

*Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):*

<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation</i>	<i>Less than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
---	--	---	----------------------

**XV. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC -- Would the project:**

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| c) 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?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**SETTING**

***REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM***

Shasta County is situated at the northern end of the Sacramento Valley, 234 miles north of San Francisco. Access to the area is relatively good and is provided by State Route (SR) 299, which extends from Interstate 5 at Redding through the Fall River Valley and on to the community of Alturas in Modoc County. SR 89 bisects the area from northwest to southeast, extending from Mount Shasta at Interstate 5 to Highway 395 in Nevada south of Lake Tahoe. There is an airport at Fall River Mills that includes a 3,600-foot paved runway with lights, tie-downs, hangars, storage, fuel, car rental, and charter services available.

***BURNEY FALLS, BOWMAN DITCH, AND AHJUMAWI PROPERTY***

Burney Falls is located north of the town of Burney, and about a one-hour drive east of Redding. SR 89 and 299 provide the main access to the area. The property and lands adjacent to it at Lake Britton are accessible by secondary roads from SR 89 and trails from McArthur-Burney Falls Memorial State Park. SR 89 and 299 and some secondary roads are currently used for the

transport of commercial products (including forest products); there are currently no significant problems with maintenance or excessive traffic.

Bowman Ditch and Ahjumawi are located north and slightly west of the town of McArthur, about a one and one-half hour drive east from Redding on SR 299. Big Lake Access, the closest point of access for a vehicle, is reached by turning north onto Main Street from SR 299 in the town of McArthur, driving alongside the fairgrounds for 0.7 mile to the fork in the road, and turning right on Rat Farm Road. Both properties are accessible by boat from Big Lake and the Tule and Little Tule Rivers.

### ***MCARTHUR SWAMP AND GLENBURN DREDGE SITE***

The McArthur Swamp is located north and slightly west of the town of McArthur. SR 299, McArthur's paved Main Street, and the unpaved, privately owned Rat Farm Road provide the primary access to this property. Drainage canals inhibit interior access to some extent, as bridges are required for either livestock or vehicle passage over these canals. Pacific Gas and Electric Company has improved the existing road on top of the McArthur Levee. The improved road is primarily for levee maintenance purposes and the road is gated to restrict public access to the levee. Following the transfer, CWA will complete the levee road system; however, public access will remain limited.

The Glenburn Dredge Site is located west of McArthur, with access provided by SR 299 and McArthur Road. In places where there are recreation uses, seasonal variations in traffic occur.

### ***TRAFFIC VOLUMES***

Existing daily traffic volumes on roadways in the project vicinity are presented in **Table XV-1**, below.

## **REGULATORY SETTING**

Each county and city government is required to adopt a comprehensive, long-term general plan for the physical development of the city or county. The General Plan must contain a circulation element designating the general location and extent of existing and proposed major thoroughfares, transportation routes and terminals, which are to be coordinated with the land use element of the plan.<sup>1</sup>

In some cases, PG&E's use of roads on third-party property is subject to road maintenance agreements. Further, in certain circumstances, landowners and persons who have possession and

---

<sup>1</sup> Cal. Gov't. Code §§ 65300, 65302(b).

control over real property owe duties of care as to conditions on the land to persons who come onto the land.<sup>2</sup>

**TABLE XV-1  
EXISTING DAILY TRAFFIC VOLUMES ON ROADWAYS IN PROJECT VICINITY**

Roadway	Location	Daily Traffic Volume <sup>a</sup>
<b>State Route 299</b>	south of State Route 89	4,350
	north of State Route 89	3,200
	south of Fall River Mill	3,400
	north of Fall River Mill	4,450
<b>State Route 89</b>	south of State Route 299	1,750
	north of State Route 299	2,000
	north of Lake Britton Road	1,450
	north of McArthur Road	1,650
<b>McArthur Road</b>	west of SR 299	850

a From 1999 *Traffic Volumes on California State Highways*, 2000; and Shasta County Public Works Department *Christian*, 69 Cal. App. 2d 108 (1968) (holding that a non-owner who has possession of and control over the property owes the same duty of care as an owner).

## TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION IMPACT DISCUSSION

- a, b) The proposed land transfer of portions of land within Burney Falls by PG&E in exchange for Bowman Ditch and portions of land within Ahjumawi Lava Springs State Park owned by DPR would not be expected to generate an increase in traffic on the transportation network. An expansion of land uses within these properties is not reasonably foreseeable, and therefore no significant change in traffic would occur over existing conditions.

The proposed land transfer of portions of land within McArthur Swamp property by PG&E to CWA would also not be expected to result in any significant long-term increases in traffic. However, implementation of the McArthur Swamp Management Plan could result in temporary increases in construction traffic. Specifically, the proposed McArthur Swamp Levee improvements, and wetland and nesting habitat creation could result in short-term increases in construction traffic primarily related to earthwork movement. However, the majority of construction activities would be internal to the site, and therefore would not be expected to result in significant increases in off-site traffic.

<sup>2</sup> See, e.g., *Lipson v. Superior Court*, 31 Cal. App. 3d 362 (1982) (holding that as a general rule every person is liable for injuries to others by the failure to use ordinary care in the skill or management of his property); *Rowland v.*

As a result, the project would have no significant effect on roadway capacity or level of service standards, including those roadways and highways designated as part of the congestion management network.

- c) The project would not involve any components that would have an effect on air traffic patterns.
- d) There are no apparent elements of the project that would increase hazards due to any new design features.
- e) The project would not result in a change in operations of, or substantially change existing emergency access to, the sites.
- f) Implementation of the MSMP could result in temporary increases in construction workers on the site and a need for construction parking. Given the size of the project site and level of construction proposed, any temporary demand would be easily accommodated on-site. Since the project would not generate a substantial increase in long-term traffic at the project site, the project would not result in any significant long-term increases in parking demand. As a result, the project would not have any significant effect on parking capacity.
- g) The project would not have any components that would conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation.

## REFERENCES

Caltrans, *1999 Traffic Volumes on California State Highways*, 2000.

Shasta County Public Works Department, 24-hour daily counts.