

Transportation/Traffic

Chapter 3.16

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The proposed Project will not have any significant impacts related to Transportation and Traffic. No mitigation measures will be required. A detailed review of potential impacts is provided in the analysis below.

INTRODUCTION

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Requirements

This section of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) addresses potential impacts to Transportation and Traffic. As required in Section 15126, all phases of the proposed Project will be considered as part of the potential environmental impact.

As noted in Section 15126.2 (a), “[a]n EIR shall identify and focus on the significant environmental effects of the proposed project. In assessing the impact of a proposed project on the environment, the lead agency should normally limit its examination to changes in the existing physical conditions in the affected area as they exist at the time the notice of preparation is published, or where no notice of preparation is published, at the time environmental analysis is commenced. Direct and indirect significant effects of the project on the environment shall be clearly identified and described, giving due consideration to both the short-term and long-term effects. The discussion should include relevant specifics of the area, the resources involved, physical changes, alterations to ecological systems, and changes induced in population distribution, population concentration, the human use of the land (including commercial and residential development), health and safety problems caused by the physical changes, and other aspects of the resource base such as water, historical resources, scenic quality, and public services. The EIR shall also analyze any significant environmental effects the project might cause by bringing development and people into the area affected. For example, an EIR on a subdivision astride an active fault line should identify as a significant effect the seismic hazard to future occupants of the subdivision. The subdivision would have the effect of attracting people to the location and exposing them to the hazards found there. Similarly, the EIR should evaluate any potentially significant impacts of locating development in other areas susceptible to hazardous conditions (e.g., floodplains, coastlines, wildfire risk areas) as identified in authoritative hazard maps, risk assessments or in land use plans addressing such hazards areas.”¹

The environmental setting provides a description of the Transportation and Traffic in the County. The regulatory setting provides a description of applicable Federal, State and Local regulatory

¹ 2012 CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.2 (a)

Draft Environmental Impact Report
Harvest Power Project

policies that were developed in part from information contained in the Tulare County 2030 General Plan, the Tulare County General Plan Background Report and/or the Tulare County General Plan Revised DEIR incorporated by reference and summarized below. Additional documents utilized are noted as appropriate. A description of the potential impacts of the proposed Project is provided and includes the identification of feasible mitigation measures (if necessary and feasible) to avoid or lessen the impacts.

Thresholds of Significance

The thresholds of significance for this section are established by the CEQA checklist item questions. The following are potential thresholds for significance.

- Result in a Level of Service (LOS) less than “D”
- Unsafe roadway/circulation design
- Impact Air Traffic
- Dangerous Site Design
- Inadequate Access
- Need for additional Public Transit
- Need for additional Bike Facilities
- Need for additional Pedestrian Facilities

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

“Tulare County has two major regional highways, State Highway 99 and 198. State Highway 99 connects Tulare County to Fresno and Sacramento to the north and Bakersfield to the south. State Highway 198 connects from U.S. Highway 101 on the west and continues eastward to Tulare County, passing through the City of Visalia and into Sequoia National Park. The highway system in the County also includes State highways, County-maintained roads, and local streets within each of the eight cities.”²

“Tulare County’s transportation system is composed of several State Routes, including three freeways, multiple highways, as well as numerous county and city routes. The county’s public transit system also includes two common carriers (Greyhound and Orange Belt Stages), the AMTRAK Service Link, other local agency transit and paratransit services, general aviation, limited passenger air service and freight rail service.”³

“Some prominent county roadways include, but are not limited to, Alta Avenue (Road 80), Caldwell Avenue/Visalia Road (Avenue 280), Demaree Road/Hillman Street (Road 108), Tulare Avenue (Avenue 232), Olive Avenue (Avenue 152), Spruce Road (Road 204), El Monte Way (Avenue 416), Paige Avenue (Avenue 216), Farmersville Boulevard (Road 164), Road 192, and Road 152. Additionally, the highway system includes numerous county-maintained local roads, as well as local streets and highways within each of the eight cities and several unincorporated

² Tulare County 2030 General Plan, page 13-2

³ General Plan Background Report, page 5-4

Draft Environmental Impact Report
Harvest Power Project

communities.”⁴

“Travel within Tulare County is a function of the size and spatial distribution of its population, economic activity, and the relationship to other major activity centers within the Central Valley (such as Fresno and Bakersfield) as well as more distant urban centers such as Los Angeles, Sacramento, and the Bay Area. In addition, there is considerable travel between the northwest portions of Tulare County and southern Fresno County and travel to/from Kings County to the west. Due to the interrelationship between urban and rural activities (employment, housing, services, etc.) and the low average density/ intensity of land uses, the private automobile is the dominant mode of travel for residents in Tulare County.”⁵

