

ATTACHMENT 1

---

SUPPLEMENTAL FEIR INFORMATION

## **Attachment 1 – Supplemental FEIR Information**

### ***Introduction***

The supplemental information contained herein was prepared subsequent to publication of the Final EIR (which occurred May 27, 2011), and prior to the Planning Commission meeting scheduled for June 9, 2011. The purpose of providing this Attachment is to ensure that all necessary information is included in the project record. This Attachment includes supplemental responses to comments and also includes the following attachments:

- A1 Project Study Report (PSR) – Interstate 5 Knighton Road Interchange
- A2 Anti-Degradation Analysis for the Wastewater Treatment and Dispersal System
- A3 1990 Unocal Truck Station Conditions of Approval (Use Permit 90-96)
- A4 TA Truck Center Supplemental Noise Analysis
- A5 Previously Revised Fiscal Impact Analysis (DEIR Appendix M)

### ***Supplement to Responses to Comments***

The following responses to comments are intended to supersede the responses that were included in the FEIR that was published on May 27, 2011. The responses included herein were inadvertently left out of the previous version.

#### ***Letter 85.1 Michelle Millette, Chief, Office of Community Planning, Caltrans District 2, California Department of Transportation***

**Response 85.1A:** The DEIR and PRDEIR are required by CEQA to provide project data and analysis which will permit the lead agency to evaluate project impacts, identify appropriate mitigation measures to eliminate or substantially avoid such impacts, and make appropriate findings based on the data and analysis. They are not required to provide a level of detail such that “the conclusions presented (sic) can be verified by all who desire to review the document”.

The Department’s concerns enumerated in this paragraph will be addressed as such concerns are further described in later paragraphs of the comment letter and its attachments.

The County has addressed all identified impacts and provided for appropriate mitigation within its authority to do so.

**Response 85.1B:** The comment is noted and incorporated in the EIR.

**Response 85.1C:** The comment is noted and incorporated in the EIR. Caltrans created and approved a Project Study Report for this area on January 28, 1998, which is a basis for the traffic analysis in the EIR and PRDEIR and the proposed interchange design. The EIR and PRDEIR have addressed the interchanges and main-line I-5 operations.

**Response 85.1D:** The comment is noted and incorporated in the EIR. Please refer to the response to 85.1A. The County has committed to the appropriate mitigation measures in which

## Attachment 1 – Supplemental FEIR Information

it is in the lead agency's power to implement or require implementation. (see Tracy First v. City of Tracy et. Al. Court of Appeals, Third Appellate District August 27, 2009).

**Response 85.1E:** The comment is noted.

**Response 85.1F:** The comment is noted and incorporated in the EIR. It is believed that the information in and appended to the PRDEIR is sufficient for reasoned analysis of and determination regarding project impacts and pertinent mitigation measures. The County met with Caltrans representatives following the comment period and has provided additional data in support of the traffic analysis in response to their request.

**Response 85.1G:** The referenced document is reproduced here in pertinent part (from its Introduction); underlining has been added:

### **Caltrans I-5 Improvement Plan Shasta County**

#### **Introduction**

In April 2009, the Shasta County Regional Transportation Planning Agency (SCRTPA) released the Shasta County Regional Improvement Program (SCRIP) Nexus Study to support impact fees on new development to fund transportation projects on Interstate 5 (I-5). Public hearings were held in the cities within Shasta County. The fees were approved by the City of Shasta Lake. Shasta County chose not to hold a public hearing to vote on implementation after the cities of Anderson and Redding chose not to approve the SCRIP fees. The Plan would only be implemented if all four jurisdictions approved the program.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that transportation impacts from local development projects be identified and that significant impacts be mitigated, including impacts to the state highway system. Individual developments should contribute their "proportional share" of costs to mitigate the traffic impacts of their projects. The term "proportional share" means the percentage of mitigation costs attributable to a project as determined by the percentage of additional traffic a project will contribute to the state highway system.

The Caltrans I-5 Improvement Plan (Plan) is to serve as a starting point for discussion with local approving agencies, the developer, and Caltrans on what may be acceptable to mitigate I-5 traffic impacts. It is not intended to serve as the only traffic analysis required, nor as a comprehensive list of options that will meet the mitigation needs of a project. Specific mitigation projects and proportional share fees will be determined and negotiated with lead agencies on a case-by-case basis.

## Attachment 1 – Supplemental FEIR Information

### Purpose of this Plan

The Plan will serve as a high level implementation document for improvements to I-5 within Shasta County that will meet the needs of the traveling public, mitigate development impacts, and accommodate future growth. The costs associated with the projects (Table 2) are planning level estimates only. Actual project costs would be determined when project specifics are more fully identified.

The Caltrans I-5 Improvement Plan does not meet CEQA-required criteria for “existing traffic plans and programs prepared by the cities and Caltrans that include guaranteed and secured funding sources” (see *Tracy First v. City of Tracy, et. al.*, Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, August 27, 2009), neither does the comment-referred Caltrans I-5 Improvement Plan, Shasta County.

No evidence is documented in this comment that plans and guaranteed funding sources exist for project-related impacts to the mainline I-5 that include private or local jurisdiction participation.

CEQA requires that when implementation of mitigation measures, absent plans and funding, must be by other than the lead agency, the impacts must be found to be, as the PRDEIR did, significant and unavoidable.

**Response 85.1H:** The Department’s disagreement with the PRDEIR’s estimated internal trip capture rate is noted and incorporated in the EIR.

Although Caltrans Traffic Impact Study Guide requires that internal trip reductions only be considered when a proposed development contains both commercial and residential uses, the comment-referenced ITE Handbook includes no such requirement (p. 86: “...However, if the shopping center is planned to have out-parcel development of a significantly different land use classification or a very large percentage of overall GLA, the site could be considered a multi-use development for the purpose of estimating site trip generation...”). The comment-referenced ITE Tables 7.1 and 7.2 note 20% (p.m. peak hour) to 30% (daily) retail-to-retail internal trip reductions as typical.

The project traffic engineer had defined this development as including six such land uses: a discount club, a (retail) shopping center, a high-turnover restaurant, a fast-food restaurant, a drive-in bank and a home improvement store. The engineer has applied the stated internalization rate (24%) to the development’s traffic generation rate for each such land use, which is consistent with the internal trip percentages for retail-to-retail uses included in Tables 7.1 and 7.2 of the ITE Trip Generation Handbook, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition (pages 93 and 94 in Chapter 7).

### **Response 85.1I:**

The comment regarding diverted-link trips is correct. Total project-related trips and peak hour trip volumes should be 22% more than assumed for all except I-5 main-line trips. The analysis for Knighton Road included existing traffic volumes plus the trip generation from Table 3.12-8, as corrected in Appendix V. Internal trips were taken in account to reduce the overall trip

## Attachment 1 – Supplemental FEIR Information

generation. Therefore, the traffic analysis on Knighton Road reflects existing traffic volumes plus the project trips from corrected Table 3.12-8.

In review of the effects of this change on EIR evaluation of project impacts:

- Comparison of impacts based on level of service (LOS), volume-to-capacity ratio (V/C) change, traffic density for traffic volumes not including either diverted linked trip or internal capture rate deductions discloses only one roadway segment which would be differently evaluated, as non-significant from an LOS standpoint; Knighton Road – I-5 SB ramps to I-5 NB ramps.

This change is of no consequence as the mitigation measure needed to reduce this impact will be required by Mitigation Measures #3.12-2a and #3.12-2b to install the required lane configurations as intersection impact mitigation.

- Main-line I-5 calculations were correctly evaluated using internal capture rate and diverted-linked trips volumes.
- Knighton Road, I-5 to Churn Creek, calculations evaluating traffic operations adjacent to the TA site were, according to the applicant's traffic engineer, calculated using traffic volumes which were not adjusted for either linked trips or internal capture.

The CEQA impacts, and required mitigation measures of the project, are thus unchanged. Appendix V, submitted by the applicant's traffic engineer following the comment period, has been reviewed by the County's consultant and provides detail regarding this response including corrections to Table 3.12-8 and corrected calculations.

**Response 85.1J:** The comment is noted and incorporated in the EIR.

Section 3.12 of the PRDEIR does not identify mitigated Levels of Service less than D as satisfactory for Caltrans facilities. LOS E was used for all existing Shasta County facilities per Policy C-61 of the Shasta County General Plan. Given that Knighton Road is a County designated facility, the County used LOS E as the threshold for all intersections on Knighton Road.

The comment statement that "...CEQA provides for mitigating to the existing conditions" is inaccurate. CEQA requires lead agency consideration of feasible mitigation measures which, when implemented, could reasonably be expected to substantially reduce or eliminate adverse significant impacts.

**Response 85.1K:** The comment is noted and incorporated in the EIR.

The data and analysis provided by the project traffic engineer does correspond to the concerns expressed by Caltrans, however, after the recommended mitigation measures are implemented the level of service will be at an acceptable level.

## Attachment 1 – Supplemental FEIR Information

**Response 85.1L:** The comment is noted and incorporated in the EIR. The analysis presented in Impact #3.12-8 was provided to address the overall circulation plan on Knighton Road and Churn Creek Road with the addition of the proposed project. Given the other sections of the DEIR (Appendix O of the DEIR includes intersection delays, volume-to-capacity ratios, and potential queuing problems of project-affected intersections) which address the traffic conditions on I-5 and at the I-5/Knighton Road interchange, this section provided additional analysis on the traffic patterns associated with the Travel Centers of America site, in accordance with the conditions of approval applied to Use Permit 90-96 for the Unocal Truck Station (now Travel Centers of America), requiring reconfiguration of truck egress. Appendix A of the PRDEIR, page 3.12.65, and Figure 3.12-19 discuss and illustrate the critical 95<sup>th</sup> percentile vehicle queues adjacent to the TA truck site. The EIR traffic engineer did not consider further analysis to be essential as other sections of the DEIR and PRDEIR address them.

**Response 85.1M:** The comment is noted and incorporated in the EIR. The traffic analysis and Appendices A through D of the PRDEIR supports the conclusions found in the PRDEIR.

Please see the response to Comment 85.1K with respect to resolution of this issue.

**Response 85.1N:** The comment is noted and incorporated in the EIR.

Alternative courses of action may be appropriate with respect to the intersection design, however, the proposed interchange design, as well as the relevant County impact fee program, are based largely on the 1998 PSR approved by Caltrans; any alternative design is beyond the scope of the EIR. (Refer also to the response to Comment 85.1C and to the Caltrans-approved PSR, 1998, for the Knighton Road/I-5 Interchange).

It would, pending the agreed resolution of appropriate interchange design, be speculative to postulate at this time whether amendment of the Public Facilities Impact Fee program will be required.

**Response 85.1O:** The comment is noted and incorporated in the EIR.

**Response 85.1P:** The comment is noted and incorporated in the EIR.

The differing conclusions of the project EIR traffic engineering consultants and Caltrans are acknowledged. The EIR, based on the EIR traffic engineering consultants' conclusions, correctly reflects the present and future impacts of truck traffic on Knighton Road and the Interstate 5 interchange. Again, please see the response to Comment 85.1K with regard to the resolution of this issue.

**Response 85.1Q:** A comment letter from Travel Centers of America (Comment Letter 92) has been received and incorporated in the EIR. Shasta County Conditional Use Permit 96-90 addresses the circulation changes required in the PRDEIR. Further discussion regarding circulation would be helpful. It appears that, based on apparent current non-compliance with County-approved site access restrictions, resolution of the circulation pattern change needs may be achieved.

## Attachment 1 – Supplemental FEIR Information

**Response 85.1R:** The comment is noted and incorporated in the EIR.

Please refer to Comment 85.1K with respect to the resolution of these expressed concerns.

**Response 85.1S:** The comment is noted and incorporated in the EIR.

Without speculation, it is unlikely that any of the alternative transportation subject matter referred to in this comment would affect the evaluation of the magnitude of the project's traffic impacts. Failure to adjust anticipated traffic volumes downward due to presumed customer utilization of other transportation modes makes the current analysis more realistic and conservative.

**Response 85.1T:** The comment is noted, agreed, and thus incorporated in the EIR.

**Response 85.1U:** The comment is noted and incorporated in the EIR.

Appropriate physical mitigation measures are identified within the PRDEIR. With respect to the implementation of proposed mitigation measures for I-5 facilities and those located in other jurisdictions, the lack of plans and guaranteed local funding sources for I-5 improvements, and the lack of plans and guaranteed facilities funding in other jurisdictions, along with Shasta County's lack of jurisdiction and control in such jurisdiction makes infeasible the imposition of project mitigation measures in these other jurisdictions (see Tracy First v. City of Tracy et. Al. Court of Appeals, Third Appellate District August 27, 2009).

Please see the response to Comments 85.1G and Letter 97, Response 97E.

**Response 85.1V:** The comment is noted and incorporated in the EIR.

CEQA permits the use of fees as mitigation if the required physical mitigation measures to be implemented are identified and if the fee program provides, as does Shasta County's, for a method of calculating "fair share" (nexus) fee contributions.

**Response 85.1W:** The comment is noted and incorporated in the EIR.

**Response 85.1X:** Public Resources Code 21086 requires that, after considering the final EIR and when making the required findings thereon a lead agency shall adopt a mitigation monitoring program. That program shall require, monitor and provide for reporting thereon the timely implementation of project mitigation measures. The information derived therefrom, on this traffic-related project, shall be provided to Caltrans.

It will be the responsibility of Shasta County as the lead agency, to timely implement all CEQA-required mitigation measures to substantially reduce or eliminate significant impacts at all stages of project development. The monitoring program to be adopted will reflect this responsibility.

