

## 4.10 TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

This section of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) evaluates the potential impacts of the SOI Plan update for Nevada City (proposed project or proposed SOI Plan update) in terms of traffic and circulation on City of Nevada City (City) and County roadways within the SOI Plan update area and other local roadways and intersections. This section also describes the environmental and regulatory settings. This section describes the applicable federal, state, and local regulations and policies related to transportation and circulation; discusses the existing roadway network and transportation facilities in the City and county; describes existing transportation and circulation conditions within the City and county; and analyzes the potential impacts from project activities on transportation and circulation. While the SOI Plan update area would only apply to existing unincorporated County lands, the traffic generated by the project would travel on highways and roadways maintained by the City and California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), County of Nevada (County), Nevada City, and City of Grass Valley as well as some private roads. Mitigation measures that would reduce impacts, where applicable, are also discussed, if feasible. The following analysis of the potential environmental impacts related to transportation and traffic is derived from the following sources and agencies:

- California Department of Transportation
- Nevada County –
  - Nevada County Regional Transportation Plan
- Nevada City

### 4.10.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The proposed project is in a 2,702-acre area encircling the City in unincorporated County land. SOI Plan update area is within Nevada County, which encompasses 978 square miles in the eastern region of California and is generally rural in nature with the exception of its three major cities, the City of Nevada City (City), the City of Grass Valley, and Town of Truckee. The City is within the western half of the County situated in the foothills of the Sierra Nevada Mountains. The existing major roadways in near the proposed project include State Route-20 and State Route-49. Interstate 80 (I-80) which provides a travel route between San Francisco on the west to Salt Lake City on the east is approximately nine miles south of the SOI Plan update area. Transportation in the SOI Plan update area and the County is via automobile traffic and the circulation system in these locations is made up of a combination of state highways, county roadways, city-maintained roadways, and privately maintained roadways; however, some mass transit and alternative transit options are available. This section discusses the existing conditions related to transportation and traffic in the SOI Plan update area, the City, and the County.

#### Existing Major Arterials and Roadways

The major transportation routes that provide regional connectivity through the City is the generally east-west trending State Route 20 (SR-20) and north-south trending State Route 49 (SR-49) which through the

City are joined. SR-20 and SR 49 are the major connectors through the City and to points east. SR-49 provides access to the northwesterly areas of the City and SOI west from the SR-20/SR-49/Uren Street Intersection. SR-20\49 connects Nevada City to the City of Grass Valley approximately four miles to the southwest. Major collector roads starting in the southeast portion of the SOI include Banner Lava Cap Road, Gracie Road, and Red Dog Road. In the northerly area major roadways include Willow Valley Road, Lewis Road, North Bloomfield Road, Cement Hill Road/Wet Hill Road/Indian Flat Road. In the westerly and southwesterly area major roadways include Old Downieville Hwy and Champion Mine Road, Ridge Road, and Nevada City Highway. Within all these areas there are numerous local roads as well as private roads that provide access to the various uses within the SOI area.

These and other County roads that provide access within the City and SOI Plan Update area are discussed in additional detail below.

## State Routes

State Route 20 (SR 20) connects the City of Grass Valley with Yuba County to the west of Grass Valley and continues north of Nevada City, connecting to I-80. The highway portion between SR 20 to the west of Grass Valley and SR 20 north to Nevada City is signed as shared SR 49/20, and is a principal arterial. This shared route is named the "Golden Center Freeway" between Route 49 south of Grass Valley and SR 20 north of Nevada City (RTP, 2015).

State Route 49 (SR 49) runs north/south and is a principal arterial for Nevada County, connecting the cities of Grass Valley and Nevada City with I-80 in Auburn (Placer County) to the south. SR 20 and SR 49 also serve as an emergency detour route for I-80. SR 49 is the lifeline for much of Nevada County's freight and lumber traffic and also provides access to recreational and tourist attractions. To the west of Nevada City, this route continues in a northerly direction to the Nevada/Yuba County line (RTP, 2015).

## County Roads

The SOI Plan Update area contains a diverse number of local roads within Nevada County. The County maintains approximately 562 miles of roadways some of which occurs in the SOI Plan update area. County roadways provide intermediate and localized access to rural areas of the county, as well as to the more populated cities such as Nevada City. County Roadways fall into six classes and include Interstate Highways and Freeways, Principal Arterials, Minor Arterials, Collectors (Major and Minor), Locals, Regional Emergency Access. Most roads are two lanes. *Table 4.10-1: Nevada County Streets and Roads in the SOI Plan update area by Functional Class*, provides a more listing of major roadways as well as major and minor collectors in the vicinity of the proposed project.

**Table 4.10-1: Nevada County Streets and Roads in the SOI Plan Update Area by Functional Classification**

Full Name	Functional Classification	Start	End
State Highway 20	Principal Arterial	Yuba Co. Line	Grass Valley
State Highway 49	Principal Arterial	Placer Co. Line	Grass Valley
State Highway 49/20	Principal Arterial	Nevada City	Grass Valley

**Table 4.10-1: Nevada County Streets and Roads in the SOI Plan Update Area by Functional Classification**

Full Name	Functional Classification	Start	End
Nevada City Hwy	Minor Arterial	Nevada City	Grass Valley
State Highway 49	Minor Arterial	Yuba County	Placer Co. Line
Alta St.	Major Collector	Grass Valley City Limits	Ridge Rd.
Loma Rica Dr.	Major Collector	Brunswick Rd.	End of Co. Maintained
Magnolia Rd.	Major Collector	Combie Rd.	Red Dog Rd.
Old Tunnel Rd.	Major Collector	Banner Lava Cap Rd.	Town Talk Rd.
Ridge Rd.	Major Collector	Rough and Ready Hwy	Nevada City City Limits
Boulder St.	Minor Collector	Nevada City City Limits	Red Dog Rd.
Cement Hill Rd.	Minor Collector	Nevada City City Limits	End of Co. Maintained
Combie Rd.	Minor Collector	Magnolia Rd.	Darkhorse Dr.
Gracie Rd.	Minor Collector	Nevada City Limits	Banner Lava Cap Rd.
Idaho Maryland Rd.	Minor Collector	Brunswick Rd.	Banner Lava Cap Rd.
Lake Vera Purdon Rd.	Minor Collector	Purdon Rd.	N. Bloomfield Graniteville Rd.
N. Bloomfield Graniteville Rd.	Minor Collector	State Highway 49	Grizzly Hill Rd.
Newtown Rd.	Minor Collector	Pleasant Valley Rd.	State Highway 49
Purdon Rd.	Minor Collector	Oak Tree Rd.	Lake Vera Purdon Rd.
Quaker Hill Cross Rd.	Minor Collector	Red Dog Rd.	Banner Quaker Hill Rd.
Red Dog Cross Rd.	Minor Collector	Banner Lava Cap Rd.	Red Dog Rd.
Red Dog Rd.	Minor Collector	Boulder St.	You Bet Rd.
Scotts Flat Rd.	Minor Collector	State Highway 20	Alpine Meadows Camp
Scotts Valley Rd.	Minor Collector	Willow Valley Rd.	Scotts Flat Rd.
Soda Springs Rd.	Minor Collector	Donner Pass Rd.	End of Co. Maintained
Willow Valley Rd.	Minor Collector	Nevada City City Limits	State Highway 20

