet Road	6	31,300	0.58	A	34,200	0.63	B	33,500	0.62	B
31. Easton Valley Parkway — Aerojet Road to Alabama Avenue	6	19,600	0.36	A	27,300	0.51	A	26,800	0.50	A
32. Easton Valley Parkway — Alabama Avenue to Glenborough Road	6	15,400	0.29	A	23,700	0.44	A	23,000	0.43	A
33. Easton Valley Parkway — Glenborough Road to Prairie City Road	6	16,700	0.31	A	28,000	0.52	A	27,700	0.51	A
34. Empire Ranch Road — White Rock Road to Carson Crossing Road	0 - 0 - 4	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	40,000	1.00	F

Notes: LOS = level of service; SR = State Route; U.S. 50 = U.S. Highway 50; V/C = volume-to-capacity

Lanes: Cumulative No Project – Cumulative Plus Project (or alternative)

Bold indicates deficiency. Shaded areas indicate impact.

Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

Table 3A.15-37

Intersection Levels of Service — Cumulative (2030) Conditions – City of Rancho Cordova – With Mitigated Transportation Network

Intersection	Control	No Project				Proposed Project				Proposed Project With Mitigated Transportation Network			
		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
		V/C ¹ or Delay ²	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS
1. Sunrise Blvd / White Rock Road	Signalized	0.63	B	0.68	B	0.67	B	0.67	B	0.72	C	0.71	C
2. Fitzgerald Road / White Rock Road	Signalized	0.32	A	0.34	A	0.31	A	0.33	A	0.34	A	0.37	A
3. Sunrise Blvd / Douglas Road	Signalized	0.65	B	0.81	D	0.71	C	0.80	C	0.71	C	0.85	D
4. Grant Line Road / Douglas Road	Signalized	0.72	C	0.61	B	0.76	C	0.64	B	0.78	C	0.73	C
5. Grant Line Road / Kiefer Road	Signalized	0.85	D	0.63	B	0.86	D	0.65	B	0.89	D	0.69	B
6. Rancho Cordova / Easton Valley	Signalized	0.72	C	0.99	E	0.70	C	0.96	E	0.71	C	1.00	E
7. Rancho Cordova / White Rock Road	Signalized	1.01	F	0.87	D	1.02	F	0.87	D	1.12	F	0.92	E
8. International Drive / White Rock Road	Signalized	0.45	A	0.66	B	0.44	A	0.70	B	0.48	A	0.77	C
9. Rio Del Oro Parkway / White Rock Road	Signalized	0.52	A	0.36	A	0.54	A	0.37	A	0.63	B	0.47	A
10. Villagio Parkway / White Rock Road	Signalized	0.35	A	0.44	A	0.41	A	0.53	A	0.51	A	0.71	C
11. Sunrise Blvd / International Drive	Signalized	0.74	C	0.72	C	0.75	C	0.69	B	0.82	D	0.75	C
12. Villagio Parkway / Americanos Road	Signalized	0.58	A	0.56	A	0.58	A	0.63	B	0.63	B	0.65	B
13. Grant Line Road / Centennial Road	Signalized	0.84	D	0.67	B	0.89	D	0.74	C	0.90	D	0.80	C
14. Villagio Parkway / Rancho Cordova Parkway	Signalized	0.65	C	0.54	C	0.68	C	0.53	C	0.65	C	0.55	C
15. Rancho Cordova Parkway / Douglas Road	Signalized	0.49	A	0.77	C	0.50	A	0.76	C	0.54	A	0.84	D
16. Americanos Blvd / Douglas Road	Signalized	0.59	A	0.78	C	0.49	C	0.68	C	0.47	C	0.65	C
17. Grant Line Road / Chrysanthy Blvd	Signalized	0.87	D	0.64	B	0.90	D	0.65	B	0.79	C	0.69	B
18. Grant Line Road / Rancho Cordova	Signalized	0.53	A	0.39	A	0.55	A	0.41	A	0.72	C	0.52	A

Notes: LOS = level of service; V/C = volume-to-capacity

¹ V/C ratio is shown for signalized intersections. Delay is shown for unsignalized intersections.

² Worst-case delay reported for unsignalized, side-street-stop intersections; average intersection delay reported for all-way-stop intersections. Both delays are reported in seconds per vehicle.

Bold indicates deficiency. Shaded areas indicate impact.

Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

Table 3A.15-38

Roadway Segment Levels of Service — Cumulative (2030) Conditions - City of Rancho Cordova – With Mitigated Transportation Network

Roadway Segment	Lanes	No Project			Proposed Project			Proposed Project With Mitigated Transportation Network		
		Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS
		1. Douglas Road—Sunrise Blvd to Villagio Parkway	6	30,100	0.56	A	29,700	0.55	A	29,400
2. Douglas Road— Villagio Parkway to Rancho Cordova Parkway	6	25,200	0.47	A	24,400	0.45	A	24,200	0.45	A
3. Douglas Road— Rancho Cordova Parkway to Americanos Road	6	13,900	0.26	A	13,300	0.25	A	13,900	0.26	A
4. Douglas Road— Americanos Road to Grant Line Road	6	15,300	0.28	A	15,200	0.28	A	17,600	0.33	A
5. Sunrise Blvd—U.S. 50 eastbound ramps to Folsom Blvd	8	79,300	1.10	F	79,200	1.10	F	78,700	1.09	F
6. Sunrise Blvd—Folsom Blvd to White Rock Road	6	49,900	0.92	E	49,400	0.91	E	48,600	0.90	E
7. Sunrise Blvd—White Rock Road to Douglas Road	6	34,200	0.63	B	33,500	0.62	B	33,100	0.61	B
8. Sunrise Blvd—Douglas Road to Keifer Boulevard	6	35,500	0.66	B	35,600	0.66	B	34,800	0.64	B
9. Sunrise Boulevard—Keifer Boulevard to Jackson Highway (SR 16)	6	23,100	0.43	A	23,200	0.43	A	22,300	0.41	A
10. White Rock Road—Zinfandel Drive to Sunrise Blvd	4	9,400	0.17	A	9,300	0.17	A	9,800	0.18	A
11. White Rock Road— Sunrise Blvd to Rancho Cordova Parkway	6	36,800	0.68	B	36,200	0.67	B	37,200	0.69	B
12. White Rock Road— Rancho Cordova Parkway to International Drive	6	13,900	0.39	A	13,500	0.38	A	14,000	0.39	A
13. White Rock Road— International Drive to Rio Del Oro Parkway	6	12,400	0.34	A	13,700	0.38	A	15,500	0.43	A
14. White Rock Road— Rio Del Oro Parkway to Villagio Parkway	4	10,200	0.28	A	12,200	0.34	A	15,000	0.42	A
15. White Rock Road— Villagio Parkway to Grant Line Road	4	15,800	0.44	A	19,900	0.55	A	23,500	0.65	B
16. Easton Valley Parkway — Rancho Cordova Parkway to Hazel Avenue	6	39,000	0.72	C	38,800	0.72	C	54,000	0.71	C
17. Rancho Cordova Parkway - Easton Valley Parkway to International	6	51,100	0.95	E	49,600	0.92	E	54,000	0.87	D
18. Rancho Cordova Parkway - International Drive. to White Rock Road.	6	41,400	0.77	C	40,800	0.76	C	54,000	0.72	C
19. International Drive — White Rock Road. to Americanos Parkway.	6	17,900	0.33	A	18,900	0.35	A	54,000	0.35	A
20. International Drive — Americanos Parkway to Rancho Cordova Parkway	6	33,600	0.62	B	34,000	0.63	B	54,000	0.64	B
21. International Drive. — Rancho Cordova Parkway. to Sunrise Blvd.	6	31,700	0.59	A	31,700	0.59	A	54,000	0.59	A
22. Villagio Parkway — White Rock Road. to Americanos Parkway.	2	5,700	0.32	A	7,800	0.43	A	18,000	0.46	A
23. Villagio Parkway — Americanos Parkway. to Rancho Cordova Parkway.	2	10,700	0.59	A	11,900	0.66	B	18,000	0.68	B
24. Villagio Parkway — Rancho Cordova Parkway. to Douglas Road.	2	12,200	0.68	B	13,000	0.72	C	18,000	0.73	C

Notes: LOS = level of service; SR = State Route; U.S. 50 = U.S. Highway 50; V/C = volume-to-capacity
Bold indicates deficiency. Shaded areas indicate impact.
 Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

Table 3A.15-39

Intersection Levels of Service — Cumulative (2030) Conditions – El Dorado County – With Mitigated Transportation Network

Intersection	No Project						Proposed Project						Proposed Project With Mitigated Transportation Network					
	A.M. Peak Hour			P.M. Peak Hour			A.M. Peak Hour			P.M. Peak Hour			A.M. Peak Hour			P.M. Peak Hour		
	Delay ¹	LOS	Control	Delay	LOS	Control	Delay	LOS	Control	Delay	LOS	Control	Delay	LOS	Control	Delay	LOS	Control
1. White Rock Road / Carson Crossing Road	27.7	C	Signalized	22.6	C	Signalized	100.8	F	Signalized	35.1	D	Signalized	5.5	A	Signalized	8.5	A	Signalized
2. White Rock Road / Stonebriar Drive	15.4	B	Signalized	11.2	B	Signalized	15.1	B	Signalized	10.4	B	Signalized	12.7	B	Signalized	9.4	A	Signalized
3. White Rock Road / Windfield Way	23.9	C	Signalized	29.6	C	Signalized	24.5	C	Signalized	31.3	C	Signalized	24.6	C	Signalized	49.0	D	Signalized
4. White Rock Road / Latrobe Road	40.1	D	Signalized	32.0	C	Signalized	37.4	D	Signalized	29.9	C	Signalized	40.8	D	Signalized	33.5	C	Signalized
5. White Rock Road / Valley View Parkway	35.3	D	Signalized	81.1	F	Signalized	42.6	D	Signalized	65.5	E	Signalized	46.3	D	Signalized	61.8	E	Signalized
6. El Dorado Hills Blvd / Serrano Parkway	48.2	D	Signalized	25.6	C	Signalized	35.9	D	Signalized	26.2	C	Signalized	38.6	D	Signalized	27.6	C	Signalized
7. El Dorado Hills Blvd / Saratoga Way	42.5	D	Signalized	40.2	D	Signalized	30.5	C	Signalized	43.5	D	Signalized	30.0	C	Signalized	44.4	D	Signalized
8. El Dorado Hills Blvd / Park Drive	30.7	C	Signalized	29.5	C	Signalized	24.7	C	Signalized	27.2	C	Signalized	24.4	C	Signalized	26.8	C	Signalized
9. Latrobe Road / Town Center Blvd	35.0	D	Signalized	95.5	F	Signalized	34.0	C	Signalized	77.5	E	Signalized	33.5	C	Signalized	80.7	F	Signalized

Notes: LOS = level of service;
Bold indicates deficiency. Shaded areas indicate impact.
 Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

