

## 4.14 Transportation and Traffic

This section presents the environmental setting and impact analysis for transportation facilities associated with the Proposed Project and the alternatives. The purpose of this section is to assess the impacts of the Proposed Project and alternatives on traffic operations and other transportation modes in the surrounding area.

### 4.14.1 Setting

The Proposed Project is located in north western Tulare County, California near the cities of Visalia, Farmersville, and Exeter. With the exception of the City of Visalia the study area is primarily rural, low-density and agricultural. The dominant mode of transportation in this region is the private automobile. The Proposed Project and alternatives would affect the roadway network located in north western Tulare County and the southeast portion of the City of Visalia and the City of Farmersville. The transportation system in the area is composed of an interconnected network of State, County and city roads; local transit systems; and a rail right-of-way (ROW). The transportation system in the study area is described below.

### Roadway Network

Several State and local roadways provide regional and local access to the study area, each of which would be used to transport construction materials, equipment, and workers to and throughout the study area. The project corridors and surrounding roadway network are illustrated in Figure 2-1 (Chapter 2, *Project Description*). Descriptions of the regional and local roadway network in the study area are provided below.

#### ***Regional Roadways***

Regional access to the study area is provided by State Route 99 (SR 99), State Route 198 (SR 198), State Route 65 (SR 65), State Route 201 (SR 201), State Route 216 (SR 216) and State Route 245 (SR 245). Below are summary descriptions of each of these regional roadways.

***SR 99*** is a north-south State highway that extends almost the entire length of the Central Valley. From its south end at Interstate 5 (I-5) near Wheeler Ridge to its north end at State Route 36 near Red Bluff, SR 99 is an alternate to I-5 through the more populated eastern portions of the valley. SR 99 passes through or near the following cities: Bakersfield, Visalia, Fresno, Madera, Merced, Modesto, Stockton, Sacramento, Yuba City, and Chico. SR 99 in the vicinity of the study area is a controlled access freeway. SR 99 would not be crossed by the Proposed Project or the alternatives. Traffic volumes along SR 99 in the area of its junction with SR 198 have an annual average daily traffic (ADT) level of 55,000 vehicles per day (Caltrans, 2009).

***SR 198*** is an east-west State highway that connects the California Central Coast to the mid-Central Valley at Visalia. The road begins at U.S. Route 101 south of King City and has a junction with I-5 in Fresno County. From I-5 to just east of Visalia, SR 198 is a controlled access freeway with four lanes. It has an interchange with SR 99 in Visalia and continues east of Visalia

as a two-lane highway where it ends at Sequoia National Park. The Proposed Project would cross SR 198 where it is a two-lane highway; the alternatives would cross SR 198 where it is a four-lane controlled access freeway. Traffic volumes along SR 198 in the study area (east of Lovers Lane) have an annual ADT level of 30,000 vehicles per day (Caltrans, 2009).

**SR 65** is a north-south State highway composed of two segments connecting Bakersfield to Exeter (south of the study area) and Roseville to Olivehurst. A large section of SR 65 that is planned to link the two segments has not yet been constructed. The Proposed Project would cross SR 65. Traffic volumes along SR 65 in the study area (south of SR 198) have an annual ADT level of 10,000 vehicles per day (Caltrans, 2009).

**SR 201** is an east-west State highway that connects SR 99 in Kingsburg, Fresno County with SR 245 (Millwood Drive) in the study area. Alternative 3 would cross SR 201. Traffic volumes along SR 201 in the study area (junction at SR 245) have an annual ADT level of 1,150 vehicles per day (Caltrans, 2009).

**SR 216** is an east-west two-lane State highway which stretches from Visalia to Woodlake in Tulare County. Alternatives 2, 3, and 6 would cross SR 216. Traffic volumes along SR 216 in the study area (east of Lovers Lane) have an annual ADT level of 11,000 vehicles per day (Caltrans, 2009).

**SR 245** is a north-south two-lane State highway that runs from near Exeter to near Kings Canyon National Park, connecting SR 198 in Tulare County to State Route 180 in Fresno County. It runs through the City of Woodlake and the small unincorporated communities of Elderwood, Badger, and Pinehurst. Alternatives 2 and 6 would cross SR 245, and a short segment of Alternative 6 would parallel the west side of the road between Avenue 360 and Avenue 364. Traffic volumes along SR 245 in the study area (at the junction of SR 198) have an annual ADT level of 3,300 vehicles per day (Caltrans, 2009).