Source: Nevada County General Plan Circulation Element, 2010.

\* Note: The functional classification uses different terminology for roadway segments than the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) as shown in Table 4.15- Table 4.15-4: Existing LOS for County Highway Segments, below. The designation are shown this way in the tables to maintain consistency with the source document.

## Existing Roadway Traffic Volumes

Caltrans' published data for 2016 provides peak hour traffic volumes for all State highways within the County. *Table 4.10-2: Existing LOS for County Highway Segments*, provides a summary of the two-way peak hour volumes and LOS achieved on State highway facilities for existing conditions within those highways included to the study that are within the SOI Plan Update area. It should be noted that these traffic volumes include cannabis operations that were in existence in 2016.

**Table 4.10-2: Existing LOS for County Highway Segments**

Highway	Segment	Roadway Classification	Roadway Type	Maximum Peak Hour Service Volume to Satisfy LOS Threshold <sup>1</sup>	Existing (2006)	
					Two-Way Peak Hour Volume	Minimum LOS Achieved?
SR 20	Brunswick Rd to Nevada City, East Junction SR 49	Four-Lane Arterial, Divided	Rural	3,219	3,050	Yes
SR 49	Nevada City, Junction SR 20 to Newtown/Indian Flat Rd	Two-Lane Arterial	Rural	1,539	1,200	Yes

Notes: <sup>1</sup> Based on 2016 Nevada County Regional Transportation Plan

## County Roadway Level of Service

The level of service (LOS) of major roadways is a measure of the operating efficiency of a transportation facility. Letter designations from A (best) to F (worst) are assigned to a road or intersection to describe how well it functions. Levels of service below C occur mainly in the more urbanized areas such as in Nevada City. Although the level of service provides a general indication of the capacity of a roadway, the actual volume of traffic that can be accommodated at each level of service depends on several factors including: number of lanes, width of lanes, width of shoulder, topography, design speed, and vehicle mix (percent auto, truck, etc.). *Table 4.10-3: Two Lane Conventions Highway Level of Service* – provides a description of LOS major roadways and *Table 4.10-4: Two and Four Lane Freeways/Expressways Level of Service* provides a description of the LOS of higher volume roadways.

**Table 4.10-3: Two-Lane Conventional Highways Level of Service Description**

LOS	Demand/Capacity Ratio	Traffic Description
A	<0.34	Free flow, light
B	<0.45	Free flow to stable flow, moderate
C	0.46-0.65	Stable flow, moderate volumes, freedom to maneuver noticeably restricted
D	0.66-0.85	Approaches unstable flow, heavy volumes, very limited freedom to maneuver
E	0.86-1.00	Extremely unstable flow, maneuverability and psychological comfort extremely poor
F	>1.00	Forced delay measured in average flow travel speed (MPH). Signalized segments experience delays >60.0 seconds/vehicle.

Source: Transportation Research Board 2010

**Table 4.10-4: Two and Four Lane Freeways/Expressways Level of Service**

LOS	Demand/Capacity Ratio	Traffic Description
A	<0.34	Free flow
B	0.35-0.52	Free to stable flow, light to moderate volumes
C	0.53-0.69	Stable flow, moderate volumes, freedom to maneuver noticeably restricted
D	0.70-0.92	Approaches unstable flow, heavy volumes, very limited freedom to maneuver
E	0.93-1.00	Extremely unstable flow, maneuverability and psychological comfort extremely poor
F0	1.01-1.25	Forced flow, heavy congestion, long queues from behind breakdown points, stop and go
F1	1.26-1.35	Very heavy congestion, very long queues
F2	1.36-1.45	Extremely heavy congestion, longer queues, more numerous breakdown points, longer stop periods
F3	>1.46	Gridlock

Source: Transportation Research Board 2010

The current and estimated future traffic conditions for significant western Nevada County Road and Highways was provided in the 2015-2035 Nevada County Regional transportation Plan (RTP). The purpose and requirements of the RTP are discussed in the subsequent section of this chapter. The existing LOS of segments of roadway within and adjacent to the SOI Plan update area are provided in *Table 4.10-5 Estimated Future Traffic Conditions for Significant Western Nevada County Roads and Highways*, below. As shown in the table, none of these listed roadways operate at less than an “LOS” D. There are two of the 26 segments that operate at “LOS D,” 10 that operate at “LOS C,” and 14 that operate and “LOS B.”