Table 3A.15-40 Intersection Levels of Service — Cumulative (2030) Conditions – Caltrans – With Mitigated Transportation Network																			
Intersection	Control	No Project						Proposed Project						Proposed Project With Mitigated Transportation Network					
		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		LOS		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		LOS		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		LOS	
		Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS
1. Hazel Avenue / Tributary - WB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	28.7	C	94.1	F	44.0	D	102.3	F	46.3	D	102.8	F						
2. Hazel Avenue / EB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	43.8	D	152.4	F	36.5	D	147.3	F	37.0	D	147.7	F						
3. Folsom Blvd / WB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	8.4	A	13.3	B	6.3	A	10.7	B	6.7	A	10.7	B						
4. Folsom Blvd / EB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	30.5	C	39.1	D	26.8	C	29.8	C	26.8	C	30.2	C						
5. Prairie City Road / WB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	30.0	C	30.2	C	37.2	D	12.9	B	42.6	D	12.7	B						
6. Prairie City Road / EB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	22.2	C	15.9	B	21.2	C	13.3	B	20.5	C	12.2	B						
7. East Bidwell Street / WB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	19.9	B	22.7	C	28.1	C	22.5	C	28.6	C	23.1	C						
8. East Bidwell Street / EB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	20.3	C	23.6	C	17.1	B	20.7	C	16.6	B	20.1	C						
9. El Dorado Hills Blvd / WB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	30.7	C	29.5	C	24.7	C	27.2	C	24.4	C	26.8	C						
10. El Dorado Hills Blvd / EB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	4.4	A	5.0	A	3.8	A	4.2	A	3.8	A	3.7	A						
11. Sunrise Boulevard / Jackson Highway (SR 16)	Signalized	29.4	C	29.9	C	29.2	C	30.3	C	28.5	C	31.2	C						
12. Grant Line Road / Jackson Highway (SR 16)	Signalized	25.7	C	26.3	C	24.2	C	26.2	C	24.8	C	25.4	C						
13. Oak Avenue Parkway / WB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	17.9	B	11.7	B	17.9	B	12.0	B						
14. Oak Avenue Parkway / EB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	27.3	C	27.4	C	26.0	C	27.4	C						
15. Empire Ranch Road / WB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	14.7	B	15.8	B	14.8	B	15.6	B						
16. Empire Ranch Road / EB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	15.8	B	19.2	B	15.9	B	20.0	B						
17. Silva Valley Road / WB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	39.4	D	25.5	C	39.5	D	25.3	C	36.5	D	29.7	C						
18. Silva Valley Road / EB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	4.9	A	19.3	B	8.1	A	23.3	C	7.4	A	22.6	C						

Notes: LOS = level of service; Blank = intersection does not exist under this alternative
Bold indicates deficiency. Shaded areas indicate impact.
Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

**Table 3A.15-41
Freeway Mainline Levels of Service — Cumulative (2030) Conditions – Caltrans – With Mitigated Transportation Network**

Freeway Segment	No Project			Proposed Project			Proposed Project With Mitigated Transportation Network					
	A.M. Peak Hour	P.M. Peak Hour	A.M. Peak Hour	P.M. Peak Hour	A.M. Peak Hour	P.M. Peak Hour	A.M. Peak Hour	P.M. Peak Hour				
	V/C	LOS ²	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS				
EASTBOUND U.S. 50												
Zinfandel Drive to Sunrise Boulevard	1.04	F	1.15	F	1.07	F	1.17	F	1.05	F	1.16	F
Sunrise Blvd to Rancho Cordova Parkway	0.87	D	1.02	F	0.91	E	1.05	F	0.89	D	1.04	F
Rancho Cordova Parkway to Hazel Avenue	1.03	F	1.15	F	1.08	F	1.18	F	1.04	F	1.16	F
Hazel Avenue to Folsom Boulevard	0.90	D	0.88	D	0.95	E	1.00	E	0.91	E	0.96	E
Folsom Blvd to Prairie City Road	0.92	E	1.10	F	1.01	F	1.15	F	0.96	E	1.12	F
Prairie City Road to Oak Avenue Parkway	1.11	F	1.17	F	1.22	F	1.19	F	Braided Ramps - V/C<1			
Oak Avenue Parkway to East Bidwell Street - Scott Road	0.80	D	0.96	E	0.83	D	0.98	E	0.80	D	0.95	E
East Bidwell Street - Scott Road to Empire Ranch Road	0.77	D	1.00	E	0.86	D	1.05	F	0.79	D	1.01	F
Empire Ranch Road to El Dorado Hills Boulevard – Latrobe Road	0.71	C	0.87	D	0.72	C	0.89	D	0.67	C	0.84	D
El Dorado Hills Boulevard – Latrobe Road to Silva Valley Road	0.61	C	0.79	D	0.64	C	0.82	D	0.62	C	0.81	D
Silva Valley Road to Bass Lake Road	0.81	D	0.95	E	0.84	D	0.97	E	0.84	D	0.97	E
WESTBOUND U.S. 50												
Bass Lake Road to Silva Valley Road	0.95	E	0.70	C	0.96	E	0.70	C	0.97	E	0.70	C
Silva Valley Road to El Dorado Hills Boulevard – Latrobe Road	0.92	E	0.63	C	0.89	D	0.61	C	0.89	D	0.60	C
El Dorado Hills Boulevard – Latrobe Road to Empire Ranch Road	1.08	F	0.84	D	1.06	F	0.82	D	1.05	F	0.80	D
Empire Ranch Road to East Bidwell Street - Scott Road	0.86	D	0.65	C	0.98	E	0.80	D	0.98	E	0.78	D
East Bidwell Street - Scott Road to Oak Avenue Parkway	0.74	C	0.58	C	0.79	D	0.75	D	0.78	D	0.74	C
Oak Avenue Parkway to Prairie City Road	1.23	F	1.10	F	1.13	F	1.02	F	1.13	F	1.00	F
Prairie City Road to Folsom Boulevard	0.94	E	0.88	D	0.98	E	0.95	E	0.98	E	0.90	E
Folsom Boulevard to Hazel Avenue	0.92	E	0.82	D	0.97	E	0.89	D	0.96	E	0.85	D
Hazel Avenue to Rancho Cordova Parkway	1.05	F	1.08	F	1.07	F	1.11	F	1.06	F	1.07	F
Rancho Cordova Parkway to Sunrise Boulevard	1.01	F	1.04	F	1.03	F	1.08	F	1.03	F	1.06	F
Sunrise Boulevard to Zinfandel Drive	1.03	F	0.93	E	1.04	F	0.95	E	1.03	F	0.94	E

Notes: LOS = level of service; NA = not applicable; U.S. 50 = U.S. Highway 50; V/C = volume-to-capacity

¹ Capacity based on 2200 vphpl for freeway lanes, 1600 vphpl for auxiliary lanes.

Bold indicates deficiency where calculation indicates that demand exceeds capacity. Shaded areas indicate impact.

Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

Table 3A.15-42

Merge/Diverge/Weave Levels of Service — Cumulative (2030) Conditions — Caltrans — With Mitigated Transportation Network

Merge/Diverge/Weave Levels of Service	Merge, Diverge, or Weave	No Project				Proposed Project				Proposed Project With Mitigated Transportation Network				
		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		
		Density ¹	LOS ²	Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS	
EASTBOUND U.S. 50														
Hazel Avenue off-ramp	Diverge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hazel Avenue on-ramp – Aerojet off-ramp	Weave	32.4	D	29.9	D	36.2	E	36.1	E	34.7	D	34.7	D	34.7
Folsom Boulevard off-ramp	Diverge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Folsom Boulevard on-ramp	Merge	27.1	C	30.6	D	30.3	D	32.0	D	28.8	D	28.8	D	31.1
Prairie City Road off-ramp	Diverge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Prairie City Road direct on-ramp	Merge	45.7	F	49.7	F	49.4	F	52.3	F	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Prairie City Road flyover on-ramp	Weave	42.9	E	49.7	F	50.9	F	52.3	F	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Oak Avenue Parkway off-ramp														
Prairie City Road slip on-ramp to Oak Avenue Parkway off-ramp	Weave	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Prairie City Road flyover on-ramp	Merge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Prairie City Road loop on-ramp	Merge	36.1	F	43.5	F	37.4	F	41.9	F	21.6	C	24.2	C	24.2
Oak Avenue Parkway direct on-ramp	Merge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
East Bidwell Street - Scott Road direct off-ramp	Diverge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
East Bidwell Street - Scott Road loop on-ramp	Merge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
East Bidwell Street - Scott Road direct on-ramp	Merge	20.5	C	26.6	C	24.1	C	29.7	D	21.6	C	28.3	D	28.3
Empire Ranch Road direct off-ramp	Diverge	23.1	C	26.9	C	26.1	C	28.7	D	24.5	C	27.9	C	27.9
Empire Ranch Road loop on-ramp	Merge	26.8	C	31.2	D	26.2	C	30.1	D	24.5	C	28.3	D	28.3
Empire Ranch Road direct on-ramp	Merge	24.8	C	28.8	D	25.9	C	30.3	D	24.1	C	28.5	D	28.5
El Dorado Hills Boulevard - Latrobe Road off-ramp	Diverge	35.5	E	38.2	E	35.5	E	38.3	E	34.0	D	36.5	E	36.5
El Dorado Hills Boulevard Latrobe Road on-ramp	Merge	21.7	C	27.3	C	22.1	C	27.9	C	22.4	C	27.9	C	27.9
Silva Valley Road direct off-ramp	Diverge	20.3	C	26.6	C	21.0	C	27.5	C	20.6	C	27.2	C	27.2
Silva Valley Road loop on-ramp	Merge	21.3	C	23.7	C	22.4	C	24.0	C	22.4	C	23.9	C	23.9
Silva Valley Road direct on-ramp	Merge	23.4	C	28.2	D	23.8	C	28.7	D	23.9	C	28.8	D	28.8

Table 3A.15-42

Merge/Diverge/Weave Levels of Service — Cumulative (2030) Conditions – Caltrans – With Mitigated Transportation Network

Freeway Ramp	Merge, Diverge, or Weave	No Project				Proposed Project				Proposed Project With Mitigated Transportation Network				
		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		
		Density ¹	LOS ²	Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS	
WESTBOUND U.S. 50														
Silva Valley Road direct off-ramp	Diverge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Silva Valley Road loop on-ramp	Merge	31.6	D	26.6	C	32.9	D	27.3	C	32.6	D	26.7	C	NA
Silva Valley Road direct on-ramp	Merge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
El Dorado Hills Boulevard - Latrobe Road off-ramp	Diverge	15.5	B	10.7	B	15.7	B	10.8	B	15.8	B	10.5	B	NA
El Dorado Hills Boulevard - Latrobe Road on-ramp	Merge	30.0	D	25.8	C	31.1	D	26.7	C	30.6	D	26.0	C	NA
Empire Ranch Road direct off-ramp	Diverge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Empire Ranch Road loop on-ramp	Merge	37.0	F	29.2	D	38.9	F	32.3	D	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Empire Ranch Road direct on-ramp	Merge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	24.4	C	20.5	C	NA
East Bidwell Street - Scott Road direct off-ramp	Diverge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
East Bidwell Street - Scott Road loop on-ramp	Merge	38.0	F	29.4	D	37.3	E	33.7	D	37.0	E	32.8	D	NA
East Bidwell Street - Scott Road direct on-ramp	Merge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Oak Avenue Parkway direct off-ramp	Diverge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Oak Avenue Parkway loop on-ramp	Merge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Oak Avenue Parkway direct on-ramp	Merge	37.1	F	28.9	D	36.3	F	32.4	D	36.2	F	31.7	D	NA
Prairie City Road direct off-ramp	Weave	52.8	F	47.7	F	42.3	E	38.7	E	42.3	E	37.1	E	NA
Prairie City Road loop on-ramp	Merge	47.6	F	41.6	F	51.1	F	47.3	F	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Prairie City Road direct on-ramp	Merge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	30.0	D	28.6	D	NA
Folsom Boulevard off-ramp	Diverge	15.2	B	15.1	B	16.0	B	16.4	B	15.9	B	15.3	B	NA
Folsom Boulevard on-ramp	Merge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hazel Avenue direct off-ramp	Diverge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Hazel Avenue loop on-ramp	Merge	29.6	D	24.8	C	30.4	D	26.7	C	29.7	D	25.0	C	NA
Hazel Avenue direct on-ramp	Merge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Notes:

LOS = level of service; NA = not applicable – a lane drops at off ramp or adds at on ramp; U.S. 50 = U.S. Highway 50; Blank = ramp does not exist under this alternative

¹ Density in passenger cars per mile per lane for merge/diverge analysis only.

