


# STATE ROUTE 12 JAMESON CANYON ROAD WIDENING & STATE ROUTES 29/12 INTERCHANGE PROJECT



## Final Initial Study— Mitigated Negative Declaration (CEQA) and Environmental Assessment with Finding of No Significant Impact (NEPA) Volume 1

04-NAP-12, KP 0.4/5.3 (PM 0.2/3.3)  
04-SOL-12, KP 0.0/R4.2 (PM 0.0/R2.6)  
Expenditure Authorization 264100  
04-NAP-29, KP 6.7/8.7 (PM 4.2/5.4)  
04-NAP-12, KP 0.0/0.4 (PM 0.0/0.2)  
Expenditure Authorization 287900

January 2008

The environmental review, consultation, and any other action required in accordance with applicable Federal laws for this project is being, or has been carried out by Caltrans under its assumption of responsibility pursuant to 23 U. S. C. 327.

Prepared by:



SCH 2007082158  
04-NAP-12, KP 0.4/5.3 (PM 0.2/3.3)  
04-SOL-12, KP 0.0/R4.2 (PM 0.0/R2.6)  
EA 264100  
04-NAP-29, KP 6.7/8.7 (PM 4.2/5.4)  
04-NAP-12, KP 0.0/0.4 (PM 0.0/0.2)  
EA 287900


On State Route 12 (Jameson Canyon Road)  
from State Route 29 in Napa County to Red Top Road in Solano County  
and  
On State Route 29 in Napa County  
from north of South Kelly Road to south of Route 221

**FINAL INITIAL STUDY with  
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION (CEQA)  
and  
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (NEPA)**

Submitted Pursuant to: (State) Division 13, Public Resources Code  
(Federal) 42 USC 4332(2)(C)

Prepared by  
THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
Department of Transportation

1-31-08  
Date of Approval

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Bijan Sartipi  
District Director, District 4  
California Department of Transportation




**CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT  
FOR  
State Route (SR) 12 Jameson Canyon Road Widening  
and State Routes (SRs) 29/12 interchange Project**

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency, and the Solano Transportation Authority have determined that the widening of SR 12 Jameson Canyon Road in combination with the tight diamond design alternative for the SRs 29/12 interchange will have no significant impact on the human environment. This FONSI is based on the attached EA (dated January 31, 2008) which has been independently evaluated by Caltrans and determined to adequately and accurately discuss the need, environmental issues, and impacts of the proposed project and appropriate mitigation measures. It provides sufficient evidence and analysis for determining that an EIS is not required. Caltrans takes full responsibility for the accuracy, scope, and content of the attached EA.

The environmental review, consultation, and any other action required in accordance with applicable Federal laws for this project is being, or has been, carried-out by Caltrans under its assumption of responsibility pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 327.

1-31-08  
Date

  
Bijan Sartip  
Caltrans District Director



**Mitigated Negative Declaration (CEQA)**  
Pursuant to: Division 13, Public Resources Code


**Project Description**

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) proposes to widen the two-lane conventional highway State Route 12 (Jameson Canyon) to a four-lane conventional highway and improve the intersection of State Routes 29 and 12 to an interchange. This project involves both Napa and Solano Counties. This project will reduce the existing traffic congestion by adding two more lanes, thus solving existing operational problems along the Jameson Canyon Road. The intersection of State Routes 29 and 12 are substandard and Caltrans has proposed to improve it by either of two alternatives, single point interchange or tight diamond interchange.

**Determination**

Caltrans has prepared an Initial Study/Environmental Assessment and determines from this study that the proposed project would not have a significant effect on the environment for the following reasons:

- The project will not significantly affect fish, plant life or wildlife; nor will it significantly affect any rare or endangered species.
- There will be no significant impacts upon the aesthetic features of the area.
- The project will not significantly affect any important farmland, any floodplain or any wetlands.
- No historic or archaeological sites or structures of architectural or engineering significance will be affected.
- The project will not affect neighborhoods, social, cultural, or educational facilities, or the economy of the area.
- The potential for geologic or seismic hazards will not be increased by the project.
- The project is compatible with local, regional and state land use planning and will not introduce any new patterns of land use or any growth in the area. It will not alter present patterns of traffic circulation or movement.
- There will be no impacts on noise, air, and water quality. The project will not change the rate of use of any natural resources.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Bijan Sartipi  
District Director, District 4  
California Department of Transportation

1-31-08  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date



---

## Summary

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), the Napa County Transportation Planning Agency, and the Solano Transportation Authority propose to widen State Route (SR) 12 through Jameson Canyon and convert the State Routes (SRs) 29 and 12 intersection into an interchange. The purpose of the project is to relieve traffic congestion along SR 12 by increasing its capacity and to reduce conflicts and delays at the junction of SRs 29 and 12. Traffic congestion on this portion of SR 12 is heavy during peak hours with demand exceeding the capacity of the facility. Traffic congestion also occurs at the SRs 29/12/Airport Boulevard intersection with queues and delays of 80 seconds or longer per vehicle. Without any capacity improvements, traffic congestion on SR 12 and at the SRs 29/12/Airport Boulevard intersection are projected to become even worse by the year 2035; the delay times at the SRs 29/12/Airport Boulevard intersection would increase from 80 seconds to between 290-320 seconds per vehicle.

The project is located in both Napa and Solano Counties. The project is approximately 9.1 km (5.7 miles) long starting from its eastern terminus at Red Top Road near the I-680/I-80/SR 12 junctions in Solano County and ending at its western terminus at the junction of SRs 29 and 12 and Airport Boulevard in Napa County.