### **Local Roadways**

The local roadways that border, cross, or may be used to access the study area are described below. Some of the roads would be affected during line stringing activities over the roads, while others would be used for access throughout the construction phase of the project. Many of the local roads experience relatively low traffic volumes. Below are summary descriptions of the local roadways that may be affected by the Proposed Project and/or alternatives. The descriptions include annual ADT levels, where recent data (i.e., 2006 and later) are available.

### **Proposed Project**

The Proposed Project would cross a number of public and private roads. North of the Rector Substation, the Proposed Project would cross West Walnut Avenue, a two-lane County roadway with no shoulders. South of and parallel to SR 198, the Proposed Project would cross public roads between 5th Avenue and Road 212. Some of the public roadways crossed in this segment include: 6th Avenue, a two-lane County roadway with no shoulders; Farmersville Boulevard, a two lane County road with paved shoulders that had an estimated 2006 annual ADT level of 7,950 (County

of Tulare, 2007); N. Anderson Road, a two-lane County roadway with no shoulders; and N. Spruce Road a two-lane County roadway with no shoulders that had an estimated 2006 annual ADT level of 1,090 (County of Tulare, 2007). The Proposed Project would also cross Avenue 300, a two-lane County roadway with no shoulders; Avenue 320, a two-lane County roadway with no shoulders; and Road 228, a two-lane County roadway with no shoulders.

### **Alternatives 2, 3, and 6**

Alternatives 2, 3, and 6 would cross the same roadways as the Proposed Project for the initial 1.1 miles of the alignments north of Rector Substation. The alternatives would continue north and would cross SR 198 and SR 216. From where Alternative 6 would progress east, then north, before joining Alternative 2, it would cross several local public and private roads, including Road 156, which had a 2007 annual ADT level 1,820 (TCAG, 2009); Avenue 352, with a 2007 annual ADT level of 600 (TCAG, 2009); and Avenue 360. Where Alternative 2 would progress east, it would cross local public roads including Millwood Drive. Alternative 3 would continue north and would cross SR 201. East of SR 201, the alignment would cross very few public roadways and would primarily cross existing County fire roads. Boyd Road a narrow asphalt and gravel County roadway with no shoulders would also be crossed.

### **Public Transit**

Tulare County Area Transit (TCaT) provides fixed route transit services between large and small communities throughout the greater Tulare County Area. TCaT Route 30 operates within the study area. (TCRMA, 2009) The Proposed Project would not cross any roadways used by Route 30 bus. Alternatives 2, 3 and 6 would cross the Route 30 line at SR 216 (Ivanhoe Drive).

### **Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation**

Bicycle facilities include bike paths, bike lanes, and bike routes. Bike paths are paved trails that are separated from the roadways (Class 1). Bike lanes are lanes on roadways that are designated for use by bicycles by striping, pavement legends, and signs (Class 2). Bike routes are roadways that are designated for bicycle use, but do not have additional width for bicycle lanes (Class 3). The Proposed Project and alternatives would not cross any designated bicycle facilities (TCAG, 2007).

Pedestrian facilities include sidewalks, crosswalks, and pedestrian signals. While the Proposed Project and alternatives would cross a number of public and private roadways, it appears that they would not cross any designated pedestrian facilities.

### **Airports**

There are eight public use airports in Tulare County. These include five publicly owned and operated facilities and three privately owned and operate airports (County of Tulare, 2007). The largest general aviation airport in the study area is Visalia Municipal Airport, located approximately 10 miles to the west of Rector Substation near the junction of SR 99 and SR 198. The nearest airport to any the Proposed Project or alternative alignments is Woodlake Airport, approximately 1.5 miles south and 2.1 miles north of Alternative 6 and the Proposed Project, respectively.

## Rail Service

The Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the Burlington Northern & Santa Fe Railroad (BNSFRR) and the San Joaquin Valley Railroad (SJVRR) all provide freight service in Tulare County. Passenger rail service is provided by AMTRAK (San Joaquin Service). The Proposed Project would cross an active UPRR line at two locations. Alternatives 2, 3, and 6 would cross the UPRR line at two locations. Alternative 2 would also cross the BNSF line.

