Resource Management Agency
COUNTY OF TULARE
AGENDA ITEM

AGENDA DATE: June 30, 2020 – REVISED

Public Hearing Required	Yes ☐	N/A ☒
Scheduled Public Hearing w/Clerk	Yes ☐	N/A ☒
Published Notice Required	Yes ☐	N/A ☒
Advertised Published Notice	Yes ☐	N/A ☒
Meet & Confer Required	Yes ☐	N/A ☒
Electronic file(s) has been sent	Yes ☒	N/A ☐
Budget Transfer (Aud 308) attached	Yes ☐	N/A ☒
Personnel Resolution attached	Yes ☐	N/A ☒
Agreements are attached and signature line for Chairman is marked with tab(s)/flag(s)	Yes ☒	N/A ☐

CONTACT PERSON: Celeste Perez PHONE: (559) 624-7010

SUBJECT: First Amendment Sequoia Gateway, LLC Development Agreement (DEV 18-001)

REQUEST(S):

That the Board of Supervisors:

1. Approve the First Amendment to Sequoia Gateway, LLC Development Agreement No. 29180 (DEV 18-001); and
2. Authorize the Chair of the Board of Supervisors to sign the First Amendment to the Sequoia Gateway, LLC Development Agreement; and
3. Approve the Addendum to the Sequoia Gateway Environmental Impact Report.
4. Authorize the Clerk of the Board to record the agreement with the Clerk-Recorder.

SUMMARY:

The Sequoia Gateway, LLC Development Agreement (DEV 18-001) was approved on June 4, 2019. This is the first amendment to that agreement, which does change, and supersedes some of the terms of the original agreement. The 126.9-acre Sequoia Gateway Commerce and Business Park Specific Plan was approved by Resolution No. 2018-0938 and Ordinance No. 3549 ("the Project") on December 4, 2018. The Developer has completed the rough grading and basin improvements per the Improvement Plans. The Board approved the Community Facilities District (CFD) in June of 2019. The first phase grading plan permits were issued in May.

Amendment to the Development Agreement includes clarifications in Recitals D. Phase 1 Highway Commercial and Valley Children's Medical Offices and Phase 2-Highway Commercial / Mixed Use/ Regional Retail. Section 4.05 Major

Infrastructure Improvements and Section 9.02 Transfer Agreements.

This amendment is based on more recent determinations of the timing and amount of traffic mitigation required for the project based on updated traffic studies, per Caltrans, the CEQA document and per this development agreement. It also addresses the final design and procurement for the offsite sewer facilities, as agreed to by the City of Visalia. This Amendment is also for clarifications and modifications sought by the transferees (i.e. Valley Children's Hospital) in regards to the timing and nature of financial obligation requirements, as other properties are being transferred as well.

The project is located south of Avenue 280 (Caldwell Avenue) at the southeast corner of State Route 99 and Avenue 80, approximately one mile west of the City of Visalia in Tulare County.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:

In accordance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), an EIR was approved by the BOS on December 4, 2018 (SCH # 2016091017). The attached Addendum to the EIR includes City sewer connection analysis, and the results of an updated traffic study that does not change the analysis of the EIR, but qualifies traffic mitigation during the first phase of the project.

FISCAL IMPACT/FINANCING:

No Net County Cost to the General Fund, since the applicant funds the matter. The Development Agreement and Community Facilities District provides for the long-term funding mechanisms to provide payment of offsite impact fees to the City and County for the Project's impacts to services in the area.

LINKAGE TO THE COUNTY OF TULARE STRATEGIC BUSINESS PLAN:

Approval of the First Amendment Sequoia Gateway LLC Commerce and Business Park Development Agreement is linked to two initiatives of Tulare County's Strategic Business Plan: Economic Well-Being and Quality of Life as the subdivision, if approved, will constitute appropriate financing for this project and foster orderly growth in compliance with the General Plan.