The rolling terrain on either side of SR 12 is open space or being used for agricultural purposes. There are a few residences along SR 12 that are part of large ranches. The junction of SRs 29/12/Airport Boulevard is generally flat and surrounded by industrial parks. The Napa County Airport and two golf courses are nearby.

The proposed project has two build alternatives and a no-build alternative. Both build alternatives widen SR 12 from two lanes to four lanes and include a concrete median barrier to separate east- and westbound traffic. Two median openings, one in each county, would be provided along with acceleration and deceleration lanes. Nine retaining walls would be constructed—three cut walls (also known as soil nail walls) and six fill/MSE (mechanically stabilized earth) walls. The type of retaining wall used at each of the nine locations would depend on adjacent topography and geologic factors. The tallest retaining wall would be approximately 30 meters (100 feet) high and in two tiers. Cross culverts underneath SR 12 would be extended to the new width of SR 12.

Existing utility facilities along SR 12 or near the SRs 29/12/Airport Boulevard intersection would be relocated to just beyond the outside shoulder areas and Caltrans right of way.

The two build alternatives differ in their configurations for the SRs 29/12/Airport Boulevard interchange. In Alternative 1, the interchange would be a tight-diamond configuration. In Alternative 2, the interchange would be a single-point configuration. Both interchange configurations would have SR 12 elevated, with a possible two span bridge, over Route 29, which would remain at grade. Both alternatives would accommodate all direct traffic movements for SR 12/Airport Boulevard to and from SR 29.

The no build alternative would leave SR 12, the SRs 29/12/Airport Boulevard intersection, and surrounding area unchanged.

The proposed project would require partial acquisitions of sixty-six parcels. Most of the partial acquisitions would be narrow strips—“slivers”—adjacent to SR 12 or the SRs 29/12/Airport Boulevard intersection. No residential relocations would occur. Two driveways would be relocated because of proposed new retaining walls.

A total of four residences along SR 12 are deemed affected by increased traffic noise; their predicted future noise levels would exceed 66 dBA Leq (h). The affected residential receptors all have direct, line-of-sight of the highway. Noise abatement in the form of sound walls has been investigated for all affected receptors. None of the sound walls were determined to be feasible.

This project may affect the following federally listed species:

threatened

- California red-legged frog (CRLF; *Rana aurora draytonii*)
- vernal pool fairy shrimp (*Branchinecta lynchii*)

endangered

- vernal pool tadpole shrimp (*Lepidurus packardii*)
- Conservancy fairy shrimp (CFS; *Branchinecta conservatio*)

Additionally, the project may affect the following California state listed species:

endangered

- American peregrine falcon (*Falco peregrinus anatum*)

threatened

- Swainson’s hawk (*Buteo swainsonii*)

---

*species of concern*

- fifteen California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) amphibian, reptile, bird, and mammal species

Oak woodlands, riparian forests, wetlands, and other waters occurring within the project area will also be affected.

Caltrans is in the process of identifying mitigation sites for the implementation of onsite mitigation for temporary and permanent impacts to oak woodland, riparian forest, and wetland habitats. Where onsite mitigation is unavailable or infeasible, Caltrans will seek nearby offsite mitigation for permanent loss of habitats through the purchase of appropriate habitat or mitigation bank credits. Caltrans is coordinating with regulatory agencies in the preservation and restoration effort to compensate for impacts to wetlands and other waters of the U. S., and CRLFs breeding and movement/aestivation habitat. Additional preservation and restoration of vernal pool habitat may be necessary to compensate for impacts to federally-listed large branchiopods. Furthermore, Caltrans will mitigate for the loss of native trees by restoring oak woodland and riparian woodland. Locations of tree replacement plantings will be established at on- and off-site locations to be determined by Caltrans and the regulatory agencies.

Impacts to water quality will be addressed through best management practices (BMPs).

There will be no impacts to cultural resources, air quality, hazardous materials, or the community resulting from this project.

Anticipated permits for this project include a California Department of Fish and Game Section 1602 Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement; a Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 404 Individual Permit from the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE); a CWA Section 401 Water Quality Certification permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB); and a Biological Opinion—Section 7 Incidental Take Statement from the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).

Blank page

---

# Table of Contents

<b>Summary</b> .....	v
<b>Chapter 1 Proposed Project</b>	
1.1 Introduction.....	1
1.2 Background.....	1
1.3 Project Purpose and Need.....	2
1.4 Project Description.....	5
Alternatives.....	6
Rejected Alternatives.....	11
Project Cost and Funding Sources.....	15
1.5 Permits and Approval Needed.....	15
<b>Chapter 2 Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Avoidance, Minimization &amp;/or Mitigation Measures</b>	
2.1 Human Environment.....	31
2.1.1 Land Use.....	31
2.1.2 Growth.....	37
2.1.3 Farmlands/Agricultural Lands.....	40
2.1.4 Community Impacts.....	47
2.1.5 Utility/Emergency Services.....	50
2.1.6 Traffic/Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities.....	51
2.1.7 Visual/Aesthetics.....	75
2.1.8 Cultural Resources.....	110
2.2 Physical Environment.....	113
2.2.1 Hydrology and Floodplain.....	113
2.2.2 Water Quality and Storm Water Runoff.....	117
2.2.3 Geology/Soils/Seismic/Topography.....	121
2.2.4 Hazardous Waste/Materials.....	125
2.2.5 Air Quality.....	127
2.2.6 Noise.....	139
2.2.7 Energy.....	154
2.3 Biological Environment.....	158
2.3.1 Natural Communities.....	163
2.3.2 Wetlands and Other Waters.....	175
2.3.3 Plant Species.....	183
2.3.4 Animal Species.....	189
2.3.5 Threatened and Endangered Species.....	199
2.3.6 Invasive Species.....	207
2.4 Construction Impacts.....	209
2.5 Climate Change.....	211
<b>Chapter 3 Comments and Coordination</b> .....	215
<b>Chapter 4 List of Preparers</b> .....	217
<b>Chapter 5 Distribution List</b> .....	221
<b>Technical Studies</b> .....	227

