

3.14 Transportation/Traffic

This section describes the regulatory and environmental setting for transportation and traffic. It also describes the impacts on transportation and traffic that would result from implementation of the *Climate Action 2020: Community Climate Action Plan (CAP)* and includes mitigation for significant impacts, where feasible and appropriate.

3.14.1 Environmental Setting

This section describes the existing transportation and traffic system in Sonoma County. This information has been primarily drawn and modified from the *Sonoma County General Plan 2020, Draft Environmental Impact Report* (Sonoma County 2006) and the *2009 Comprehensive Transportation Plan for Sonoma County* (Sonoma County Transportation Authority 2009). The Sonoma County Transportation Authority (SCTA) is in the process of updating the Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP). Updated current conditions of the County's transportation system that will be part of the updated CTP are drawn from SCTA's *Staff Report, 2015 CTP Performance Measures, Current Conditions and Performance Target Recommendations* dated October 13, 2014 (Sonoma County Transportation Authority 2014).

Sonoma County has a variety of transportation systems, including local roads, public transit, a railroad right-of-way, airports, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities. These are discussed in detail below.

3.14.1.1 Highway and Roadway Network

Historically, travel and trade routes have been developed parallel to the north/south orientation of County valleys, as they offered the least resistance. For that reason, even today east/west road development (and travel) is poorer than in the north/south direction. Many roads today follow the routes of former Native American paths, which in turn were created by animal paths over many centuries. Roads were often developed to follow water routes, e.g., the Russian River, or to connect to the ocean.

Sonoma County has approximately 2,700 centerline miles of publicly owned and maintained roadways. Table 3.14-1 depicts the owner and maintenance responsibility of the public roads within Sonoma County. The County owns and maintains over half of the roadway system, due to large unincorporated areas with low-density urban development. The California State Department of Transportation (Caltrans) owns and maintains more than 235 centerline miles of highway, with more than 75% in the rural portions of the County. The major Caltrans highways in Sonoma County include: State Routes (SR) 1, 12, 37, 116, 121, and 128, as well as U.S. Highway 101 (U.S. 101). The state highways are among the most heavily traveled routes (e.g., U.S. 101), accounting for 50% or more of the daily vehicle miles traveled (VMT) in the County.

Table 3.14-1. Sonoma County Centerline Mileage of Public Roads

Owner/Maintenance Responsibility	Miles	Percent
County of Sonoma	1,387	52%
Incorporated Cities	943	35%
Caltrans (State)	235	9%
State Parks Department	92	3%
Federal Agencies	20	1%
<i>Total</i>	<i>2,677</i>	<i>100%</i>

Source: Sonoma County Transportation Authority 2009.

Physical Conditions

Physically, the County road system suffers from a number of problems (Sonoma County Transportation Authority 2009).

- Poor pavement conditions: Sonoma County's roads average a Pavement Condition Index (PCI) of 46, whereas a PCI of 80 is considered optimum. This is the lowest of any county in the Bay Area, and the County has one of the largest deferred maintenance backlogs in the Bay Area.
- Lack of shoulder or pedestrian walking areas: many County roads lack standard shoulders or pedestrian walking areas to enhance the safety and pleasure of walking and cycling.
- Flooding issues: roads, including state highways and freeways, were subject to serious flooding problems in the 1990s.
- Poor sight distances: portions of some County roads do not meet current safe sight stopping distance standards.

Existing Traffic Conditions

Freeway Congestion

Freeway congestion is defined as conditions where vehicle speeds regularly drop below 35 miles per hour (mph) for at least 15 minutes each weekday. Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) freeway congestion monitoring data indicate that congestion delay in the San Francisco Bay Area increased 18% in 2013 to an average of 2.6 minutes per commuter each weekday in 2013 from 2.2 minutes in 2012 (Metropolitan Transportation Commission 2015a).

In Sonoma County, the individual freeway sections of U.S. 101 experience the most recurring congestion on weekdays (Metropolitan Transportation Commission 2015b). According to MTC, the following are the most congested freeway segments in the County.

- U.S. 101 southbound, from Hopper Avenue to Baker Avenue
- U.S. 101 southbound, from Redwood Highway to Petaluma Boulevard South
- U.S. 101 northbound, from Santa Rosa Avenue to Colgan Avenue
- U.S. 101 northbound, from Santa Rosa Avenue to Yolanda Avenue
- U.S. 101 northbound, from Petaluma Boulevard South to Washington Street
- U.S. 101 northbound, from CA-12 to 6th Street

Incorporated Jurisdiction Areas

A description of the existing traffic conditions in each jurisdiction is summarized below. Overall, the incorporated cities within the County generally tend to experience traffic congestion at the city center and downtown locations.