SUBJECT: First Amendment to Sequoia Gateway, LLC Development Agreement (DEV 18-001)
DATE: June 30, 2020

ADMINISTRATIVE SIGN-OFF:

Aaron R. Bock, MCRP, JD, LEED AP
Assistant Director

Michael Washam
Associate Director

Reed Schenke P.E.
Director

cc: County Administrative Office

Attachment No. 1 – First Amendment to Sequoia Gateway, LLC Development Agreement (DEV 18-001)
Attachment No. 2 – Addendum to Environmental Impact Report (SCH # 2016091017)

BEFORE THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF TULARE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE MATTER OF FIRST AMENDMENT TO THE SEQUOIA GATEWAY LLC DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT (DEV 18-001)	**)** **)** **)** **)**	**Resolution No.**_____ **Agreement No.** _____

UPON MOTION OF SUPERVISOR _____, SECONDED BY SUPERVISOR _____, THE FOLLOWING WAS ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, AT AN OFFICIAL MEETING HELD _____, BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSTAIN:
ABSENT:

ATTEST: JASON T. BRITT
COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER/
CLERK, BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

BY: _____
Deputy Clerk

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

1. Approved the First Amendment to Sequoia Gateway, LLC Development Agreement No. 29180 (DEV 18-001); and
2. Authorized the Chair of the Board of Supervisors to sign the First Amendment to the Sequoia Gateway, LLC Development Agreement; and
3. Approved the Addendum to the Sequoia Gateway Environmental Impact Report.
4. Authorized the Clerk of the Board to record the agreement with the Clerk-Recorder.

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION MODIFICATONS

2.1. OVERVIEW

Proposed Project

The proposed project consists of a Specific Plan/Corridor Plan for the development of a highway commercial/regional commercial center, known as Sequoia Gateway Commerce and Business Park ("Sequoia Gateway project"), on approximately 126.9 acres at the southeast quadrant of State Route 99 and Caldwell Avenue (Avenue 280) in the unincorporated area of Tulare County (See Figure PD-1). The Sequoia Gateway project is proposed to be developed in two major phases, including: Phase 1, consisting of highway commercial uses such as fast-food outlets, retail, and gas station fueling pumps with associated convenience store, along with a medical clinic buildings on approximately 26.1 acres in the northwest corner of the project site, and; Phase 2, comprising a mix of commercial land uses including regional retail, hotel, office, restaurant, and fast-food uses on approximately 100.8 acres. . Project development would occur in accordance with the detailed planning and design guidelines and standards set forth in the "Sequoia Gateway Commerce and Business Park Specific Plan". Phase 1 would commence development in the near-term upon approval of entitlements and permits for that initial phase of development. Phase 2 would commence development at such future time as the planned reconstruction of the State Route 99/Caldwell Interchange, currently programmed for completion in 2024, is completed, and other prerequisite criteria are met for moving forward with permitting and entitlements for that latter phase of development.

Associated Infrastructure Elements

Several infrastructure elements are planned in support of the Sequoia Gateway Commerce Park. These include the following: 1) transportation improvements such as the construction of internal roadways and frontage improvements along Caldwell Avenue including the installation of a traffic signal at the project entrance,; 2) construction of to the City's wastewater treatment plant through an offsite sewer main/lateral; 3) extension of a California Water Service Company (Cal Water) water main along Caldwell Avenue from its Visalia District distribution system; 4) construction of offsite and onsite utility connections for gas, electric and other "dry" utilities; and, 5) construction of an integrated stormwater management system including the use of bioswales, porous pavement, a storm drain system, and detention basins. The project's infrastructure elements are described in detail subsequently in this chapter.

Previous Approvals and Entitlements

a. In December 2013, the Tulare County Board of Supervisors approved an Application for a General Plan Initiation (GPI) for a General Plan Amendment for the Sequoia Gateway project pursuant to the Regional Corridor Policies of the County General Plan. (See Section *3.9. Land Use and Planning* for a detailed description of applicable Genera Plan policies and an analysis of the consistency of the Sequoia Gateway project with those policies.)

b. On December 4, 2018 the Tulare County Board of Supervisors approved and certified the EIR for the project and approved the entitlements for it, including a General Plan Amendment, Special Use Permit, a Specific Plan, the framework of a Development Agreement, and the Commercial Parcel Map.

c. On June 4, 2019, the Tulare County Board of Supervisors adopted the Sequoia Gateway Development Agreement by Ordinance 3549 based on Planning Commission Recommendation Resolution No. 9549 and Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 2018-0938.