# Appendixes

**Appendix A** – CEQA Checklist

**Appendix B** – Title VI Policy Statement

**Appendix C** – Glossary of Technical Terms

**Appendix D** – Acronyms

**Appendix E** – Letter of Concurrence from the State Historic Preservation Officer

**Appendix F** – Endangered and Threatened Species Lists

**Appendix G** – Plant Species Lists

**Appendix H** – Animal Species List

**Appendix I** – Biological Assessment Transmittal Letter to USFWS

**Appendix J** – Minimization and Mitigation Summary

**Appendix K** – USFWS Section 7 Biological Opinion Incidental Take Statement

**Appendix L** – Farmland Correspondence

**Appendix M** - FHWA Concurrence on Air Quality Conformity Determination

---

## Figures

1.1	Project Location Map.....	3
1.4.1a to 1.4.1d and 1.4.1f to 1.4.1i	SR 12 Jameson Canyon Widening .....	17-27
1.4.2	Tight Diamond Configuration for the SRs 29/12 Interchange.....	29
1.4.3	Single Point Configuration for the SRs 29/12 Interchange.....	30
2.1.3.1	Napa Parcels.....	44
2.1.3.2	Solano Parcels.....	45
2.1.4.1	Census Tracts Surrounding the Project Area.....	46
2.1.6.1 to 2.1.6.15	Proposed Bicycle Facilities.....	60-74
2.1.7.1	Project Area's Landscape Units.....	89
2.1.7.2 to 2.1.7.4	Image Types in Landscape Unit 1, Unit 2, and Unit 3.....	90-92
2.1.7.5a to 2.1.7.5b	Key Viewpoint 1—Existing and Two Simulated Views.....	93
2.1.7.6a to 2.1.7.6c	Key Viewpoint 2—Existing and Two Simulated Views.....	94-95
2.1.7.7a to 2.1.7.7c	Key Viewpoint 3—Existing and Two Simulated Views.....	96-97
2.1.7.8a to 2.1.7.8c	Key Viewpoint 4—Existing and Two Simulated Views.....	98-99
2.1.7.9a to 2.1.7.9b	Key Viewpoint 5—Existing and Simulated Views.....	100
2.1.7.10a to 2.1.7.10b	Key Viewpoint 6—Existing and Simulated Views.....	101
2.1.7.11a to 2.1.7.11c	Key Viewpoint 7—Existing and Simulated Views, Single Point and Tight Diamond Interchange Configurations.....	102-103
2.1.7.12a to 2.1.7.12c	Key Viewpoint 8—Existing and Simulated Views, Single Point and Tight Diamond Interchange Configurations.....	104-105
2.2.6.1.1 to 2.2.6.1.6	Noise Receptor Locations.....	143-148
2.3.1.1	Biological Study Area.....	159
2.3.2.1a to 2.3.2.1c	Wetlands and Waters within the Project Biological Study Area.....	160-162



---

# Chapter 1-Proposed Project

---

## 1.1. Introduction

The State Route (SR) 12 Jameson Canyon Road Widening and State Routes (SRs) 29 and 12 Interchange Improvement Project proposes to widen the existing two-lane conventional highway to a four-lane highway and convert the existing intersection of SRs 29 and 12 to an interchange. The widening project is approximately 9.1 km (5.7 miles) long starting from its east terminus at Red Top Road in Solano County and ending at its west terminus at the junction of SRs 12 and 29 in Napa County. The interchange project encompasses SR 29 from just south of SR 221 and ending near Kelly Road South, and SR 12 from Airport Boulevard to the intersection with Kelly Road. (See Figure 1.1.)

## 1.2. Background

SR 12 is an important east-west highway that traverses San Joaquin, Sacramento, Solano, Napa, and Sonoma Counties and carries interregional as well as local traffic. It connects with I-5 (in San Joaquin County), I-80 (in Solano County), and U. S. Route 101 (in Sonoma County). The portion of SR 12 that is the focus of this project is known as Jameson Canyon Road and, in Solano County, it is also called SR 12 West (the portion east of I-80 is referred to as SR 12 East). On an average annual daily basis (counted at Kelly Road in 2003), SR 12 carries between 24,700 and 32,500 motorists, in either direction, between the southern Napa Valley and the Fairfield/Suisun Valley areas. Many of the motorists using this portion of SR 12 live in Solano County and work in Napa County. As more jobs have been established in Napa County and more residences built in Solano County, traffic volumes, congestion, and travel times have increased on this portion of SR 12.

This portion of SR 12 is mostly a two-lane conventional highway set in a rural landscape with flat to rolling terrain. Beginning at SR 29, there is a third lane extending eastbound for approximately 1.5 km (0.93 miles), for passing purposes, before the highway tapers to two lanes. The existing lane widths are 3.6 m (12 ft) with shoulder widths ranging from 0.7 to 2.4 m (2.30 to 8 ft).

There are two at-grade, signal-controlled intersections (Kelly Road,– and Kirkland Ranch Road) and one at-grade, unsignalized Y-intersection (Lynch Road) in Napa

County. There is an unsignalized T-intersection at Red Top Road in Solano County. SR 12 is accessible from adjacent properties, except between SR 29 and Kelly Road.