- City of Cloverdale: Of the 17 intersections identified as the primary intersections in Cloverdale along the main arterial network, all intersections are operating acceptably at level of service (LOS) C or better (City of Cloverdale 2005).
- City of Cotati: Of the 20 intersections identified as the most critical to Cotati's local circulation system and its connectivity to the regional transportation network, 18 are operating acceptably at LOS D or better (City of Cotati 2014).
- City of Healdsburg: Of the 28 primary intersections identified in the City of Healdsburg, 25 are operating at LOS C or better overall. The three intersections operating at LOS D or worse would be unacceptable during the PM peak periods (City of Healdsburg 2009).
- City of Petaluma: Of the 46 intersections identified as most likely to be impacted by future development in the city, the majority of intersections would operate at LOS C or better during AM and PM peak hours. Nine intersections would operate at LOS D or worse during either peak hour (City of Petaluma 2006).
- City of Rohnert Park: Many Rohnert Park city streets have relatively little traffic congestion and operate at LOS C or better during the PM peak commute hour. Several roadway segments experience congestion and exceed the acceptable level of service during the PM peak period. These roadways include portions of Commerce Boulevard, Seed Farm Road, Petaluma Hill Road, Stony Point Road, Millbrae Avenue, and Wilfred Road (City of Rohnert Park 2000).
- City of Sebastopol: Of the 18 intersections identified as those most critical to Sebastopol's local circulation system and its connectivity to the regional transportation network, 17 are operating acceptably at LOS D or better (City of Sebastopol 2014).
- City of Sonoma: The current travel pattern within Sonoma is dominated by SR 12 (comprised of Broadway, West Napa Street, and the Sonoma Highway), with the highest volumes occurring along West Napa Street. Supporting arterials such as Napa Road, Fifth Street West, MacArthur Street, Second Street West, and West Spain Street experience the most traffic congestion. Of the 16 primary intersections identified in the City of Sonoma, 11 are operating at LOS D or better overall (City of Sonoma 2006).
- Town of Windsor: Of the 33 intersections identified as those most critical to the Town of Windsor's local circulation system and its connectivity to the regional transportation network, all are operating acceptably at LOS D or better (Town of Windsor 2015).

3.14.1.2 Transit Service

Municipal Bus Transit Services

Several jurisdictions along the U.S. 101 corridor provide local transit service within their communities, including the cities of Santa Rosa, Petaluma, Healdsburg, and Cloverdale. Of the local jurisdictions, the City of Santa Rosa's CityBus provides the most comprehensive level of service, with 19 numbered routes. Petaluma Transit provides scheduled service along five separate routes using a fleet of modern, 35-foot low-floor transit coaches. The City of Rohnert Park contracts with Sonoma

County transit for local bus service. Most of these systems operate a few small vehicles over a very limited route system, providing service mostly to the transit dependent (i.e., those without access to a car).

Countywide and Regional Bus Transit Services

Sonoma County Transit (SCT) operates inter-city and local routes throughout the County, including all cities along the U.S. 101 corridor, the Sonoma Valley to the east, and the City of Sebastopol and Russian River areas to the west. The Sonoma County Transit fleet size is a total of 49 vehicles with 45 heavy-duty buses and 4 mini-buses. SCT operates 23 weekday routes and 14 weekend routes. The system links most small towns and communities and all nine incorporated cities in the County including Cloverdale, Healdsburg, Windsor, Santa Rosa, Sebastopol, Rohnert Park, Cotati, Sonoma, and Petaluma.

Golden Gate Transit (GGT) offers regional transit service and commuter routes from Sonoma County to Marin County and San Francisco. GGT operates seven transit routes: five routes that commute to/from San Francisco and two basic bus service routes. The basic routes (Routes 80 and 101) offer all-day service between Santa Rosa and San Francisco. The other routes are commuter routes that offer only peak hour and peak direction service during morning and evening commute periods. Peak direction is defined as toward San Francisco in the morning and from San Francisco in the afternoon.

Mendocino Transit Authority (MTA) provides inter-county service between Santa Rosa and Ukiah in Mendocino County, and to several communities along the Sonoma/Mendocino Coast. MTA operates two infrequent service routes along SR 1 and into Santa Rosa. Route 65 operates from Mendocino, via Fort Bragg, Willits, to Santa Rosa via U.S. 101. Route 95 operates from Point Arena to Santa Rosa via SR 1, with stops in Bodega Bay and Sebastopol.

Sonoma-Marin Rail Transit

The State Legislature established the Sonoma-Marin Area Rail Transit (SMART) District in January 2003 to plan, construct, and operate a commuter rail line in Marin and Sonoma Counties. The proposed SMART project includes building and operating a 14-station, 70-mile passenger rail line from Larkspur to Cloverdale using the publicly owned right-of-way of the former Northwestern Pacific (NWP) Railroad line, and a Class I multi-use pedestrian and bicycle path parallel to much of the line. Stations in Sonoma County would include: Petaluma Downtown, Petaluma Corona Road, Cotati, Rohnert Park, Santa Rosa Downtown, Santa Rosa Jennings Avenue, Windsor, Healdsburg, and Cloverdale. A maintenance facility for the entire line would be constructed in southern Windsor. The SMART project would utilize new “light” self-powered diesel trains.

The first phase of the SMART, which includes a 42-mile rail and trail project connecting San Rafael and Santa Rosa, is currently under construction, and passenger rail service is anticipated to begin in 2016. Extensions of SMART to the north and south will be developed and constructed as additional funding is identified.