² LOS computed for the merge/diverge/weave analysis consistent with Highway Capacity Manual/ (HCM) 2000 methodologies.

³ Where an auxiliary lane begins at an on ramp (as an add lane) or where an auxiliary lane end at an off ramp (as an add lane)

Bold indicates deficiency where calculation indicates that demand exceeds capacity. Shaded areas indicate impact.

Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

CITY OF FOLSOM

The mitigated network mitigates the impacts to the intersections of

- ▶ Sibley Street / Blue Ravine Road
- ▶ East Bidwell Street / Nesmith Court
- ▶ Oak Avenue Parkway / Easton Valley Parkway

However, it does not mitigate the impacts to the intersections of

- ▶ Oak Avenue Parkway / East Bidwell Street,
- ▶ East Bidwell Street / Iron Point Road,
- ▶ Scott Road (East) / Easton Valley Parkway

The mitigated network creates a new impact to the intersection of

- ▶ Prairie City Road / White Rock Road

A potential mitigation for the Prairie City Road / White Rock Road intersection is replacement of the at grade intersection with a grade separated interchange.

SACRAMENTO COUNTY

The mitigated network mitigates the impacts to the roadway segments of

- ▶ Grant Line Road from White Rock Road to Jackson Highway (SR 16),
- ▶ Scott Road (West) from White Rock Road to Latrobe Road
- ▶ White Rock Road from Grant Line Road to Prairie City Road

However, it does not mitigate the impact to the roadway segment of

- ▶ Hazel Avenue from Curragh Downs Drive to U.S. 50 westbound ramp

The new road of Empire Ranch Road from White Rock Road to Carson Crossing Road is deficient at the assumed four lanes.

The mitigated network does not mitigate the impact to the intersection of

- ▶ Hazel Avenue / Gold Country Boulevard

CITY OF RANCHO CORDOVA

The mitigated network creates a new impact to the intersection of

- ▶ Rancho Cordova Parkway / White Rock Road.

EL DORADO COUNTY

The mitigated network mitigates the impacts to the intersection of

- ▶ White Rock Road / Carson Crossing Road.

CALTRANS

The mitigated network mitigates the impacts to the

- ▶ Eastbound Prairie City Road slip on-ramp merge
- ▶ Eastbound Prairie City Road flyover on to Oak Avenue Parkway off weave
- ▶ Eastbound Oak Avenue Parkway loop on-ramp merge
- ▶ Westbound Empire Ranch Road loop on-ramp merge
- ▶ Westbound Prairie City Road loop on-ramp merge

The mitigated network mitigates the impacts to the Eastbound U.S. 50 freeway segment of

- ▶ Rancho Cordova Parkway to Hazel Avenue
- ▶ Prairie City Road to Oak Avenue Parkway

However, it only decreases the impacts to the Eastbound U.S. 50 freeway segments of

- ▶ Zinfandel Drive to Sunrise Boulevard
- ▶ Folsom Boulevard to Prairie City Road

And the mitigated network does not mitigate the impact to the intersection of

- ▶ Hazel Avenue / Tributary- WB U.S. 50 Ramps

3A.15.4 CUMULATIVE QUARRY TRUCK TRAFFIC

Three aggregate quarries are proposed for the area south of the SPA. The Teichert and Walltown (Granite) quarries would be located south of White Rock Road along a proposed extension of Scott Road (East), and the DeSilva Gates quarry would be located along Scott Road (West). The only study of the potential impact of these quarry operations that is currently available is the Teichert Quarry Draft Environmental Impact Report. All three quarries are expected to be in full operation by the year 2030 and the truck trips described in that DEIR were added to the cumulative traffic volumes.

Aggregate, concrete, and hot asphalt mix would be distributed to construction sites and concrete product manufacturing facilities throughout Sacramento County, western El Dorado County, eastern Yolo County and northern San Joaquin County. On a peak day, 12,660 trucks trips would be generated by the three quarries, according to the Teichert Quarry DEIR. The assumed quarry truck trip generation can be seen in Table 3A.15-43. Trucks typically operate from 6 AM to 4 PM. There would not usually be any quarry trucks operating in the PM peak hour; therefore, the analysis in this document does not include the future quarry truck traffic during the cumulative PM peak hour. The Teichert Quarry DEIR estimates that there would be 814 truck trips in the AM peak hour. Trucks from the Teichert and Granite quarries would access the roadway system by a new southern extension of Scott Road (East). De Silva Gates trucks would access the roadway network via Scott Road (West), according to the Teichert Quarry DEIR.

The Teichert Quarry DEIR assigned 47% of the truck trips through the Folsom South of U.S. 50 SPA. The distribution is shown on Exhibit 3A.15-110. Trucks travelling to U.S. 50 and to the City of Folsom were assumed to travel on Prairie City Road and Scott Road. The City of Folsom considers the proposed number of daily quarry truck trips on this Specific Plan roadways to be in excess of an acceptable number due to potential air quality and noise impacts. The City wants to minimize the number of quarry truck trips on roads inside or adjacent to the proposed SPA because of their potential impacts to pavement, air quality and noise, as well as being considered to be incompatible with its dense smart-growth urban character.

**Table 3A.15-43
Estimated Trip Generation from East County Mining Applications**

Time Period	Vehicle Type	Teichert		Granite		DeSilva-Gates		All		Total
		Enter	Exit	Enter	Exit	Enter	Exit	Enter	Exit	
Peak day	Aggregate/Asphalt Trucks	1,200	1,200	1,000	1,000	960	960	3,160	3,160	6,320
	Other Trucks (3 to 5 axle)	2	2	1,234	1,234	1,935	1,935	3,171	3,171	6,342
	Outside services (2 axle)	10	10	4	4	3	3	17	17	34
	Employee vehicles	60	60	175	175	50	50	285	285	570
	Total vehicles	1,272	1,272	2,413	2,413	2,948	2,948	6,633	6,633	13,266
	Total PCEs	3,676	3,676	6,881	6,881	8,738	8,738	19,295	19,295	38,590
AM Peak Hour on Peak day	Aggregate/Asphalt Trucks	156	156	52	52	50	50	258	258	516
	Other Trucks	0	0	58	58	91	91	149	149	298
	Outside services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Employee vehicles	10	0	5	0	5	0	20	0	20
	Total vehicles	166	156	115	110	146	141	427	407	834
	Total PCEs	478	468	335	330	428	423	1,241	1,221	2,462

Source: Teichert Quarry Traffic Impact Study

The Proposed Project would add several new roadway facilities in the project area not included in the Teichert Quarry DEIR, some of which would act as logical routes for quarry truck traffic. In particular, the proposed Oak Avenue Parkway extension would likely accommodate some of these truck trips. A revised trip distribution was estimated, and is shown in Exhibit 3A.15-111. This distribution is not considered acceptable to the City of Folsom, but it reflects a logical distribution of truck trips. This distribution has been used in the estimation of cumulative traffic volumes in the project vicinity.

To minimize project transportation impacts to the SPA, the mitigated network was developed. One part of the mitigated network would be the construction of a quarry truck road that would extend east from Grant Line Road and travel south of the Prairie City State Vehicular Recreation Area, cross Scott Road (West) and end at the proposed Scott Road (East) extension near the Teichert and Walltown (Granite) quarries. All quarry truck traffic headed to or from Grant Line Road or White Rock Road west of Grant Line Road would likely use this proposed quarry truck road. The revised truck distribution used for the mitigated network is shown in Exhibit 3A.15-112.

3A.15.5 ALTERNATIVE QUARRY TRUCK ANALYSIS CONCLUSIONS

To quantify the potential impact of quarry truck traffic on the SPA, several alternative quarry truck scenarios were analyzed:

- ▶ Cumulative No Project, No Quarry Trucks
- ▶ Cumulative Proposed Project, No Quarry Trucks
- ▶ Cumulative Proposed Project, Assumed Quarry Truck Distribution
- ▶ Cumulative Proposed Project, Mitigated Network Quarry Truck Distribution
- ▶ Cumulative Proposed Project, “Local Trucks Only” Quarry Truck Distribution

The “Local Trucks Only” distribution reroutes all trucks going to or from U.S. 50 via White Rock Road. The “Local Trucks Only” distribution is shown in Exhibit 3A.15-113.

The results of the analyses are summarized in Tables 3A.15-44 through 3A.15-51. This analysis is presented to inform the public and decision makers regarding the potential range of effects of quarry truck trips on the roadway network in the project vicinity.

CITY OF FOLSOM

Compared to the Cumulative Proposed Project scenario (with the Assumed Quarry Truck Distribution), elimination of quarry trucks altogether would not result in any fewer intersection impacts. Similarly, allowing only local quarry trucks to use City of Folsom roads would not eliminate any impacts to intersections.

Compared to the “Cumulative Proposed Project, No Quarry Trucks” scenario, the addition of quarry trucks would cause three intersections on White Rock Road at Prairie City Road, Scott Road (West) and Scott Road (east) to degrade to LOS D conditions in the am peak hour.

SACRAMENTO COUNTY

If there were no quarry trucks, there would not be a project impact to the intersection of Grant line Road / White Rock Road. If there were no quarry trucks, there would not be project impacts to the roadway segment of Grant Line Road between Kiefer Road and Jackson Highway.. Allowing only local quarry trucks to use City of Folsom roads would not eliminate roadway segment impacts to Grant Line Road and White Rock Road.

Compared to the “Cumulative Proposed Project, No Quarry Trucks” scenario, the addition of quarry trucks would cause the segments of White Rock Road from Prairie City Road to Scott Road (East) to operate at LOS F conditions. While the segments of Grant Line Road between White Rock Road and Kiefer Boulevard would operate at LOS F conditions without quarry trucks, their addition would cause operations on this segment of Grant Line Road to degrade substantially.

CITY OF RANCHO CORDOVA

Compared to the Cumulative Proposed Project scenario (with the Assumed Quarry Truck Distribution), elimination of quarry trucks altogether would not result in fewer intersection or roadway segment impacts. Allowing only local quarry trucks to use City of Folsom roads would create one additional impact at the Grant Line Road / Centennial Road Intersection. A potential way to prevent an impact at this location under this scenario would be to build a grade separated interchange at this location instead of an at-grade intersection.

EL DORADO COUNTY

Compared to the Cumulative Proposed Project scenario (with the Proposed Quarry Truck Distribution), elimination of quarry trucks altogether would not result in fewer intersection impacts. Allowing only local quarry trucks to use City of Folsom roads would not eliminate any impacts to intersections.