SR 29, running north-south, is also an important highway that traverses Solano, Napa, and Lake Counties. It connects the major cities of Napa County and carries recreationally- and agriculturally-related traffic into and out of the region. In the project area, SR 29 is a four-lane conventional highway. The existing intersection with SR 12 and Airport Boulevard consists of two southbound and three northbound through lanes for SR 29, one northbound left-turn lane to Airport Boulevard and two southbound left-turn lanes to SR 12. At this intersection, SR 12 consists of one through lane to Airport Boulevard and one left-turn lane to southbound SR 29. The lane configuration on Airport Boulevard includes two left-turn lanes to northbound SR 29 and one through lane to SR 12. All four quadrants of the intersection have right turn lanes.

### 1.3 Project Purpose and Need

The purpose of the project is to relieve traffic congestion and delays along SR 12 by increasing its capacity and reducing conflicts at the junction of SRs 29 and 12. The project is needed because of unacceptable levels of service, queues and delays at intersections, projected increase in traffic volumes, and a higher than average accident rate at the intersection of SR 29 and SR12/Airport Boulevard.

SR 12, in year 2005, carried an Average Daily Traffic (ADT) volume of 34,500 vehicles from Red Top Road (just west of I-80) to North Kelly Road (just east of the junction of SRs 29 and 12). SR 29, in year 2005, carried an ADT of 66,000 vehicles through the project limits from north of SR 12 to south of SR 12.

During the peak hour, SR 12 from Red Top Road through Jameson Canyon to North Kelly Road currently operates at an unacceptable Level of Service (LOS) “F” and carries more average daily traffic than its capacity. The intersections of SR 12 with SR 29, North Kelly Road, and Red Top Road also operate at generally unacceptable LOS ranging between “D” and “F.” [See Section 2.1.6 in this document or *OPERATIONAL ANALYSIS FOR THE SR-12 WIDENING PROJECT & ROUTE 12/29 INTERCHANGE (2007).*]

The junction of SRs 29 and 12 is currently a signalized intersection. In the AM and PM peak hours, the heavy volume of vehicles converging at that junction results in queues and delay times of approximately 80 seconds per vehicle before vehicles pass through or turn at the intersection.

Project Location Figure 1.1



## LEVELS OF SERVICE



for Two-Lane Highways

Level of Service	Flow Conditions	Operating Speed (mph)	Technical Descriptions
<b>A</b>		55+	Highest quality of service. Free traffic flow with few restrictions on maneuverability or speed. <b>No delays</b>
<b>B</b>		50	Stable traffic flow. Speed becoming slightly restricted. Low restriction on maneuverability. <b>No delays</b>
<b>C</b>		45	Stable traffic flow, but less freedom to select speed, change lanes or pass. <b>Minimal delays</b>
<b>D</b>		40	Traffic flow becoming unstable. Speeds subject to sudden change. Passing is difficult. <b>Minimal delays</b>
<b>E</b>		35	Unstable traffic flow. Speeds change quickly and maneuverability is low. <b>Significant delays</b>
<b>F</b>			Heavily congested traffic. Demand exceeds capacity and speeds vary greatly. <b>Considerable delays</b>

Source: 2000 HCM, Exhibit 20-2, LOS Criteria for Two-Lane Highways in Class I

## LEVELS OF SERVICE

for Intersections with Traffic Signals

Level of Service	Delay per Vehicle (seconds)
<b>A</b>	 ≤10
<b>B</b>	 11-20
<b>C</b>	 21-35
<b>D</b>	 36-55
<b>E</b>	 56-80
<b>F</b>	 >80

**Factors Affecting LOS of Signalized Intersections**

**Traffic Signal Conditions:**

- Signal Coordination
- Cycle Length
- Protected left turn
- Timing
- Pre-timed or traffic activated signal
- Etc.

**Geometric Conditions:**

- Left- and right-turn lanes
- Number of lanes
- Etc.

**Traffic Conditions:**

- Percent of truck traffic
- Number of pedestrians
- Etc.

Source: 2000 HCM, Exhibit 16-2, Level of Service Criteria for Signalized Intersections

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) notes in the North Bay Corridor Study, dated March 1998, that “population and job growth are expected to continue to intensify along SR 29, U. S. Route 101, and I-80, leading to increased east-west travel demand across...SRs 12, 116, 121...Travel demand is diverse and includes not only weekday commuting, but weekend tourism, truck traffic from agricultural operations, and traffic generated by major events.” According to MTC’s Regional Transportation Plan, “Transportation 2030 Plan,” daily person trips from year 2000 to year 2030 between Napa and Solano Counties on SRs 12 and 29 are projected to increase 68%, which is exceeded in the Bay Area only by trips between San Benito/Monterey/Merced-Santa Clara at 120%, Lake/Colusa-Napa at 102%, and Mendocino/Sonoma at 83%.

In the year 2035, the ADT volume for SR 12 is projected to be 62,200. The ADT for SR 29 is projected to be 109,400.

In the year 2035, the operations of SR 12 are projected to remain at LOS “F” during the AM and PM peak hours. The operations of the SRs 29/12 intersection will also remain at LOS “F” in both the AM and PM peak hours.

The delay times at the junction of SRs 29/12 will increase from the current 80 seconds to between 290 and 320 seconds.

### *Safety*

The accident rates (from January 1, 2003 to December 31, 2005) for SR 12 through Jameson Canyon are comparable to the statewide average for similar facilities.

The accident rates for SRs 29 and 12 at the SRs 29/12 intersection are two to four times the statewide average for similar facilities and intersections. The higher than average rate of accidents at the intersection indicates a potential need to separate vehicle movements between the two routes.