“According to the 2005 HCM, LOS is categorized by two parameters, uninterrupted flow and interrupted flow. Uninterrupted flow facilities have no fixed elements, such as traffic signals, that cause interruptions in traffic flow (e.g., freeways, highways, and controlled access). Interrupted flow facilities have fixed elements that cause an interruption in the flow of traffic such as stop signs, signalized intersections, and arterial roads (Transportation Research Board). The difference between uninterrupted flow and interrupted LOS is defined in the following summary.”⁶

**Table 3.16-1
Uninterrupted Traffic Flow Facilities LOS**

LOS A	Represents free flow. Individual vehicles are virtually unaffected by the presence of others in the traffic stream.
LOS B	Is in the range of stable flow, but the presence of other vehicles in the traffic stream begins to be noticeable. Freedom to select desired speeds is relatively unaffected, but there is a slight decline in the freedom to maneuver.
LOS C	Is in the range of stable flow, but marks the beginning of the range of flow in which the operation of individual vehicles becomes significantly affected by interactions with others vehicles in the traffic stream.
LOS D	Is a crowded segment of roadway with a large number of vehicles restricting mobility and a stable flow. Speed and freedom to maneuver are severely restricted and the driver experiences a generally poor level of comfort and convenience.
LOS E	Represents operating conditions at or near level capacity. All speeds are reduced to a low, but relatively uniform value. Small increases in flow will cause breakdowns in traffic movement.
LOS F	Is used to define forced or breakdown flow (stop and go gridlock). This condition exists wherever the amount of traffic approaches a point where the amount of traffic exceeds the amount that can travel to a destination. Operations within queues are characterized by stop and go waves and they are extremely unstable.

Source: 2011 Regional Transportation Plan, Tulare County Association of Governments

**Table 3.16-2
Interrupted Traffic Flow Facilities LOS**

LOS A	Describes operations with average intersection stopped delay of ten seconds or less (how long a driver must wait at a signal before the vehicle can begin moving again).
LOS B	Describes operations with average intersection stopped delay in the range of 10.0 to 20.0 seconds per vehicle, and with reasonably unimpeded operations between intersections.

⁴ General Plan Background Report, page 5-7

⁵ General Plan Background Report, page 5-4

⁶ 2011 TCAG Regional Transportation Plan, page 3-17

Draft Environmental Impact Report
Harvest Power Project

LOS C	Describes operations with higher average stopped delays at intersections (in the range of 20.0 to 35.0 seconds per vehicle). Stable operations between locations may be more restricted due to the ability to maneuver and change lanes at mid-block locations can be more restrictive than LOS B. Further, longer queues and/or adverse signal coordination may contribute to lower average speeds.
LOS D	Describes operations where the influence of delay is more noticeable (35.0 to 55.0 seconds per vehicle). Intersection stopped delay is longer and the range of travel speeds are about 40 percent below free flow speed. This is caused by inappropriate signal timing, high volumes and some combinations of these.
LOS E	Is characterized by significant approach stopped delay (55.0 to 80.0 seconds per vehicle), and average travel speeds of one-third the free flow speed or lower. These conditions are generally considered to represent the capacity of the intersection or arterial.
LOS F	Characterizes arterial flow at extremely low speeds, with high intersection stopped delay (greater than 80.0 seconds per vehicle). Poor progression, long cycle lengths and high traffic demand volumes may be major contributing factors to this condition. Traffic may be characterized by frequent stop-and-go conditions.

Source: 2011 Regional Transportation Plan, Tulare County Association of Governments

“Public transportation provides an economical and efficient alternative for getting people to work, school and other chosen destinations. In Tulare County, buses are the primary mode of public transportation. Public transportation also takes the form of shared ride taxi, automobile and vanpools; dial-a-ride, and specialized handicapped accessible services. In Tulare County, social service transportation is provided by the following: local transit agencies, demand responsive operators and city/county special programs for senior citizens, mental health organizations and disabled citizens programs. These programs are funded and subsidized through State and federal grants, Local Transportation Funds (LTF), State Transit Assistance Funds (STAF), and local transportation sales tax revenues.”⁷

Traffic

As it was anticipated that the proposed Project would generate more than 100 peak hour trips, it was determined that a traffic impact study was required. “The following criterion is a starting point in determining when a TIS is needed. When a project:

1. Generates over 100 peak hour trips assigned to a State highway facility
2. Generates 50 to 100 peak hour trips assigned to a State highway facility – and, affected State highway facilities are experiencing noticeable delay; approaching unstable traffic flow conditions (LOS “C” or “D”).
3. Generates 1 to 49 peak hour trips assigned to a State highway facility – the following are examples that may require a full TIS or some lesser analysis⁴ :
 - a. Affected State highway facilities experiencing significant delay; unstable or forced traffic flow conditions (LOS “E” or “F”).
 - b. The potential risk for a traffic incident is significantly increased (i.e., congestion related collisions, non-standard sight distance considerations, increase in traffic conflict points, etc.).
 - c. Change in local circulation networks that impact a State highway facility (i.e., direct access to State highway facility, a non-standard highway geometric design, etc.).”⁸

⁷ 2011 TCAG Regional Transportation Plan, page 1-14

⁸ Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies, page 2

Airport

“There are nine public use airports in Tulare County. These include six publicly owned and operated facilities (Porterville Municipal, Sequoia Field, Tulare Municipal [Mefford Field], Visalia Municipal, Woodlake, and Harmon Field [currently closed]) and three privately owned and operated airports (Alta Airport [currently closed], Thunderhawk Field, and Eckert Field). Badger Field is under consideration for Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) recertification as a restricted private airfield (as of August 2006).”⁹

Design for Emergency Access

According to § 21060.3 and § 15359 of the CEQA Guidelines, an “Emergency” means a sudden, unexpected occurrence, involving a clear and imminent danger, demanding immediate action to prevent or mitigate loss of, or damage to, life, health, property, or essential public services. “Emergency” includes such occurrences as fire, flood, earthquake, or other soil or geologic movements, as well as such occurrences as riot, accident, or sabotage. A Proposed Project could potentially generate impacts through inadequate design for emergency access.

Alternative Transportation

“TCAT has been providing rural route service between various cities and towns in Tulare County since 1981. TCAT retains MV Transportation to provide all of its transit services, which includes fixed route and demand responsive services for inter-city and intra-city service in many small communities throughout the County. TCAT is the most extensive transit system in Tulare County and connects with Dinuba Area Regional Transit (DART), Visalia City Coach (VCC), Tulare InterModal Express (TIME), Porterville City Operated Local Transit (COLT), Kings Area Rural Transit (KART), Kern Regional Transit, Orange Belt and Greyhound bus.”¹⁰

REGULATORY SETTING

Federal Agencies & Regulations

None that apply to the proposed Project.

State Agencies & Regulations

Caltrans: Transportation Concept Reports

Caltrans has prepared a number concept reports for State Routes, Interstate Routes, and US Routes for each District. Tulare County is located in Caltrans District 6. The concept reports that apply the Proposed Project include SR 63 and SR 201.

⁹ Tulare County 2030 General Plan, page 13-2

¹⁰ 2011 TCAG Regional Transportation Plan, page 1-14

Caltrans Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies

“The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) has developed this "Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies" in response to a survey of cities and counties in California. The purpose of that survey was to improve the Caltrans local development review process (also known as the Intergovernmental Review/California Environmental Quality Act or IGR/CEQA process). The survey indicated that approximately 30 percent of the respondents were not aware of what Caltrans required in a traffic impact study (TIS).”¹¹

Local Policy & Regulations

Tulare County Transportation Control Measures (TCM)

“Transportation Control Measures (TCM) are designed to reduce vehicle miles traveled, vehicle idling, and/or traffic congestion in order to reduce vehicle emissions. Currently, Tulare County is a nonattainment region under the Federal Clean Air Act (CAA) and the California Clean Air Act (CCAA). Both of these acts require implementation of TCMs. These TCMs for Tulare County are as follows:

- Rideshare Programs;
- Park and Ride Lots;
- Alternate Work Schedules;
- Bicycle Facilities;
- Public Transit;
- Traffic Flow Improvement; and
- Passenger Rail and Support Facilities.”¹²

Tulare County Association of Governments (TCAG)

“...[W]ith the passage of Assembly Bill (AB) 69 State law has required the preparation of Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs) to address transportation issues and assist local and state decision makers in shaping California’s transportation infrastructure.”¹³ The Tulare County Association of Government has prepared the 2011 Regional Transportation Plan. Specific policies that apply to the Proposed Project are listed as follows:

TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM MANAGEMENT (TSM) Policy 5

Support installation of adequate left and right turning pockets to allow increased storage, as necessary.

TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM MANAGEMENT (TSM) Policy 6

Encourage improvements in design of signalized intersections to improve turning for large vehicles and circulation flow.

¹¹ Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies, page ii

¹² Tulare County 2030 General Plan RDEIR, page 3.2-2

¹³ 2011 TCAG Regional Transportation Plan, page 1-11

Tulare County General Plan Policies

The General Plan has a number of policies that apply to projects within Tulare County. General Plan policies that relate to the proposed Project are listed below.

TC-1.14 Roadway Facilities

As part of the development review process, new development shall be conditioned to fund, through impact fees, tonnage fees, and/or other mechanism, the construction and maintenance of roadway facilities impacted by the project. As projects or locations warrant, construction or payment of pro-rata fees for planned road facilities may also be required as a condition of approval.

TC-1.15 Traffic Impact Study

The County shall require an analysis of traffic impacts for land development projects that may generate increased traffic on County roads. Typically, applicants of projects generating over 100 peak hour trips per day or where LOS “D” or worse occurs, will be required to prepare and submit this study. The traffic impact study will include impacts from all vehicles, including truck traffic.

TC-1.16 County Level Of Service (LOS) Standards

The County shall strive to develop and manage its roadway system (both segments and intersections) to meet a LOS of “D” or better in accordance with the LOS definitions established by the Highway Capacity Manual.

HS-1.9 Emergency Access

The County shall require, where feasible, road networks (public and private) to provide for safe and ready access for emergency equipment and provide alternate routes for evacuation.

IMPACT EVALUATION

Would the project:

- a) **Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?**

Project Impact Analysis: *Less than Significant Impact*

“The Harvest-Tulare Anaerobic Digester and Compressed Natural Gas Facility as proposed will add a high solids anaerobic digestion facility and Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) refueling station to Harvest-Power California, LLC’s existing Harvest-Tulare composting operations. The facility has been operational since 1996 and currently holds all operational permits to compost green material, food, and dairy manure. The proposed Project will

Draft Environmental Impact Report
Harvest Power Project

include a dry anaerobic digestion facility on the same footprint as the existing composting facility and a CNG fueling station to produce and dispense CNG for sale on an adjacent parcel controlled by Harvest Power. The proposed Project site plan is shown in Figure 2. The trip generation and trip distribution data used in the various Project analyses are described and quantified below.

The facility would utilize approximately two (2) acres of the 35 acre footprint in the southern portion of the facility. The process converts the feedstock through high solids anaerobic digestion into biomethane, or renewable natural gas. The project will increase the total annual tonnage processed at the site from 86,000 tons per year to 216,000 tons per year. This increase includes both the proposed anaerobic digester and upgrading tonnages at the composting facility.”¹⁴

The Existing intersection lane configurations and peak hour traffic volumes were analyzed for existing levels of service. **Table 3.16-3** shows the existing levels of service for the study intersections respectively. The signalized intersection levels of service shown in **Table 3.16-3** are representative of the whole intersection, individual intersection movements are shown for the 2-way stop controlled locations.

**Table 3.16-3
Existing Conditions - Levels Of Service**

Intersection	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
	LOS	Delay ¹	LOS	Delay ¹
Lovers Lane at SR 137	A	8.5	A	8.6
Lovers Lane at Road 240				
<i>Northbound Approach</i>	A	7.8	A	7.8
<i>Southbound Approach</i>	A	7.6	A	7.7
<i>Westbound Approach</i>	B	11.7	B	12.1
<i>Eastbound Approach</i>	B	11.3	B	12.5
Lovers Lane at Project Driveway				
<i>Northbound Approach</i>	A	7.8	A	7.7
<i>Southbound Approach</i>	A	7.6	A	7.8
<i>Westbound Approach</i>	A	9.5	B	11.2
<i>Eastbound Approach</i>	A	9.8	B	10.7
Lovers Lane at Road 248				
<i>Northbound Approach</i>	A	7.7	A	7.8
<i>Southbound Approach</i>	A	7.6	A	7.8
<i>Westbound Approach</i>	B	11.1	B	12.7
<i>Eastbound Approach</i>	A	9.9	B	13.4

¹ delay in seconds per vehicle
Source: Traffic Study

Table 3.16-4 shows the Existing Plus the Project levels of service analysis for the study intersections. The signalized intersection levels of service shown in **Table 3.16-4** are representative of the whole intersection, individual intersection movements are shown for the 2-way stop controlled locations.