## Regulatory Context

The development and regulation of the study area transportation network involves State and local jurisdictions. State jurisdiction includes permitting and regulation of the use of State roads, while local jurisdiction includes implementation of State permitting, policies, and regulations, as well as management and regulation of local roads. Construction work that would occur within or over a public roadway would require encroachment permits prior to commencing work in the public ROW from all jurisdictions that manage or maintain the applicable roadway(s).

Caltrans' construction practices require temporary traffic control planning for any time the normal function of a roadway is suspended. In addition, Caltrans requires that permits be obtained for transportation of oversized loads and transportation of certain materials, and for construction-related traffic disturbances. Caltrans regulations would apply to the transportation of oversized loads associated with the construction of the Proposed Project or alternatives. Likewise, County and local (City of Visalia and City of Farmersville) regulations related to ROW encroachment and oversized loads would apply to the construction of the Proposed Project or alternatives. However there are no applicable plans and policies within the Tulare County, Fresno County, City of Visalia, or City of Farmerville general plans.

### 4.14.2 Significance Criteria

Based on criteria in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, a project would be considered to have a significant effect on the environment if it would:

- 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);
- b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways;
- c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that would result in substantial safety risks;
- d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment);
- e) Result in inadequate emergency access;
- f) Result in inadequate parking capacity;

- g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., conflict with policies promoting bus turnouts, bicycle racks, etc.).

### 4.14.3 Applicant Proposed Measures

No Applicant Proposed Measures have been identified by SCE to reduce project impacts on transportation and traffic.

### 4.14.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

#### Approach to Analysis

According to the CEQA *Guidelines*, a project would normally result in an impact to transportation and traffic if it would cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system. Occasional post-construction maintenance activities involving one or two vehicle trips at a time would briefly affect only local segments. Therefore, long-term operational impacts would be inconsequential.

The duration of potentially significant impacts related to short-term disruption of traffic flow and increased congestion generated by construction vehicles and/or loss of a travel lane to accommodate the construction work zone, would be limited to the period of time needed to complete construction of a project component. Therefore, mitigation measures identified below focus on reducing the short-term construction effects of the Proposed Project. Short-term impacts associated with transportation and traffic would result from increases in traffic volumes, temporary closure of roads and loss of travel lanes, and potential safety effects.

- 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).**

The Proposed Project would not introduce any new uses to the project area that would generate long-term changes in traffic. Thus, potential traffic and transportation effects would be confined to construction of the Proposed Project (No Impact).

- b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.**

**Impact 4.14-1: Construction activities could adversely affect traffic and transportation conditions in the project area. *Less than significant with mitigation* (Class II)**

Proposed Project construction activities are expected to require between nine and 12 months to complete. Heavy truck trips would be required for hauling equipment and materials to and from the construction sites. Construction activities would include hauling of oversize loads, including

pieces of towers and poles, conductor spools, substation hardware, various types of equipment, etc. The peak period of truck trip activity is estimated to occur during foundation and structure (i.e., poles and towers) installation. Assuming the use of two crews for foundations and two crews for structure hauling, the average peak truck activity is estimated to be 32 truck round trips per day that would occur over a period of approximately 40 days. The primary impacts from the movement of construction trucks would include short-term and intermittent lessening of roadway capacities due to slower movements and larger turning radii of the trucks compared to passenger vehicles.

Daily vehicle trips would be generated associated with the arrival and departure of construction workers. It is estimated that several construction crews would operate concurrently each day, with a peak of up to 50 workers associated with the Proposed Project. Assuming a trip generation rate of 1.5 round trips per day per worker, the 50 employees would not be anticipated to exceed 75 auto round trips (150 one-way trips) from the construction workers traveling to and from the work sites each day. Accounting for the delivery of construction components and material excavation, the total number of off-site construction truck trips would be up to 32 round trips (64 one-way trips) per work day over a 40 day period. Material staging areas are proposed that would include a field office, provide a reporting area for workers, be used to store materials and equipment, and provide a parking area for project vehicles. Construction workers would park at the staging areas and at the specific project sites.

Construction-generated traffic would be temporary and therefore would not result in any long-term degradation in operating conditions or level of service on any of the roadways in the vicinity of the Proposed Project. Because not all construction-related trips would be assigned to the same construction location (e.g., crews would be assigned to different sections of the alignment), these project-generated trips would not result in substantial traffic. Therefore, this short-term increase in vehicle trips would not significantly affect level of service and traffic flow on roadways. Short-term construction-generated traffic would result in less than significant impacts (Class III).