3.14.1.3 Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities

Pedestrian System

The countywide pedestrian system includes: sidewalks, pathways, recreational trails, Class I multiuse trails, and informally, roadway shoulders. Sidewalks or pathways are present in older

neighborhoods of cities and are also in place in almost all of the most recently developed residential, civic, and business developments. System gaps are frequently found in locations between the oldest and the newest development. In areas that were developed during the 1950s to 1980s, the focus was on access by motorists, and pedestrian facilities were frequently not required (Sonoma County Transportation Authority 2008).

Bicycle System

The countywide bicycle system includes, but is not limited to, the following facilities: Class I, Class II, Class III, bicycle boulevards, multi-use trails, traffic calming, signage, bicycle-activated signal detection, and bicycle parking infrastructure. The following is a description of the bikeways in the County.

- Class I bikeways are known as multi-use paths and provide bicycle travel on an all-weather surface within a right-of-way that is for exclusive use by pedestrians, bicyclists, and other non-motorized modes.
- Class II bikeways are referred to as “bike lanes” and provide a striped and stenciled lane for one-way travel on either side of a street or highway.
- Class III bikeways are intended to provide continuity to the County bicycle network. Bike routes are established along through-routes not served by Class I or Class II bikeways or to connect discontinuous segments of Class I or Class II bikeways together.

The bicycle system of Sonoma County is composed of both on-road and off-road facilities; however, many gaps still exist that break the continuity of bicycle travel. Throughout the County, Class I, II, and III facilities have been implemented. There are also unpaved recreational trails. Table 3.14-2 lists the miles of each bicycle facility provided in each local jurisdiction.

The off-road facilities consist of separated bike paths (Class I), and many of the Class I facilities have been, or will be, constructed along creek alignments owned by cities or the County (e.g., Sonoma County Water Agency) and along prior or existing railroad rights-of-way (e.g., existing Joe Rodota Trail; proposed SMART Pathway). The on-road facilities consist of bike lanes (Class II) and shared lane facilities, such as sharrows (Class III).

Table 3.14-2. Sonoma County Bicycle Facilities by Class

Jurisdiction	Class I (miles)	Class 2 (miles)	Class 3 (miles)
Cloverdale	1.72	4.69	0.23
Healdsburg	0.55	10.25	4.73
Windsor	2.68	7.67	--
San Rosa	23.00	54.00	33.00
Cotati	1.63	2.85	--
Rohnert Park	7.10	9.90	4.60
Petaluma	19.0	20.30	0.90
Sebastopol	1.23	--	--
Sonoma	3.91	0.97	--
County	16.77	13.86	1.45
<i>Total</i>	<i>77.59</i>	<i>119.48</i>	<i>44.91</i>

Source: Sonoma County Transportation Authority 2009.

The SCTA is in the process of developing a Countywide Primary Bikeway Network, a continuous countywide network of on- and off-street bikeways that extend between and through communities. The Primary Bikeway Network would consist of a selection of existing and proposed Class I, Class II, and Class III bikeways that provide inter-city and inter-county routes along with connections to other transportation modes, major destinations, jobs, neighborhoods, recreation, and local bicycle networks. The intention of the network is to focus and collaborate on a set of basic routes that will provide access to major destinations and activity areas. Approximately 65 miles of Primary Bikeway Network currently exist and approximately 514 miles of bikeways are proposed on the Primary Bikeway Network.

3.14.1.4 Airports

There are six airports in Sonoma County open for public use: two are privately owned (Sonoma Skypark and Sonoma Valley), three are owned by cities (Cloverdale, Healdsburg, and Petaluma airports), and the Sonoma County Airport is County-owned. The Sonoma County Airport is the only airport within the County offering commercial airline service. The Sonoma County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) adopted the Sonoma County Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (CALUP), which identifies compatible land uses in the areas adjacent to the airports as related to noise, airspace, and safety. All six Sonoma County airports are subject to the regulations of the ALUC and the CALUP.

Sonoma Skypark and Sonoma Valley airports are located south of the City of Sonoma. The three city-owned airports are within their respective localities, and the Sonoma County Airport is south of the Town of Windsor.

3.14.2 Regulatory Setting

3.14.2.1 Federal

There are no relevant federal regulations for transportation and traffic.

3.14.2.2 State

State agencies, counties, and cities use various criteria to determine acceptable LOS on their roadway systems. LOS is a scale used to determine the operating quality of a roadway segment or intersection based on volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratios or average delay experienced by vehicles on the facility. The levels range from A to F, with LOS A representing free-flow traffic and LOS F representing severe traffic congestion. Agencies adopt LOS standards that define the levels of operations that are acceptable within their jurisdictions.

California Department of Transportation

Caltrans is the responsible agency for management of transportation infrastructure and transportation improvements in California. Caltrans manages the state highway system, and works with federal and local transportation agencies to coordinate funding for highway and transit improvements.

Each Caltrans district prepares a Transportation Concept Report for every state highway, or portion thereof, in its jurisdiction, to facilitate long-term planning and to determine how a highway will be developed and managed to deliver the targeted LOS and quality of service envisioned. Local jurisdictions (counties and cities) have the option of adopting a higher LOS standard for freeway segments within their limits.