2.2. SANITARY SEWER COLLECTION AND TREATMENT MODIFICATIONS

Under this project modification, the project would connect to the existing City of Visalia 48" sanitary sewer line at the intersection of Walnut Avenue and Aviation Way. Project wastewater would be conveyed to the City system by a new 6,300-foot connecting sewer which would be installed in a sewer easement due north of Sequoia Gateway Drive. The sewer line will be located in a the area designated for extension of Sequoia Gateway Drive that will be improved by Caltrans. Attachment A shows the alignment of offsite sewer line. The sewer line will go through areas subject to future development as designated on the Visalia General Plan. Development of and service to these areas is not part of this project since those properties are zoned agriculture and are not entitled to development. However, the sewer line has been sized to accommodate those properties when they are approved for development by the City of Visalia.

The project wastewater would be conveyed to the City's Water Conservation Plant located east of SR-99 and south of SR-198. Given the relatively low volume of wastewater flows generated by the project (i.e., 90,000 gpd), compared to City-wide flows (i.e., 10.7 million gpd), the increment of collection and treatment required for the project would not necessitate physical improvements to the City's existing sewer system or treatment plant (i.e., permitted treatment capacity 20 million gpd) to accommodate the project (see "Wastewater Treatment and Disposal" below for further discussion)(Cal Water 2016, p. 58). The Sanitary Sewer Design analysis conducted by 4Creeks in Attachment B hereof demonstrates that there is adequate trunk line and treatment plant capacity. As such, the following analysis of the off-site wastewater collection and treatment alternative is focused on the potential impacts associated with installation of the connecting sewer main in comparison to those impacts discussed in the EIR.

Environmental Analysis of Wastewater Alternative

The impacts associated with the off-site wastewater collection and treatment alternative are discussed below and compared to the impacts associated with the proposed on-site treatment facilities, and compared with the impacts associate with the offsite sewer alignment analyzed in the EIR.

Aesthetics: The construction activities for the connecting pipeline would not be visible to neighboring residents and motorists, and the pipeline would not be visible after completion. No physical improvements would be required for the City's existing sanitary collection system or the Water Conservation Plant to accommodate the wastewater flows from the project. As such, the visual impacts

associated with the wastewater collection and treatment alternative would be less than those analyzed in the EIR.

Agricultural Resources: Under the off-site wastewater collection and treatment alternative, the connecting pipeline to the City's sanitary sewer system would be installed entirely on existing agricultural properties that have been actively and continuously farmed and cultivated. After completion of the pipeline, the surface area would be restored to its original grade and farming operations would resume. There would be no conversion of agricultural land. By comparison, the proposed on-site treatment plant would occupy 2.5 acres of Prime Farmland which is currently under cultivation for row crops. The offsite sewer option would reduce the severity of the agricultural impacts associated with the project. Therefore, the agricultural impacts associated with the off-site treatment alternative would be less than those resulting from the planned on-site treatment facilities, and would be less than significant in either case.

Air Quality: During construction, the connecting sewer for the off-site treatment alternative would involve trenching and filling of approximately 126,700 square feet (2.9 acres) of area along the 1.2-mile pipeline route. This would result in dust generation and exhaust emissions from construction equipment and vehicles. The dust emissions would be mitigated through required dust control measures prescribed by the air district. The Project with the onsite wastewater treatment plant would involve grading and filling 2.5 acres of area on the wastewater treatment plant site, plus grading and filling 3,250 lineal feet (1.5 acres) of trenching from Phase 1 to the onsite wastewater treatment plant for a total graded area of 4.0 acres. The construction of the proposed on-site treatment facilities would result in similar amounts of emissions as the off-site treatment alternative, with dust emissions largely controlled and exhaust emissions being relatively minor. Therefore, the air quality impacts associated with the modified off-site treatment alternative would be less than the planned on-site facility, and both would be less than significant in either case, and less than those of the Project.

With respect to climate change, the planned on-site treatment facilities and off-site treatment alternative would generate similar small amounts of greenhouse gas emissions associated with construction and operation, as discussed above for air pollutant emissions.

In summary, the air emissions from the off-site treatment alternative would be similar to those associated with the planned on-site treatment facilities, and less than those from the offsite sewer alternative evaluated in the EIR. The air quality and climate change impacts would be mitigated to less-than-significant levels in either case. Therefore, the level of air quality and climate change impacts resulting from the off-site treatment alternative would be similar to those associated with the planned on-site treatment facilities.

Biological Resources: Under the off-site wastewater collection and treatment alternative, the connecting pipeline to the City's sanitary sewer system would be installed entirely within areas that are under active and continuous cultivation for row crops and cover crops. There are no trees along the proposed route which could provide nesting habitat for raptors and other migratory birds. The off-site treatment alternative would not require any improvements to the existing City of Visalia sanitary sewer system or water conservation plant, and thus would not affect biological resources in the vicinity of the existing facilities. There are two proposed irrigation ditch crossings. These crossing would be under the irrigation ditches to avoid impacts to wetland areas. The planned on-site treatment facility site also has

low habitat value. Approximately 1.5 acres of the adjacent Nelson Pit would used for disposal and storage of treated wastewater. The Nelson Pit could provide habitat for burrowing owls and other protected bird species, as well as wetland species. No sensitive species were identified during biological surveys of the project site and Nelson Pit. Under the off-site treatment alternative, pre-construction surveys for protected species would be required which would ensure that disturbance to any newly established nests by raptors or other migratory birds would be avoided through pre-established mitigation procedures, as required for the planned project and treatment facilities. Therefore, the level of potential biological impacts associated with the off-site treatment alternative would be similar to the impacts resulting from the planned on-site treatment facilities, and would be mitigated to less-than-significant levels in both instances.

Cultural and Paleontological Resources: Under the off-site wastewater collection and treatment project modification, the connecting pipeline to the City's sanitary sewer system would be installed entirely within existing farmed areas which are highly disturbed and thus have a low potential to yield intact cultural material. A cultural resources inventory search identified no recorded cultural sites, and the archaeological field survey found no visible evidence of cultural resources along or in the vicinity of the pipeline route. The off-site treatment project modification would not result any improvements to the existing City of Visalia sanitary sewer system of water conservation plant, and thus would not affect cultural resources in the vicinity of the existing facilities. Similarly, no evidence was found of potential cultural resources in the vicinity of the planned on-site treatment facilities. However, it is possible that previously undiscovered buried resources could be encountered during site grading and development along the connecting pipeline route or at the planned on-site treatment facility site. Under the off-site treatment project modification, pre-established mitigation procedures will be implemented in the event of discovery of cultural resources during construction, as required for the planned project and on-site treatment facilities. Therefore, the level of potential cultural resources impacts associated with the off-site treatment alternative would be similar to the impacts resulting from the planned on-site treatment facilities, and would be mitigated to less-than-significant levels in both instances.

Geology and Soils: The off-site treatment project modification and the onsite treatment facilities are subject to very similar soil conditions and levels of seismic hazard. Both are located well outside an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, so the possibility of ground surface rupture is remote in either case. Both would be subject to ground shaking from an earthquake centered on the regional faults such as the San Andreas fault, the Owens Valley fault, or the White Wolf fault. The potential for these and other seismic hazards, such as liquefaction or seismically-induced settlement, to significantly affect either alternative would be subject to detailed geotechnical investigations. The site soils would also be evaluated for expansion potential and subsidence. These studies would evaluate the geologic and soils hazards and would identify appropriate mitigation measures to minimize risks associated with any such hazards in either case. Given the similarity of soil and seismic conditions, and given that the potential impacts would be mitigated to less-than-significant levels in either case, the level of geologic impacts resulting from the off-site treatment alternative would be similar to the impacts associated with planned on-site treatment facilities.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials: For both the off-site treatment project modification and the planned on-site treatment facilities, the past and current agricultural operations in the immediate vicinity would have involved the storage and use of fuels, pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers. While there is a potential for residual contamination from these activities in both cases, the potential for associated hazard would be fully investigated and remediated, as appropriate, in accordance with federal, state, and local regulations.

The construction and operation of both the originally planned and offsite treatment project modification would involve the use of various fuels and materials which are classified as hazardous materials. In the case of the on-site treatment facilities, a hazardous materials management plan and response plan would be prepared and implemented in case of accidental spill or unauthorized release of hazardous materials. Under the off-site treatment alternative, a potential rupture of the connecting sewer would be dealt with in accordance with City of Visalia emergency plans for such spill events. Since the incremental wastewater flows from the project would not necessitate any physical improvements to the Water Conservation Plant, the potential for increased risk from hazardous materials at the treatment plant would be less than significant.

In summary, the level of hazardous materials impacts resulting from the off-site treatment alternative would be similar to the impacts associated with planned on-site treatment facilities, and would be less than significant in both instances.

Hydrology and Water Quality: The potential for surface water quality impacts during construction of the connecting pipeline for the off-site treatment project modification would be similar to those associated with the on-site treatment facilities. During grading and construction, stormwater runoff would have the potential to erode exposed soils and result in sedimentation in either case. Due to the relatively level terrain, the potential for surface water pollution could be readily mitigated in both cases through standard erosion and sediment controls, and the resulting water quality impacts would be less than significant in both cases.

With respect to flooding potential, neither the connecting pipeline for the off-site treatment project modification nor the planned on-site treatment facilities are located within a FEMA-designated floodplains or floodways. As such, the potential flooding impacts would be less-than-significant in either case.

Regarding impacts to groundwater and surface waters, the off-site treatment project modification would involve treatment of project wastewater flows at the City of Visalia Water Conservation Plant which provides tertiary treatment to recycled water standards for reuse in irrigation of landscaped open space and crops, and for groundwater recharge. The on-site wastewater facilities that were originally planned would also provide treatment to tertiary levels for application of recycled water to project landscaping and recharge. Therefore, the impacts to groundwater under the off-site treatment alternative would be similar to those associated with the planned on-site treatment facilities, and would be less than significant in both cases. Impacts to surface water from the offsite sewer project modification would be negligible. The offsite sewer line will pass under, but not across two irrigation canals with a minimum clearance depth of 6.5 feet and reinforce concrete casings below the bottom of the irrigation culverts to eliminate potential for frack outs and blow outs.

Land Use and Planning: The potential for land use conflicts would be less for the off-site treatment project modification. Along the connection pipeline route, the nearest residences are located less than 1,000 feet away and would not be subject to temporary noise and dust generated by grading and construction activity when it occurs nearby. At the on-site treatment facilities originally planned for the site, the nearest residences are at least 1,000 feet away where construction effects would be barely noticeable. Treatment processes often involve objectionable odors and conflicts would have occurred with the onsite treatment approach originally planned for the site. The offsite treatment facilities will be completely enclosed, and actual treatment of the wastewater will occur several miles away from existing residences. Upon completion, the off-site treatment of sewer flows would be buried underground and would have no land use impact. The planned on-site treatment facilities would be

located above ground but would be at least 1,000 feet from existing residences where any noise or dust effects would be less than significant. On balance, the level of land use impacts associated with the off-site treatment alternative would be less than those resulting from the planned on-site treatment facilities.

Noise: Under the off-site treatment alternative, the construction of the connecting sewer line to the City of Visalia system would not result in temporary significant noise impacts since there are no residences near the pipeline route. The construction of the on-site treatment facility originally planned would be at least 1,000 feet from the nearest residences, where the construction noise could be audible but would not be significant. In summary, the off-site treatment alternative would not result in a greater level of noise impacts than the on-site treatment facility originally planned for the site.

Public Services: Neither the off-site treatment alternative nor the planned on-site treatment facilities would result in demand for fire, police, or emergency services. Thus, the impacts to public services resulting from the off-site treatment alternative would be similar those associated with the planned on-site treatment facilities, and would be less than significant in both cases.

Transportation/Traffic: The construction of the connecting pipeline for the off-site treatment project modification would be outside of existing City and County streets and there would be no disruption of local traffic resulting from construction equipment maneuvering in the roadway rights-of-way. Since no physical improvements would be required for the City's existing sanitary collection system or the Water Conservation Plant to accommodate the wastewater flows from the project, no construction traffic would be generated. The on-site wastewater facilities originally planned for the Project would generate significant construction traffic, although this traffic would be an integral component of traffic generated for overall construction of Phase 2 of the Sequoia Gateway project. During project operation, the off-site treatment project modification would generate the same or less traffic than the planned on-site treatment facility would generate minimal traffic. Therefore, the traffic impacts resulting from the off-site treatment project alternative would be similar to or less than those associated with the planned on-site treatment facilities, and would be less than significant in both cases

Utilities and Service Systems: The demand for water supply and the solid waste disposal would be determined by overall project demands and not by the means of wastewater treatment and disposal. Usage of the offsite wastewater option would result in the elimination of the potential for the use of recycled water for Project landscaping, which would increase the use of potable water by 126 Acre-Feet according to the estimates in Table USS-3 in the EIR. The Project would still result in a reduction in the groundwater usage of 386 Acre-Feet per year under the existing agricultural operations to 221 Acre-Feet per year under the off-site sewer modified project. The water supply impacts under the off-site treatment project modification would be greater, but still less then significant because there will be an overall reduction of current groundwater use.