CALTRANS

Compared to the Cumulative Proposed Project scenario (with the Proposed Quarry Truck Distribution), elimination of quarry trucks altogether would not result in any fewer intersection, freeway segment, merge / diverge or weave impacts. Allowing only local quarry trucks to use City of Folsom roads would not eliminate any impacts to intersections, freeway segments, merge / diverge or weaving areas.

INDEPENDENT QUARRY TRUCK MANAGEMENT PLAN

Currently Sacramento County, the City of Folsom, the City of Rancho Cordova, El Dorado County, Caltrans, the Capital Southeast Connector JPA and the quarry applicants are jointly working on a quarry truck management plan to address the issues associated with quarry truck traffic. The goals of that plan are as follows:

- ▶ To plan, phase, fund, and implement roadway improvements needed to accommodate the mobility needs of the east county quarries, Greencycle and the traveling public to meet the given demand.
- ▶ To consider creative transportation solutions that are sensitive to affected existing and future land uses while minimizing out of way travel.
- ▶ To promote stakeholder collaboration and cooperation.

A technical analysis for the Truck Management Plan has been prepared, which involves the following elements:

- ▶ Estimating the amount of truck traffic generated from the proposed quarries and the distribution of that traffic
- ▶ Identifying a set of potential truck access scenarios and analyzing traffic operations under each scenario
- ▶ Determining the general roadway improvements that would be needed to accommodate the estimated truck traffic
- ▶ The Truck Management Plan is not an EIR and will not determine mitigation measures for the quarries. However, that study is striving to identify the roadway improvements that will likely be needed to avoid traffic congestion and operational issues caused by quarry truck traffic.

Much of the analysis in the Truck Management Plan focused on projected 2030 conditions. The 2030 analysis assumed full implementation of the roadway system contained in the proposed Folsom SOI area and the proposed Sacramento County General Plan Update near the East County quarries, which is substantially different than the limited number of two-lane roadways that currently serve the East County area. However, the timing of future roadway improvements in the vicinity of the quarries depends on the timing of future residential and commercial development in the East County area, which is uncertain. The Truck Management Plan thus also discusses the roadway improvements that may be needed if the one or more of the quarries go forward ahead of significant residential and commercial development in the Folsom SOI area.

The Truck Management Plan identified the need for two types of near-term roadway improvements:

- ▶ Capacity improvements needed to maintain acceptable traffic levels of service
- ▶ Operational improvements, such as extra width at intersections that would be needed to provide adequate turning radius for quarry trucks

If a substantial amount of aggregate production occurs prior to significant development in the East County area, the analysis indicated the potential need for three types of near-term capacity improvements:

- 1) Widening the following two-lane roadways to four lanes when volumes exceed acceptable levels:
 - Scott Road from White Rock Road to U.S. 50 and/or Prairie City Road from White Rock Road to U.S. 50, depending on the selected truck routing plan
 - White Rock Road from Scott Road to Grant Line Road (or construction of an east-west truck access road parallel to White Rock Road from the quarries to Grant Line Road)

- Grant Line Road from White Rock Road and Douglas Road
- 2) The addition of auxiliary lanes or at least acceleration lanes on westbound U.S. 50 from Scott Road and Folsom Boulevard
 - 3) The addition of traffic signals and turn lanes at the following intersections that would have concentrations of truck volumes:
 - White Rock Road/Scott Road (East)
 - White Rock Road/Prairie City Road and White Rock Road/Grant Line Road (or construction of an east-west truck access road parallel to White Rock Road from the quarries to Grant Line Road)
 - Grant Line Road and Jackson Highway (SR 16)

The East County roadways serving the quarries currently have two lanes with no shoulders and in some locations have poor vertical or horizontal curves. At many intersections, there is inadequate width for trucks to turn without flowing into opposing travel lanes. The locations where near-term operational improvements would be needed include:

- White Rock Road/Scott Road (East) – extra width for truck turning movements
- White Rock Road/Prairie City Road – potentially extra width for truck turning movements, if Prairie City Road has significant trucks in selected truck routing plan
- Prairie City Road and U.S. 50 – widen northbound to westbound loop on-ramp and provide westbound acceleration lane on U.S. 50, if Prairie City Road has significant trucks in selected truck routing plan

There is uncertainty about the distribution of future truck traffic and how it may impact roadways in the vicinity of the quarry sites. It would be important to implement monitoring stations to collect real time traffic data. The best locations for these monitoring stations are as follows:

- White Rock Road west of Grant Line Road
- White Rock Road east of Grant Line Road
- White Rock Road west of Scott Road (East)
- White Rock Road east of Scott Road (East)
- Scott Road (East) north of White Rock Road
- Prairie City Road north of White Rock Road
- Grant Line Road south of White Rock Road

It would also be important to install CCTV surveillance cameras at key intersections to allow real time monitoring at the County Traffic Operations Center. The likely locations for these cameras are as follows:

- White Rock Road/Scott Road (East)
- White Rock Rd/Prairie City Road
- Grant Line Rd/Potential East-West Truck Access Road

**Table 3A.15-44
Intersection Levels of Service — Cumulative (2030) Conditions – City of Folsom – Quarry Truck Influence**

Intersection	Control	No Project – No Quarry Trucks				Proposed Project – No Quarry Trucks				Proposed Project – Assumed Quarry Truck Distribution				Proposed Project With Mitigated Network Quarry Truck Distribution				Proposed Project – “Local Only” Quarry Truck Distribution			
		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
		Delay ¹	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS
1. Folsom Blvd / Blue Ravine Road	Signalized	48.8	D	64.0	E	48.8	D	64.4	E	49.5	D	64.4	E	50.1	D	63.7	E	50.1	D	63.7	E
2. Sibley Street / Blue Ravine Road	Signalized	44.0	D	30.3	C	50.3	D	30.1	C	55.0	D	30.1	C	36.0	D	29.3	C	36.0	D	29.3	C
3. Oak Avenue Parkway / Blue Ravine Road	Signalized	35.1	D	37.2	D	35.9	D	37.7	D	35.9	D	37.7	D	35.8	D	37.5	D	35.8	D	37.5	D
4. Empire Ranch Road / Natoma Street	Signalized	10.2	B	8.8	A	24.9	C	9.3	A	24.9	C	9.3	A	24.2	C	9.0	A	24.2	C	9.0	A
5. Oak Avenue Parkway / Riley Street	Signalized	19.7	B	24.7	C	19.6	B	24.8	C	19.6	B	24.8	C	19.8	B	25.2	C	19.8	B	25.2	C
6. Oak Avenue Parkway / East Bidwell Street	Signalized	30.1	C	40.8	D	31.8	C	48.6	D	32.2	C	48.6	D	32.3	C	48.2	D	32.3	C	48.2	D
7. Nesmith Court / East Bidwell Street	Signalized	23.6	C	54.8	D	24.7	C	62.6	E	24.7	C	62.6	E	24.4	C	28.2	C	24.4	C	28.2	C
8. Scholar Way / East Bidwell Street	Signalized	12.7	B	14.3	B	12.5	B	16.2	B	12.4	B	16.2	B	12.4	B	16.7	B	12.4	B	16.7	B
9. Power Center Drive / East Bidwell Street	Signalized	8.1	A	18.8	B	7.1	A	17.7	B	7.0	A	17.7	B	7.1	A	18.3	B	7.1	A	18.3	B
10. Broadstone Parkway / East Bidwell Street	Signalized	26.9	C	31.5	C	28.0	C	33.1	C	28.2	C	33.1	C	27.8	C	32.9	C	27.8	C	32.9	C
11. Empire Ranch Road / Broadstone Parkway	Signalized	20.1	C	21.7	C	19.9	B	24.4	C	19.9	B	24.4	C	19.7	B	24.2	C	19.7	B	24.2	C
12. Oak Avenue Parkway / Haverhill Drive	Signalized	16.7	B	9.7	A	15.0	B	8.8	A	15.0	B	8.8	A	15.0	B	8.7	A	15.0	B	8.7	A
13. Oak Avenue Parkway / Halidon Way	Signalized	13.9	B	11.5	B	14.6	B	12.9	B	14.6	B	12.9	B	14.6	B	13.0	B	14.6	B	13.0	B
14. Folsom Blvd / Iron Point Road	Signalized	21.1	C	26.3	C	20.3	C	30.3	C	20.3	C	30.3	C	19.4	B	29.2	C	19.4	B	29.2	C
15. Prairie City Road / Iron Point Road	Signalized	24.9	C	32.3	C	25.1	C	30.6	C	24.9	C	30.6	C	24.9	C	30.4	C	24.9	C	30.4	C
16. Grover Road / Iron Point Road	Signalized	19.6	B	11.5	B	18.8	B	11.2	B	18.8	B	11.2	B	18.9	B	11.9	B	18.9	B	11.9	B
17. McAdoo Drive / Iron Point Road	Signalized	22.3	C	15.1	B	20.8	C	16.7	B	20.8	C	16.7	B	20.9	C	16.9	B	20.9	C	16.9	B
18. Oak Avenue Parkway / Iron Point Road	Signalized	31.4	C	44.0	D	32.6	C	40.4	D	32.6	C	40.4	D	32.5	C	39.9	D	32.5	C	39.9	D
19. Rowberry Drive / Iron Point Road	Signalized	10.0	A	9.7	A	27.1	C	32.0	C	27.1	C	32.0	C	27.1	C	32.0	C	27.1	C	32.0	C
20. Broadstone Parkway / Iron Point Road	Signalized	18.1	B	20.4	C	18.2	B	20.2	C	18.2	B	20.2	C	18.5	B	20.2	C	18.5	B	20.2	C
21. East Bidwell Street / Iron Point Road	Signalized	26.7	C	60.6	E	29.7	C	77.0	E	29.7	C	77.0	E	29.4	C	81.8	F	29.4	C	81.8	F
22. Cavitt Road / Iron Point Road	Signalized	14.8	B	21.5	C	12.9	B	21.6	C	12.9	B	21.6	C	12.9	B	21.5	C	12.9	B	21.5	C
23. Serpa Way / Iron Point Road	Signalized	24.2	C	39.2	D	24.3	C	43.7	D	24.3	C	43.7	D	25.8	C	51.0	D	25.8	C	51.0	D
24. Empire Ranch Road / Iron Point Road	Signalized	80.5	F	60.7	E	82.2	F	79.9	E	82.2	F	79.9	E	46.9	D	50.6	D	46.9	D	50.6	D
25. Prairie City Road / High School	Signalized	34.8	C	24.3	C	34.8	C	25.8	C	34.8	C	25.8	C	34.3	C	25.3	C	34.3	C	25.3	C
26. East Bidwell Street / Placerville Road	Signalized	446.2	F	1,328	F	145.3	F	965.6	F	145.3	F	965.6	F	136.1	F	995.9	F	136.1	F	995.9	F
27. Prairie City Road / White Rock Road	Signalized	19.1	B	26.4	C	21.5	C	24.8	C	40.6	D	24.8	C	34.2	C	74.0	E	28.1	C	74.0	E
28. Scott Road (West) / White Rock Road	Signalized	10.4	B	9.8	A	14.0	B	10.2	B	36.0	D	10.2	B	13.1	B	8.9	A	11.6	B	8.9	A
29. Scott Road (East) / White Rock Road	Signalized	21.4	C	27.2	C	18.9	B	22.1	C	35.6	D	22.1	C	28.0	C	22.1	C	25.2	C	22.1	C
30. Placerville Road / White Rock Road	Side-street stop ²	0.0	A	21.4	C	11.8	B	9.7	A	11.7	B	9.7	A	12.7	B	10.5	B	12.6	B	10.5	B
31. Empire Ranch Road / North Road	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	10.6	B	18.3	B	10.6	B	18.3	B	10.7	B	18.0	B	10.7	B	18.0	B
32. Prairie City Road / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized	14.4	B	18.5	B	32.2	C	32.6	C	32.1	C	32.6	C	31.9	C	34.3	C	31.7	C	34.3	C
33. Oak Avenue Parkway / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	38.7	D	30.3	C	37.3	D	30.3	C	30.3	C	28.0	C	29.4	C	28.0	C