State Transportation Improvement Program

The California Transportation Commission (CTC) administers transportation programming, which is the public decision-making process that sets priorities and funds projects that have been envisioned in long-range transportation plans. The CTC commits expected revenues for transportation projects over a multiyear period. The State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) is a multi-year capital improvement program for transportation projects both on and off the State Highway System. The STIP is funded with revenues from the State Highway Account and other sources. STIP programming typically occurs every 2 years.

The *California Transportation Plan 2025* was adopted in 2006 and updated in 2007. The *California Transportation Plan 2025*, which is overseen by Caltrans, serves as a blueprint for California's transportation system, as defined by goals, policies, and strategies to meet the state's future mobility needs. The goals defined in the plan fall into three categories: social equity, prosperous economy, and quality environment. Each goal is tied to performance measures. In turn, members from regional and metropolitan planning agencies report these performance measures to Caltrans (State of California 2007). The *California Transportation Plan 2025 2030 addendum* (2007) updated the *California Transportation Plan 2025* to comply with the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient, Transportation Equity Act – A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). This federal law authorized transportation funding through 2009 and established new requirements for statewide and metropolitan transportation planning. Caltrans is presently working on an update to the *California Transportation Plan 2025* that would extend to 2040. The 2040 update is expected to be approved in 2016.

Assembly Bill 32 and Senate Bill 375

With the passage of Assembly Bill (AB) 32, the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, the State of California committed itself to reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. The

California Air Resources Board (ARB) is coordinating a response to comply with AB 32. In 2008, ARB defined its 1990 baseline level of emissions. On December 11, 2008, ARB adopted its Proposed Scoping Plan for AB 32. This scoping plan included the approval of Senate Bill (SB) 375 as the means for achieving regional transportation-related GHG targets. In 2011, ARB completed its major rule making for reducing GHG emissions. Rules on emissions, as well as market-based mechanisms, such as the cap-and-trade program, took effect on January 1, 2012.

SB 375 provides guidance regarding curbing emissions from cars and light trucks to help the state comply with AB 32. There are four major components to SB 375. First, SB 375 requires regional GHG emissions targets. ARB's Regional Targets Advisory Committee will guide the adoption of targets to be met by 2020 and 2035 for each Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) in the state. These targets, which MPOs may propose themselves, must be updated every 8 years in conjunction with the revision schedule of the housing and transportation elements of local general plans. Second, MPOs are required to create a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) that provides a plan for meeting regional targets. The SCS and the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) must be consistent, including action items and financing decisions. If the SCS does not meet the regional target, the MPO must produce an Alternative Planning Strategy that details an alternative plan for meeting the target. Third, SB 375 requires regional housing elements and transportation plans to be synchronized on 8-year schedules. In addition, Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) allocation numbers must conform to the SCS. If local jurisdictions are required to rezone land as a result of changes in the housing element, rezoning must take place within 3 years of adoption of the housing element. Finally, MPOs must use transportation and air emissions modeling techniques that are consistent with the guidelines prepared by the CTC. Regional Transportation Planning Agencies, cities, and counties are encouraged, but not required, to use travel demand models that are consistent with CTC guidelines.

The adopted RTP, per SB 375 (Plan Bay Area) is discussed below.

Complete Streets (AM 1358)

AB 1358, also known as the California Complete Streets Act of 2008, requires cities and counties to include "complete street" policies in their general plans. These policies address the safe accommodation of all users, including bicyclists, pedestrians, motorists, public transit vehicles and riders, children, the elderly, and the disabled. These policies can apply to new streets as well as the redesign of corridors.

3.14.2.3 Regional

Metropolitan Transportation Commission

MTC is the Bay Area's regional transportation planning agency and federally designated MPO. MTC is responsible for preparing the RTP, a comprehensive blueprint for the development of mass transit, highway, airport, seaport, railroad, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. The RTP is a 20-year plan that is updated every 3 years to reflect new planning priorities and changing projections of future growth and travel demand. The long-range plan must be based on a realistic forecast of future revenues, and the transportation projects taken as a whole must help improve regional air quality. The MTC also screens requests from local agencies for state and federal grants for transportation projects to determine compatibility with the RTP.

Plan Bay Area

Plan Bay Area is overseen by the MTC and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). It serves as the region's SCS and the 2040 RTP (preceded by *Transportation 2035*), integrating transportation and land use strategies to manage GHG emissions and plan for future population growth. The RTP and SCS include policies that call for shifting more travel demand to transit and accommodating growth along transit corridors in Priority Development Areas (PDAs). In July of 2013, *Plan Bay Area* was adopted by ABAG and the MTC. Major transit projects included in the plan include the SMART commuter rail and multi-use pathway, the SMART extension from San Rafael to Larkspur, and expanded and enhanced bus service for Golden Gate Transit and Santa Rosa CityBus (Association of Bay Area Governments 2013).