## **1.4 Project Description**

The proposed project has two components—the SR 12 highway and the SRs 29/12 intersection. The SR 12 highway component begins at the intersection of Kelly Road and SR 12 in Napa County and ends at the intersection of Red Top Road and SR 12 (just 0.2 miles from the junction with I-80 and less than 1 mile from the junction with I-80 and I-680) in Solano County for a total length of approximately 9.1 km (5.7

miles). The SRs 29/12 intersection component begins on SR 29 just south of SR 221 and ends near Kelly Road South, and on SR 12 from Airport Boulevard to the intersection with Kelly Road.

Both components have been combined into the proposed project because of their proximity to each other. And, except for residents in the Jameson Canyon area, motorists utilize both the highway and the SRs 29/12 intersection together. Thus, the SRs 29/12 intersection and the SR 12/Red Top Road intersection are “logical termini” for the proposed project because they are rational end points (project limits) for the proposed transportation improvements and for the review of environmental impacts. The SR 12/I-80 and I-80/I-680 interchanges, which are east of SR 12/Red Top Road intersection, were not considered a terminus for the proposed project because there is a separate project that addresses operational improvements between SR 12, I-80, and I-680.

The project, as proposed, has independent utility. The widening of the highway and the improvement of the SRs 29/12 intersection results in a usable facility even if no other transportation improvements in the area are made.

The implementation of the project as proposed does not restrict the consideration of alternatives for other reasonably foreseeable transportation improvements in that portion of SR 12 or the SRs 29/12 intersection.

## Alternatives

The following are the alternatives for the proposed project:

- **Alternative 1: Widen SR 12 to 4-lanes with a “Tight Diamond” interchange at its terminus with SRs 29/12**
- **Alternative 2: Widen SR 12 to 4-lanes with a “Single Point” interchange at its terminus with SRs 29/12**
- **No-Build**

Both build alternatives widen SR 12 to a 4-lane highway. The facility would be designed to highway standards (design speed of 90 km/h, 55 mph). The existing

intersections with Kelly, Kirkland Ranch, Lynch, and Red Top Roads will be maintained.

Both build alternatives elevate SR 12 over SR 29, which would remain at grade. Both would accommodate all direct traffic movements for SR 12/Airport Boulevard to and from SR 29. The construction of this interchange will require a temporary detour for east-west traffic on SR 12/Airport Boulevard south of the existing intersection. For the “tight diamond” interchange alternative, there will be diagonal on/off ramps in all four quadrants. All the ramps would be on fill with retaining walls as needed. Two permanent traffic signals are anticipated at the ends of the ramps on SR 12/Airport Boulevard. For the “single point” interchange alternative, the diagonal ramps in all quadrants meet at a single point intersection on SR 12. All the new ramps would either be on bridge structures or fill with retaining walls as needed. Traffic movements at the single point intersection would be controlled by a three-phase, permanent traffic signal.

The proposed project would be constructed in phases to match available funding. The first phase provides two new 3.6 m (12 ft) lanes south of the existing SR 12 facility and would be used for eastbound traffic (westbound traffic will use both lanes of the existing facility). The inside shoulder of the widened facility would be 1.5 m (4.5 ft) and the outside shoulder 2.4 m (8 ft). The outside shoulder will be signed and striped for an eastbound Class II bike lane (where possible, the outside shoulder of the existing facility will also be signed and striped for a westbound Class II bike lane). A concrete barrier would be constructed in the median to separate the two directions of traffic. There will be breaks in the median barrier—one in Napa County and one in Solano County—to allow drivers to make u-turns and reverse direction as needed. Culverts under SR 12 will be extended beneath the new eastbound lanes. One of the culverts would be enlarged for a potential, future undercrossing of the Bay Area Ridge Trail. Nine retaining walls would be constructed—three cut walls (also known as soil nail walls) and six fill/MSE (mechanically stabilized earth) walls. The type of retaining wall used at each of the nine locations would depend on adjacent topography and geologic factors. The tallest retaining wall would be approximately 30 meters (100 feet) high and in two tiers.

The second phase of the proposed project upgrades the existing facility and its shoulders to current standards. Horizontal and vertical curves will meet the current minimum highway standards for a design speed of 90 km/h (55 mph). The westbound roadbed will be raised to conform to the same level as the eastbound roadbed.

The last phase of the proposed project converts the junction of SRs 29 and 12 into an interchange. The interchange will continue to have four 3.6 m (12 ft) through lanes, two in each direction, on SR 29. SR 12 would have five 3.6 m (12 ft) through lanes, two westbound and three eastbound, with 3.0 m (10 ft) shoulders between SR 29 and Kelly Road. The three eastbound lanes merge to two lanes east of Kelly Road. Other details of the interchange include the following:

- one 3.6 m (12 ft) left-turn lane in each direction from SR 12-Airport Boulevard to the SR 29 on-ramps
- a 3.6 m (12 ft) auxiliary lane with a 3.0 m (10 ft) shoulder on SR 29 in the southbound direction north of the interchange
- access control in all areas within the limits of the current SRs 29/12 intersection that are currently access controlled
- new ramps with at minimum 2.4 m (8 ft) right and 1.2 m (4 ft) left shoulders.
- a new on-ramp in the southwest quadrant that will have two 3.6 m (12 ft) lanes from the SR 12/Airport intersection merging into one before the entrance to SR 29
- an off-ramp from northbound SR 29 in the southeast quadrant with a single 3.6 m (12 ft) lane at the exit that expands into two 3.6 m (12 ft) lanes at the intersection; one lane will be for right turning movements (east) to SR 12, and the other will be for left turns (west) to Airport Boulevard
- two 3.6m (12 ft) lanes exiting from southbound SR 29 in the northwest quadrant and expanding into four lanes at the intersection; one lane will turn right (west) onto Airport Boulevard, while the other three lanes will turn left (east) onto SR 12
- a two-lane connector from westbound SR 12, at the northeast quadrant, that will merge with one lane from the left-turn pocket from eastbound SR 12/Airport Boulevard; these three 3.6 m (12 ft) lanes will drop to two, which will enter northbound SR 29. A 3.0 m (10 ft) shoulder will be provided on northbound SR 29.