**Table 3A.15-44
Intersection Levels of Service — Cumulative (2030) Conditions – City of Folsom – Quarry Truck Influence**

Intersection	Control	No Project – No Quarry Trucks				Proposed Project – No Quarry Trucks				Proposed Project – Assumed Quarry Truck Distribution				Proposed Project With Mitigated Network Quarry Truck Distribution				Proposed Project – “Local Only” Quarry Truck Distribution			
		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
		Delay ¹	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS
34. Rowberry Drive / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	21.2	C	24.7	C	21.2	C	24.7	C	21.8	C	25.3	C	21.8	C	25.3	C
35. 1 st Street / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	18.9	B	19.2	B	18.9	B	19.2	B	19.5	B	19.2	B	19.5	B	19.2	B
36. 2 nd Street / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	25.0	C	28.6	C	25.0	C	28.6	C	25.7	C	29.9	C	25.7	C	29.9	C
37. 3 rd Street / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	24.6	C	26.2	C	24.6	C	26.2	C	24.1	C	26.8	C	24.1	C	26.8	C
38. Scott Road (East) / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	30.7	C	41.2	D	31.2	C	41.2	D	30.8	C	41.5	D	30.5	C	41.5	D
39. Placerville Road / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	31.4	C	31.0	C	31.4	C	31.0	C	0.8	A	0.9	A	0.8	A	0.9	A
40. 4 th Street / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	na	na	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	31.5	C	31.2	C	31.5	C	31.2	C
41. Hillside Drive / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	16.1	B	16.4	B	16.1	B	16.4	B	16.2	B	17.0	B	16.2	B	17.0	B
42. Empire Ranch Road / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	23.5	C	27.9	C	23.5	C	27.9	C	23.7	C	27.1	C	23.7	C	27.1	C
43. Prairie City Road / Middle Road	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	8.6	A	11.0	B	8.1	A	11.0	B	8.9	A	9.1	A	9.1	A	9.1	A
44. Oak Avenue Parkway / Middle Road	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	19.2	B	22.3	C	16.6	B	22.3	C	16.2	B	19.6	B	18.3	B	19.6	B
45. Scott Road (East) / Street “B”	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	23.3	C	26.0	C	22.0	C	26.0	C	24.1	C	27.1	C	25.0	C	27.1	C
46. East Road / Street “B”	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	24.6	C	24.3	C	24.6	C	24.3	C	24.7	C	24.2	C	24.7	C	24.2	C
47. Prairie City Road / Street “A”	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	8.9	A	9.6	A	8.9	A	9.6	A	9.0	A	8.6	A	8.7	A	8.6	A
48. Oak Avenue Parkway / Street “A”	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	26.4	C	27.6	C	24.6	C	27.6	C	25.0	C	28.7	C	26.0	C	28.7	C
49. 2 nd Street / Street “A”	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	18.0	B	18.4	B	18.0	B	18.4	B	17.9	B	18.3	B	17.9	B	18.3	B
50. Scott Road (East) / Street “A”	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	23.9	C	22.2	C	22.9	C	22.2	C	23.4	C	21.4	C	24.3	C	21.4	C
51. East Road / Street “A”	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	9.7	A	9.8	A	9.7	A	9.8	A	9.8	A	9.8	A	9.8	A	9.8	A
52. Placerville Road / Street “A”	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	25.7	C	26.5	C	25.7	C	26.5	C	25.1	C	25.8	C	25.1	C	25.8	C
53. Empire Ranch Road / Street “A”	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	14.9	B	14.1	B	14.9	B	14.1	B	14.2	B	12.7	B	14.2	B	12.7	B
54. Scott Road (East) / South Road	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	20.6	C	20.7	C	18.8	B	20.7	C	19.1	B	20.3	C	20.5	C	20.3	C
55. Oak Avenue Parkway / White Rock Road	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	16.6	B	27.1	C	27.3	C	27.1	C	30.9	C	24.6	C	18.7	B	24.6	C
56. Empire Ranch Road / White Rock Road	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	27.9	C	17.7	B	28.9	C	17.7	B	32.4	C	28.4	C	34.3	C	28.4	C

Notes: LOS = level of service; U.S. 50 = U.S. Highway 50; V/C = volume-to-capacity; Blank = intersection does not exist under this alternative

¹ Average intersection delay reported for all-way-stop intersections; worst-case delay reported for unsignalized, side-street-stop intersections; average intersection delay reported for all-way-stop intersections. All delays are reported in seconds per vehicle.

Intersection signalized with the proposed project.

Bold indicates deficiency.

Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

**Table 3A.15-45
Roadway Segment Levels of Service — Cumulative (2030) Conditions - Sacramento County – Quarry Truck Influence**

Roadway Segment	Lanes	No Project – No Quarry Trucks			Proposed Project – No Quarry Trucks			Proposed Project – Assumed Quarry Truck Distribution			Proposed Project With Mitigated Network Quarry Truck Distribution			Proposed Project – “Local Only” Quarry Truck Distribution		
		Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS
1. Folsom Blvd — Sunrise Blvd to Mercantile Drive	4	31,900	0.89	D	32,000	0.89	D	32,000	0.89	D	31,700	0.88	D	31,700	0.88	D
2. Folsom Blvd — Mercantile Drive to Hazel Avenue	4	22,700	0.63	B	23,200	0.64	B	23,200	0.64	B	22,700	0.63	B	22,700	0.63	B
3. Folsom Blvd — Hazel Avenue to Aerojet Road	4	8,000	0.22	A	8,900	0.25	A	8,900	0.25	A	8,500	0.24	A	8,500	0.24	A
4. Folsom Blvd — Aerojet Road to U.S. 50	4	26,300	0.73	C	25,400	0.71	C	25,400	0.71	C	25,400	0.71	C	25,400	0.71	C
5. Grant Line Road—White Rock Road to Century Road	4	40,700	1.02	F	48,100	1.20	F	65,100	1.63	F	60,200	1.00	F	62,500	1.04	F
6. Grant Line Road— Century Road to Douglas Road	4	38,500	0.96	E	45,100	1.13	F	62,000	1.55	F	71,500	1.19	F	71,500	1.19	F
7. Grant Line Road—Douglas Road to Kiefer Road	4	40,000	1.11	F	43,900	1.22	F	60,800	1.69	F	70,100	1.17	F	70,100	1.17	F
8. Grant Line Road— Kiefer Road to SR Jackson Road (SR16)	4	20,600	0.57	A	22,500	0.63	B	39,500	1.10	F	43,300	0.72	C	43,300	0.72	C
9. Grant Line Road — Jackson Road (SR16) to Sunrise Blvd	4	24,100	0.67	B	25,800	0.72	C	38,600	1.07	F	40,900	1.02	F	40,900	1.02	F
10. Hazel Avenue — Greenback Lane to Madison Avenue	6	56,300	1.04	F	56,800	1.05	F	56,800	1.05	F	57,000	1.06	F	57,000	1.06	F
11. Hazel Avenue — Madison Avenue to Curragh Downs Drive	6	76,700	1.42	F	78,900	1.46	F	78,900	1.46	F	79,000	1.46	F	79,000	1.46	F
12. Hazel Avenue — Curragh Downs Drive to Gold Country Blvd ¹	6	88,000	1.47	F	91,300	1.52	F	91,300	1.52	F	91,400	1.52	F	91,400	1.52	F
13. Hazel Avenue — Gold Country Blvd to U.S. 50 westbound ramp	6	91,100	1.52	F	94,800	1.58	F	94,800	1.58	F	94,900	1.58	F	94,900	1.58	F
14. Jackson Road (SR-16) — Grant Line Road to Dillard Road	2	13,000	0.57	D	12,700	0.55	D	12,900	0.56	D	12,800	0.56	D	12,800	0.56	D
15. Jackson Road (SR-16) — Dillard Road to Rancho Murieta Parkway	2	16,200	0.71	E	16,300	0.71	E	16,500	0.72	E	15,900	0.69	E	15,900	0.69	E
16. Prairie City Road —U.S. 50 eastbound ramp to Easton Valley Parkway	4 - 6	28,900	0.80	D	33,400	0.62	B	39,500	0.73	C	41,200	0.76	C	36,900	0.68	B
17. Prairie City Road —Easton Valley Parkway to White Rock Road	2 - 4	18,300	1.02	F	31,100	0.86	D	37,200	1.03	F	40,600	1.13	F	36,200	1.01	F
18. Scott Road (West) — White Rock Road to Latrobe Road	2	3,800	0.17	B	5,700	0.25	C	5,700	0.34	C	5,100	0.30	C	6,900	0.30	C
19. Stonehouse Road — Latrobe Road to Jackson Road (SR-16)	2	5,600	0.24	C	7,200	0.31	C	7,400	0.32	C	6,900	0.30	C	6,900	0.30	C
20. Sunrise Blvd — Jackson Road (SR 16) to Grant Line Road	6	22,300	0.62	B	22,500	0.63	B	22,500	0.63	B	22,800	0.63	B	22,800	0.63	B
21. White Rock Road— Ranch Cordova City Limit to Grant Line Road	4	13,600	0.38	A	17,700	0.49	A	19,900	0.55	A	23,500	0.65	B	34,900	0.97	E
22. White Rock Road—Grant Line Road to Prairie City Road	4	55,100	1.38	F	66,700	1.67	F	85,800	2.15	F	80,200	1.34	F	80,200	1.34	F
23. White Rock Road— Prairie City Road to Scott Road (West)	4 - 5	41,100	1.03	F	44,500	0.89	D	69,800	1.40	F	59,800	1.00	E	55,500	0.93	E
24. White Rock Road— Scott Road (West) to Oak Avenue Parkway	4 - 5	41,900	1.05	F	46,800	0.94	E	56,500	1.13	F	56,600	0.94	E	56,600	0.94	E
25. White Rock Road— Oak Avenue Parkway to Scott Road (East)	4 - 5	41,900	1.05	F	44,000	0.88	D	59,800	1.20	F	58,200	0.97	E	52,100	0.87	D
26. White Rock Road— Scott Road (East) to Placerville Road	4 - 5	28,400	0.71	C	29,200	0.58	A	30,300	0.61	B	37,300	0.62	B	40,700	0.68	B
27. White Rock Road— Placerville Road to Empire Ranch Road	4 - 5	33,400	0.84	D	36,900	0.74	C	38,000	0.76	C	46,900	0.78	C	50,300	0.84	D
28. White Rock Road— Empire Ranch Road to Carson Crossing Road	4 - 5	33,400	0.84	D	48,200	0.96	E	49,300	0.99	E	24,500	0.41	A	27,800	0.46	A
29. Hazel Avenue — Folsom Blvd connector to Easton Valley Parkway	6	17,600	0.33	A	19,000	0.35	A	19,000	0.35	A	18,800	0.35	A	18,800	0.35	A
30. Easton Valley Parkway — Hazel Avenue to Aerojet Road	6	31,300	0.58	A	34,200	0.63	B	34,200	0.63	B	33,500	0.62	B	33,500	0.62	B
31. Easton Valley Parkway — Aerojet Road to Alabama Avenue	6	19,600	0.36	A	27,300	0.51	A	27,300	0.51	A	26,800	0.50	A	26,800	0.50	A
32. Easton Valley Parkway — Alabama Avenue to Glenborough Road	6	15,400	0.29	A	23,700	0.44	A	23,700	0.44	A	23,000	0.43	A	23,000	0.43	A
33. Easton Valley Parkway — Glenborough Road to Prairie City Road	6	16,700	0.31	A	28,000	0.52	A	28,000	0.52	A	27,700	0.51	A	27,700	0.51	A
34. Empire Ranch Road — White Rock Road to Carson Crossing Road	0 - 0 - 4	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	40,000	1.00	F	40,000	1.00	F