Focusing Our Vision Program: Priority Development Areas

The Bay Area's regional agencies (i.e., ABAG, Bay Area Air Quality Management District [BAAQMD], San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, MTC) initiated the Focusing Our Vision (FOCUS) Program. The purpose of this program is to encourage growth and revitalization near transit facilities in existing communities. The program provides planning and construction funding for projects in PDAs with high transit accessibility and potential for redevelopment. The Downtown Station area in Santa Rosa, Central Petaluma, Sonoma Mountain Village in Rohnert Park, Downtown/SMART transit area in Cloverdale, Downtown Cotati, and areas of Windsor and Sebastopol all have the potential to be PDAs in Sonoma County (Association of Bay Area Governments 2012).

3.14.2.4 Local

This section discusses the SCTA, the countywide planning and programming agency for transportation of Sonoma County.

In addition, Appendix C, *Local General Plan Goals, Objectives, and Policies*, provides a list of the goals, objectives, and policies in the local general plans of the participating jurisdictions including those related to transportation and traffic. These goals, objectives, and policies were reviewed to assess whether the project is consistent with the general plans of participating jurisdictions. Disclosure of this consistency analysis is for informational purposes. An additional purpose of providing a list of relative local policies is, where appropriate, to provide the context within which the CAP will be locally implemented. As described in the CAP, most of the CAP measures represent implementation of many of the priorities outlined in existing local policies.

Inconsistencies with general plan policies are not necessarily considered significant impacts under CEQA unless they are related to physical impacts on the environment that are significant in their own right.

Implementation of the CAP is consistent with the applicable general plan goals, objectives, and policies of the participating jurisdictions in relation to transportation and traffic.

Sonoma County Transportation Authority

The SCTA is the countywide planning and programming agency for transportation in Sonoma County. The SCTA was formed as a result of legislation passed in 1990 to serve as the coordinating and advocacy agency for transportation funding in Sonoma County. The SCTA partners with other

agencies to improve transportation in the County via U.S. 101, state routes, local streets, transit facilities, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities. SCTA prepares the County's CTP, which serves as the vision for transportation in the County. The goals of the CTP are to maintain the transportation system, relieve traffic congestion, reduce GHG emissions, plan for safety and health, and promote economic vitality in the County. The projects identified in the CTP are included in future RTP/SCS (*Plan Bay Area*), which aids in prioritizing future program funding for these endeavors.

SCTA is currently in the process of updating the 25-year CTP (*Moving Forward 2040*). There are 93 bike/walk projects, 31 transit maintenance and expansion projects, and 108 highway and local road projects included in the updated CTP (Sonoma County Transportation Authority 2015).

3.14.3 Impacts Analysis

3.14.3.1 Methodology

This analysis is based on a review of the transportation and traffic information contained in the relevant planning documents for Sonoma County and the eight incorporated cities. Planning documents considered in the analysis of potential land use impacts included the *Sonoma County General Plan 2020*, and the general plans for the cities of Cloverdale, Cotati, Healdsburg, Petaluma, Rohnert Park, Sebastopol, and Sonoma, and the town of Windsor. Effects related to transportation and traffic are analyzed qualitatively and are focused on the CAP's potential to impact existing transportation and traffic systems in the County during construction and operation.

3.14.3.2 Significance Criteria

The State CEQA Guidelines Appendix G (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15000 et seq.) has identified significance criteria to be considered for determining whether a project could have significant impacts on existing transportation and traffic.

An impact would be considered significant if construction or operation of the project would have any of the following consequences.

- Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation, including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including, but not limited to, intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit.
- Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level-of-service standards and travel demand measures or other standards established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.
- Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks.
- Substantially increase hazards because of a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).
- Result in inadequate emergency access.
- Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

3.14.3.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact TR-1a: Implementation of the CAP could conflict with applicable plans, ordinances, or policies related to the transportation circulation system during construction (less than significant with mitigation).

The CAP is a policy-level document that does not include any site-specific designs or proposals, or grant any entitlements for development that would have the potential to conflict with applicable plans, ordinances, or policies related to the transportation circulation system. As a policy document, the CAP would have no direct impact related to transportation, but future implementation of activities supported by the CAP could conflict with applicable plans, ordinances, or policies related to the transportation circulation system.

The CAP promotes mixed-use and transit-oriented development in city centers consistent with existing land use plans. Further, several CAP measures promote the construction of minor changes to the existing streetscape, such as traffic calming roadway improvements; and additional transit, pedestrian, and bicycle facilities to promote increased transit accessibility.

Although specific details are unknown, construction of these facilities may temporarily disrupt traffic flows on area roadways by increasing the amount of heavy-duty construction vehicles sharing the roadways with normal vehicle traffic, disrupt alternative modes of transportation by blocking bicycle or pedestrian pathways or public transit lanes on area roadways, or result in lane closures that could delay the movement of emergency vehicles. Construction that involve minor changes to the existing streetscape could result in the temporary closure of pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Depending on the intensity and magnitude of such activities, construction of facilities promoted by the CAP could conflict with applicable plans, ordinances, or policies related to the transportation circulation system during the construction period. This would be a significant impact.