In the last phase, the portion of the bike lane adjacent to eastbound SR 12 from the SRs 29/12 interchange to Kelly Road would be converted to a two-directional, Class I bike path. The portion of the bike lane adjacent to westbound SR 12 from Kelly Road to the SRs 29/12 would be terminated; to continue westbound, bicyclists would crossover Kelly Road to use the two-directional, Class I bike path adjacent to eastbound SR 12.

The No-Build Alternative would retain SR 12 and the SRs 29/12 intersection in their current configurations. The facilities would be unchanged other than routine maintenance operations.

### **Comparison of Build Alternatives**

The following matrix contrasts the two build alternatives for the proposed project.

	<b><u>Alternative 1 with Tight Diamond Interchange</u></b>	<b><u>Alternative 2 with Single Point Interchange</u></b>
<b><u>Purpose and Need:</u></b>	<p><b><u>SIMILAR LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS) IN 2035:</u></b> <i>for movements between southbound SR 29 and eastbound SR 12 during the AM (LOS-C) and PM (LOS-D) peak periods</i></p> <p><b><u>SLIGHTLY BETTER LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS) IN 2035:</u></b> <i>for movements between SR 12 and northbound SR 29 during the AM (LOS-B) and PM (LOS-A) peak periods</i></p> <p><b><u>SLIGHTLY LESS DELAY TIME IN 2035:</u></b> <i>29.8 seconds between SR 12 and SR 29 southbound and 15.0 seconds between SR 12 and SR 29 northbound</i></p> <p><b><u>SIMILAR VEHICLE QUEUE LENGTHS AND STORAGE:</u></b> <i>problem locations are at SR 12/North Kelly Road and SR 12 westbound at Red Top Road</i></p>	<p><b><u>SIMILAR LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS) IN 2035:</u></b> <i>for movements between southbound SR 29 and eastbound SR 12 during the AM (LOS-C) and PM (LOS-D) peak periods</i></p> <p><b><u>SLIGHTLY WORSE LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS) IN 2035:</u></b> <i>for movements between SR 12 and northbound SR 29 during the AM (LOS-C) and PM (LOS-D) peak periods</i></p> <p><b><u>SLIGHTLY MORE DELAY TIME IN 2035:</u></b> <i>25.7 seconds between SR 12 and SR 29 southbound and 25.7 seconds between SR 12 and SR 29 northbound</i></p> <p><b><u>SIMILAR VEHICLE QUEUE LENGTHS AND STORAGE:</u></b> <i>problem locations are at SR 12/North Kelly Road and SR 12 westbound at Red Top Road</i></p>

<p><b><u>Environmental Impacts: Biology</u></b></p>	<p><b><u>SLIGHTLY LESS IMPACTS ON WETLANDS:</u></b>  <i>permanent impact 3.8 acres</i>  <i>temporary impact 5.5 acres</i>  <b><u>SIMILAR IMPACTS ON WATERS OF THE U. S.:</u></b>  <i>permanent impact 0.5 acres</i>  <i>temporary impacts 1.1 acres</i>  <b><u>SLIGHTLY LESS IMPACTS ON CALIFORNIA RED-LEGGED FROGS:</u></b>  <i>permanent impact 69.06 acres</i>  <i>temporary impact 136.30 acres</i>  <b><u>SIMILAR IMPACTS ON BRACHIOPODS (PRIMARILY VERNAL POOL FAIRY SHRIMP):</u></b>  <i>permanent impact 7.92 acres</i>  <i>temporary impact 5.55 acres</i>  <b><u>SLIGHTLY MORE IMPACTS ON TREES:</u></b>  <i>a total of 547 trees will be affected</i></p>	<p><b><u>SLIGHTLY MORE IMPACTS ON WETLANDS:</u></b>  <i>permanent impact 4.1 acres</i>  <i>temporary impact 5.1 acres</i>  <b><u>SIMILAR IMPACTS ON WATERS OF THE U. S.:</u></b>  <i>permanent impact 0.5 acres</i>  <i>temporary impact 1.0 acres</i>  <b><u>SLIGHTLY MORE IMPACTS ON CALIFORNIA RED-LEGGED FROGS:</u></b>  <i>permanent impact 71.14 acres</i>  <i>temporary impact 134.21 acres</i>  <b><u>SIMILAR IMPACTS ON BRACHIOPODS (PRIMARILY VERNAL POOL FAIRY SHRIMP):</u></b>  <i>permanent impact 7.83 acres</i>  <i>temporary impact 5.59 acres</i>  <b><u>SLIGHTLY LESS IMPACTS ON TREES:</u></b>  <i>a total of 528 trees will be affected</i></p>
<p><b><u>Environmental Impacts: Visual/Aesthetics</u></b></p>	<p><b><u>MORE AESTHETICALLY PLEASING FEATURES:</u></b>  Overall, this alternative has greater area of wider embankments and fewer retaining walls in the interior of the SRs 29/12 interchange area, thus, permitting more tree/shrub planting. The signage and lighting support elements are less dominant.</p>	<p><b><u>LESS AESTHETICALLY PLEASING FEATURES:</u></b>  The SRs 29/12 interchange area will have more paving and more retaining walls with narrower planting areas facing SR 29 and less room for tree planting. The signage and the lighting support elements will be more visually dominant at the single point.</p>
<p><b><u>Environmental Impacts: Farmlands</u></b></p>	<p><b><u>SIMILAR IMPACTS UPON FARMLANDS:</u></b>  affects portions of ten parcels of prime, unique, or statewide important farmlands totaling 25 acres  affects portions of six Williamson Act contract parcels totaling 34.28 acres</p>	<p><b><u>SIMILAR IMPACTS UPON FARMLANDS:</u></b>  affects portions of ten parcels of prime, unique, or statewide important farmlands totaling 25 acres  affects portions of six Williamson Act contract parcels totaling 34.28 acres</p>