**Table 4.10-5: Estimated Future Traffic Conditions for Significant Western Nevada County Roads and Highways**

Roadway Segment	Classification	2035 Estimated, Peak Hour	
		Two-Way Volume	LOS
Gold Flat Rd Hawke Ln to Hollow Wy	Two-Lane Arterial	240	C
Gold Flat Rd S. of Gracie Rd	Two-Lane Arterial	240	C
Nevada City Hwy NE. of Brunswick Rd	Two-Lane Arterial	1,370	D
Nevada City Hwy S. of Ridge Rd (Nc Corp Limit)	Two-Lane Arterial	510	C
Nevada City Hwy SW of Banner Lava Cap Rd	Two-Lane Arterial	470	C
Old Tunnel Rd S. of Banner Lava Cap Rd	Two-Lane Arterial	340	C
Old Tunnel Rd N. of Brunswick Rd	Two-Lane Arterial	430	C
Ridge Rd W. of Nevada City Hwy (Nc Corp)	Two-Lane Arterial	590	C
Sutton Wy Solar Dr to Golden Gate Terrace	Two-Lane Arterial	810	C
SR 49 SR 20 to Coyote Street	Two-Lane Arterial	1,160	D
SR 49 W. Broad St/Cement Hill Rd to Elks Lodge Entrance	Two-Lane Arterial	640	C
SR 20/49 W. Empire St to S. Auburn St (Northbound)	Two Freeway Lanes and Auxiliary Lane	1,710	B

**Table 4.10-5: Estimated Future Traffic Conditions  
for Significant Western Nevada County Roads and Highways**

Roadway Segment	Classification	2035 Estimated, Peak Hour	
		Two-Way Volume	LOS
SR 20/49 W. Empire St to S. Auburn St (Southbound)	Two Freeway Lanes and Auxiliary Lane	1,880	B
SR 20/49 South Auburn St to E. Bennett St (Northbound)	Two Freeway Lanes	1,560	B
SR 20/49 South Auburn St to E. Bennett St (Southbound)	Two Freeway Lanes	1,730	B
SR 20, South of Idaho-Maryland (Northbound)	Two Freeway Lanes and Auxiliary Lane	2,140	B
SR 20, South of Idaho-Maryland (Southbound)	Two Freeway Lanes and Auxiliary Lane	2,480	B
SR 20/49 Idaho Maryland Rd to Brunswick Rd (Northbound)	Two Freeway Lanes and Auxiliary Lane	1,600	B
SR 20/49 Idaho Maryland Rd to Brunswick Rd (Southbound)	Two Freeway Lanes and Auxiliary Lane	1,950	B
SR 20/49 Brunswick Rd to Gold Flat Rd (Northbound)	Two Freeway Lanes	1,530	B
SR 20/49 Brunswick Rd to Gold Flat Rd (Southbound)	Two Freeway Lanes	1,440	B
SR 20/49 Gold Flat Rd to Sacramento St (Northbound)	Two Freeway Lanes	1,320	B
SR 20/49 Gold Flat Rd to Sacramento St (Southbound)	Two Freeway Lanes	1,110	B
SR 20, Mill Street to Sr-49 (Eastbound)	Two Freeway Lanes and Auxiliary Lane	550	B
SR 20, Mill Street to Sr-49 (Westbound)	Two Freeway Lanes and Auxiliary Lane	890	B
SR 20 SR 49 to Nevada Street/Manzanita Diggins Dr	Major Two-Lane Highway	390	C
Source: Fehr & Peers, 2016.			

## Nevada County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)

The adopted Nevada County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is meant to guide transportation investments in Nevada County through 2035. The RTP is a cooperative effort between the Nevada County Transportation Commission (NCTC), the County of Nevada, the incorporated cities within the County, Caltrans, and the residents of Nevada and was adopted in 2017. Additionally, the RTP is consistent with the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) and the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) and includes involvement and outreach to the general public as well as the Native American tribes within the County (NCTC 2016).

The RTP also identifies a range of improvements to address existing and future transportation deficiencies including: level-of service improvements; improvements that better balance roadway use between motorized vehicles, transit, bicycles, and pedestrians; and safety improvements. Within the SOI Plan Update area or in close proximity within existing City jurisdiction, there are three long term project improvements listed in the RTP that can reasonably be expected to be funded and constructed between 2025 and 2035. There is project listed as unconstrained. Unconstrained projects are that that are

unfunded but that may be constructed prior to the year 2035 if additional revenues are realized or funded by future development. The RTP does not show any short-term projects for the project or adjacent areas. The three long-term projects and one unconstrained are shown listed below.

### Long-Term Project(s):

SR 20/49 at Uren St.- includes intersection improvements. This improvement would be funded by local RTMF funds and would occur at a date to be determined.

SR 49 at Coyote St.- includes intersection improvements. This improvement would be funded by local RTMF funds and would occur at a date to be determined.

SR 20/49 SB Off Ramp at Ridge Rd./Gold Flat Rd – includes widening southbound off ramp and addition of a right turn lane. This improvement would be funded by local RTMF funds and would occur at a date to be determined.

### Unconstrained Project(s):

Nevada City Hwy./ Banner Lava Cap Rd. – this project is a regionally significant project and includes intersection improvements. The funding source is to be determined and would occur at a date to be determined.

### *Existing Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities*

In the incorporated jurisdictions in Nevada County, pedestrian facilities most often consist of sidewalks and shared bicycle facilities, while in the unincorporated more rural areas such as those in the SOI Plan Update area, if trails are available, they are typically unpaved and are still used for shared use by cyclists and pedestrians. Outside of the developed areas, walking is less common due to the distance between origins and destinations, lack of sidewalks, and automobile-oriented development. To increase the number of people who walk for utilitarian and recreational purposes, the NCTC adopted a Pedestrian Improvement Plan in March 2011 which was subsequently amended in May 2012 and July 2014 to add two projects neither of which are located in the City or SOI Plan Update area.

The RTP Identified 15 segments of bicycle improvements including one Class I bike path, 13 Class III bike paths, and one Bicycle Detection project. The bike paths also could be used by for pedestrian activities. For areas within the Nevada County, the RTP identified a total of 50 improvements. Of the 50 bike paths, there are approximately 10 within the SOI Plan Update area and includes the following:

**Table 4.10-6 – Bikeway Improvements Summary**

Improvement	Segment	Distance
Class I bike Path along Combie Road	SR-49 to existing Class I	0.75 miles
Class II bike lanes on Nevada City Highway	Nevada City city limits to Grass Valley City limits	0.09
Class II bike lanes on Old Tunnel Road	Banner Lava Cap Road to Grass Valley city limits	0.09 miles
Class II bike lanes on Ridge Road	Pear Orchard Road to Nevada City city limits	0.54 miles
Class II bike lanes on Ridge Road	Grass Valley city limits to Pear Orchard Road	0.91 miles
Class III bike route on Banner Lava Cap Road.	Idaho Maryland Road to Red Dog Road	2.50 miles
Class III bike route on Old Downieville Highway	SR-49 to Nevada City city limits	1.52 miles

**Table 4.10-6 – Bikeway Improvements Summary**

Improvement	Segment	Distance
Class II bike route on Willow Valley Road	Scotts Flat Road to SR-20	0.29
Class III with multi-use shoulder on Red Dog Road	Nevada City limits to Quaker Hill Cross	2.45 miles
Class III with multi-use should on Willow Valley Road	Nevada City city limits to Scotts Valley Road	1.50

Source: RTP

## TRANSIT SERVICES AND FACILITIES

Transit services in western Nevada County are provided through a Joint Powers Agreement executed between Nevada County, the City of Grass Valley, and Nevada City. The Nevada County Transit Services Division (TSD) is responsible for the operation and management of the two public transit systems in western Nevada County. The two systems are the Gold County Stage (GCS) Fixed Route transit service, and the Gold Country LIFT Demand Response Paratransit Service. (NCTC RTP 2018).