Construction impacts are outside of the scope of the CAP, and outside of the Regional Climate Protection Authority's jurisdiction to address. Nonetheless, there is no reason to anticipate future significant construction-related transportation impacts as these impacts can normally be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. As required by CEQA, this EIR identifies potential mitigation measures that lead agencies could and should impose in their consideration of particular projects.

Recommended Mitigation Measure TR-1 would require the construction contractor to implement a traffic control plan to minimize disruptions to the transportation circulation system during construction activities promoted by the CAP. In addition, any structures that could be constructed consistent with the CAP would be subject to further CEQA analysis of project-specific impacts. Thus, with implementation of recommended Mitigation Measure TR-1, potential construction impacts on the transportation circulation system would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure TR-1: Traffic control plan implementation during construction activities.

The lead agencies will require project sponsors and construction contractors to coordinate with the local jurisdiction, transit providers, and emergency service providers to develop a traffic control plan to minimize the effects of construction traffic on transit service, roadway operations, emergency responses, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and public safety in the surrounding area. (A traffic control plan may not be required for minor construction activities.) The project sponsor will be responsible for monitoring to ensure that the plan is effectively implemented by the construction contractor(s). Measures that may be employed throughout the course of the construction period include, but are not limited to, the following.

- Provide advance notice of lane and sidewalk closures, durations, and alternative routes to emergency service providers, motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians.
- Provide clearly marked pedestrian detours if any sidewalk or pedestrian walkway closures are necessary.
- Provide clearly marked bicycle detours if heavily used bicycle routes must be closed, or if bicyclist safety may otherwise be comprised.
- Provide crossing-guards and/or flag persons as needed to avoid traffic conflicts and ensure pedestrian and bicyclist safety.
- Locate all stationary equipment as far as possible from areas used heavily by vehicles, bicyclists, and pedestrians.
- Use nonskid traffic plates over open trenches to minimize hazards.
- Implement traffic control measures to minimize vehicle travel delays through construction zones.
- Maintain acceptable response times and performance objectives for emergency response services.
- Avoid routing construction traffic through residential areas to the extent feasible. Prohibit mobilization and demobilization of heavy construction equipment during AM and PM peak traffic hours.
- Maintain access for driveways and private roads outside the immediate construction zone by using steel plates or temporary backfill, as necessary.
- Provide designated areas for construction worker parking wherever feasible to minimize use of parking on streets or in city center areas.

Impact TR-1b: Implementation of the CAP could conflict with applicable plans, ordinances, or policies related to the transportation circulation system during operation (less than significant).

The CAP promotes a reduction of VMT in general, which would reduce regional traffic, thus reducing congestion on major arterials and highways. In turn, this would improve overall traffic conditions compared to unabated VMT growth and continued congestion.

Several CAP measures that promote and could include the construction of additional facilities or retrofits to existing buildings aimed at improving energy efficiency and increasing renewable energy use, increasing solid waste diversion, increasing recycled water treatment and use, and increasing capture/use of methane from landfills and dairies. Most of these new facilities would be constructed within or on existing buildings (e.g., rooftops, wastewater treatment plants, landfills, dairies), and these improvements would not generate new trips, as there would be no new uses.

The CAP also includes measures that would promote mixed-use and transit-oriented development in city centers consistent with existing land use plans. The County and incorporated cities have already adopted policies aimed at promoting city-centered development patterns to direct future growth to cities and protect the surrounding agricultural and resource lands. Policies would also result in GHG reduction benefits. As local plans already promote such development, the mixed-use and transit-oriented development within city centers supported by the CAP would not result in new trips or

increased traffic beyond that already anticipated in local general plans. Furthermore, the CAP would not represent a change in local land use policies.

Increased transit operations and additional pedestrian and bicycle facilities promoted by the CAP could increase transit ridership as well as decrease vehicle, bicyclists, and pedestrian conflicts in the vicinity of city centers. With additional pedestrian and bicycle facilities, the number of vehicles on roadways could also potentially be reduced, resulting in an overall benefit to the transportation circulation in city-center area roadways. Adding mixed-use or residential use near SMART stations is part of existing land use policies in local cities with proposed SMART stations, and SMART is an adopted project. Therefore, the CAP would not change the potential for associated impacts on the transportation circulation system. The additional transit facilities and developments in city centers promoted by the CAP would not likely conflict with applicable plans, ordinances, or policies related to the transportation circulation system above that already anticipated in existing land use plans and approved transit projects.

The CAP also promotes the construction of solid waste facilities to increase waste diversion, reuse of materials, and recycling. During operating hours at solid waste disposal and transfer sites, heavy trucks deliver solid waste to the transfer site to be sorted and diverted prior to disposal at a landfill. Heavy trucks also pick up sorted solid waste to be disposed of at landfills. Access roads for transfer stations usually experience a greater proportion of heavy truck traffic. Operations associated with a solid waste facility could require substantial amounts of truck trips impacting roadways shared with normal vehicle traffic. The siting of these facilities is currently unknown and would be subject to further CEQA analysis of project-specific impacts regarding new trips generated by the solid waste facility. Thus, potential operational impacts on the transportation circulation system are considered to be less than significant at this time.