<b><u>Right of Way Requirements:</u></b>	<b><u>SLIGHTLY LESS RIGHT OF WAY REQUIRED:</u></b> 34 partial acquisitions (totaling 17.72 acres) at the SRs 29/12 interchange 32 partial acquisitions (totaling 63.42 acres) from North Kelly Road to Red Top Road	<b><u>SLIGHTLY MORE RIGHT OF WAY REQUIRED:</u></b> 34 partial acquisitions (totaling 20.16 acres) at the SRs 29/12 interchange 32 partial acquisitions (totaling 63.42 acres) from North Kelly Road to Red Top Road
<b><u>Project Cost—Right of Way (2007 estimate)</u></b>	<b><u>LOWER RIGHT OF WAY COST</u></b> SRs 29/12 interchange: \$11,781,000 SR 12 widening: \$10,607,000	<b><u>HIGHER RIGHT OF WAY COST</u></b> SRs 29/12 interchange: \$12,588,000 SR 12 widening: \$10,607,000
<b><u>Project Cost—Construction (2007 estimate)</u></b>	<b><u>LOWER CONSTRUCTION COST</u></b> SRs 29/12 interchange: \$61,356,000 SR 12 widening: \$115,806,000	<b><u>HIGHER CONSTRUCTION COST</u></b> SRs 29/12 interchange: \$74,949,000 SR 12 widening: \$115,806,000

### **Preferred Alternative**

In January 2008, the project's development team, which includes staff from Caltrans, the Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency, and the Solano Transportation Authority, identified the Tight Diamond Interchange alternative as the preferred alternative for the proposed project. The team based its decision on the factors above, and on comments received and expressed at the open houses.

### **Rejected Alternatives**

#### **SR 12 Jameson Canyon Road Widening**

- **13.8 m (45 ft) median four-lane expressway with frontage roads**

This alternative proposed to convert the existing SR 12 Jameson Canyon Road to a four-lane expressway with a design speed of 110 km/h (65 mph). Two-way frontage roads would be built on both sides of the expressway so that access to it would be limited at selected intersections. However, the footprint of this alternative would create significant right of way and environmental impacts, with the median width of 13.8 m (45 ft) and nearly an 8 m (26 ft) separation between expressway and each frontage road. With the steep terrain, especially in Solano County, this alternative would require large cuts, fills and retaining walls [approximately 46 m (150 ft) at one

location]. This alternative was rejected due to significantly greater right of way requirements, environmental impacts, and high construction costs.

- **PSR Alternative-18.6 m (61 ft) median four-lane expressway with frontage roads**

This alternative was the primary alternative proposed in the approved Project Study Report (PSR) to initiate this project. This alternative would convert the existing SR 12 Jameson Canyon Road to a four-lane expressway with a design speed of 100 km/h (62 mph). Two-way frontage roads would have been built on both sides of the expressway so that access would be limited to selected intersections. As with the 13.8 m (45 ft) median alternative, the footprint of this alternative would have created right of way and environmental impacts with the wide median, frontage roads and a required 8 m (26 ft) separation between the frontage roads and the expressway. Thus, it was dropped from further consideration.

- **6.6 m (21.6 ft) median four-lane expressway with collector-distributor roads**

This alternative proposed to convert the existing SR 12 Jameson Canyon Road to a four-lane expressway with design speed of 110 km/h (65 mph). On both sides of the expressway, collector-distributor roads (roads off the mainline) would collect multiple driveways together and distribute them to the expressway with one opening, thereby limiting access to it. Acceleration and deceleration lanes would allow ease of ingress and egress to and from the expressway. The footprint of this alternative was less than the above alternative, but it still created significant right of way and environmental impacts, with the median width of 6.6 m (21.6 ft) and nearly 8 m (26 ft) separation between expressway and the collector-distributor roads. This alternative was rejected due to significantly greater right of way requirements, environmental impacts, and high construction costs.

### **SRs 29/12 Intersection Improvements**

- **At-Grade Intersection Improvement**

Several at-grade improvements were investigated to alleviate traffic congestion at the existing SRs 29/12 intersection. The three proposals studied in the PSR included various widening proposals to the existing at-grade intersection that added through-lanes on SR 29 and turning lanes between SRs 29 and 12.

---

The first proposal added a northbound lane to SR 29 and southbound left turn lane to SR 29 for a total of three left turn lanes to SR 12. This proposal was rejected because it did not address future traffic levels.

The second proposal included three left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one through/right turn lane on SR 29 southbound. In addition, one left turn lane, three through lanes and one through/right turn lane on SR 29 northbound were included. Eastbound SR 12 had to be widened to three lanes to accommodate the southbound left turn movement. This proposal was rejected because it did not address future traffic levels and it could not accommodate an interchange configuration in the future.

