

## **3.12 Traffic**

### **3.12.1 Physical Setting**

#### **Methodology**

This section describes the existing transportation network, including roadways which provide access to the SBSP Restoration Project Area. It also includes a summary of the physical setting, at regional and project levels, and the regulatory setting, and evaluates the potential impacts associated with implementation of the SBSP Restoration Project. This traffic impact analysis is based on the traffic volumes identified by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and local jurisdictions and maps prepared by the regional transit service providers.

#### **Regional Setting**

The SBSP Restoration Project Area spans the east, south, and west sides of South San Francisco Bay. The transportation network in and around San Francisco Bay consists of state highways, surface streets, railways, public transit systems, and air systems. A series of highways rings the Bay, with interconnections provided by bridges crossing the open water. Major north-south trending roadways include:

- Interstate 880 (I-880), which extends along the east side of the Bay and connects I-80 in Oakland to State Route (SR) 17 in San Jose. In the SBSP Restoration Project Area, I-880 is east of the Eden Landing and Alviso pond complexes;
- US Highway 101 (US 101), which extends along the west side of the Bay and travels the length of California from Oregon to Mexico. In the SBSP Restoration Project Area, US 101 extends along the peninsula and south of the Alviso pond complex through the cities of Menlo Park, East Palo Alto, Mountain View and Sunnyvale;
- I-280, which extends along the west side of the Bay. I-280 originates in San Francisco and trends south through San Jose, where it connects to I-680; and
- I-680, which originates north of Suisun Bay and extends south to the junction with I-280 in the South Bay (southeast of the Alviso pond complex).

Major east-west trending highways and bridges that provide connections to the communities on both sides of the Bay include:

- I-80, which passes through Oakland and connects to US 101 in San Francisco via the San Francisco – Oakland Bay Bridge;
- SR 92, which originates from I-880 in Hayward and crosses the Bay via the San Mateo Bridge and continues west to Half Moon Bay. In the SBSP Restoration Project Area, SR 92 defines the northern boundary of the Eden Landing pond complex;
- SR 84, which originates from I-880 in the East Bay and crosses the Bay via the Dumbarton Bridge to San Gregorio. In the SBSP Restoration Project Area, SR 84 extends through the Ravenswood pond complex; and

- SR 237, which originates from I-680 in Milpitas and runs south of San Francisco Bay to its connection with SR 85 in Sunnyvale. In the SBSP Restoration Project Area, SR 237 is south of the Alviso pond complex.

Within each individual jurisdiction, the local traffic network consists of arterial streets, collector streets, and local streets. Typically, arterial streets accommodate through traffic and are located around rather than through residential neighborhoods, commercial centers, and industrial areas. Collector streets supplement and provide access to arterial streets and provide access to neighborhoods; on such streets, the needs of through traffic and turning and parking must be balanced. Local streets primarily provide access to abutting properties; ease of access, pedestrian safety, and parking have priority over traffic movement.

The public transit network consists of the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) subway, buses, and the train. BART provides service in the eastern portion of the SBSP Restoration Project Area, passing through the East Bay cities of Hayward, Union City and Fremont generally east of the Eden Landing pond complex; BART does not provide service in the peninsula portion of the Project Area or in the South Bay. Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District (AC Transit) provides service throughout the East Bay as well as express service across the Dumbarton Bridge and Bay Bridge to San Francisco. San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans) provides bus service throughout San Mateo County and into parts of San Francisco and Palo Alto. Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) operates buses and light rail that serve the urbanized portions of Santa Clara County.

The Union Pacific Railroad network extends through the region on both sides of the Bay and provides both freight and passenger service. Amtrak's Capitol Corridor route provides intercity rail passenger service between Sacramento and San Jose. Caltrain provides rail service between San Francisco and San Jose.

A number of airports are located around the Bay, including the San Francisco International Airport, Oakland International Airport, and the Norman Y. Mineta San Jose International Airport. Smaller private and public airports are scattered throughout the Bay Area, including Moffett Federal Airfield (see Figures 3.9-2 through 3.9-4 in Section 3.9, Land Use).

San Francisco Bay is a major navigational and recreational water body that connects the three SBSP Restoration Project pond complexes via watercraft.

## **Project Setting**

### ***Eden Landing***

SR 92 bounds the Eden Landing pond complex to the north, and I-880 is approximately two miles to the east. According to the Caltrans Traffic and Vehicle Data Systems Unit, traffic volumes in 2005 for SR 92 between the San Mateo-Hayward bridge toll plaza and Clawiter Road were 8,000 vehicles during the peak hour<sup>1</sup> and 96,000 average daily traffic (ADT) during the peak month<sup>2</sup> (Caltrans 2005).

<sup>1</sup> Peak hour values indicate the volume in both directions; in urban and suburban areas, the peak hour normally occurs every weekday.

The primary access to the Eden Landing pond complex is via SR 92 and Eden Landing Road through the ELER and along internal roads that previously supported salt production operations. Access at this location is for CDFG staff only as the pond complex is mostly off-limits to the public (except for users of existing trails and hunters on specific hunt days). Public access to the Eden Landing pond complex is available only along trails that extend along the perimeter of the pond complex, including those along the east side of the ELER and along the ACFCC. As described in Section 3.7, Recreation Resources, bicyclists and pedestrians are allowed on these trails, but off-trail access is prohibited. Staging areas for the trails occur at various points east of the pond complex along the trails. Roadways in the vicinity of the ELER include Eden Landing Road, Arden Road, Trust Way, Baumberg Avenue, and the residential streets in the Eden Shores development. These roadways are accessible from other local roadways and either SR 92 or I-880. Coyote Hills Regional Park provides access to the ACFCC trail.

No AC Transit bus lines travel to the Eden Landing pond complex. Two bus routes travel along streets to the east of the pond complex, including Route 83 that travels along Clawiter Road, Eden Landing Road, and Arden Road. Route S travels along Eden Shores Boulevard and terminates at the western end of the street.

The Hayward Executive Airport is approximately 2.5 miles to the north of the Eden Landing pond complex. The Union Pacific Railroad extends through the City of Hayward in the north-south direction between the pond complex and I-880 (outside the pond complex).

**Ponds E8A, E8X and E9.** Ponds E8A, E8X, and E9 are in the center of the Eden Landing pond complex and are not directly accessible via local roadways. Existing levees that ring these ponds provide access for CDFG staff to conduct O&M activities. Public access is not allowed within the ponds except during specific waterfowl hunting dates.

**Ponds E12 and E13.** Ponds E12 and E13 are in the northern portion of the Eden Landing pond complex but are not directly accessible via local roadways. Existing levees that ring these provide access for CDFG staff to conduct O&M activities. Public access is not allowed within the ponds except during specific hunt dates.

### **Alviso**

The primary access to the southern portion of Alviso pond complex is provided by US 101 or SR 237 and surface streets. In 2005, traffic volumes for US 101 between Moffett Boulevard and SR 85 (west of, but the closest location to the pond complex where traffic data were collected) were 11,000 vehicles during the peak hour and 164,000 peak month ADT (Caltrans 2005). In 2005, the traffic volumes for SR 237 between the Great America Parkway and North First Street (the closest location to the pond complex, south of the community of Alviso) were 10,200 vehicles during the peak hour, and 137,000 peak month ADT (Caltrans 2005).

---

<sup>2</sup> The peak month average daily traffic (ADT) is the average daily traffic for the month of heaviest traffic flow. This data is obtained because on many routes, high traffic volumes which occur during a certain season of the year are more representative of traffic conditions than the annual ADT

Because large portions of the Alviso pond complex are open to the public as a recreational facility (for hiking, waterfowl hunting, and wildlife viewing), a number of access points are available. Most of these access points allow bicycle or foot traffic only, but motor vehicles are allowed at certain locations to reach duck blinds during waterfowl hunting season (see Section 3.7, Recreation Resources, for more information on public access).

Access to the Alviso pond complex is provided from the recreational facilities, which can be reached by I-880, I-237, and local streets, including North First Street and Grand Boulevard (which provide access to the Refuge), Caribbean Drive (which provides access to Sunnyvale Baylands Park), and North Shoreline Boulevard (which provides access to the Mountain View Shoreline Park).

No VTA transit bus lines travel to the Alviso pond complex. Several bus routes travel along streets south of the pond complex, including Routes 120, 122, 104, 40, and 51 (Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority 2006).

Airports in the vicinity of the Alviso pond complex include Moffett Federal Airfield to the south of Ponds A2E, AB2, and A3W; Palo Alto Municipal Airport less than 1.5 miles to the west; and Norman Y. Mineta San Jose International Airport, approximately five miles to the south.

The Union Pacific Railroad crosses the Alviso pond complex in the north-south direction and extends along Ponds A12, A13, A15, A16, A17 past the historic town of Drawbridge as well as the Island Ponds (A20 and A21).

**Pond A6.** Pond A6 is in the north-central portion of the Alviso pond complex away from any local roadways. Internal roads provided by the existing levees extend around the perimeter of the pond, and are accessible only to existing USFWS staff for O&M activities. Public access is not allowed within Pond A6.

**Pond A8.** Pond A8 is in the south-central portion of the Alviso pond complex. It is not adjacent to any local roadways with direct access to the site. Existing levees around this pond provide access for USFWS staff to conduct O&M activities.

**Pond A16.** Pond A16 is located in the southeastern portion of the Alviso pond complex. It is not adjacent to any local roadways with direct access to the site. An existing trail on the levee surrounding Pond A16 provides pedestrian access as well as access for USFWS staff to conduct O&M activities. The Union Pacific Railroad tracks extend along the west side of this pond.

### **Ravenswood**

The western segment of the Dumbarton Bridge / SR 84 extends through the Ravenswood pond complex, and the Bayfront Expressway bounds the site to the south. In 2005, the traffic volumes for SR 84 between Willow Road and University Avenue (south of the pond complex) were 4,950 vehicles during the peak hour and 70,000 peak month ADT (Caltrans 2005). US 101 is approximately one-half mile to the southwest. The traffic volumes for US 101 in 2005 between Willow Road and Marsh Road (west of

the pond complex) were 12,500 vehicles during the peak hour and 186,000 peak month ADT (Caltrans 2005). The Ravenswood pond complex is accessible via SR 84 and Bayfront Expressway.

SamTrans transit bus lines travel to the Ravenswood pond complex. One bus route travels along SR 84, the DB/DB1 line (San Mateo County Transit District 2006).

The Dumbarton Rail corridor (owned by SamTrans) extends through the City of Menlo Park in the east-west direction south of (and outside of) the pond complex and the Bayfront Expressway. San Carlos Airport is situated less than five miles to the northwest.

**Pond SF2.** Pond SF2 is directly south of SR 84. The traffic volumes for SR 84 are provided above.

### **3.12.2 Regulatory Setting**

Cities and counties are responsible for planning, designing, constructing, operating and maintaining local public roadways within their jurisdictions. These entities issue encroachment permits whenever construction activities will be conducted within public rights-of-way. Encroachment permits are intended to safeguard the affected jurisdictions' properties, either by providing preventive measures to be implemented during project construction, or providing corrective measures if damage occurs.

#### **State**

Any encroachment within the right-of-way of a state highway or route would be subject to Caltrans' regulations, including issuance of an encroachment permit and the provision of temporary traffic control systems. Such a system could include traffic control warning signs, lights, and/or safety devices to ensure the safety of the traveling public.

#### **Local**

Any encroachment within the right-of-way of a City or County roadway would require an encroachment permit and the provision of temporary traffic control systems, as required by the public works department of the affected jurisdiction.

### **3.12.3 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

#### **Overview**

This section includes an analysis of potential short-term (construction) and long-term (operation) traffic impacts of the SBSP Restoration Project. In addition, mitigation measures are recommended, as necessary, to reduce significant traffic impacts.

#### **Significance Criteria**

For the purposes of the EIS/R, a significant traffic impact would occur if the Project would result in the following:

- Cause traffic operations on a roadway or at an intersection to degrade (*e.g.*, due to increased traffic generated by construction vehicles and/or loss of a travel lane to accommodate the construction work zone);
- Cause a substantial increase in traffic relative to the traffic volume of the local traffic network;
- Result in lengthy delays for transit riders;
- Result in an inadequate parking capacity;
- Substantially impede access to local streets or adjacent uses, including emergency access;
- Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that would result in substantial safety risks;
- Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (*e.g.*, sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (*e.g.*, farm equipment);
- Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (*e.g.*, bus turnouts, bicycle racks); or
- Temporarily or permanently disrupt rail operations.

The SBSP Restoration Project is not expected to result in lengthy delays for transit riders and would not impede access to local streets or adjacent uses (including emergency access) as all construction activities would occur within the boundaries of the three pond complexes; no lane or road closures would occur on any roadways as a result of construction or operation of the proposed Project. The Project would not increase hazards due to design features or incompatible uses as the Project would involve only restoration of wetlands and inclusion of recreational facilities within open space areas away from public roads. Recreational facilities proposed along levees within the SBSP Restoration Project Area boundaries would be designed in accordance with relevant guidelines and regulations, and would not constitute a hazard for those who use the facilities. In addition, the Project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. The inclusion of recreational facilities (such as new trails that would connect existing trails) has the potential to support alternative transportation by increasing the use of bicycles and human-powered boats to access destinations via existing and new trails, including for commuting purposes. Disruptions to rail operations are discussed in Section 3.16, Utilities of this EIS/R.

As explained in Section 3.1.2, while both CEQ Regulations for Implementing NEPA and the CEQA Guidelines were considered during the impact analysis, impacts identified in this EIS/R are characterized using CEQA terminology. Please refer to Section 3.1.2 for a description of the terminology used to explain the severity of the impacts.

## **Approach to Analysis**

### **Construction**

**Program Alternatives.** Construction activities would require the importation of soil to construct the proposed levees that provide flood protection, to fill or block borrow ditches, and to create upland transitional habitat. Over the 50-year planning horizon for the Project, as much as 10 to 15 million cy of fill may be imported to the SBSP Restoration Project Area for these activities, which could occur as part

of subsequent phases or between phases for storage within the pond complexes. The material may be brought to the Project Area by barge and/or by trucks. Assuming the fill is transported via trucks with storage capacity of 20 cubic yards (cy) per truck, as many as 750,000 two-way truck trips would be generated. Assuming truck trips would occur over the 50-year planning period, up to 136 one-way daily truck trips would be generated daily for the delivery of fill material<sup>3</sup>. This assumption is calculated for the purposes of environmental analysis in this EIS/R due to the uncertainties associated with the actual amount of fill that would be required and the timing of delivery of such fill. The actual number of daily, one-way, construction-related truck trips delivering fill could be more or less than 136, depending on whether portions of the fill would be delivered by barge and the actual number of days during which such deliveries would occur. Detailed evaluations of traffic impacts based on more realistic estimates will be conducted as part of project-level environmental review for future phases of the Project.

Although the locations and timing of future Project phases and the actual amount of imported fill required for each phase have not yet been determined, it is expected that the fill would be used throughout the three complexes. Therefore the EIS/R assumes that the truck trips would be spread out geographically around the South Bay.

In addition, short-term construction traffic would consist of the transportation of the worker crew, which would be up to 25 daily one-way trips (assuming 10 worker per crew and 2.5 trips per day), and other construction truck trips delivering equipment and materials. Estimates of the other construction truck trips have not yet been determined and would be determined for each phase of work.

Access routes to the SBSPP Restoration Project pond complexes would include the major highways surrounding the pond complexes and local roadways that pass through a variety of industrial, commercial, and residential uses. Access to the pond complexes would differ by location, and may vary depending on the specific ponds that would be restored. Generally, access into the pond complexes would include the following:

- Eden Landing pond complex: Multiple accesses are available, including from SR 92 or I-880 to local streets. There are various arterial, collector, and local streets that provide access to the ponds from these highways;
- Alviso pond complex: Due to the scattered nature of the ponds, multiple accesses are available. The site may be accessed by SR 237, I-880, or US 101. There are various arterial, collector, and local streets that provide access to the ponds from these highways; and
- Ravenswood pond complex: Directly from SR 84 and Bayfront Parkway.

Construction vehicle trips would be expected to comply with the truck routes and requirements for the affected jurisdictions. Due to the availability of space within the pond complexes, staging of material and equipment would be accommodated entirely within these properties.

---

<sup>3</sup> The calculation is based on 220 construction days per year x 50 years. Therefore, 750,000 two-way truck trips / (220 days per year \* 50 year) = 68 two-way truck trips per day or 136 one-way truck trips per day. Even if the entire volume of fill was transported by truck, the actual number of daily truck trips may higher or lower depending on Project phasing and how traffic is distributed throughout each subsequent phase.

**Phase 1 Actions.** Construction activities under Phase 1 actions of Alternatives B and C would require the transport of equipment to and from the SBSP Restoration Project Area. All soils excavated within Ponds E8A, E9, E8X, E12, E13, A6, A8, A16, and SF2 would be reused on site, such that no transport of soil from offsite to the Project Area would be required. Truck trips would be associated only with the delivery of material/equipment, water, and worker vehicles. Short-term construction traffic would consist of the transportation of the worker crew, which would be up to 25 daily one-way trips (assuming 10 worker per crew and 2.5 trips per day), and other construction truck trips delivering equipment and materials, which would consist of approximately 75 one-way trips at the beginning (during start-up of construction) and again at the end of construction, distributed at the three complexes (nearly 40 one-way construction-related trips would access the Alviso pond complex, and more than 15 one-way truck trips would access each the Eden Landing and Ravenswood pond complexes<sup>4</sup>); no equipment and material hauling trips are expected on a daily basis. However, water truck trips would average approximately four per day at each of the complexes.

Access routes to the SBSP Restoration Project Area would include the major highways surrounding the pond complexes and local roadways. Specifically, access to the pond complexes is as follows:

- Ponds E8A/E9: SR 92 and I-880, and combination of Union City Boulevard (collector street), Bettencourt Way (local street), Whipple Road (arterial street), Horner Street (local street), and Veasy Street (local street);
- Ponds E12/E13: SR 92 to the Clawiter Road (arterial street) exit or from I-880 to Industrial Parkway (arterial street), west to Arden Road (local street) and Eden Landing Road (local street) to the refuge gate;
- Ponds A6: SR 237 via a combination of North First Street (arterial street), Hope, Mill, Gold, and Elizabeth streets. With the exception of First Street, all the other streets are considered local streets;
- Ponds A8: SR 237 via a combination of North First, Hope, Mill, Gold, and Elizabeth streets;
- Ponds A16: SR 237 via Zanker Road (arterial street); and
- Ponds SF2: SR 84.

Due to the availability of space within the pond complexes, staging of material and equipment during Phase 1 activities would be accommodated entirely within these properties.

### **Operation**

The long-term operation of Alternative A and Phase 1 No Action would involve O&M activities including the replacement and/or repairs of water control structures, and limited maintenance of existing levees. This would require vehicular travel by existing staff to the site(s). These activities would occur periodically and cannot be anticipated at this time.

<sup>4</sup> Truck delivery trips are associated with the delivery of equipment and materials for construction; specifically for Pond A8, truck trips include the transport of concrete.



The long-term operation of the Alternatives B and C and Phase 1 actions is assumed to require approximately one maintenance staff person that would travel to the pond complexes for maintenance activities on a weekly basis (one or two times a week). In addition, operation of these alternatives would include the Adaptive Management Plan monitoring activities, which would result in additional workers (e.g., staff, consultants) to access the site for monitoring activities. The frequency of traffic trips to the SBSP Restoration Project Area would depend on the monitoring activities involved, and would vary by season (e.g., during the bird breeding season there may be more trips to the Project Area than during the non-breeding season). For the purposes of analysis, it is assumed that ten one-way trips would occur per week associated with Adaptive Management Plan monitoring activities.

Implementation of Alternatives B and C would also result in an increase in overall vehicle miles traveled (VMT) associated with the expected increase in vehicle trips by visitors of the new recreational facilities in the pond complexes. The increase, which would likely steadily rise over the 50-year planning horizon as new recreational facilities are built, cannot be determined at this time because no baseline visitor data has been collected.

## **Program-Level Evaluation**

### ***SBSP Long-Term Alternatives***

#### ***SBSP Impact 3.12-1: Potential short-term degradation of traffic levels on a roadway or at an intersection due to construction.***

***Alternative A No Action.*** Under this alternative, landowners would continue to operate and maintain the ponds in a manner similar to the ISP, although ongoing O&M activities would be scaled back. No construction activities would occur within the SBSP Restoration Project Area. As such, no construction-generated traffic would occur and no impact would occur. Operation-related traffic effects are evaluated in SBSP Impact 3.12-2 below.

#### **Alternative A Level of Significance: No Impact**

***Alternative B Managed Pond Emphasis.*** Construction activities would require the import of as much as 10 to 15 million cy of fill for levee construction, filling or blocking of borrow ditches, and the creation of upland transitional habitat over the 50-year planning horizon. The transport of this material could occur as part of subsequent phases of the SBSP Restoration Project or between future phases.

Construction activities may generate up to 136 one-way daily truck trips associated with the delivery of fill material assuming that trips are spread out evenly over a 50-year planning period (although it is possible that some portion of the fill would be delivered via barge). In addition, construction worker traffic and traffic associated with equipment/material delivery would result in incremental increases in truck traffic on roadways. Construction activities would be confined within the SBSP Restoration Project Area, and no construction would occur outside the pond complexes on local or regional roadways. As such, potential construction traffic impacts would be associated only with increases in traffic volumes rather than lane/road closures from construction activities on roadways.

The duration of construction activities for subsequent phases has not been determined<sup>5</sup> but Project traffic volume increases are not expected to occur continuously for 50 years along the same routes. Construction traffic would be temporary in nature, lasting the duration of the construction activity, likely scattered geographically throughout the SBSP Restoration Project Area and scattered throughout the day-time hours. If Project construction traffic were to occur during the peak morning and afternoon traffic commute hours along the regional highways and arterial/collector streets described in the Approach to Analysis section above, then it is possible that construction traffic volumes may degrade the traffic levels of a roadway or intersection by increasing congestion and delays associated with increased volume and slower movement of large trucks (e.g., larger turning radii, slower speed). The regional highways are major commuter routes that are congested during the peak commute periods. Similarly, the arterials and collector streets that link various land uses (residential, commercial, and industrial uses) to the highway system would similarly be expected to have traffic volumes during the peak commute hours during both morning and afternoons. Degradation of traffic operations would be a potentially significant impact. To ensure that degradation of intersections and roadway levels would not occur, SBSP Mitigation Measure 3.12-1 would be required. In addition, subsequent project-level environmental review would be conducted for each future phase to determine the estimated Project-related construction traffic volumes (e.g., from sediment and equipment transport and worker commute) and the effects on the roadway network, and additional mitigation measures (if needed) would be identified to reduce effects to less-than-significant levels.

Transport of imported fill occurring between future phases of the SBSP Restoration Project would require the same limitation on the timing of construction-related truck trips to ensure that degradation of intersections and roadway levels would not occur. However, it is not expected that subsequent environmental documentation would be necessary as long as the number of construction-related truck trips do not exceed 136 trips per day. If the number of daily construction-related truck trips would exceed 136 trips, subsequent environmental documentation would be necessary to assess the impacts of the increased traffic on the road network.

**SBSP Mitigation Measure 3.12-1:** Timing of construction-related truck trips.

The landowners (CDFG and USFWS) shall include in construction plans and specifications the requirement that construction-related truck trips, specifically deliveries of fill and equipment, shall occur outside the weekday am and pm peak commute traffic hours.

**Alternative B Level of Significance: Less than Significant with Mitigation**

**Alternative C Tidal Habitat Emphasis.** Implementation of Alternative C would result in similar construction-related Project traffic impacts as Alternative B because construction activities would generally be the same. Short-term traffic-related impacts would be potentially significant and SBSP Mitigation Measure 3.12-1 would be required to reduce potential effects to less-than-significant levels.

---

<sup>5</sup> Only the duration of the Phase 1 actions are known; Phase 1 actions would last up to five months at each pond site. The construction duration for subsequent phases are not known.

---

**Alternative C Level of Significance: Less than Significant with Mitigation**

---

***SBSP Impact 3.12-2: Potential long-term degradation of traffic levels on a roadway or an intersection.***

**Alternative A No Action.** Under this alternative, landowners would continue to operate and maintain the ponds in a manner similar to the ISP, although ongoing O&M activities would be scaled back. Existing staff would travel to the site(s) periodically over the 50-year planning period to perform O&M activities. The number of workers onsite would likely be less than a typical construction worker crew size of five to ten people. Due to the temporal nature of O&M traffic and the limited trips these workers would generate, the SBSP Restoration Project would not cause a substantial increase in traffic relative to the traffic volume of the local traffic network, and thus impacts would be less than significant.

**Alternative A Level of Significance: Less than Significant**

**Alternative B Managed Pond Emphasis.** The increase in traffic volumes associated with routine O&M and Adaptive Management Plan monitoring activities would be minimal (more than ten one-way trips per week). They would likely be scattered geographically throughout the pond complexes and throughout the year, depending on the type of monitoring. As such, traffic increases associated with long-term O&M activities and monitoring would be less than significant.

The recreational facilities that are proposed over the 50-year planning horizon would generate increased visitor traffic to the SBSP Restoration Project Area. The amount of traffic cannot be determined at this time, and would likely vary depending on the type and location of facilities. For example, provision of new recreation opportunities (*e.g.*, trails, environmental center, kayak launch) in areas that previously had few such opportunities (*e.g.*, Eden Landing pond complex) may increase the number of recreation users to the site. However, the provision of connecting trails within an area that already has trails or other amenities may draw more existing users (*e.g.*, bicyclists, hikers, birdwatchers) who use nearby facilities than new users who would access the site by car. Increases in traffic volumes related to new recreational facilities would be gradual, occurring incrementally as new facilities are constructed, and scattered geographically throughout the SBSP Restoration Project Area. Traffic volume increases may also be related to the projected population growth in the South Bay within the next 50 years, an increase that is not directly attributable to the Project. Traffic volume increases associated with the Project are expected to occur during the daytime hours, when these recreational facilities are open (from dawn to dusk). Particularly, these increases would likely be concentrated during the weekends, when recreational uses are typically highest<sup>6</sup>. Access to the SBSP Restoration Project Area would likely be provided by the major highways surrounding the pond complexes and/or by a variety of local roadways, depending on the origins of the recreational users.

---

<sup>6</sup> Higher use (peak use) levels typically occur on weekends or holidays (Vogel, pers. comm.. 2007).

As mentioned above, the anticipated increase in traffic volumes over the 50-year planning period associated with users of the new recreational facilities has not yet been determined. It is possible that a substantial increase in traffic relative to the traffic volume of the local traffic network would be generated. However this is an unlikely scenario given that users tend to access recreation facilities during the weekends, when commute traffic is not an issue. In addition, traffic would be dispersed throughout the South Bay on both regional highways and local roadways, as multiple access routes and points to the proposed facilities are available. Given that traffic increases would occur outside the peak commute hours when regional roadways are most congested and the most delays occur, potential impacts associated with long-term Project operations would be less than significant. Subsequent environmental documentation would be required for each phase of construction to confirm the effects of long-term traffic on the operations of the local roadways and intersections.

**Alternative B Level of Significance: Less than Significant**

**Alternative C Tidal Habitat Emphasis.** Due to the similarity in the proposed recreational facilities under both Alternatives B and C, implementation of Alternative C would result in similar less-than-significant impacts associated with increased traffic and potential degradation of traffic operations on a roadway or an intersection.

**Alternative C Level of Significance: Less than Significant**

---

**SBSP Impact 3.12-3: Potential increase in parking demand.**

**Alternative A No Action.** No construction activities are proposed under this alternative. As such, parking demand for construction would not occur. Under this alternative, operation of the ponds would require limited O&M activities, as described in Section 2.4. Small crews of workers may be onsite during work activities. These workers would park within the SBSP Restoration Project Area. Adequate parking capacity would be available within the Project Area, and impacts would be less than significant.

**Alternative A Level of Significance: Less than Significant**

**Alternative B Managed Pond Emphasis.** Construction staging would be accommodated within the SBSP Restoration Project Area. As such, the Project would not generate demand for parking outside the boundaries of the pond complexes. Therefore, no impacts would occur during construction.

Parking associated with O&M and Adaptive Management Plan monitoring activities would occur primarily within the SBSP Restoration Project Area. The demand for parking for these activities is expected to be minimal, occurring mostly during the weekday periods. If additional parking spaces are needed outside the Project Area, they would be accommodated by the spaces available at designated parking lots (e.g., at Eden Landing Ecological Reserve at the Eden Landing pond complex, the Refuge EEC at the Alviso pond complex, street parking at the Ravenswood pond complex) or along roadways adjacent to the pond complexes.

The increase in recreation users over the long-term likely would require additional parking capacity for people who access the site via motor vehicles. As described in SBSP Impact 3.12-2 above, the traffic volume increase associated with the long-term implementation of the SBSP Restoration Project has not yet been determined. Parking for these vehicles would be accommodated at existing parking areas (e.g., staging area at the Eden Landing Ecological Reserve, Refuge EEC at the Alviso pond complex) or along adjacent roadways. Table 3.12-1 presents an inventory of off-street parking near the SBSP Restoration Project Area access points, including handicapped parking.

**Table 3.12-1 Off-Street Parking Near SBSP Restoration Project Access Points**

LOCATION	NO. OF SPACES	OWNER
Bayfront Park	30 (4h)	City of Menlo Park
Dumbarton Bridge, western approach, north side	Approx. 35 (2h)	Caltrans
Dumbarton Bridge, western approach, south side	Approx. 35 (2h)	Caltrans
Mt. View Shoreline Park	166 (4h)	City of Mt. View
Shoreline Amphitheater Overflow	> 200	City of Mt. View
Sunnyvale WPCP Carl Rd.	Approx. 15	City of Sunnyvale
Sunnyvale Baylands Park	> 200	City of Sunnyvale
Alviso Marina County Park	107 (at least 2h)	Santa Clara Co. Parks and Recreation
Refuge Environmental Education Center	42 (4h)	USFWS
Eden Landing Access Area (to be constructed as part of the ELER Restoration Project)	58	EBRPD
Note: h = handicapped parking spaces		

Because the demand for parking spaces from the new recreation facilities has not yet been determined, the adequacy of existing on- and off-site parking is not known, and impacts would be potentially significant. Subsequent environmental review would be conducted for all future phases of the Project to determine whether adequate parking is available for proposed facilities. Parking demand would likely vary depending on the facility proposed, and would unlikely change if, for example, a connection trail segment or a new viewing platform is proposed because these facilities would provide an extension of an existing amenity rather than a new amenity that draws new users. Brand new recreation opportunities in areas without such facilities would likely generate increased visitation because those facilities would become new destination points. Because the demand for parking in subsequent phases is not known, the potential for inadequate parking is potentially significant and mitigation measures would be required to reduce potential effects. To ensure that sufficient parking spaces would be available for the SBSP Restoration Project, the facilities would be designed to accommodate additional parking spaces as needed. Landowners would be required to assess the capacity of the new recreational facilities in the light of the availability of parking. Where insufficient parking spaces are anticipated, the landowners, in coordination with the cities with jurisdiction over the recreation improvements (where applicable), would be required

to provide additional parking to accommodate the anticipated vehicles (see SBSP Mitigation Measure 3.12.3).

**SBSP Mitigation Measure 3.12-3:** Parking at recreational facilities.

The Landowners (CDFG and USFWS), in coordination with the cities with jurisdiction over the proposed recreation improvements (where applicable), shall design recreational facilities with sufficient parking spaces to accommodate the projected increase in vehicles that access the site, unless adequate off-site parking is available to offset the demand for parking spaces.

**Alternative B Level of Significance: Less than Significant with Mitigation**

**Alternative C Tidal Habitat Emphasis.** Due to the similarity in the proposed recreational facilities under both Alternatives B and C, implementation of Alternative C would result in similar potentially significant impacts related to parking. Implementation of SBSP Mitigation Measure 3.12-3 would reduce potential effects to less-than-significant levels.

**Alternative C Level of Significance: Less than Significant with Mitigation**

---

**SBSP Impact 3.12-4: Potential increase in wear and tear on the designated haul routes during construction.**

**Alternative A No Action.** No construction activities are anticipated under Alternative A, and as such no construction truck trips would occur on area roadways. No impact would occur.

**Alternative A Level of Significance: No impact**

**Alternative B Managed Pond Emphasis.** The use of large trucks to transport equipment and material to and from the work sites may affect road conditions on the designated haul routes by increasing the rate of road wear. The degree to which this impact would occur depends on the design (pavement type and thickness) and the existing condition of the road. Major arterials and collectors are designed to accommodate a mix of vehicle types, including heavy trucks. The Project's impacts are expected to be negligible on those roads. However, residential streets are not designed with a pavement thickness that will withstand substantial truck traffic volumes. If a substantial amount of construction truck traffic were to occur repeatedly through residential streets, then the Project would contribute to the wear and tear of these roadways. The designated haul routes for all subsequent phases of the Project have not yet been determined. However, if residential streets are selected to be part of the designated haul routes, and substantial construction-related traffic are anticipated for the future phases of construction, then SBSP Mitigation Measure 3.12-4 would be required to mitigate for potential impacts to these roadways.

**SBSP Mitigation Measure 3.12-4:** Videotape road conditions.

If residential streets are part of the designated haul route for any future phases of the SBSP Restoration Project, the landowners shall prepare a videotape of road conditions prior to the start-up of construction for the residential streets affected by the Project. The landowners (CDFG and USFWS) shall prepare a similar videotape of road conditions after Project construction is completed. The pre- and post-construction conditions of haul routes shall be reviewed by staff of the local Public Works Department. An agreement shall be entered into prior to construction that will detail the pre-construction conditions and post-construction requirements of the roadway rehabilitation program.

**Alternative B Level of Significance: Less than Significant with Mitigation**

**Alternative C Tidal Habitat Emphasis.** Alternative C would result in similar construction activities as Alternative B, and the impacts and mitigation measure would also be applicable. Implementation of SBSP Mitigation Measure 3.12-4 would reduce effects on residential roadways to less-than-significant levels.

**Alternative C Level of Significance: Less than Significant with Mitigation**

---

**Project-Level Evaluation**

**Phase 1 Impact 3.12-1: Potential short-term degradation of traffic levels on a roadway or at an intersection due to construction.**

**Phase 1 No Action**

The following discussion addresses the No Action Alternative (Alternative A) at the project level.

Under the No Action Alternative, landowners would continue to operate and maintain the Phase 1 ponds in a manner similar to the ISP, although ongoing O&M activities would be scaled back. As described in SBSP Impact 3.11-3 above, no construction activities would occur within the SBSP Restoration Project Area under the No Action Alternative. As such, no impact associated with the short-term degradation of traffic levels on a roadway or an intersection due to construction would occur.

**Phase 1 No Action Level of Significance: No Impact****Phase 1 Actions**

The following discussion addresses the Phase 1 actions (the first phase of Alternatives B and C) at the project level.

**Eden Landing.** Construction activities would occur within the designated ponds (Ponds E8A, E9, and E8X; and Ponds E12 and E13) and would not require closure of any traffic lanes or roadways outside of the pond complex. Construction activities would generate traffic associated with transport of materials

and equipment and worker commute. As described above, more than 15 one-way construction-related truck trips would enter the pond complex at the beginning of the construction period and exit the site at the end of the construction period; these trips would likely be distributed throughout the day. On a daily basis, approximately 30 one-way truck trips (for water delivery and worker commute) would occur; work commute trips would likely occur at the beginning and end of the day, potentially coinciding with the commute traffic, whereas water delivery trips would likely be distributed throughout the day. Access to the site would be provided either via SR 92, Clawiter Road and Eden Landing Road<sup>7</sup>, or via I-880, Whipple Road, Union City Boulevard, Bettencourt Way, Horner Street, and Veasy Street.

Due to the limited number of construction-related truck trips that would be generated from the Phase 1 actions at the Eden Landing pond complex, congestion and short-term delays on the access roadway and intersections are not expected. Potential impacts would be less than significant.

**Alviso.** Construction activities would occur within the designated ponds (Ponds A6, A8, and A16) and would not require closure of any traffic lanes or roadways outside of the Alviso pond complex. Construction activities would generate traffic associated with transport of materials and equipment and worker commute. As described above, more than 30 one-way construction-related truck trips would enter the pond complex at the beginning of the construction period and exit the site at the end of the construction period; these trips would likely be distributed throughout the day. In addition, less than 10 concrete truck trips would access Pond A8. On a daily basis, approximately 30 one-way truck trips (for water delivery and worker commute) would occur; work commute trips would likely occur at the beginning and end of the day, potentially coinciding with the commute traffic, whereas water delivery trips would likely be distributed throughout the day. Access to the site would be provided by SR 237 via either a combination of North First, Hope, Mill, Gold, and Elizabeth streets, or Zanker Road<sup>8</sup>.

Similar to the discussion above for Eden Landing, due to the limited number of construction-related truck trips that would be generated from the Phase 1 actions at the Alviso pond complex, congestion and short-term delays on the access roadway and intersections are not expected. Potential impacts would be less than significant.

**Ravenswood.** Construction activities would occur within Pond SF2 and would not require closure of any traffic lanes or roadways outside of the Ravenswood pond complex. Construction activities would generate traffic associated with transport of materials and equipment and worker commute. As described above, more than 15 one-way construction-related truck trips would enter the pond complex at the beginning of the construction period and exit the site at the end of the construction period; these trips

---

<sup>7</sup> The traffic volume for SR 92 is 8,000 vehicles during the peak hour in 2005. Limited traffic volume is provided for the roadways in the City of Hayward and Union City. The City of Hayward General Plan identifies a daily traffic volume of 21,800 for Industrial Boulevard, south of SR 92 (City of Hayward 2002). Traffic volumes are not available on any of the collector or local streets in Hayward.

<sup>8</sup> The City of San Jose has conducted limited traffic counts for its city streets. The total traffic volume (north leg, in and outbound) on Zanker Road at SR 237 was 4,860 vehicles over a 24-hour period in July 2003 (Weaver 2006). Intersection traffic volumes on Gold Street and Alviso-Milpitas Road (north of 237), northbound and southbound (north leg) are 990 and 2,980 vehicles over a 24-hour period, respectively, in Jan 2006. Traffic volumes are also available for Elizabeth Street and Hope Street. For the east leg, the volumes in east- and west-bound directions are 130 and 190, respectively. For the north leg, traffic volumes are 260 and 250 in the north- and south-bound directions in June 2004. Traffic counts are not available on North First Street or Mill Street.



would likely be distributed throughout the day. On a daily basis, approximately 30 one-way truck trips (for water delivery and worker commute) would occur; work commute trips would likely occur at the beginning and end of the day, potentially coinciding with the commute traffic, whereas water delivery trips would likely be distributed throughout the day. Access to the site would be provided directly by SR 84<sup>9</sup>.

Similar to the discussions above for Eden Landing and Alviso pond complexes, due to the limited number of construction-related truck trips that would be generated from the Phase 1 actions at the Ravenswood pond complex, congestion and short-term delays on the access roadway and intersections are not expected. Potential impacts would be less than significant.

### **Phase 1 Actions Level of Significance: Less than Significant**

---

***Phase 1 Impact 3.12-2: Potential long-term degradation of traffic levels on a roadway or an intersection.***

#### ***Phase 1 No Action***

The following discussion addresses the No Action Alternative (Alternative A) at the project level.

Operation of the ponds would require limited O&M activities that would result in limited and short-term increase in vehicular traffic. However, due to the temporal nature of O&M traffic and the limited trips, Phase 1 No Action would cause a less than significant increase in traffic relative to the traffic volume of the local traffic network.

#### **Phase 1 No Action Level of Significance: Less than Significant**

#### ***Phase 1 Actions***

The following discussion addresses the Phase 1 actions (the first phase of Alternatives B and C) at the project level.

***Eden Landing.*** New recreational facilities would be provided in and around Ponds E8A, E9, and E8X, E12, and E13. These facilities would consist of approximately five miles of trails and a kayak/boat launch vicinity of the Eden Landing pond complex. Eden Landing currently has limited recreational facilities, although such uses are located in the vicinity of the Eden Landing pond complex (Hayward Regional Shoreline north of SR 92 and at the ELER adjacent to the site); it is possible that the new recreational facilities would attract existing users of nearby recreational facilities as well as attract new users who access the site via passenger vehicles.

---

<sup>9</sup> Traffic volumes for SR 84 is 4,950 vehicles during the peak hour (Caltrans 2005).

As discussed for SBSP Impact 3.12-2, vehicular access to the sites would likely be provided by the major highways surrounding the pond complexes and a number of local roadways, depending on the origins of the recreational users. The number of new users accessing the site via passenger vehicles is not known. However, the provision of five miles of trails and a kayak launch is not anticipated to generate a substantial increase in traffic relative to the traffic volume of the local traffic network, particularly since the use of these facilities would likely occur mostly during the weekends, outside of morning and afternoon peak commute traffic hours. Due to the typical timing of access and the distribution of vehicular traffic accessing the Eden Landing pond complex, potential impacts associated with long-term Project operations would be less than significant.

**Alviso.** New recreational facilities that would be provided at the Alviso pond complex include new trails, viewing platforms, and interpretive stations. The Alviso pond complex is surrounded by other recreational facilities, and as such the new recreational facilities would likely attract existing users of surrounding recreational facilities as well as new users accessing the site by passenger vehicles.

As discussed for SBSP Impact 3.12-2, vehicular access to the Alviso pond complex would likely be provided by the major highways surrounding the pond complexes and/or a number of local roadways, depending on the origins of the recreational users. The provision of these recreational facilities is not anticipated to result in a substantial increase in traffic relative to the traffic volume of the local traffic network, particularly since the use of these facilities would likely occur mostly during the weekends, outside of morning and afternoon peak commute traffic hours. Due to the timing of typical access of these facilities and the distribution of vehicular traffic on area roadways accessing the Project site, potential impacts associated with long-term Project operations would be less than significant.

**Ravenswood.** Recreational facilities at Pond SF2 would include rehabilitation of an existing trail and installation of viewing platforms and interpretative stations. The Ravenswood pond complex is adjacent to recreational facilities (*e.g.*, Bayfront Park and trail along SR 84). It is possible that the new recreational facilities would attract existing users of nearby recreational facilities as well as new users accessing the site by passenger vehicles. Vehicular access to the sites is provided directly by SR 84. Traffic volumes for SR 84 are provided in Section 3.12.2 above.

The rehabilitation of an existing trail and addition of viewing platforms and interpretative stations are not anticipated to result in a substantial increase in traffic relative to the traffic volume of the local traffic network, particularly since the use of these facilities would likely occur mostly during the weekends, outside of peak commute traffic hours. Due to the typical timing of access and the limited recreational facilities that are provided at the Ravenswood pond complex, potential impacts associated with long-term Project operations would be less than significant.

### **Phase 1 Actions Level of Significance: Less than Significant**

---

**Phase 1 Impact 3.12-3: Potential increase in parking demand.****Phase 1 No Action**

The following discussion addresses the No Action Alternative (Alternative A) at the project level.

No construction activities would occur under the Phase 1 No Action. As such, no impact associated with construction parking demand would occur. Operation of the ponds under the No Action Alternative would require O&M activities that would generate limited vehicular traffic and parking demand. Sufficient parking capacity is available within the SBSP Restoration Project Area to accommodate O&M parking demand, and as such, impacts would be less than significant.

**Phase 1 No Action Level of Significance: Less than Significant****Phase 1 Actions**

The following discussion addresses the Phase 1 actions (the first phase of Alternatives B and C) at the project level.

As discussed in SBSP Impact 3.12-3, above, adequate parking capacity exists onsite for construction vehicles.

**Eden Landing.** Operation of the new recreational facilities would result likely in an increase in vehicular traffic accessing the Eden Landing pond complex and associated vehicular parking demand, as current recreation in the pond complex is limited. As shown in Table 3.12-1 and described in Chapter 2 of this EIS/R, a staging area accommodating 58 vehicles is being built as part of the restoration plan for the 835-acre ELER. This staging area will be constructed prior to completion of the proposed recreational facilities for the Phase 1 actions at the Eden Landing pond complex and would be available for visitors of the new recreational facilities. The 58 parking spaces are expected to provide sufficient parking for new visitors who access the site using passenger cars. As discussed in SBSP Impact 3.12-2, the highest demand for recreational use typically occurs during the weekend periods. Because the area surrounding the pond complex consists of industrial uses that do not operate during the weekends, additional on-street parking spaces would be available adjacent to the pond complex, thus increasing the supply of parking spaces. The staging area and on-street parking would be expected to meet the increase parking demand associated with increased visitation to the new proposed facilities. As such, the increased demand for parking is not expected to exceed parking capacity and therefore this impact is less than significant.

**Alviso.** Operation of the new recreational facilities is expected to result in an increase in vehicular traffic and associated parking demand. The proposed interpretative stations and viewing platform would be located at Pond A16. The Alviso Bay Trail, connecting to existing trails from generally the Stevens Creek Nature Center (in Mountain View) to the south of the City of Sunnyvale SPCP (in Sunnyvale), would extend south along the perimeter of Ponds A2E, AB2, and A3W. Parking in the vicinity of Pond A16 would be provided by the existing parking lot at the Refuge EEC, which provides spaces for 42 passenger cars (including four handicapped spaces) (see Table 3.12-1 above) and three buses. Because the proposed facilities at Pond A16 would be connected to the existing trails and would unlikely be

considered a stand-alone destination spot for recreational users, any increase in parking demand would be expected to be accommodated by the existing parking lot.

With respect to the Alviso Bay Trail, limited parking is currently available at the Sunnyvale end of the trail and there is no public parking on Crittenden Lane in the Mountain View end of the trail. However, parking spaces exist further west of the trail at Mountain View Shoreline Park and southeast at the City of Sunnyvale Water Pollution Control Plant (WPCP). As shown in Table 3.12-1, 166 parking spaces (including four handicapped spaces) are available at Shoreline Park and approximately 15 parking spaces are available at the City of Sunnyvale WPCP. The City of Sunnyvale currently allows recreational users to park at the WPCP parking lot. Currently, recreation users use these parking areas to access the existing Bay Trail from the two segments. The Alviso Bay Trail connects existing segments of the Bay Trail to the west and east; as such, it is likely that the users of this trail are traveling through the trail from other starting points to the east and west, rather than starting at these new connection points. Because the trail would offer a continuation of an existing amenity rather than a new recreational destination or new type of activity, access to the trail would not be concentrated at the new connection points. Parking spaces currently offered at Mountain View Shoreline Park, City of Sunnyvale WPCP, and along streets are expected to accommodate new users. It should be noted that additional parking is available west and east of the proposed trail at the Shoreline Amphitheatre Overflow parking lot (more than 200 parking spaces) and Sunnyvale Baylands Park (more than 200 spaces), as shown in Table 3.12-1.

**Ravenswood.** Operation of the new recreational facilities is expected to result in an increase in vehicular traffic and associated parking demand. Recreational facilities at Pond SF2 would include rehabilitation of an existing trail and installation of viewing platforms and interpretative stations. The rehabilitated trail would connect with the existing Bay Trail along SR 84. Parking for the Bay Trail is currently provided at the base of the Dumbarton Bridge (70 designated spaces, including four handicapped spaces) (see Table 3.12-1) and along the road edge. Because the proposed facilities are extended amenities to the existing trail, it is not expected to generate substantial demand for additional parking. The designated spaces and road edge parking are expected to meet the increase parking needs associated with increased visitation to the new proposed facilities. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

Improvements to Bayfront Park include a viewing platform and an interpretive station at the northeast corner of the park overlooking San Francisco Bay and the restoration at the Ravenswood pond complex. Thirty parking spaces (including four handicapped spaces) exist on the west side of the park. Because the proposed facilities at Bayfront Park would be connected to the existing recreational uses at the park and would not be considered a new destination for recreational users, they are not expected to generate a substantial increase in visitors and traffic to the park. Consequently, no increase in parking demand is expected.

### **Phase 1 Actions Level of Significance: Less than Significant**

---

---

**Phase 1 Impact 3.12-4: Potential increase in wear and tear on the designated haul routes during construction.**

**Phase 1 No Action**

The following discussion addresses the No Action Alternative (Alternative A) at the project level.

As no construction activities would occur under the Phase 1 No Action, no construction trips would occur on area roadways. Therefore, no impact would occur.

**Phase 1 No Action Level of Significance: No Impact**

**Phase 1 Actions**

The following discussion addresses the Phase 1 actions (the first phase of Alternatives B and C) at the project level.

**Eden Landing.** The discussion of potential impacts on the pavement conditions of roadways are presented in SBSP Impact 3.12-4 above. The designated haul routes for the Phase 1 actions at the Eden Landing pond complex include a variety of streets, including residential streets (Bettencourt Way and Horner Street). Construction of Phase 1 actions at the Eden Landing pond complex would require approximately 15 one-way construction truck trips at the beginning and 15 one-way construction truck trips at the end of the construction period associated with the delivery of material and equipment; in addition, less than five water truck trips would occur daily. No imported soil would be needed for the Phase 1 actions. Due to the limited number of construction truck trips and the limited duration of construction activities (up to five months), the Phase 1 actions are not expected to contribute substantially to wear and tear of roadways. As such, the impact is less than significant.

**Alviso.** The designated haul routes for the Phase 1 actions at the Alviso pond complex include a variety of streets, including residential streets (Hope, Mill, Gold and Elizabeth streets). Construction of Phase 1 actions at the Alviso pond complex would require approximately 30 one-way construction truck trips at the beginning and 30 one-way construction truck trips at the end of the construction period associated with the delivery of material and equipment; in addition, less than five water truck trips would occur daily. No imported soil would be transported to the pond complex and no soil would be exported out of the complex as part of the Phase 1 actions. Due to the limited number of truck trips and the limited duration of construction activities (up to five months), the Phase 1 actions are not expected to contribute substantially to wear and tear of roadways. As such, this impact is less than significant.

**Ravenswood.** The Ravenswood pond complex is directly accessible via SR 84. No local or residential streets provide access to Pond SF2. As such, impacts on roadway pavement conditions would be less than significant.

**Phase 1 Actions Level of Significance: Less than Significant**