Impact TR-2: Implementation of the CAP could conflict with an applicable congestion management program established by the Sonoma County Transportation Authority for designated roads or highways (less than significant).

As noted above, the CAP promotes a reduction of VMT in general, which would reduce regional traffic, thus reducing congestion on major arterials and highways, which is consistent with the intent of SCTA congestion management.

As discussed under Impact TR-1b, several CAP measures promote additional transit facilities and operations as well as pedestrian and bicycle facilities to reduce vehicle fuel use by encouraging a shift in the mode of transportation used. The CAP also includes measures that would promote mixed-use and transit-oriented development in city centers consistent with existing land use plans. The County and incorporated cities have already adopted policies aimed at promoting city-centered development patterns to direct future growth to cities and protect the surrounding agricultural and resource lands. Policies also point toward reduced GHGs. As many local plans already promote such development, the mixed-use and transit-oriented development within city centers supported by the CAP would not result in increased traffic or conflict with SCTA's congestion management program beyond that already anticipated in local general plans. Furthermore, the CAP would not represent a change in local land use policies. Additional transit operations and pedestrian and bicycle facilities promoted by the CAP could increase transit ridership and promote alternative forms of transportation, reducing the overall number of vehicles on roadways. Thus, the additional transit facilities and developments in city centers promoted by the CAP would not likely conflict with SCTA's congestion management program above that already anticipated in existing land use plans, and impacts would be less than significant.

Impact TR-3: Implementation of the CAP could change air traffic patterns resulting in substantial safety risks (less than significant).

Implementation of the CAP would be consistent with existing land use policies, and construction of any facilities promoted by the CAP would not change air traffic patterns resulting in aviation safety risks. Further, any structures that would be constructed or projects that would be undertaken consistent with the CAP would be subject to further CEQA analysis of project-specific impacts and applicable federal, state, and local aviation safety regulations. Local regulations require compliance with the adopted Sonoma County CALUP, which identifies compatible land uses in the areas adjacent to the airports as related to noise, airspace, and safety. With compliance with local regulations, impacts from changing air traffic patterns resulting in aviation safety risks would be less than significant.

Impact TR-4a: Implementation of the CAP could substantially increase hazards due to design features or incompatible uses during construction (less than significant with mitigation).

As described in Impact TR-1a, construction of facilities promoted by the CAP may temporarily disrupt traffic flows on area roadways by increasing the amount of heavy-duty construction vehicles sharing the roadways with normal vehicle traffic, disrupt alternative modes of transportation by blocking bicycle or pedestrian pathways or public transit lanes on area roadways, or result in lane closures that could delay the movement of emergency vehicles. During the construction period, the presence of construction or the increased amount of heavy-duty construction vehicles on roadways could substantially increase hazards due to incompatible uses with normal vehicles on roadways. This could result in a significant impact. Implementation of recommended Mitigation Measure TR-1, which requires the preparation of a traffic control plan, would minimize hazards due to incompatible uses during the construction period, and impacts would be less than significant.

Impact TR-4b: Implementation of the CAP could substantially increase hazards due to design features or incompatible uses during operation (less than significant).

There are several CAP measures that promote the construction of new facilities aimed at increasing renewable energy use, increasing solid waste diversion, increasing capture/use of methane from landfills, and reducing emission from livestock operations. Most of these new facilities would be constructed within or on existing buildings (e.g., rooftops, wastewater treatment plants, landfills, and dairies) and would not change the existing area roadways causing a substantial increase in hazards due to design features or incompatible uses.

Several CAP measures encourage a shift in the mode used for transportation and to reduce travel demand. These CAP measures promote minor changes to the existing streetscape, such as traffic calming roadways improvements; and adding transit, pedestrian, and bicycle facilities to promote increased transit accessibility. In general, these roadways and transit improvements would decrease vehicle, bicyclists, and pedestrian conflicts. Any streetscape improvements involving transit, pedestrian, and bicycle facilities would be required to comply with Caltrans and local design guidelines for roadways and transportation facilities as applicable. With compliance with state and local regulations and design guidelines, roadways and transit improvements promoted by the CAP would not substantially increase hazards due to design features or incompatible uses.

Further, the CAP also promotes the construction of mixed-use and transit-oriented development in city centers as well as solid waste facilities to increase waste diversion, reuse of materials, and recycling. Infill mixed-use and transit-oriented development in city centers would be located near existing similar uses and would also be consistent with local land use plans. These mixed-use and

transit-oriented developments would not likely change the existing area roadways causing a substantial increase in hazards due to design features or incompatible uses. The siting of these facilities is currently unknown and would be subject to further CEQA analysis of project-specific impacts regarding new trips generated by the solid waste facility and compatibility with adjacent land uses. Thus, impacts related to potential hazards due to incompatible uses during operation are considered to be less than significant at this time.

Impact TR-5a: Implementation of the CAP could result in inadequate emergency access during construction (less than significant with mitigation).