**Response 85.1Y:** The comment is noted and incorporated in the EIR.

## Attachment 1 – Supplemental FEIR Information

In response to this comment, Mitigation Measures 3.12-3, 3.12-4 and 3.12-7 have been modified in the errata to allow for effectively equivalent mitigation measures to be used. Ramp metering may be considered as an effective equivalent measure.

**Response 85.1Z:** The comment is noted and incorporated in the EIR.

Please see response to comment 85.1G.

**Response 85.1AA through 85.1YY:** The CEQA/traffic-related comments in this prior, December 24, 2010 letter to the County, have been addressed in the responses to the comments in Caltrans' letter of January 26, 2011.

### **Letter 90     George Cole**

**Response 90D:** Please see Comment Letter 85.1, Response 85.1G.

---

### ***Additional Information in Responses to Comments***

The following information is intended to supplement the responses to comments in the FEIR and to provide further disclosure of information used in the decision making process.

#### Trip Generation and Link Diverted Trips:

The Knighton Road segments between the Interstate 5 SB Ramp and Churn Creek Road are identified to operate over the planning threshold segment capacity with the addition of project traffic for both weekday and Saturday conditions. The segment analysis presented in the DEIR was based on the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) planning thresholds for different types of roadways. These thresholds are based on certain assumptions for number of traffic signals, speed, turning movement counts, peak hour factor, and length of facility. These planning level thresholds provide a quick assessment of the segment operations.

While the roadway segment levels of service are shown to be over capacity, the standard of practice is to utilize the more detailed intersection level of analysis to verify whether the general segment analysis is adequately describing the operational condition. This is because the generalized segment thresholds are based on individual intersection analysis with generalized assumptions on the lane configurations, turning movements, signal timing and other characteristics based only on the facility type. For instance, a typical minor collector road might have two lanes without turn lanes or signals so the capacity would be based on that configuration. In reality, a minor collector might have a turn lane and signals and operate more like a minor arterial. Knighton Road is more appropriately classified by Shasta County as a minor arterial, given its regional nature anticipated urban settings, and current connection with Interstate 5.

## Attachment 1 – Supplemental FEIR Information

For Knighton Road, the daily volume threshold for a minor collector with two lanes is 15,000 vehicles per day for LOS E (Reference: PRDEIR TIA). If the roadway was classified as a major collector with two lanes, the daily volume threshold would be 18,000 vehicles per day for LOS E (Reference: PRDEIR TIA). Furthermore, the recently developed 2010 HCM provides a daily traffic volume range of 15,000 to 20,000 daily vehicles for LOS E operations on a two-lane street. Using the 2010 HCM planning thresholds, the Knighton Road segment between the Interstate 5 SB and NB ramps would operate under capacity and fall within the higher threshold of LOS E. It would be reasonable for the County to use the 20,000 daily vehicles threshold for Knighton Road.

Per the standard of practice for urban settings, a more detailed analysis is typically conducted at the signalized intersections to evaluate the traffic operations and resultant level of service to identify the lane geometry required to accommodate the traffic demand and meet a level of service standard. In the PRDEIR TIA, an intersection analysis was conducted that includes the mitigation measures at the intersections along Knighton Road. These mitigations were identified based on the project traffic volumes with diverted link trips and, even with the corrected calculations found in Appendix V, provide the appropriate mitigation measures for the project impacts.

### **Summary of Attachments**

A1 – Project Study Report (PSR) - Interstate 5 Knighton Road Interchange: This report is a 1998 Caltrans document which studied the operational and capacity improvements for the Knighton Road/Interstate 5 interchange. The PSR was used in determining an appropriate interchange design.

A2 – Anti-Degradation Analysis: This report is an August 2010 analysis which was included as part of the Project's Waste Discharge Report that was submitted to the Regional Water Quality Control Board. The analysis indicates that the proposed wastewater treatment and dispersal plan would not degrade ground or surface water quality.

A3 – 1990 Truck Stop Conditions of Approval: This attachment presents the existing conditions of approval for the Unocal Truck Station (now the Travel Centers of America truck stop, located at Knighton Road and Pacheco. The conditions of approval, and related improvement deferral agreement, require re-configuration of the truck egress from the site at the appropriate time as determined by the County.

A4 – TA Truck Center Supplemental Noise Analysis: This June 2011 analysis and memorandum were prepared in response to concerns regarding truck traffic on Pacheco Road. The analysis indicates that routing trucks to Pacheco Road would not result in significant increases in noise levels at nearby residential uses or at the public school to the east, above existing levels.

A5 – Updated Fiscal Impact Analysis (DEIR Appendix M): This updated report was inadvertently left out of the published FEIR.