Gold County Stage Fixed Route Transit Service consists of a fixed route transit system that connects population, commercial, and employment centers throughout western Nevada County. GCS operates six routes that serve the Nevada City/Grass Valley area and the unincorporated area of western Nevada County, and also provides regional connections to Placer County.

### 4.10.2 REGULATORY SETTING

Traffic analysis in California is guided by policies and standards set at the state level by Caltrans and at the local level by the applicable jurisdictions. At the Federal level, for the SOI Plan update, regulation would be related to the Nevada County Airport located south of Banner Lava Cap Road. Each level of regulation and the associated agencies are discussed below.

#### Federal

There are no federal laws or regulations pertaining to transportation and circulation that are relevant to the proposed project. However, as explained in Section 3.2: Regulatory History and Background, even though cannabis is “decriminalized” under State law, and even with the U.S. Department of Justice (USDOJ) issuance of memoranda guiding federal law enforcement related to cannabis activities within jurisdictions that have legalized cannabis, cannabis activities continue to be illegal at the federal level and are subject to the prosecutorial discretion of the federal government.

#### ***Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)***

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) regulates aviation at regional, public, private, and military airports. The FAA regulates objects affecting navigable airspace. According to 49 Code of Federal Regulations Part 77.13, any person/organization who intends to sponsor any of the following construction or alterations must complete FAA form 7460 for FAA approval of:

- Any construction or alteration exceeding 200 feet above ground level.

- Any construction or alteration:
  - Within 20,000 feet of a public use or military airport, which exceeds a 100:1 surface from any point on the runway;
  - Within 10,000 feet of a public use or military airport, which exceeds a 50:1 surface from any point on the runway; and
  - Within 5,000 feet of a public use heliport, which exceeds a 25:1 surface.
- Any highway, railroad, or other traverse way whose prescribed adjusted height would exceed the above-noted standards.
- When requested by the FAA.
- Any construction or alteration located on a public use airport or heliport regardless of height or location.

## State

### ***California Department of Transportation***

#### *California Department of Transportation Statewide Transportation Improvement Program*

The Caltrans Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) is a multi-year, statewide, intermodal program of transportation projects that is consistent with the statewide transportation plan and planning processes, and metropolitan plans. Caltrans prepares the STIP in cooperation with the Metropolitan Planning Organizations and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies. The STIP contains all capital and non-capital transportation projects or identified phases of transportation projects for funding under the Federal Transit Act and Title 23 of the U.S. Code.

#### *California Department of Transportation Interregional Transportation Improvement Program*

Caltrans' five-year ITIP is prepared pursuant to Government Code 14526, Streets and Highways Code Section 164, and the California Transportation Commission's STIP Guidelines. Regional agencies work with Caltrans to identify projects that will address improvements to the interregional transportation system and improve the movement of people, vehicles, and goods between regions.

### ***State Scenic Highways***

California's Scenic Highway Program was created by the Legislature in 1963. The purpose of the program is to preserve and protect scenic highway corridors from change that would diminish the aesthetic value of the lands adjacent to highways. A highway may be designated scenic depending on how much of the natural landscape can be seen by travelers, the scenic quality of the landscape, and the extent to which development intrudes on the traveler's enjoyment of the view.

In Nevada County, SR 20 from Skillman Flat Campground (14 miles east of Nevada City) to one-half mile east of Lowell Hill Road is an officially designated state scenic highway. Additionally, most other highways within the county have been identified as eligible state scenic highways but have not been officially designated. These highways include much of SR 20 and SR 49. The status of a State Scenic Highway

changes from eligible to officially designated when the local jurisdiction adopts a scenic corridor protection program that is approved by Caltrans.

### ***California Department of Transportation Concept Records***

Caltrans is responsible for the planning, design, construction, operation, and maintenance of all state-owned roadways, including SR-20 and SR-49. Caltrans provides administrative support for transportation programming decisions made by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) for State funding programs. The State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) is a multi-year capital improvement program that sets priorities and funds transportation projects envisioned in long-range transportation plans. The Caltrans Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies provides general guidance regarding the preparation of traffic impact studies for projects that may have an impact on the State Highway System. The Caltrans Highway Design Manual (HDM) establishes uniform policies and procedures for State highway designs.

TCRs have been completed by Caltrans for the state highway system serving the County. TCRs are Caltrans long-range (20-year) planning documents for each state highway route that describe the conceptual improvement options for each given transportation route or corridor. The TCRs identify existing and forecasted travel data, route maps, and a list of planned, programmed, and needed projects for each highway over the next 20 years. TCR's identify how a highway will be developed and managed in order to deliver a targeted level of service (Concept LOS) that is feasible to attain over a 20-year planning horizon. Concept LOS represents the minimum acceptable service conditions over the next 20 years. TCRs for the State highways in the County and their respective Concept LOS are listed below.

#### ***SR 20 Transportation Concept Report (Caltrans 2013)***

- Concept LOS D on all expressways
- Concept LOS E on 2-lane conventional highways
- Concept LOS E on 4-lane freeways

#### ***SR 49 Transportation Concept Report (Caltrans 2017)***

- Concept LOS D on all segments

### ***Nevada County Regional Transportation Plan 2016 Update***

The NCTC which is the designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency for Nevada County, is required by California law to prepare, adopt, and submit an updated RTP to Caltrans and the CTC every five years. The 2016 RTP documents Nevada County's regional transportation needs for the next 20 years and establishes a cost-feasible action plan to meet those needs. The RTP includes policies and guidelines for use of federal, state, and local funding. Development of updates to the RTP is a cooperative effort between NCTC, Caltrans, and other stakeholders, including but not limited to Native American tribes, local transit authorities, local service providers, and the general public (NCTC RTP 2018).

The 2016 RTP demonstrates close ties to the RTIP, ITIP, STIP, the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP), the California Transportation Plan, and the California Strategic Highway Safety Plan (NCTC 2016).

The purpose of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is to establish transportation policy and to document the short-term (2015-2025) and long-term (2025-2035) regional transportation needs covering the RTP horizon and to set forth an effective, cost-feasible Action Plan to meet these needs. The 2016 RTP guides transportation investments in the region, with the goal of creating and maintaining a comprehensive, multimodal, safe and efficient transportation system. The plan outlines projects for roadway and transit networks, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, aviation, railroad facilities, goods movement, intelligent transportation systems, transportation system management, air quality, and transportation safety to provide an integrated, multimodal transportation system.

### ***Regional Transportation Mitigation Fee Program***

The Regional Transportation Mitigation Fee (RTMF) Program was adopted in 2016 and established a mitigation fee schedule to finance improvements to the regional network of street and roads that are needed to for the increased traffic that would result from new development in western Nevada County. The fee program has been adopted by Grass Valley, Nevada City, and the Nevada County and is administered by the Nevada County Transportation Commission (MCTC) through agreements with those agencies. Fees are collected based on the land use and number of trips that would be generated. Residential is assessed a fee of \$396.00 per trip and non-residential uses are assessed a fee of \$70.00 per trip.

Within the SOI Plan Update area or immediately adjacent areas, there are three capital improvements programs. This includes the SR-20 and SR-49 southbound ramps at Ridge Road and Goldflat Road, SR-20 and SR-49 at Uren Street, and SR-49 at Coyote Street.

## **Local**

### ***Nevada County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP)***

The Nevada County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) was adopted by the Nevada County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) on September 21, 2011. The plan sets compatibility criteria applicable to local agencies in their preparation or amendment of land use plans and ordinances and to land owners in the design of new development. The influence area extends 1.7 miles from the airport's runway. The plan is used by the ALUC staff to define compatibility for noise, safety, airspace protection, and overflight as it pertains to newly proposed projects in the vicinity of the Airport.

### ***Nevada City General Plan***

Government Code 665302 (b)(1) establishes the requirements for General Plan Circulation Elements. The code requires that a Circulation Element shall consist of “the general location and extent of existing and proposed major thoroughfares, transportation routes, terminals, any military airports and ports, and other local public utilities and facilities, all correlated with the land use element of the plan. The

circulation element is intended to address circulation and capacity needs, safety and emergency access, and non-motorized transportation. In addition, the circulation element is supposed to identify the functional classification of roads and level-of-service requirements.

The Nevada City General Plan (NCGP) is the guiding document related to development within the City but recognizes that the RTP (discussed above) should be the basis for the City Circulation Element. At the same time the NCGP notes that the single most important purpose of the NCGP is to preserve the existing essential character of the City, which can be seen in the discussion of transportation. The NCGP notes that the City has numerous twisting and dead-end streets that add to the eccentricities that add to the unique character of the town and should be preserved. The street patterns; however, creates the potential for congestion and safety issues even though the traffic volumes are relatively low. Nevada City maintains the goal of preserving the City character in terms of circulation and doing so by diverting traffic to the highways separated from development by wooded greenbelts. The NCGP has circulation related objectives and policies further describing the desired roadway network and while also keeping in mind the regional objectives and policies outlined in the RTP.

According to the RTP, Nevada City does not have a LOS policy, but instead seeks to maintain “reasonable traffic levels.”

#### Objectives

- Cooperate with the county in fulfilling the aims of the current RTP.

#### Policy

- Use the County RTP as the basis for the Nevada City Circulation Element subject to adoption of the current version by the City Council.
- All circulation improvements shall be consistent with the circulation plan Map and classifications.

#### *Local Circulation*

#### Objectives

- Limit Road widening and other major change to the characteristic street pattern. Rather, use these eccentricities as traffic capacity constraints, and encourage added traffic to be diverted as directly as possible to the highways.
- Improve the access to the few freeway interchange points, since they are to receive a large portion of future added traffic.

#### Policies

- Maintain reasonable traffic levels on local streets to protect residents from the harmful effects of noise, fumes, and safety hazards.
- Limit development served by traffic capacity constraints

- Require proposed development served by the Gold Flat interchange to contribute to coordinated evaluation and implementation of needed traffic improvements in the area, as determined by RTP proposals and cost estimated, or else an independent evaluation prepared for Nevada City.
- Encourage construction of pedestrian and bicycle pathways where appropriate to provide safe alternatives to vehicular traffic.

### ***Nevada City Zoning Ordinance***

The Nevada City Zoning Ordinance uses a development fee structure established at the time of issuance of all building permits to help cover some of the cost of new and improved roadways. Section 16.08.010 notes a finding that new development within areas to be annexed create a burden on the circulation system as defined in the RTP. Accordingly, new development will pay fees in accordance with the RTP until such time the new circulation element of the NCGP is adopted. The development fees are to be saved in a separate account used to construct road improvements identified in the RTP and specifically the Western Nevada County RTP Mitigation Fee Administrative Plan. The fees are to be used to improve those areas of the circulation system within the urban area as defined in the RTP which are most impacted by the new development for which a building permit or conditional use permit is being sought.

### ***Nevada County Transportation Commission***

The Mission of the Nevada County Transportation Commission (NCTC) is to Plan, Communicate and Coordinate with the citizens and decision-makers of Nevada County, Grass Valley, Nevada City, Truckee, and Caltrans to create a balanced regional transportation system. The NCTC initiates design concepts, engineering feasibility studies, environmental studies, and proposes funding sources to construct transportation improvements. Once these tasks are completed, projects are turned over to Caltrans or to a local jurisdiction for construction (NCTC, 2019).

---

## **4.10.3 STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines, the effects of a project are evaluated to determine whether they would result in a significant adverse impact on the environment. An EIR is required to focus on these effects and offer mitigation measures to reduce or avoid any significant impacts that are identified. The criteria used to determine the significance of impacts may vary depending on the nature of the project. According to Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, the proposed project would have a significant impact related to land use and planning, if it would:

- Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities.
- Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3 subdivision (b).
- Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).
- Result in inadequate emergency access.