As described under Impact TR-1a, construction of facilities promoted by the CAP may temporarily disrupt traffic flows on area roadways by increasing the amount of heavy-duty construction vehicles sharing the roadways with normal vehicle traffic, disrupt alternative modes of transportation by blocking bicycle or pedestrian pathways or public transit lanes on area roadways, or result in lane closures that could delay the movement of emergency vehicles. During the construction period, construction activities or the increased amount of heavy-duty construction vehicles on roadways could result in inadequate emergency access. This could result in a significant impact. Implementation of recommended Mitigation Measure TR-1, which requires the preparation of a traffic control plan, would minimize delays to emergency access during the construction period, and impacts would be less than significant.

Impact TR-5b: Implementation of the CAP could result in inadequate emergency access during operation (less than significant).

Operationally, most of the new facilities promoted by CAP measures would have been constructed within or on existing buildings (e.g., rooftops, wastewater treatment plants, landfills, and dairies) and would not result in inadequate emergency access as these facilities would be additions to the existing structure. The CAP also promotes the construction of mixed-use and transit-oriented development in city centers; and solid waste facilities to increase waste diversion, reuse of materials, and recycling. Infill mixed-use and transit-oriented development in city centers would be consistent with existing local land use plans, and the CAP would not result in new impacts because it would not change existing land use plans. Although the siting and location of the solid waste facilities are unknown, these facilities are generally structures that are located on a continuous parcel of land and would not change access on public right-of-way or result in inadequate emergency access.

Further, there are several CAP measures that encourage a shift in the mode used for transportation and reducing travel demand. These CAP measures promote minor changes to the existing streetscape, such as traffic calming roadway improvements; and additional transit, pedestrian, and bicycle facilities to promote increased transit accessibility. In general, these roadways transit, pedestrian, and bicycle improvements would not deteriorate accessibility or result in inadequate emergency access but instead would promote alternatives to single-occupancy vehicle travel. Moreover, the CAP promotes a reduction of VMT in general, which would reduce regional traffic, thus reducing congestion on major arterials and highways, which will ease response times for emergency vehicles in general compared to unabated VMT growth. Thus, impacts would be less than significant.

Impact TR-6: Implementation of the CAP could conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs related to public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities or could otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities (beneficial impact).

Several CAP measures promote additional transit facilities and operations as well as pedestrian and bicycle facilities to reduce vehicle fuel use by encouraging a shift in the mode of transportation used. As discussed above, these improvements could increase transit ridership as well as decrease vehicle, bicyclist, and pedestrian conflicts in the vicinity of city centers. With additional pedestrian and bicycle facilities, the number of vehicles on roadways could also potentially be reduced resulting in an overall increase in the safety of these facilities. Further, CAP measures promoting additional transit facilities and bicycle and pedestrian facilities are consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of local land use and general plans. Thus, implementation of the CAP would be consistent with policies, plans, or programs related to public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, and impacts would be beneficial.

3.14.3.4 Cumulative Impacts

Impact C-TR-1: Implementation of the CAP, in combination with other foreseeable development in the surrounding area, could have a significant cumulative impact to transportation and traffic (less than cumulatively considerable with mitigation).

The geographic context for the evaluation of cumulative construction traffic impacts is localized to the truck routes and nearby roadways for a project. For cumulative operational transportation and traffic impacts, the geographic context is generally larger; thus, the overall growth of the County is considered when assessing potential cumulative impacts. The context of cumulative transportation and traffic impacts addresses the effects of the CAP in combination with other development in Sonoma County.

Implementation of the CAP policies to reduce GHG emissions could promote the construction of new facilities. Although the siting and location of facilities promoted by the CAP are unknown, if the construction of a nearby project occurs at the same time as the construction for a CAP-promoted facility, cumulative construction transportation and traffic effects could occur. As discussed under Impact TR-1a, construction of facilities promoted by the CAP could affect existing roadways and bicycle and pedestrian facilities. However, with implementation of recommended Mitigation Measure TR-1, potential construction transportation and traffic impacts are expected to be less than significant. Although specific construction transportation and traffic mitigation measures for other projects are unknown, construction of these projects would be required to be compliant with applicable local standards. Given this, it is not anticipated that the CAP would contribute considerably to significant cumulative construction transportation impacts.

With regards to cumulative operational transportation and traffic impacts, the implementation of cumulative development projects would have the potential to increase traffic due to additional vehicles and vehicle trips associated with growth and development in the County. However, implementation of the CAP would not result in a population increase greater than projected for the buildout of local land use plans because the CAP would not change local land use plans, and the additional facilities supported by the CAP would result in only minor employment increases and associated population growth. Rather, the CAP supports existing land use plans and policies that seek to concentrate the expected population growth in city centers and along transit corridors. Densifying the population in city centers could result in a localized incremental increases in traffic within the area, but this would be the result of existing land use plans and policies and not an

incremental change brought about by the CAP. Overall, the CAP should help to reduce VMT regionally, which would be beneficial for general traffic conditions. Further, although specific details of other projects are unknown, all projects would be required to be compliant with applicable local standards regarding traffic and transportation. Thus, although cumulative impacts on operational transportation and traffic may be significant due to increasing vehicles and vehicle trips from cumulative development in the County, the CAP's contribution would be less than considerable and in many cases beneficial.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank