

4.6 TRANSPORTATION / CIRCULATION

Would the proposal result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Hazards to safety from design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Insufficient parking capacity on site or off site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Rail, waterborne, or air traffic impacts?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Consideration of potential transportation and circulation impacts that may result from the project would primarily involve determining whether a net change would occur in traffic generated by personnel commuting to or from the affected facilities, and by vehicle trips.

The project, the divestiture of properties by Edison, would not directly generate additional traffic to or from the sites. However, indirect effects of divestiture could result in increased operations and increased on-site employment levels. These factors could incrementally increase transportation and circulation in the site areas.

SETTING

Regional Setting

A network of interstate and state highways and local roads is present in the region encompassing the affected facilities. The ability of that network to accommodate existing traffic demands depends on the specific location considered.

Local Setting

Alamitos

Access for the Alamitos site is provided by Studebaker Road, a local-serving roadway, and 7th Street (State Route 22).

Cool Water

Access for the Cool Water site is provided by Santa Fe Street and Daggett-Yermo Road / A Street, local-serving roadways, and the I-40 and I-15 freeways.

Ellwood

Access for the Ellwood site is provided by Hollister Avenue, a local-serving roadway, and the U.S. 101 freeway.

El Segundo

Access for the El Segundo site is provided by Vista Del Mar Boulevard and Rosecrans Avenue, local-serving roadways, and Sepulveda Boulevard (State Route 1) and I-405 (The San Diego Freeway).

Etiwanda

Access for the Etiwanda site is provided by Etiwanda Avenue, a local-serving roadway, and Foothill Boulevard (State Route 66) and the I-15 freeway.

Highgrove

Access for the Highgrove site is provided by Taylor Street and Main Street, local-serving roadways, and the I-15 freeway.

Huntington Beach

Access for the Huntington Beach site is provided by Newland Street, a local-serving roadway, and State Route 1 (The Pacific Coast Highway).

Long Beach

Access for the Long Beach site is provided by West Seaside Boulevard, a local-serving roadway, and State Route 103 (Terminal Island Freeway).

Mandalay

Access for the Mandalay site is provided by North Harbor Boulevard, a local-serving roadway, and the U.S. 101 freeway.

Ormond Beach

Access for the Ormond Beach site is provided by South Edison Drive and Hueneme Road, local-serving roadways, and the U.S. 101 freeway.

Redondo

Access for the Redondo site is provided by Harbor Drive, a local-serving roadway, and State Route 1 (The Pacific Coast Highway).

San Bernardino

Access for the San Bernardino site is provided by San Bernardino Avenue and Mountain View Avenue, local-serving roadways, and the I-10 freeway.

CHECKLIST ISSUES

a) Traffic Generation and Congestion

As stated above, the project itself would not directly generate additional traffic to or from the affected sites, and therefore, no direct project traffic impacts would occur.

The project could, however, indirectly cause traffic effects if new owners were to increase electrical output from the power plants. An increase in employment associated with an increased output could occur. Such an increase in employment, however, would not be in direct proportion to the increase in power, and because the number of employees at each plant is relatively low compared to other possible land uses, traffic increases would likely not be substantial.

Conclusion

Because possible traffic increases would be negligible in comparison to existing traffic volumes and the capacity on the roadways providing access for the sites, this traffic impact would be less than significant.

b) Hazards to Safety

Combined Issues

No change in roadway design or safety hazards would result from divestiture of the Edison power plants. Continued or increased operation of the power plants at the affected sites would preclude the creation of any new incompatible uses.

Conclusion

Because neither a change in design features, nor any creation of incompatible uses would occur as a result of the project, there would be no impacts associated with these traffic hazards.

c) Emergency Access and Access to Nearby Uses

Continued or increased operation of the power plants at the affected sites would not change access for emergency vehicles or access to nearby uses. No facilities are specifically proposed as part of the project that would change emergency access at any plant or that would affect access to nearby uses. Edison would ensure that it maintains access as needed to any portions of the power plant sites not to be divested through conditions in the sale agreements with new owners or through other means. Similarly, Edison would allow the new owners access through the Edison retained properties. No new access gates are planned for either the divested or retained properties.

Conclusion

Because no changes in emergency access or in access to nearby uses would occur as a result of the project, there would be no impacts associated with vehicle access.

d) Parking Capacity

Combined Issues

As discussed in checklist item "a" in this section, the project could indirectly result in incremental increases in employment levels at some of the plants to be divested if the electrical generation at those plants were to increase. Because the number of employees at each plant is relatively low compared to other possible land uses, the foreseeable increase in employment, and thus parking demand, would likely not be substantial.

Conclusion

Because the changes foreseeable in employment at the affected project sites would be minimal, the impact associated with parking capacity would be less than significant.

e) Hazards for Pedestrians and Bicyclists

No new facilities are proposed that would increase hazards or create barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists.

Conclusion

Because the project would not affect pedestrian or bicycle facilities, or the potential hazards of using such facilities, there would be no impacts associated with pedestrian and bicycle hazards.

f) Conflicts with Adopted Policies

No actions are proposed as part of the project that would be in conflict with adopted policies regarding alternative transportation.

Conclusion

Because project actions would not conflict with adopted alternative transportation policies, there is no impact associated with alternative transportation policies.

g) Rail, Waterborne, or Air Traffic

No activities related to the project would involve rail, waterborne, or air traffic.

Conclusion

Because the project does not involve rail, waterborne, or air traffic, no impact associated with such traffic would occur.