Notes: LOS = level of service; SR = State Route; U.S. 50 = U.S. Highway 50; V/C = volume-to-capacity
Lanes: Cumulative No Project – Cumulative Plus Project (or alternative)
Bold indicates deficiency.
Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

**Table 3A.15-46
Intersection Levels of Service — Cumulative (2030) Conditions – City of Rancho Cordova – Quarry Truck Influence**

Intersection	Control	No Project – No Quarry Trucks				Proposed Project – No Quarry Trucks				Proposed Project – Assumed Quarry Truck Distribution				Proposed Project With Mitigated Network Quarry Truck Distribution				Proposed Project – “Local Only” Quarry Truck Distribution			
		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
		V/C ¹ or Delay ²	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS
1. Sunrise Blvd / White Rock Road	Signalized	0.61	B	0.68	B	0.65	B	0.67	B	0.67	B	0.67	B	0.72	C	0.71	C	0.81	D	0.71	C
2. Fitzgerald Road / White Rock Road	Signalized	0.30	A	0.34	A	0.29	A	0.33	A	0.31	A	0.33	A	0.34	A	0.37	A	0.42	A	0.37	A
3. Sunrise Blvd / Douglas Road	Signalized	0.65	B	0.81	D	0.71	C	0.80	C	0.71	C	0.80	C	0.71	C	0.85	D	0.71	C	0.85	D
4. Grant Line Road / Douglas Road	Signalized	0.56	A	0.61	B	0.59	A	0.64	B	0.76	C	0.64	B	0.78	C	0.73	C	0.78	C	0.73	C
5. Grant Line Road / Kiefer Road	Signalized	0.68	B	0.63	B	0.70	B	0.65	B	0.86	D	0.65	B	0.89	D	0.69	B	0.89	D	0.69	B
6. Rancho Cordova Parkway / Easton Valley Parkway	Signalized	0.72	C	0.99	E	0.70	C	0.96	E	0.70	C	0.96	E	0.71	C	1.00	E	0.71	C	1.00	E
7. Rancho Cordova Parkway / White Rock Road	Signalized	0.99	E	0.87	D	1.00	E	0.87	D	1.02	F	0.87	D	1.12	F	0.92	E	1.20	F	0.92	E
8. International Drive / White Rock Road	Signalized	0.42	A	0.66	B	0.41	A	0.70	B	0.44	A	0.70	B	0.48	A	0.77	C	0.60	A	0.77	C
9. Rio Del Oro Parkway / White Rock Road	Signalized	0.49	A	0.36	A	0.51	A	0.37	A	0.54	A	0.37	A	0.63	B	0.47	A	0.75	C	0.47	A
10. Villagio Parkway / White Rock Road	Signalized	0.32	A	0.44	A	0.37	A	0.53	A	0.41	A	0.53	A	0.51	A	0.71	C	0.63	B	0.71	C
11. Sunrise Blvd / International Drive	Signalized	0.74	C	0.72	C	0.75	C	0.69	B	0.75	C	0.69	B	0.82	D	0.75	C	0.82	D	0.75	C
12. Villagio Parkway / Americanos Road	Signalized	0.58	A	0.56	A	0.58	A	0.63	B	0.58	A	0.63	B	0.63	B	0.65	B	0.63	B	0.65	B
13. Grant Line Road / Centennial Road	Signalized	0.68	B	0.67	B	0.73	C	0.74	C	0.89	D	0.74	C	0.90	D	0.80	C	0.98	E	0.80	C
14. Villagio Parkway / Rancho Cordova Parkway	Signalized	0.65	C	0.54	C	0.68	C	0.53	C	0.68	C	0.53	C	0.65	C	0.55	C	0.65	C	0.55	C
15. Rancho Cordova Parkway / Douglas Road	Signalized	0.49	A	0.77	C	0.50	A	0.76	C	0.50	A	0.76	C	0.54	A	0.84	D	0.54	A	0.84	D
16. Americanos Blvd / Douglas Road	Signalized	0.59	A	0.78	C	0.49	C	0.68	C	0.49	C	0.68	C	0.47	C	0.65	C	0.47	C	0.65	C
17. Grant Line Road / Chrysanthy Blvd	Signalized	0.71	C	0.64	B	0.73	C	0.65	B	0.90	D	0.65	B	0.79	C	0.69	B	0.79	C	0.69	B
18. Grant Line Road / Rancho Cordova Parkway	Signalized	0.37	A	0.39	A	0.39	A	0.41	A	0.55	A	0.41	A	0.72	C	0.52	A	0.72	C	0.52	A

Notes: LOS = level of service; V/C = volume-to-capacity

¹ V/C ratio is shown for signalized intersections. Delay is shown for unsignalized intersections.

² Worst-case delay reported for unsignalized, side-street-stop intersections; average intersection delay reported for all-way-stop intersections. Both delays are reported in seconds per vehicle.

Bold indicates deficiency.

Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

**Table 3A.15-47
Roadway Segment Levels of Service — Cumulative (2030) Conditions - City of Rancho Cordova – Quarry Truck Influence**

Roadway Segment	Lanes	No Project – No Quarry Trucks			Proposed Project – No Quarry Trucks			Proposed Project – Assumed Quarry Truck Distribution			Proposed Project With Mitigated Network Quarry Truck Distribution			Proposed Project – “Local Only” Quarry Truck Distribution		
		Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS	Volume	V/C	LOS
1. Douglas Road—Sunrise Blvd to Villagio Parkway	6	30,100	0.56	A	29,700	0.55	A	29,700	0.55	A	29,400	0.54	A	29,400	0.54	A
2. Douglas Road— Villagio Parkway to Rancho Cordova Parkway	6	25,200	0.47	A	24,400	0.45	A	24,400	0.45	A	24,200	0.45	A	24,200	0.45	A
3. Douglas Road— Rancho Cordova Parkway to Americanos Road	6	13,900	0.26	A	13,300	0.25	A	13,300	0.25	A	13,900	0.26	A	13,900	0.26	A
4. Douglas Road— Americanos Road to Grant Line Road	6	15,300	0.28	A	15,200	0.28	A	15,200	0.28	A	17,600	0.33	A	17,600	0.33	A
5. Sunrise Blvd—U.S. 50 eastbound ramps to Folsom Blvd	8	79,300	1.10	F	79,200	1.10	F	79,200	1.10	F	78,700	1.09	F	78,700	1.09	F
6. Sunrise Blvd—Folsom Blvd to White Rock Road	6	49,900	0.92	E	49,400	0.91	E	49,400	0.91	E	48,600	0.90	E	48,600	0.90	E
7. Sunrise Blvd—White Rock Road to Douglas Road	6	34,200	0.63	B	33,500	0.62	B	33,500	0.62	B	33,100	0.61	B	33,100	0.61	B
8. Sunrise Blvd—Douglas Road to Keifer Boulevard	6	35,500	0.66	B	35,600	0.66	B	35,600	0.66	B	34,800	0.64	B	34,800	0.64	B
9. Sunrise Boulevard—Keifer Boulevard to Jackson Road SR 16	6	23,100	0.43	A	23,200	0.43	A	23,200	0.43	A	22,300	0.41	A	22,300	0.41	A
10. White Rock Road—Zinfandel Drive to Sunrise Blvd	4	7,200	0.13	A	7,100	0.13	A	9,300	0.17	A	9,800	0.18	A	21,100	0.39	A
11. White Rock Road— Sunrise Blvd to Rancho Cordova Parkway	6	34,600	0.64	B	34,000	0.63	B	36,200	0.67	B	37,200	0.69	B	48,500	0.90	D
12. White Rock Road— Rancho Cordova Parkway to International Drive	6	11,700	0.33	A	11,300	0.31	A	13,500	0.38	A	14,000	0.39	A	25,400	0.71	C
13. White Rock Road— International Drive to Rio Del Oro Parkway	6	10,200	0.28	A	11,500	0.32	A	13,700	0.38	A	15,500	0.43	A	26,800	0.74	C
14. White Rock Road— Rio Del Oro Parkway to Villagio Parkway	4	8,000	0.22	A	10,000	0.28	A	12,200	0.34	A	15,000	0.42	A	26,400	0.73	C
15. White Rock Road— Villagio Parkway to Grant Line Road	4	13,600	0.38	A	17,700	0.49	A	19,900	0.55	A	23,500	0.65	B	34,900	0.97	E
16. Easton Valley Parkway — Rancho Cordova Parkway to Hazel Avenue	6	39,000	0.72	C	38,800	0.72	C	38,800	0.72	C	54,000	0.71	C	54,000	0.71	C
17. Rancho Cordova Parkway - Easton Valley Parkway to International Drive	6	51,100	0.95	E	49,600	0.92	E	49,600	0.92	E	54,000	0.87	D	54,000	0.87	D
18. Rancho Cordova Parkway - International Drive to White Rock Road	6	41,400	0.77	C	40,800	0.76	C	40,800	0.76	C	54,000	0.72	C	54,000	0.72	C
19. International Drive. — White Rock Road to Americanos Parkway	6	17,900	0.33	A	18,900	0.35	A	18,900	0.35	A	54,000	0.35	A	54,000	0.35	A
20. International Drive. — Americanos Parkway to Rancho Cordova Parkway	6	33,600	0.62	B	34,000	0.63	B	34,000	0.63	B	54,000	0.64	B	54,000	0.64	B
21. International Drive. — Rancho Cordova Parkway to Sunrise Boulevard	6	31,700	0.59	A	31,700	0.59	A	31,700	0.59	A	54,000	0.59	A	54,000	0.59	A
22. Villagio Parkway — White Rock Road to Americanos Parkway	2	5,700	0.32	A	7,800	0.43	A	7,800	0.43	A	18,000	0.46	A	18,000	0.46	A
23. Villagio Parkway — Americanos Parkway to Rancho Cordova Parkway	2	10,700	0.59	A	11,900	0.66	B	11,900	0.66	B	18,000	0.68	B	18,000	0.68	B
24. Villagio Parkway — Rancho Cordova Parkway to Douglas Road	2	12,200	0.68	B	13,000	0.72	C	13,000	0.72	C	18,000	0.73	C	18,000	0.73	C

Notes: LOS = level of service; SR = State Route; U.S. 50 = U.S. Highway 50; V/C = volume-to-capacity

¹ Not expected to be a through roadway for baseline conditions.