¹⁴ Traffic Impact Study, TPG Consulting, page 11

Draft Environmental Impact Report
Harvest Power Project

**Table 3.16-4
Existing Conditions PLUS Project - Levels Of Service**

Intersection	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
	LOS	Delay ¹	LOS	Delay ¹
Lovers Lane at SR 137	A	9.4	A	9.4
Lovers Lane at Road 240				
<i>Northbound Approach</i>	A	7.8	A	7.8
<i>Southbound Approach</i>	A	7.6	A	7.7
<i>Westbound Approach</i>	B	11.7	B	12.1
<i>Eastbound Approach</i>	B	11.3	B	12.5
Lovers Lane at Project Driveway				
<i>Northbound Approach</i>	A	7.7	A	7.7
<i>Southbound Approach</i>	A	7.6	A	7.8
<i>Westbound Approach</i>	A	9.4	B	11.3
<i>Eastbound Approach</i>	A	10.0	B	10.8
Lovers Lane at Road 248				
<i>Northbound Approach</i>	A	7.6	A	7.8
<i>Southbound Approach</i>	A	7.6	A	7.8
<i>Westbound Approach</i>	B	10.9	B	12.8
<i>Eastbound Approach</i>	A	9.8	B	13.4

¹ delay in seconds per vehicle
Source: Traffic Study

“In the latest updated traffic study, and based on the total tonnage in the project discription, it was found that there was a slight reduction in trucks per day from the July, 2012 study. The total yield dropped from 19 new peak hour trips to 18 new peak hour trips to the Project site. Therefore, it can be reasonably concluded that since the overall peak hour trips is only 18 additional trips, the resulting levels of service at the study intersections will also operate well above the threshold of significance established by both the County of Tulare or Caltrans.”¹⁵

Cumulative Impact Analysis: *Less than Significant Impact*

The geographic area of this cumulative analysis is the intersections outlined in the traffic report. This cumulative analysis is based on the information provided in the Tulare County 2030 General Plan, General Plan background Report, Tulare County 2030 General Plan EIR, and the traffic report.

All study area intersections are projected to operate well above the adopted County or Caltrans level of service standards with the additional traffic expected from the Harvest-Tulare Project in future conditions (See **Table 3.16-5**). As such, less than significant impacts related to this checklist item will occur.

¹⁵ Updated Harvest Power Traffic Study, March 5, 2013

Draft Environmental Impact Report
Harvest Power Project

**Table 3.16-5
2035 Conditions WITH the Harvest-Tulare Project - Levels Of Service**

Intersection	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
	LOS	Delay ¹	LOS	Delay ¹
Lovers Lane at SR 137	B	10.8	B	11.6
Lovers Lane at Road 240				
<i>Northbound Approach</i>	A	8.0	A	7.9
<i>Southbound Approach</i>	A	7.8	A	7.9
<i>Westbound Approach</i>	B	12.2	B	12.0
<i>Eastbound Approach</i>	B	13.3	B	13.6
Lovers Lane at Project Driveway				
<i>Northbound Approach</i>	A	8.0	A	7.9
<i>Southbound Approach</i>	A	7.9	A	8.0
<i>Westbound Approach</i>	B	11.3	B	12.9
<i>Eastbound Approach</i>	B	12.4	B	12.7
Lovers Lane at Road 248				
<i>Northbound Approach</i>	A	8.0	A	7.9
<i>Southbound Approach</i>	A	7.9	A	8.0
<i>Westbound Approach</i>	B	12.8	B	12.6
<i>Eastbound Approach</i>	B	13.7	B	14.2

¹ delay in seconds per vehicle
Source: Traffic Study

Mitigation Measures:

None Required.

Conclusion: ***Less than Significant Impact***

As noted earlier, less than significant Project specific and cumulative impacts related to this checklist item will occur.

- b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?**

Project Impact Analysis: ***Less than Significant Impact***

As noted in the response to Checklist item 3.16 a), no significant impacts to levels of service will occur. The proposed Project will not impact any other congestion management standard. As such, no Project specific impacts related to this checklist item will occur.

Cumulative Impact Analysis: ***Less than Significant Impact***

The geographic area of this cumulative analysis is the intersections outlined in the traffic report. This cumulative analysis is based on the information provided in the Tulare County

2030 General Plan, General Plan background Report, Tulare County 2030 General Plan EIR, and the traffic report.

As noted in the response to 3.16 a), the proposed Project will not impact level of service in future conditions. Less than significant cumulative impacts related to this checklist item will occur.