Wastewater Treatment and Disposal: Under the off-site treatment project modification, Project wastewater would be conveyed to the City of Visalia Water Conservation Plant where it would be subject to tertiary treatment. The City's water conservation plant treats approximately 10.7 million gallons per day (mgd) of wastewater (Cal Water 2016), which is well below its permitted capacity of 20 mgd. Therefore, the City's plant has sufficient capacity to accommodate the 0.082 mgd of wastewater flows that would be generated by the Sequoia Gateway project without the need for expansion or modification of the existing treatment plant. The City's treatment plant is continuous monitored and is

staffed full time, and any environmental issues that may result from operational issues would be less than those for the onsite system. Therefore, the level of impact to wastewater treatment and disposal resulting from the off-site treatment project modification would be similar to or less than that of the d on-site treatment facility originally planned for the project, and would be less than significant in both cases.

Conclusion

In summary, the impacts associated with the project modification to use an off-site sewer line and offsite wastewater treatment along the alignment proposed would be similar to or less than those associated with the on-site treatment facilities originally planned for the Project. For all other impact categories, the impacts associated with the off-site treatment alternative would be similar to those resulting from the planned on-site treatment facilities. Therefore, the off-site treatment alternative would not result in environmental impacts that were analyzed for the Project or the offsite altnernative discussed in the EIR. As such, the off-site treatment along the modified alignment alternative would represent an environmentally superior alternative to the on-site treatment plant planned for the Sequoia Gateway project.

2.3. TRAFFIC IMPROVEMENT MODIFICATIONS/EXPANSION OF PHASE 1

Under this project modification, the proposed traffic signals at the intersections of the northbound and southbound State Highway 99 ramps with Caldwell would be eliminated. Instead, the southbound intersection would be improved with a stop sign in the eastbound direction, and the northbound ramp intersection with Caldwell would be improved with a four-way stop, and a dedicated right turn from the northbound ramp to eastbound Caldwell. These traffic signals were thought to be needed based on the project of traffic resulting from the 116 planned, approved and anticipated project identified in Figures 18A and 18B of the traffic study that were expected to be fully operational by opening day of the Project. According to a review of those project, 36 out of the 116 projects itemized on Figures 18A and 18B did not occur, and are not expected to occur in the near term. Consequently, a focused traffic study was prepared to determine whether or not these signals were needed under these modified conditions. Caltrans and the County may not permit the installation of traffic signals or other traffic control unless they meet the minimum traffic warrants contained in the Manual for Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD). The traffic study also analyzed the level of service for the subject intersection with the expansion of Phase 1.

TJKM consultants prepared a traffic study that was based on intersection obtained by recent traffic studies in the area. These traffic counts were considered representative of those resulting from any planned, approved and anticipated projects. The traffic counts were substantially less than those projected in the EIR. According to TJKM's analysis, "The Highway 99 southbound ramp and Caldwell Avenue does not meet the signal warrants in the AM and PM Peak Hours." Modified improvements were proposed as follows:

1. Installing (or continuing) all way stop (sign) control at the intersections. Note that all way stop sign control is currently in place at the Caldwell Avenue/Drive 85B (NB Ramps) intersection.

2. Modifying the striping at the WB Caldwell Avenue approach to Drive 85 (NB Ramps) intersection to a separate left-turn only lane, and shared thru-right with an adjacent bike lane. This would change the current configuration which includes a shared thru-left lane, and separate right turn lane with the bike lane splitting the lanes.

TJKM analyzed the traffic impacts and levels of service with these improvements and found that with a dedicated right turn lane that the peak hour warrants were not met for this intersection as well. With the modified improvements proposed, the southbound ramp operates at LOS C at the full buildout of Phase 1, and the northbound ramp operated at LOS D at the full buildout of Phase 1. Both are acceptable to the County and Caltrans, especially given the improvements that Caltrans will be making to the intersection starting in 2022.

The modified improvements affect a smaller area of land than the signals that were originally proposed and which were evaluated in the EIR, and therefore the affect on the environment is deemed to be less than that analyzed in the EIR.

Conclusion

The modified improvements affect a smaller area of land than the signals that were originally proposed and which were evaluated in the EIR, and therefore the affect on the environment is deemed to be less than that analyzed in the EIR.