Evaluation of the potential impacts of the SOI Plan update on transportation was based on a review of the NCGP, Zoning Ordinance, regional transportation plans, and other applicable and related policy documents. It should be noted that a project does not necessarily result in a significant impact absent perfect compliance with these documents, rather a project is consistent if, taken in view of the whole of the action, it is in overall agreement in the implementation of the plans. In other words, a project does not have to strictly or substantially conform to every applicable general policy.

Based on these standards, the effects of the SOI Plan update have been categorized as either a, “less than significant” impact or a, “potentially significant” impact. Mitigation measures, where applicable, are recommended for potentially significant impacts. If a potentially significant impact cannot be reduced to a less than significant level through the application of mitigation, it is categorized as, “significant and unavoidable”

### ***Methodology***

The evaluation of potential impacts related to transportation is based on a review of existing transportation facilities and conditions, and transportation-related plans and policies relevant to the proposed project. Due to the scope of the implementation of the SOI Plan update, and because specific land uses and projects that could occur within future annexation areas are not known at this time, the analysis is not able to quantitatively evaluate changes to the levels of service of intersections and segments of roadway. In addition, because much of the SOI Plan Update is currently built with uses, in many areas, substantial new development is not anticipated. Unless denser development is proposed as part of future actions an increase in traffic-related impacts is not anticipated. Therefore, this analysis addresses general expectations of traffic within the SOI Plan Update area and adjacent areas and the potential indirect environmental effects of the proposed project.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines recently underwent revisions that will take effect in July 1, 2020. As part of the revision, transportation impacts are to be evaluated using vehicle miles traveled (VMT) instead of the traditional Level LOS. VMT is a measure of the actual miles that an individual in their vehicle travel as opposed to LOS which measures the relative flow of vehicles as determined by potential delays and the time it requires to travel from one point to the next. As part of the CEQA update, Jurisdiction were given until the July 1, 2020 date to implement new thresholds of significance based on the guidance to use VMT and specifically thresholds guidelines are shown in State CEQA § 15064.3 Determining the Significance of Transportation Impacts. At this time neither the City nor LAFCo have adopted thresholds or standards of significance that include an analysis of VMT. Therefore, within this section of the document, when appropriate, LOS is used to describe traffic conditions; however, a qualitative analysis of VMT is used when possible and appropriate and in conjunction with the availability of transit or other alternative means of travel that may reduce the overall vehicle trips and total miles traveled.

## **4.10.4 PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION**

The proposed project consists of an update to the SOI Plan for the City (proposed project). This EIR evaluates four project alternatives. The following impact evaluation focuses on the LAFCo/City Preferred

Consensus Alternative (Consensus Alternative) which has been identified as the Preferred Alternative in accordance with CEQA requirements. Impacts for the other alternatives are discussed in Chapter 6.0 Alternatives. In some instances; however, impacts related to the overall SOI Plan update may be presented when applicable and to help illustrate the environmental effects in the framework of the overall SOI Plan update. The impacts are discussed in terms of direct and indirect impacts. Direct impacts are those that occur immediately upon initiation of a project such as ground disturbance or demolition of existing structure(s). Indirect impacts occur when a project would induce growth into areas such as through the extension of infrastructure and that extension could facilitate new development or result in an annexation that could enable future development.

## **Impact**

### ***Impacts Discussion Overview***

The Impacts Discussion Overview describes the characteristics of the Consensus Alternative development potential, assumptions for provision of services, and includes City and environmental review requirements. The discussion immediately following is applicable to both Impact TR-1 through TR-4, below, but is provided here to avoid repetitive discussion.

The Consensus Alternative would update the SOI Plan area, and future development projects within the area under the authority of the City would only occur in conjunction with annexation to the City. The Consensus Alternative would update the SOI Plan area, and future development projects under City jurisdiction would occur only after being annexed to the City. The majority of these undeveloped areas within the Consensus Alternative area are designated for estate residential, rural residential, or open space with minor areas designated for planned development, employment centers, public uses, or service commercial. Development in these areas is anticipated to be consistent with the existing City designations.

The six potential development areas identified by the City are discussed throughout this document. These sites do not yet have development approval and the specific project footprints are unknown. The anticipated timeline for built out would occur over a period of years and is anticipated to be at similar densities as to what is shown in the project description and in accordance with existing City planning documents.

Within the Consensus Alternative boundaries there are four priority annexation areas, Priority Annexation Area #1, #2, #3, and #4. These areas in general are already developed, are in close proximity to, or are already being served by existing water or wastewater lines. These areas are in logical locations for extension of City municipal services and represent a logical progression of City boundaries. The sites consist of an existing Caltrans facility, the County Juvenile Hall, a cemetery and rural residential development. There are no development plans for these areas; however, a few vacant lots exist with the potential to be used for rural residential uses. Land uses consistent with existing designation on these sites would contribute a low volume of traffic and would not result in substantial trips resulting in a significant impact.

All future development within the Consensus Alternative area, including the six potential development areas identified by the City and described above would be subject to City design and review as part of City's project review process. All projects would be evaluated for consistency with the NCGP, Nevada City Municipal Code, and Nevada City Design Guidelines. The City also has authority to prezone all future annexations to Nevada City to ensure consistency with the surrounding area. Additionally, the City has the authority to and would specify conditions to ensure that future projects would incorporate all required elements of the listed development guidance documents including the RTP and required mitigation fees that would help maintain the integrity and consistency of land uses. The project by project review also would include a City led CEQA analysis and as applicable, would require additional project specific mitigation measures or binding conditions of approval to reduce impacts related to environmental issue that could be affected by changes to land use.

***Impacts TR-1: Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?***

A potentially significant impact to traffic and circulation would occur if the Consensus Alternative would conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable plans, policies, or ordinances related to transportation, circulations, and transit. The Consensus Alternative does not include any proposal for new development and would not entitle any projects that would directly result in any construction activities. The proposed project; therefore, would not result in any direct increases of traffic or use of the circulation system or result in any physical changes to the circulation system that would alter its patterns of use.