² Assumed to have high access control.

Bold indicates deficiency.

Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

Intersection	Control	No Project – No Quarry Trucks				Proposed Project – No Quarry Trucks				Proposed Project – Assumed Quarry Truck Distribution				Proposed Project With Mitigated Network Quarry Truck Distribution				Proposed Project – “Local Only” Quarry Truck Distribution			
		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
		Delay ¹	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS
1. White Rock Road / Carson Crossing Road	Signalized	27.9	C	22.6	C	103.7	F	35.1	D	100.8	F	35.1	D	5.5	A	8.5	A	5.4	A	5.4	A
2. White Rock Road / Stonebriar Drive	Signalized	16.4	B	11.2	B	16.1	B	10.4	B	15.1	B	10.4	B	12.7	B	9.4	A	12.3	B	12.3	B
3. White Rock Road / Windfield Way	Signalized	24.0	C	29.6	C	24.9	C	31.3	C	24.5	C	31.3	C	24.6	C	49.0	D	25.0	C	25.0	C
4. White Rock Road / Latrobe Road	Signalized	37.7	D	32.0	C	36.3	D	29.9	C	37.4	D	29.9	C	40.8	D	33.5	C	43.5	D	43.5	D
5. White Rock Road / Valley View Parkway	Signalized	32.6	C	81.1	F	39.8	D	65.5	E	42.6	D	65.5	E	46.3	D	61.8	E	52.5	D	52.5	D
6. El Dorado Hills Blvd / Serrano Parkway	Signalized	48.2	D	25.6	C	35.9	D	26.2	C	35.9	D	26.2	C	38.6	D	27.6	C	38.6	D	38.6	D
7. El Dorado Hills Blvd / Saratoga Way	Signalized	42.5	D	40.2	D	30.5	C	43.5	D	30.5	C	43.5	D	30.0	C	44.4	D	30.0	C	30.0	C
8. El Dorado Hills Blvd / Park Drive	Signalized	30.7	C	29.5	C	24.7	C	27.2	C	24.7	C	27.2	C	24.4	C	26.8	C	24.4	C	24.4	C
9. Latrobe Road / Town Center Boulevard	Signalized	35.0	D	95.5	F	34.0	C	77.5	E	34.0	C	77.5	E	33.5	C	80.7	F	33.5	C	33.5	C

Notes: LOS = level of service; **Bold** indicates deficiency.
Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

Intersection	Control	No Project – No Quarry Trucks				Proposed Project – No Quarry Trucks				Proposed Project – Assumed Quarry Truck Distribution				Proposed Project With Mitigated Network Quarry Truck Distribution				Proposed Project – “Local Only” Quarry Truck Distribution			
		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
		Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS
1. Hazel Avenue / Tributary - WB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	28.7	C	94.1	F	44.0	D	102.3	F	44.0	D	102.3	F	46.3	D	102.8	F	46.3	D	102.8	F
2. Hazel Avenue / EB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	43.8	D	152.4	F	36.5	D	147.3	F	36.5	D	147.3	F	37.0	D	147.7	F	37.0	D	147.7	F
3. Folsom Blvd / WB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	8.4	A	13.3	B	6.3	A	10.7	B	6.3	A	10.7	B	6.7	A	10.7	B	6.7	A	10.7	B
4. Folsom Blvd / EB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	30.5	C	39.1	D	26.8	C	29.8	C	26.8	C	29.8	C	26.8	C	30.2	C	26.8	C	30.2	C
5. Prairie City Road / WB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	28.8	C	30.2	C	34.8	C	12.9	B	37.2	D	12.9	B	42.6	D	12.7	B	42.6	D	12.7	B
6. Prairie City Road / EB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	22.4	C	15.9	B	20.0	B	13.3	B	21.2	C	13.3	B	20.5	C	12.2	B	19.3	B	12.2	B
7. East Bidwell Street / WB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	19.2	B	22.7	C	25.0	C	22.5	C	28.1	C	22.5	C	28.6	C	23.1	C	25.4	C	23.1	C
8. East Bidwell Street / EB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	20.1	C	23.6	C	17.1	B	20.7	C	17.1	B	20.7	C	16.6	B	20.1	C	16.6	B	20.1	C
9. El Dorado Hills Blvd / WB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	30.7	C	29.5	C	24.7	C	27.2	C	24.7	C	27.2	C	24.4	C	26.8	C	24.4	C	26.8	C
10. El Dorado Hills Blvd / EB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	4.4	A	5.0	A	3.8	A	4.2	A	3.8	A	4.2	A	3.8	A	3.7	A	3.8	A	3.7	A
11. Sunrise Blvd / Jackson Highway SR 16	Signalized	29.4	C	29.9	C	29.2	C	30.3	C	29.2	C	30.3	C	28.5	C	31.2	C	28.5	C	31.2	C
12. Grantline Road / Jackson Highway SR 16	Signalized	25.7	C	26.3	C	24.2	C	26.2	C	24.2	C	26.2	C	24.8	C	25.4	C	24.8	C	25.4	C
13. Oak Avenue Parkway / WB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	17.3	B	11.7	B	17.9	B	11.7	B	17.9	B	12.0	B	17.3	B	12.0	B
14. Oak Avenue Parkway / EB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	26.3	C	27.4	C	27.3	C	27.4	C	26.0	C	27.4	C	25.1	C	27.4	C
15. Empire Ranch Road / WB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	14.7	B	15.8	B	14.7	B	15.8	B	14.8	B	15.6	B	14.8	B	15.6	B
16. Empire Ranch Road / EB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	NA	NA	NA	NA	15.8	B	19.2	B	15.8	B	19.2	B	15.9	B	20.0	B	15.9	B	20.0	B
17. Silva Valley Road / WB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	33.7	C	25.5	C	33.6	C	25.3	C	39.5	D	25.3	C	36.5	D	29.7	C	49.4	D	29.7	C
18. Silva Valley Road / EB U.S. 50 ramps	Signalized	4.9	A	19.3	B	8.0	A	23.3	C	8.1	A	23.3	C	7.4	A	22.6	C	7.7	A	22.6	C

Notes: LOS = level of service; Blank = intersection does not exist under this alternative; **Bold** indicates deficiency.
Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

**Table 3A.15-50
Freeway Mainline Levels of Service — Cumulative (2030) Conditions – Caltrans – Quarry Truck Influence**

Freeway Segment	No Project – No Quarry Trucks				Proposed Project – No Quarry Trucks				Proposed Project – Assumed Quarry Truck Distribution				Proposed Project With Mitigated Network Quarry Truck Distribution				Proposed Project – “Local Only” Quarry Truck Distribution			
	A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
	V/C	LOS ²	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS
EASTBOUND U.S. 50																				
Zinfandel Drive to Sunrise Boulevard	1.00	F	1.15	F	1.03	F	1.17	F	1.07	F	1.17	F	1.05	F	1.16	F	1.03	F	1.17	F
Sunrise Boulevard to Rancho Cordova Parkway	0.83	D	1.02	F	0.88	D	1.05	F	0.91	E	1.05	F	0.89	D	1.04	F	0.88	D	1.05	F
Rancho Cordova Parkway to Hazel Avenue	0.99	E	1.15	F	1.04	F	1.18	F	1.08	F	1.18	F	1.04	F	1.16	F	1.04	F	1.18	F
Hazel Avenue to Folsom Boulevard	0.85	D	0.88	D	0.91	E	1.00	E	0.95	E	1.00	E	0.91	E	0.96	E	0.91	E	1.00	E
Folsom Blvd to Prairie City Road	0.86	D	1.10	F	0.95	E	1.15	F	1.01	F	1.15	F	0.96	E	1.12	F	0.95	E	1.15	F
Prairie City Road to Oak Avenue Parkway	1.07	F	1.17	F	1.17	F	1.19	F	1.22	F	1.19	F	Braided Ramps - V/C<1				Braided Ramps V/C<1			
Oak Avenue Parkway to East Bidwell Street - Scott Road	0.77	D	0.96	E	0.82	D	0.98	E	0.83	D	0.98	E	0.80	D	0.95	E	0.82	D	0.98	E
East Bidwell Street - Scott Road to Empire Ranch Road	0.75	D	1.00	E	0.83	D	1.05	F	0.86	D	1.05	F	0.79	D	1.01	F	0.83	D	1.05	F
Empire Ranch Road to El Dorado Hills Boulevard – Latrobe Road	0.69	C	0.87	D	0.71	C	0.89	D	0.72	C	0.89	D	0.67	C	0.84	D	0.71	C	0.89	D
El Dorado Hills Boulevard – Latrobe Road to Silva Valley Road	0.59	C	0.79	D	0.62	C	0.82	D	0.64	C	0.82	D	0.62	C	0.81	D	0.62	C	0.82	D
Silva Valley Road to Bass Lake Road	0.78	D	0.95	E	0.80	D	0.97	E	0.84	D	0.97	E	0.84	D	0.97	E	0.84	D	0.97	E
WESTBOUND U.S. 50																				
Bass Lake Road to Silva Valley Road	0.91	E	0.70	C	0.92	E	0.70	C	0.96	E	0.70	C	0.97	E	0.70	C	0.92	E	0.70	C
Silva Valley Road to El Dorado Hills Boulevard – Latrobe Road	0.89	D	0.63	C	0.87	D	0.61	C	0.89	D	0.61	C	0.89	D	0.60	C	0.87	D	0.61	C
El Dorado Hills Boulevard – Latrobe Road to Empire Ranch Road	1.06	F	0.84	D	1.03	F	0.82	D	1.06	F	0.82	D	1.05	F	0.80	D	1.03	F	0.82	D
Empire Ranch Road to East Bidwell Street - Scott Road	0.84	D	0.65	C	0.96	E	0.80	D	0.98	E	0.80	D	0.98	E	0.78	D	0.96	E	0.80	D
East Bidwell Street - Scott Road to Oak Avenue Parkway	0.71	C	0.58	C	0.78	D	0.75	D	0.79	D	0.75	D	0.78	D	0.74	C	0.78	D	0.75	D
Oak Avenue Parkway to Prairie City Road	1.13	F	1.02	F	1.08	F	1.02	F	1.13	F	1.02	F	1.13	F	1.00	F	1.08	F	1.02	F
Prairie City Road to Folsom Blvd	0.88	D	0.88	D	0.93	E	0.95	E	0.98	E	0.95	E	0.98	E	0.90	E	0.93	E	0.95	E
Folsom Boulevard to Hazel Avenue	0.88	D	0.82	D	0.92	E	0.89	D	0.97	E	0.89	D	0.96	E	0.85	D	0.92	E	0.89	D
Hazel Avenue to Rancho Cordova Parkway	1.01	F	1.08	F	1.03	F	1.11	F	1.07	F	1.11	F	1.06	F	1.07	F	1.03	F	1.11	F
Rancho Cordova Parkway to Sunrise Boulevard	0.97	E	1.04	F	0.99	E	1.08	F	1.03	F	1.08	F	1.03	F	1.06	F	0.99	E	1.08	F
Sunrise Blvd to Zinfandel Drive	1.00	E	0.93	E	1.01	F	0.95	E	1.04	F	0.95	E	1.03	F	0.94	E	1.04	F	0.95	E