Installation of the Proposed Project would require overhead crossings of several public roadways, including Road 168, Walnut Avenue, SR 198, Farmersville Boulevard, Spruce Road, and SR 65. The installation of the transmission lines across these roadways would temporarily disrupt existing transportation and traffic patterns in the vicinity of the crossings. Impacts would include direct disruption of traffic flows and street operations. In addition to transmission line stringing activities over public roads, the Proposed Project would cross private roads, potentially resulting in short-term (e.g., a couple of hours) restrictions to private property access.

Prior to stringing conductor, temporary guard structures are proposed to be installed along the road crossings for public protection. The purpose of the guard structures would be to prevent the conductor from being lowered or falling into traffic. The guard structures would consist of 60 to 80 foot standard wood poles placed on each side of the road being crossed. It should be noted that the use of guard structures during transmission line stringing activities over roadways would be at the discretion of the regulatory agency with permit authority of the roadway. For example,

Caltrans typically requires short-term road closures at crossings where lines are strung over State routes, and the County or city may require other or additional safety measures as part of its encroachment permit requirements. While SCE would obtain and comply with State and local road encroachment permits for public roads that are crossed by the approved transmission line, temporary closures of roads and/or lanes could result in potentially significant impacts related to traffic congestion. However, implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.14-1a, 4.14-1b, and 4.14-1c would ensure that impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measure 4.14-1a:** SCE shall also coordinate short-term construction activities at private road crossings with the applicable private property owners. Copies of all encroachment permits and evidence of private property coordination shall be provided to the CPUC prior to the commencement of construction activities.

**Mitigation Measure 4.14-1b:** SCE shall prepare and implement a Traffic Management Plan subject to approval of Caltrans and/or the applicable local government(s). The approved Traffic Management Plan and documentation of agency approvals shall be submitted to the CPUC prior to the commencement of construction activities. At a minimum, the plan shall:

- Include a discussion of work hours, haul routes, work area delineation, traffic control and flagging;
- Identify all access and parking restriction and signage requirements;
- Require workers to park personal vehicles at the approved staging area and take only necessary project vehicles to the work sites;
- Lay out plans for notifications and a process for communication with affected residents and landowners prior to the start of construction. Advance public notification shall include posting of notices and appropriate signage of construction activities. The written notification shall include the construction schedule, the exact location and duration of activities within each street (i.e., which road/lanes and access point/driveways would be blocked on which days and for how long), and a toll-free telephone number for receiving questions or complaints; and
- Include plans to coordinate all construction activities with emergency service providers in the area, consistent with Mitigation Measure 4.12-2 (see Section 4.12, *Public Services*). Emergency service providers shall be notified of the timing, location, and duration of construction activities. All roads shall remain passable to emergency service vehicles at all times.
- Identify all roadway locations where special construction techniques (e.g., night construction) would be used to minimize impacts to traffic flow.

**Mitigation Measure 4.14-1c:** SCE shall coordinate with Caltrans local government(s), and/or any other appropriate entity, regarding measures to minimize the cumulative effect of simultaneous construction activities in overlapping areas.

**Significance after Mitigation:** Less than significant.

## **Operations**

Once constructed, the transmission lines would require routine maintenance trips, inspection, and vegetation management activities. Vegetation management in the transmission line corridors could include control of noxious weeds and trimming of shrubs or trees for safety upkeep and would be limited to seasonal and yearly traffic. Maintenance activities would not increase above existing levels that are employed to maintain the existing transmission line ROWs and the increase in traffic due to new ROW transmission line corridor maintenance would be imperceptible to background traffic already in the area and, therefore, would not result in an increase in traffic in the project area (No Impact).

---

### ***c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that would result in substantial safety risks.***

The Proposed Project would make intermittent use of helicopters, but would not change air traffic patterns in the area. No impacts would occur because the nearest airport (Woodlake Airport) is approximately 2.1 miles from the project area; therefore, there would be no impacts related to air traffic patterns (No Impact).