The Consensus Alternative would not result in any direct changes to any existing land uses or change any land use regulations or designations. Such changes could occur upon the initiation of a new project or if a modification to land uses are proposed as part of a future annexation. The Consensus Alternative does not include any amendments but does suggest future pre-zoning of parcels consistent with other planning efforts. The Consensus Alternative would not result in any direct impacts to any roadways or other element of the circulation system. Development of the six potential development areas described above; however, will be subject to the City's review and regulation when development plans are submitted, and/or application(s) filed. At this time the City would determine if projects are consistent with applicable transportation programs, plans, ordinances, or policies and require changes to project design if needed.

As discussed above, it is anticipated conformance with all the listed City and environmental regulatory requirements would ensure future projects within the Consensus Alternative area are consistent with the City standards and implementation of the RTP. The City would use the regional traffic model and capital improvements plan as part of analysis of future planning actions and development of mitigation. Development of mitigation in this way would substantially assist in the development of measures that would reduce the traffic impacts of future development in the SOI. Accordingly, all future annexation projects enabled by the Consensus Alternative would be required to implement applicable mitigation already contained in the RTP. All future projects would be required to pay appropriate City fees to help pay for needed roadway, bicycle, transit and other improvements and to meet transportation goals.

Lastly, all future project would be required to undergo separate CEQA analysis. This analysis would ensure analysis of the projects conformance with applicable programs, plans, ordinances, and policies addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities. As part of this analysis, the City also would coordinate with Caltrans as needed for project support and to ensure projects within the Consensus Alternative area are consistent related policy documents and roadway, transit, and alternative transportation design. All projects would be required to pay appropriate City fees and it is anticipated the projects would make necessary project specific improvements to transportation facilities as required by the City. These improvements combined with required environmental resource protections would ensure conflicts remain less than significant and mitigation is not required.

**Mitigation Measures:** No Mitigation Measures are Required.

**Impact TR-2:                    *Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?***

As discussed above CEQA guidelines recently underwent revisions that will take effect in July 1, 2020 and jurisdictions were given until this date to implement new thresholds of significance. At this time neither the City nor LAFCo have adopted thresholds or standards of significance that include an analysis of VMT. According to the revised guidelines, a qualitative analysis of VMT can be used when possible and appropriate and in conjunction with the availability of transit or other alternative means of travel that may reduce the overall vehicle trips and total miles traveled.

The project does not propose, nor would it directly result in any construction or development within the Consensus Alternative area. Implementation of the Consensus Alternative would not have any direct impacts to travel within the City increase the VMT, or result in a reduction in the LOS of area roadways. The proposed project would not authorize any development and there are no specific development plans proposed. The proposed project is limited to an adjustment to the SOI boundary to enable future annexations.

Indirect impacts and increases to VMT and decreases in LOS if areas are annexed and future projects occur could, depending on the density of future development and existing capacity of surrounding roadways, affect the efficiency of roadways. Due to the anticipated timing of future actions it is anticipated that thresholds used to evaluate traffic impacts of projects that would be enabled by the Consensus Alternative would be evaluated by the City using VMT in accordance with the listed CEQA guideline.

The Consensus alternative does include the six potential development areas, future development of these areas would be subject to the City's review and regulation when development plans are submitted, and application(s) are filed. Potential future annexation and/or development of these properties would generate an unknown number of vehicle trips on area roadways. To account for these trips, additional analysis will be required at the time formal development applications are made and when the nature of the final projects are known.

Regarding the four priority annexation areas, most of the area Priority Annexation Area #1 is located adjacent to the terminus of the southern boundary of the City SCCD at Gold Flat Road and adjacent to SR-

20. There are no plans for further development of this area. It has been designated as a priority annexation area in consideration of the fact that the City has extended sewer service to the existing CalTrans facility within this area. Priority Annexation Area #2 abuts the southern right-of-way of SR-49 in the western portion of the Consensus Alternative update area. This area is not proposed for any new development but contains the County Juvenile Hall and is currently connected to the City's wastewater system. The new VMT generated from these areas is anticipated to be very low or not increase due to an annexation because expansion is not proposed.

Priority Annexation Area #3 contains 19 parcels, three of which are connected to the City sewer system and two are undeveloped. Extension of services could result in service to the two undeveloped parcels and other developed sites. Priority Annexation Area #4 contains 22 parcels including a cemetery and 18 intervening privately owned properties, some of which are developed with rural residential homes. Annexation of these areas could result in extension of services to existing developed and undeveloped areas. If services are extended to developed sites it would not induce additional construction. Although extension of services could result in development of undeveloped sites, the development is anticipated to be consistent with the land use designations and the City would pre-zone these parcels and hence, existing development. All future development plans in these areas would be subject to the design review process to ensure consistency with applicable planning regulations. VMT generated from these areas also is anticipated to be very low because they are already substantially developed.

In addition to the above listed areas, extension of services that would be enabled by the Consensus Alternative could result in additional annexations of other properties within the SOI. All future development plans in these areas would be subject future CEQA review. Although the scale of the development is anticipated to be small, VMT would be calculated to account for the overall distance of automobile travel attributable to future projects. Other considerations that would be evaluated as part of the subsequent CEQA review would include a determination of a project's locations within a half mile of either an existing major transit stop or a stop along an existing high-quality transit corridor. In these instances, projects would be presumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact based on revised CEQA guidance. Projects that decrease vehicle miles traveled in a project area compared to existing conditions also would be presumed to have a less than significant transportation impact.

Although the Consensus Alternative does not propose any transportation projects, fees and mitigation imposed by the City as part of the future annexation process could indirectly fund such projects within the City and County. For these types of projects, it is presumed that no impact on vehicle miles traveled would occur and they would be presumed to cause a less than significant impact. For roadway capacity projects that development fees may be applied toward, such as project listed and previously analyzed in the EIR for the RTP, agencies have discretion to determine the appropriate measure of transportation impact consistent with CEQA and other applicable requirements. Therefore, impacts in this regard would be less than significant, and mitigation as part of this project is not required.

***Mitigation Measures:*** No Mitigation Measures are Required.

***Impact TR-3: Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?***

The City boundaries and the SOI area includes hilly and mountainous terrain with some narrow and winding roadways with limited sight radius and limited nighttime lighting. These conditions can increase the potential for accidents and other vehicle collisions.

The project does not propose, nor would it directly result in any construction or development within the Consensus Alternative area. Implementation of the Consensus Alternative would not directly result in any road development that would increase a hazard due to design features or incompatible uses.