Notes: LOS = level of service; NA = not applicable; U.S. 50 = U.S. Highway 50; V/C = volume-to-capacity
¹ Capacity based on 2200 vphpl for freeway lanes, 1600 vphpl for auxiliary lanes.
Bold indicates deficiency where calculation indicates that demand exceeds capacity.
Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

**Table 3A.15-51
Merge/Diverge/Weave Levels of Service — Cumulative (2030) Conditions – Caltrans – Quarry Truck Influence**

Freeway Ramp	Merge, Diverge, or Weave Maneuver	No Project – No Quarry Trucks				Proposed Project – No Quarry Trucks				Proposed Project – Assumed Quarry Truck Distribution				Proposed Project With Mitigated Network Quarry Truck Distribution				Proposed Project – “Local Only” Quarry Truck Distribution			
		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
		Density ¹	LOS ²	Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS
EASTBOUND U.S. 50																					
Hazel Avenue off-ramp	Diverge	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux
Hazel Avenue on-ramp – Aerojet off-ramp	Weave	30.8	D	29.9	D	34.5	D	36.1	E	36.2	E	36.1	E	34.7	D	34.7	D	34.5	D	36.1	D
Folsom Blvd off-ramp	Diverge	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux
Folsom Blvd on-ramp	Merge	25.4	C	30.6	D	28.5	D	32.0	D	30.3	D	32.0	D	28.8	D	31.1	D	28.5	D	32.0	D
Prairie City Road off-ramp	Diverge	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux
Prairie City Road direct on-ramp	Merge	44.1	F	49.7	F	47.5	F	52.3	F	49.4	F	52.3	F	NA	NA	NA	NA	47.5	F	52.3	F
Prairie City Road flyover on-ramp Oak Avenue Parkway off-ramp	Weave	41.3	E	49.7	F	46.5	F	52.3	F	50.9	F	52.3	F	NA	NA	NA	NA	46.5	F	52.3	F
Prairie City Road slip on-ramp to Oak Avenue Parkway off-ramp	Weave	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	39.1	E	40.7	E	NA	NA	NA	NA
Prairie City Road flyover on-ramp	Merge	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	NA	NA	Aux	Aux
Oak Avenue Parkway loop on-ramp	Merge	34.5	F	43.5	F	37.4	F	41.9	F	37.4	F	41.9	F	21.6	C	24.2	C	37.4	F	41.9	F
Oak Avenue Parkway direct on-ramp	Merge	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	21.8	C	24.2	C	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux
East Bidwell Street - Scott Road direct off-ramp	Diverge	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux
East Bidwell Street - Scott Road loop on-ramp	Merge	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux
East Bidwell Street - Scott Road direct on-ramp	Merge	19.6	B	26.6	C	23.1	C	29.7	D	24.1	C	29.7	D	21.6	C	28.3	D	23.1	C	29.7	D
Empire Ranch Road direct off-ramp	Diverge	22.5	C	26.9	C	25.5	C	28.7	D	26.1	C	28.7	D	24.1	C	27.9	C	25.5	C	28.7	C
Empire Ranch Road loop on-ramp	Merge	26.1	C	31.2	D	25.6	C	30.1	D	26.2	C	30.1	D	23.7	C	28.3	D	25.6	C	30.1	D
Empire Ranch Road direct on-ramp	Merge	24.1	C	28.8	D	25.2	C	30.3	D	25.9	C	30.3	D	23.6	C	28.5	D	25.2	C	30.3	D
El Dorado Hills Boulevard - Latrobe Road off-ramp	Diverge	35.0	E	38.2	E	35.0	D	38.3	E	35.5	E	38.3	E	33.6	D	36.5	E	35.0	D	38.3	E
El Dorado Hills Boulevard Latrobe Road on-ramp	Merge	21.1	C	27.3	C	21.4	C	27.9	C	22.1	C	27.9	C	21.9	C	27.9	C	21.4	C	27.9	C
Silva Valley Road direct off-ramp	Diverge	19.7	B	26.6	C	20.4	C	27.5	C	21.0	C	27.5	C	20.6	C	27.2	C	20.4	B	27.5	C
Silva Valley Road loop on-ramp	Merge	20.7	C	23.7	C	21.8	C	24.0	C	22.4	C	24.0	C	22.4	C	23.9	C	21.8	C	24.0	C
Silva Valley Road direct on-ramp	Merge	22.2	C	28.2	D	22.6	C	28.7	D	23.1	C	29.5	D	23.1	C	29.5	D	24.2	C	28.7	D

**Table 3A.15-51
Merge/Diverge/Weave Levels of Service — Cumulative (2030) Conditions – Caltrans – Quarry Truck Influence**

Freeway Ramp	Merge, Diverge, or Weave Maneuver	No Project – No Quarry Trucks				Proposed Project – No Quarry Trucks				Proposed Project – Assumed Quarry Truck Distribution				Proposed Project With Mitigated Network Quarry Truck Distribution				Proposed Project – “Local Only” Quarry Truck Distribution			
		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
		Density ¹	LOS ²	Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS	Density	LOS
WESTBOUND U.S. 50																					
Silva Valley Road direct off-ramp	Diverge	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux
Silva Valley Road loop on-ramp	Merge	30.6	D	26.6	C	31.8	D	27.3	C	32.9	D	27.3	C	32.6	D	26.7	C	31.8	D	27.3	C
Silva Valley Road direct on-ramp	Merge	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux
El Dorado Hills Boulevard - Latrobe Road off-ramp	Diverge	15.0	B	10.7	B	15.2	B	10.8	B	15.7	B	10.8	B	15.8	B	10.5	B	15.2	B	10.8	B
El Dorado Hills Boulevard - Latrobe Road on-ramp	Merge	29.4	D	25.8	C	30.4	D	26.7	C	31.1	D	26.7	C	30.6	D	26.0	C	30.4	C	26.7	C
Empire Ranch Road direct off-ramp	Diverge	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux
Empire Ranch Road loop on-ramp	Merge	35.9	F	29.2	D	37.8	F	32.3	D	38.9	F	32.3	D	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	37.8	F	32.3	D
Empire Ranch Road direct on-ramp	Merge	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	24.4	C	20.5	C	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux
East Bidwell Street - Scott Road direct off-ramp	Diverge	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux
East Bidwell Street - Scott Road loop on-ramp	Merge	36.5	E	29.4	D	37.1	E	33.7	D	37.3	D	33.7	D	37.0	E	32.8	D	37.1	E	33.7	D
East Bidwell Street - Scott Road direct on-ramp	Merge	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux
Oak Avenue Parkway direct off-ramp	Diverge	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux
Oak Avenue Parkway loop on-ramp	Merge	35.5	F	28.9	D	34.4	F	32.4	D	36.3	D	32.4	D	36.2	F	31.7	D	34.4	F	32.4	D
Oak Avenue Parkway direct on-ramp Prairie City Road direct off-ramp	Weave	51.4	F	47.7	F	43.1	F	38.7	E	42.3	E	38.7	E	42.3	E	37.1	E	43.1	F	38.7	E
Prairie City Road loop on-ramp	Merge	44.8	F	41.6	F	48.4	F	47.3	F	51.1	F	47.3	F	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	48.4	F	47.3	F
Prairie City Road direct on-ramp	Merge	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	30.0	D	28.6	D	NA	NA	NA	NA
Folsom Boulevard off-ramp	Diverge	13.8	B	15.1	B	14.6	B	16.4	B	16.0	B	16.4	B	15.9	B	15.3	B	14.6	B	16.4	B
Folsom Boulevard on-ramp	Merge	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux
Hazel Avenue direct off-ramp	Diverge	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux
Hazel Avenue loop on-ramp	Merge	27.8	C	24.8	C	28.7	D	26.7	C	30.4	D	26.7	C	29.7	D	25.0	C	28.7	D	26.7	C
Hazel Avenue direct on-ramp	Merge	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux	Aux

Notes:
LOS = level of service; NA = not applicable – a lane drops at off ramp or adds at on ramp; U.S. 50 = U.S. Highway 50; Blank = ramp does not exist under this alternative
¹ Density in passenger cars per mile per lane for merge/diverge analysis only.
² LOS computed using Highway Capacity Software (HCS) 2000 software for the merge/diverge/weave analysis consistent with *Highway Capacity Manual* (HCM) 2000 methodologies.
³ Where an auxiliary lane begins at an on ramp (as an add lane) or where an auxiliary lane end at an off ramp (as an add lane)
Bold indicates deficiency where calculation indicates that demand exceeds capacity.
Source: Data provided by DKS Associates in 2009

3A.15.6 RESIDUAL SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

Implementation of the Proposed Project or the other four action alternatives would result in significant impacts to numerous intersections and roadways. However, mitigation measures, including construction of roadway and intersection improvements, would reduce all but five of these impacts to a less-than-significant level. Five impacts would remain significant and unavoidable under the project plus cumulative scenario. Two intersection impacts, at Oak Avenue Parkway/East Bidwell Street and East Bidwell Street/Iron Point Road would remain significant and unavoidable because it is contrary to City policy to construct 8-lane roadways, as would be required to fully mitigate the impact. Impacts to three roadway segments on eastbound U.S. 50, including the Zinfandel Drive to Sunrise Boulevard segment, the Rancho Cordova Parkway to Hazel Avenue segment, and the Folsom Boulevard to Prairie City Road segment, would remain potentially significant and unavoidable. The mitigation measures proposed for these segments call for fair-share payments to support the construction of the Southeast Capitol Connector. However, based on available information, it cannot be determined that the proposed Southeast Capitol Connector would reduce traffic volumes on U.S. 50 to an acceptable LOS, and therefore these impacts are considered **significant and unavoidable** in this EIR/EIS.

The requirement that the project applicant(s) participate in funding transportation improvements outside the City of Folsom would mitigate or substantially lessen the remaining significant impacts on roadways outside of the City, but those impacts are still considered to be **significant and unavoidable**. This conclusion in part reflects the fact that, even with the installation of proposed improvements, some impacts would still remain significant because acceptable levels of service would not be achieved. This conclusion also reflects the fact that successful implementation of some of the proposed improvements would require the cooperation of third party agencies (Sacramento and El Dorado Counties, the City of Rancho Cordova, and Caltrans) over which the City of Folsom has no control on timing or implementation. For this latter reason, the City of Folsom is conservatively acknowledging the possibility that, despite its own commitment to work with these other agencies, mutually acceptable accommodation may not be reached. Consistent with the State CEQA Guidelines CCR Section 15091, subdivision (a)(2), though, the City of Folsom concludes that these other agencies can and should cooperate with the City in implementing the mitigation.

Project implementation would increase demand for single-occupant automobile travel on area roadways and intersections causing roadway and intersection impacts (Impact 3A.15-2). Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3A.15-2a would reduce the demand of the single-occupant vehicle on area roadways and intersections. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 3A.15-2b, 3A.15-2c, and 3A.15-2d would promote usage of alternative transportation modes and increase the supply of these modes. Although implementation of these mitigation measures have the potential to substantially reduce the number of single-occupant vehicles, the project would still add a large number of single-occupant vehicles in the area. Because there are no additional feasible mitigation measures to further reduce the number of project-generated single-occupant vehicle trips, the impact would be significant and unavoidable.

This page intentionally left blank.