The third proposal included four southbound left turn lanes, six northbound lanes (with one northbound left turn lane), four eastbound lanes, with two eastbound left turn lanes; and three westbound lanes, including one westbound left turn lane. Although it did meet the 2025 traffic projections (according to the traffic study performed at that time), this proposal was rejected because it was not technically feasible.

- **Spread Diamond Interchange**

This alternative was considered as a low-cost variant of the Partial Cloverleaf Alternative (below). The idea was that if the partial cloverleaf configuration was to be the ultimate concept, a “spread” diamond interchange could initially be constructed as an incremental improvement, then later incorporating the loop ramps in a future project. This alternative was rejected due to significantly greater right of way requirements and environmental impacts.

- **Partial Cloverleaf Interchange**

This alternative would include loop ramps in the northwest and southeast quadrants and diagonal ramps in all four quadrants. Auxiliary lanes on SR 29 would be required for the proposed two lane diagonal ramps in the northwest and northeast quadrants. This alternative was rejected due to significantly greater right of way requirements and environmental impacts.

- **Flyover**

The flyover alternative would have called for a direct connector from SR 29 southbound to SR 12 eastbound. The opposite movement would have been provided

by a northeast quadrant diagonal ramp. Because only the two direct connections were considered with no other improvement to the SRs 29/12 intersection, this alternative was rejected because it could not relieve all the congestion at the SRs 29/12 intersection and it was not acceptable to the local stakeholders.

### **Transportation System Management and Transit**

The Transportation System Management (TSM) alternative consists of activities that maximize the efficiency of the present system. Such activities include fringe parking, ridesharing, high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes, and traffic signal timing optimization. The Solano Transportation Authority completed a SR 12 transit corridor study in 2004. The study included the segment of SR 12 from Napa to Rio Vista on the eastern boundary of Solano County. The SR 12 Transit Corridor Study will be updated for the segment of SR 12 between Fairfield and Napa. A variety of transit options will be studied ranging from regular fixed-route, express bus, peak period only service, shuttles, and other options to determine the most viable transit option for near and long-term success in this corridor. The planned Red Top Road Park and Ride lot located adjacent to SR 12 near I-80 will be a strategic location for a transit stop and transfer location for Jameson Canyon transit service whenever that service becomes established. The new transit service will be heavily promoted in both counties and the promotion would include a transit incentive for new riders.

Ridesharing in vans or private vehicles would ease some of the congestion on SR 12, but ridesharing would have limited effectiveness on the existing two-lane highway because there will be no time advantage for the motorists and passengers who would be sharing the commute. Adding one HOV lane in each direction to SR 12 would require widening of that facility from two to four lanes, which is the action that the two proposed build alternatives would accomplish. The difference is, however, that the additional lanes would only relieve congestion for high occupancy vehicles in this TSM alternative, but would relieve congestion for both high occupancy and single-occupancy vehicles in the two proposed build alternatives. Traffic signal timing optimization is already being utilized at the SRs 29/12 intersection; it has negligible effect at the intersections with Kelly, Kirkland, and Lynch Roads because the traffic volumes on those roads are low. This alternative is unlikely to succeed in easing congestion on the existing SR 12 facility and was, therefore, rejected as an alternative.

---

## Project Cost and Funding Sources:

The right of way cost estimate for the widening of SR 12 to four lanes is \$10,607,000 in 2007 dollars and \$11,032,000 escalated to the mid-construction year of 2011. The construction cost estimate for roadway items is \$115,758,000 in 2007 dollars and \$154,857,000 escalated to the mid-construction year of 2011.

The right of way cost estimate for the conversion of the SRs 29/12 intersection to an interchange ranges from \$11,781,000 (for the Tight-Diamond Alternative) to \$12,588,000 (for the Single-Point Alternative) in 2007 dollars. The construction cost estimate ranges from \$55,385,000 (for the Tight-Diamond Alternative) to \$79,891,000 (for the Single-Point Alternative) in 2007 dollars. The right of way and construction cost estimates for the conversion of the SRs 29/12 intersection to an interchange have not yet been escalated because there is no target date for these actions yet.

Approximately \$73,990,000 of the funding for the widening of SR 12 will be from the Corridor Mobility Improvement Account, which receives bond monies from Proposition 1B—the Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Bond Act of 2006—that was approved by California voters on November 7, 2006. This amount would enable the completion of Phase 1—the construction of two lanes and shoulders for the eastbound direction and retaining walls. Phase 2—the widening and overlaying of existing highway—may be funded from a combination of State Transportation Improvement Program (both Interregional Transportation Improvement Program and Regional Transportation Improvement Program), federal (SAFETEA-LU demonstration funds, and Surface Transportation Program funds), and, possibly, local sources including sales tax measures if they should ever be approved by the electorate.

The source of funding for the conversion of the SRs 29/12 intersection to an interchange is still to be determined.

## 1.5 Permits and Approval Needed

This project will require several permits, agreements, and concurrence from the resource agencies:

- Section 7 Incidental Take Statement for the California red-legged frog (USFWS; Federal Endangered Species Act)

- 1602 Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement (CDFG; Section 1601 of the Fish and Game Code)
- 401 Water Quality Certification (RWQCB; Section 401 of the Clean Water Act)
- 404 Individual Permit (USACE; Section 404 of the Clean Water Act)

Pages 17 to 27

Figures 1.4.1a to 1.4.1d and 1.4.1f to 1.4.1l—Jameson Canyon Road Widening



Pages 29 to 30

Figures 1.4.2 and 1.4.3—Tight Diamond and Single Point Interchange Configurations