---

### ***d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).***

#### **Impact 4.14-2: Project construction activities could increase potential traffic safety hazards for vehicles, bicyclists and pedestrians on public roadways. *Less than significant with mitigation (Class II)***

The Proposed Project would not change the configuration (alignment) of area roadways, and would not introduce types of vehicles that are not already traveling on area roads. However, heavy equipment operating adjacent to or within a road ROW could increase the risk of accidents. Construction related trucks on local and State roadways would interact with other vehicles. Potential conflicts could also occur between construction traffic and alternative modes of transportation (e.g., bicyclists and buses).

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.14-1b requires SCE to prepare a Traffic Management Plan in accordance with professional engineering standards prior to construction, including compliance with roadside safety protocols to reduce the risk of accidents. Therefore, temporary increases in the potential for traffic accidents associated with the Proposed Project would be mitigated to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measure 4.14-2:** Implement Mitigation Measure 4.14-1b.

**Significance after Mitigation:** Less than significant.

***e) Result in inadequate emergency access.***

**Impact 4.14-3: Construction activities could result in delays for emergency vehicles on project area roadways. *Less than significant with mitigation (Class II)***

Construction of the Proposed Project would have temporary effects on traffic flow, particularly where the line would be constructed over roadways. Transmission line installation across roads and the temporary reduction in travel lanes could result in delays for emergency vehicles passing through the vicinity of a Proposed Project work area.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.14-1b requires the construction contractor to coordinate all construction activities with emergency service providers in and along the Proposed Project to minimize disruption to emergency vehicle access to land uses along the corridors. Specific requirements are identified under Mitigation Measure 4.14-1b and 4.12-2 (see Section 4.12, *Public Services*). Implementation of these measures would ensure that potential impacts associated with temporary effects on emergency access would be mitigated to less than significant levels.

**Mitigation Measure 4.14-3:** Implement Mitigation Measures 4.14-1b and 4.12-2.

**Significance after Mitigation:** Less than significant.

---

***f) Result in inadequate parking capacity.***

**Impact 4.14-4: Construction activities could result in inadequate parking capacity within the project area. *Less than significant (Class III)***

Construction vehicles associated with the Proposed Project that would transport materials and workers on a daily basis to and from the staging area would be parked overnight at the staging area. Other vehicles would be parked at the various construction sites within the transmission corridor if space is available and some workers would park near that day's construction site. Nonetheless, given the dispersed nature and small size of the proposed construction workforce, the Proposed Project would not generate a substantial number of parked vehicles along the project corridor at any one location, and impacts would be relatively brief; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation:** None required.

---

**g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., conflict with policies promoting bus turnouts, bicycle racks, etc.).**

The Proposed Project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation because the project would not require an increase in long-term use of traditional modes of transportation (No Impact).

---

## 4.14.5 Cumulative Impacts

The geographic context for the cumulative impacts associated with transportation and traffic issues is primarily limited to the areas where transportation facilities (e.g., roads, railroads, etc) would be crossed during conductor stringing activities.

Proposed Project construction activities, as described in Chapter 2, *Project Description*, could have a temporary construction-related impact on local traffic flow in the Proposed Project area as street and lane closures may be required. The geographic context for the cumulative impacts associated with transportation and traffic issues is primarily limited to the areas where transportation facilities (e.g., roads, railroads, etc) would be crossed during conductor stringing activities. In conjunction with other construction projects identified in Section 3.6, *Cumulative Projects*, potential cumulative impacts could occur. For example, the County of Tulare has proposed to widen Farmersville Boulevard in the general vicinity of the area associated with the Proposed Project. Caltrans has likewise identified improvements to SR 65 within the Proposed Project area. Two other Caltrans projects (i.e., SR 198 and Millwood Road) are located within the alternative project areas. If any of these projects were to occur at the same time, a cumulative traffic impact could result at certain access locations to the Proposed Project. However, as identified above, Mitigation Measure 4.14-1b requires SCE to prepare a Traffic Management Plan prior to construction and Mitigation Measure 4.14-1c requires SCE to coordinate with appropriate agencies to minimize the cumulative effect of simultaneous construction activities.