Mitigation Measures:

None Required.

Conclusion: ***Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation***

As noted earlier, less than significant Project specific and cumulative impacts related to this checklist item will occur.

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

Project Impact Analysis: ***No Impact***

The Visalia Municipal Airport is located approximately nine (9) miles northwest of the proposed Project site. Mefford Field (in the City of Tulare) is located approximately six (6) miles southwest of the proposed Project site. In addition, the proposed Project will not affect air traffic patterns. No Project specific impacts related to this checklist item will occur.

Cumulative Impact Analysis: ***No Impact***

The geographic area of this cumulative analysis is Tulare County. This cumulative analysis is based on the information provided in the Tulare County 2030 General Plan, General Plan background Report, and/or Tulare County 2030 General Plan EIR.

The proposed Project will have no Project specific impacts and thus will not contribute to any cumulative impacts related to this checklist.

Mitigation Measures:

None Required.

Conclusion: ***No Impact***

As noted above, no Project specific or cumulative impacts related to this checklist item will occur.

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

Project Impact Analysis: *No Impact*

The proposed Project includes new paving and all weather surfaces for trucks to deliver material to the anaerobic digester. The truck routing alignment does not include sharp curves. As such no Project specific impacts related to this checklist item will occur.

Cumulative Impact Analysis: *No Impact*

The geographic area of this cumulative analysis is the intersections outlined in the traffic report. This cumulative analysis is based on the information provided in the Tulare County 2030 General Plan, General Plan background Report, Tulare County 2030 General Plan EIR, and the traffic report.

As noted earlier, no significant design changes that will cause a hazard are proposed. As such, no cumulative impacts related to this checklist item will occur.

Mitigation Measures:

None Required.

Conclusion: *No Impact*

As noted above, no Project specific or cumulative impacts related to this checklist item will occur.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

Project Impact Analysis: *No Impact*

The Project site is currently has access and egress via the main entrance off Road 148, and has a second emergency point of access off of Road 248 along the Tulare Colony Ditch. As a result of the number and size of access to the Project site, the Proposed Project will not create any impacts related to this checklist item.

Cumulative Impact Analysis: *No Impact*

The geographic area of this cumulative analysis is the intersections outlined in the traffic report. This cumulative analysis is based on the information provided in the Tulare County 2030 General Plan, General Plan background Report, Tulare County 2030 General Plan EIR, and the traffic report.

Mitigation Measures:

None Required.

Conclusion: *No Impact*

As noted above, no Project specific or cumulative impacts related to this checklist item will occur.

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

Project Impact Analysis: *No Impact*

The proposed Project does involve changes to public transit, bicycle facilities or pedestrian facilities. The Project site is accessible from Avenue 240 and Road 140. There are no existing or proposed bike lanes along either of these streets. The proposed Project is located more than a mile from the nearest bus route (Tulare County, Route 40), which travels along State Route 137. As such no Project specific impacts related to this checklist item will occur.

Cumulative Impact Analysis: *No Impact*

The geographic area of this cumulative analysis is the intersections outlined in the traffic report. This cumulative analysis is based on the information provided in the Tulare County 2030 General Plan, General Plan background Report, Tulare County 2030 General Plan EIR, and the traffic report.

As the proposed Project will not result in Project specific impacts, no cumulative impacts related to this checklist item will occur.

Mitigation Measures:

None Required.

Conclusion: *No Impact*

As noted above, no Project specific or cumulative impacts related to this checklist item will occur.

DEFINITIONS/ACRONYMS

Acronyms

(AWSC)	All-Way Stop-Controlled
(HCM)	Highway Capacity Manual
(LOS)	Level of Service
(TWSC)	Two-Way Stop-Controlled

REFERENCES

Tulare County 2030 General Plan, August 2012

Tulare County General Plan Background Report, February 2010

Traffic Impact Study, Harvest-Tulare Anaerobic Digester and Compressed Natural Gas Facility, TPG Consulting. November 2012.

TPG Updated Traffic Study Letter to Harvest Power, February 28, 2013

Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies, California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), December 2002

2011 Regional Transportation Plan, Tulare County Association of Governments (TCAG), July 11, 2012

2010 Tulare County Regional Bicycle Transportation Plan, Tulare County Association of Governments (TCAG)

2012 CEQA Guidelines

Tulare County 2030 General Plan, Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report (RDEIR), February 2010