Indirectly, the annexation of areas within the Consensus Alternative area could result in new roadway development needed to serve the future projects. All of the existing Priority Annexation areas, six potential development areas, and other areas within the SOI largely adjacent to local roadways which provide access to existing major roadways. If new development is proposed in these areas it is anticipated that the new development would not require substantial new roadway development and that new driveways or short new local roadways would connect with existing roads.

The City Zoning Ordinance contains Article X – Design Standards. More specifically, Chapters 16.04.590 - Access Requirements; 16.04.600 – Alignment of Streets, 16.04.610 – Resubdivision, 16.04.620 – Intersections, 16.04.630 Street Requirements, and 16.04.640- Alleys. These sections of code set forth the design standards that must be met for the listed as determined by the City Engineer. In addition, Chapter 10.12 Traffic Control Devices discusses the installation authority given to the Chief of Police for traffic control devices for the purposed of guiding and warning traffic and to protect life or property from exceptional hazards.

Annexations would be needed to enable future projects approved by the City and would be evaluated on a project by project basis. This would include an evaluation of conformance with the listed City development regulations, any Caltrans roadways design requirements, and approval by the City Engineer. Any roadway improvements made as part of a future annexation would be required to meet all roadway design standards. Review would include a site-specific evaluation and considered CEQA to determine if the proposed project would substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment). If a determination is made, the engineer would require modifications to the plan or implementation of mitigation such as placement of signage, speed restrictions, or lighting to reduce the impacts. Therefore, indirect impacts in this regard would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

***Mitigation Measures:*** No Mitigation Measures are Required.

***Impact TR-4: Result in inadequate emergency access?***

The project does not propose the development, construction, or improvement of any roadways as part of the SOI update. Because no specific land use plan is defined, apart from establishing the updated SOI boundary, existing land uses are anticipated to remain largely unchanged and would not be directly

affected by the proposed project. As areas containing roadways that are currently County maintained area annexed, depending on the location and connectivity of the roadway, the City and County would determine if the roadway would remain under county control or if the City would assume responsibilities. The SOI update would not directly cause any additional or immediate demand for emergency access within or adjacent to existing roadway infrastructure.

Indirectly; however, it is reasonable to anticipate that due to future annexations and associated land development additional roadways and roadway capacity would be needed in some areas to accommodate emergency access. This is anticipated to increase the demand for circulation and roadway services. As discussed in Impacts TRANS-3, above, all new roadways and connections to existing roadways would be reviewed by the City Engineer to ensure that all safety standards are met. This would include an evaluation of turning radius, roadway width, weight capacity, and inclusion of emergency vehicle turn-arounds, etc., are included to all future project designs. Therefore, conformance with all the listed code requirements and City review and approval, indirect impacts of future projects would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

**Mitigation Measures:** No Mitigation Measures are Required.

---

## 4.10.5 CONCLUSION

The Consensus Alternative would not result in any direct impacts associated with adoption of the revised SOI Plan update. The proposed project does not include any new development or any entitlements that would directly impact roadways, VMT, LOS, roadway safety or emergency access.

Indirectly, annexation would likely lead to new development within newly annexed areas of the City. New development and construction of new roadways, could, if the projects and roadways not properly designed, conflict with an applicable policy or transportation planning document, or result in a new or exacerbated hazard or inadequate emergency access. Additionally, new projects would increase the VMT within the City and region. As discussed above, all future projects would undergo additional design review and CEQA evaluation. This is anticipated to reduce impacts to TRANS-1, TRANS-3, and TRANS-4, to less than significant.

Regarding the potential for future projects to result in the addition of substantial VMT as discussed in TRANS-2, above, the City has not yet adopted thresholds for the CEQA analysis of VMT. The deadline for the adoption and use is July 1, 2020. As discussed, due to the location and nature of the existing and likely development within the Consensus Alternative area substantial new developments that generate large volumes of VMT are not anticipated. However, all such projects would undergo separate CEQA analysis at the time of annexation. At this time, the City would be able to require design changes, impose mitigation, or require certain project elements to reduce the additional vehicle trips to less than the thresholds adopted. Therefore, in regard to the proposed project, both direct and indirect impacts are less than significant.

## 4.10.6 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The adoption of the Consensus Alternative would not directly result in any vehicle trips to the local or regional roadway system. The proposed project would adjust the SOI boundary including four priority annexation areas to enable the extension of public services to areas that could logically be served by the City. Within these areas, as well as adjacent areas into which cumulative growth could be induced land uses are anticipated to be similar with low-density residential uses resulting in a low overall number of trips generated and distributed to the local and regional roadway network. Existing roadways within the SOI Plan Update Area generally have above a “LOS C.” Although not all roadways segments are classified in the RTP, a substantial number are shown in *Table 4.10-5*, none of these roadways and roadway segments are below a “LOS D.” Additionally, as shown in the RTP for all western Nevada County roads a substantial majority operate at “LOS C” or better with seven roadways or roadway segments operating at “LOS E” or “LOS F.”

Other projects that may occur in the future, such as the six potential development areas identified by the City are part of the cumulative analysis and, if constructed, would contribute vehicles to the area roadways and increase the overall VMT within the City and County. The six potential development areas would result in an estimated development potential of 170-622 total units. These properties are within one mile of Nevada City and within approximately five miles of Grass Valley. Nevada City and Grass Valley are the nearest major trip attractors and are anticipated to account for local trips for shopping and other routine needs. This account is a proxy for potential trips and VMT for these future projects and it is fully anticipated some future residents would make longer daily trips to more distant locals. To account for these trips, additional analysis will be required at the time formal development applications are made and when the nature of the final projects is known.

Each future project that occurs within the City or is annexed into the City from SOI, would be required to pay the City’s traffic impact mitigation fees. The fees would be required to be paid at permit issuance based on the City’s current fee schedule. It is anticipated that some of the fees would go toward projects improving the availability of mass-transit within the City as well as improvements to pedestrian and bicycle facilities to encourage alternative travel. Thus, the Consensus Alternative contribution to cumulative traffic operation impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

The potential for inadequate emergency access is a site-specific issue. Emergency access to future project sites would be provided primarily via existing public and private roadways, and access driveways that would be required to meet the City’s road standard (or access design that has the same practical effect) and the City’s access standards. Thus, the project’s contribution to cumulative emergency access impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

***Mitigation Measures:*** No Mitigation Measures are Required.

*This page intentionally left blank.*