In addition to cumulative construction impacts, cumulative operational impacts could occur. For example, Caltrans plans to widen SR 65 to a four-lane expressway from Hermosa Avenue to SR 198. Because the Proposed Project would result in a new transmission line crossing of this segment of SR 65, the potential exists that one of the new towers could be placed too close to SR 65, potentially resulting in a conflict with the road widening project. However, Mitigation Measure 4.14-1c requires SCE to coordinate with appropriate agencies, including Caltrans, to minimize the cumulative effect of simultaneous construction activities in overlapping areas. Implementation of this measure would ensure that SCE would coordinate with Caltrans regarding the Proposed Project and its projects to avoid potential conflicts.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.14-1b and 4.14-1c would ensure that the Proposed Project's contribution to transportation and traffic-related cumulative impacts during construction would not be cumulatively considerable. During operation, maintenance activities would not

increase above existing levels that are employed to maintain the existing transmission line ROWs, and the increase in traffic due to new ROW transmission line corridor maintenance would be inconsequential. Impacts would therefore be mitigated to less than significant (Class II).

---

## 4.14.6 Alternatives

### No Project Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative, the Proposed Project would not be implemented; therefore, no transportation or traffic related impacts would occur (No Impact).

---

### Alternative 2

Impacts to transportation and traffic under Alternative 2 would be generally similar to the Proposed Project. Alternative 2 is located further north of the cities Farmersville and Exeter and would cross different roads than the Proposed Project. Alternative 2 would cross a portion of SR 198 that is a four-lane controlled access freeway and two local roads that parallel SR 198 (i.e., Avenue 296 and E. Noble Avenue), whereas the Proposed Project would cross SR 198 where it is a two-lane highway that experiences lower traffic volumes. Alternative 2 would also cross a few more local roads, and would take longer to construct, compared to the Proposed Project. Therefore, Alternative 2 would be slightly more adverse than the Proposed Project in terms of potential impacts to local traffic during the construction period. However, implementation of the same mitigation measures for the Proposed Project would reduce these impacts to less than significant (Class II).

---

### Alternative 3

Impacts to transportation and traffic under Alternative 3 would be generally similar to the Proposed Project. Alternative 3 is located further north of the cities of Farmersville and Exeter and would cross different roads than the Proposed Project. Alternative 3 would cross a portion of SR 198 that is a four-lane controlled access freeway and two local roads that parallel SR 198 (i.e., Avenue 296 and E. Noble Avenue), whereas the Proposed Project would cross SR 198 where it is a two-lane highway that experiences lower traffic volumes. Alternative 3 would also take longer to construct than the Proposed Project. Therefore, Alternative 3 would be slightly more adverse than the Proposed Project in terms of potential impacts to local traffic during the construction period. However, implementation of the same mitigation measures for the Proposed Project would reduce these impacts to less than significant (Class II).

## Alternative 6

Impacts to transportation and traffic under Alternative 6 would be generally similar to those described for the Proposed Project. The east-west segment of Alternative 6 is located north of the Proposed Project, north of Ivanhoe and Woodlake, and would cross different roads than the Proposed Project. Alternative 6 would cross a portion of SR 198 that is a four-lane controlled access freeway and two local roads that parallel SR 198 (i.e., Avenue 296 and E. Noble Avenue), whereas the Proposed Project would cross SR 198 where it is a two-lane highway that experiences lower traffic volumes. Alternative 6 would also cross approximately 10 more local roads when compared to the Proposed Project as well as two additional State Routes (i.e., SR 216 and SR 245). Alternative 6 would also take longer to construct than the Proposed Project. Therefore, Alternative 6 would be more adverse than the Proposed Project in terms of potential impacts to local traffic during the construction period. However, implementation of the same mitigation measures for the Proposed Project would reduce these impacts to less than significant (Class II).

---

## References – Transportation and Traffic

- Caltrans (California Department of Transportation), 2008. Traffic and Vehicle Data Systems Unit, 2007 All Traffic Volumes on CSHS – Accessed website - (<http://traffic-counts.dot.ca.gov/2007all.htm>) on April 21, 2009.
- County of Tulare, 2007. General Plan Background Report, December 2007. Page 5-28 and 5-67.
- Tulare County Association of Governments (TCAG), 2007. *Bicycle Transportation Plan*, September 2007.
- TCAG, 2009. Traffic County webpage (<http://www.tularecog.org/trafficcount.php>), Traffic Counts 2006 – 2010. Accessed April 21, 2009.
- Tulare County Resource Management Agency (TCRMA), 2009. Accessed the Tulare County Area Transit (TCaT) website (<http://www.co.tulare.ca.us/government/rma/trans/transit.asp>) on April 21, 2009.