California Department of Transportation

DISTRICT 4
OFFICE OF REGIONAL AND COMMUNITY PLANNING
P.O. BOX 23660, MS–10D | OAKLAND, CA 94623-0660
www.dot.ca.gov

October 6, 2025

SCH #: 2024060040
GTS #: 04-SOL-2024-00431
GTS ID: 32116
Co/Rt/Pm: SOL/12/23.3

Krystine Ball, Public Work Program Manager
City of Rio Vista
1 Main Street
Rio Vista, CA 94571

Re: Brann Ranch Master Planned Community Development Project – Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR)

Dear Krystine Ball:

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for this Project. The Local Development Review (LDR) Program reviews land use projects and plans to ensure consistency with our mission and state planning priorities. The following comments are based on our review of the August 2025 DEIR.

Please note this correspondence does not indicate an official position or approval by Caltrans on this project and is for informational purposes only.

Project Understanding
The project is for a vesting tentative subdivision map for up to 1,073 single family dwelling units and 52 multifamily dwelling units, for a total of 1,125 dwelling units; an approximately 2.4-acre mixed use area; an approximately 8.7-acre elementary school (kindergarten through sixth grade) site; a community park and smaller pocket parks; and supporting infrastructure, all located near State Route (SR) 12.

Travel Demand Analysis
The project vehicle miles traveled (VMT) analysis and significance determination are undertaken in a manner consistent with the Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation's (LCI) Technical Advisory. Per the DEIR, this project is found to have significant and unavoidable VMT impact.

Caltrans encourages the project applicant to document TDM programs with annual monitoring reports by a TDM coordinator to demonstrate effectiveness. If the project does not achieve the VMT reduction goals, the reports should also include next steps to take to achieve those targets.

Please also consider exploring the following options to help further reduce the VMT impact if the implementation of applicable TDM measures is insufficient to mitigate the project VMT impact to a less-than-significant level: VMT based Transportation Impact Fee programs, VMT Mitigation Exchanges, and VMT Mitigation Banks. Please note that Caltrans has funded several local/regional agencies to study the feasibility of a variety of VMT mitigation programs through the Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant program (*link*). Caltrans welcomes the potential opportunities to work with the City.

Per the LDR Safety Review Practitioners Guidance (*link*), queuing analysis should be performed for any potential safety concerns on the State Transportation Network (STN). Caltrans has reviewed Appendix I, Transportation Impact Analysis and have following comments:

General

- Regarding Appendix B, please include Quality Counts AM Traffic counts for Intersections #2, #3, #7, and #9 and confirm whether the units for the queues on Tables 5, 7, 12, and 14 are "feet" or "cars."

- Please also confirm whether queue increases due to project trips for all intersections for all future scenarios. Provide all queues at all approaches where queues are present, for example, Table 5 shows no queues for Intersection #1, but the Vistro outputs show queues of 5.34', 26.59', 30.80' and 256.61' for Northbound (NB), Southbound (SB), Eastbound (EB), and Westbound (WB), respectively.

- Please submit a request for a Caltrans Right of Way (ROW) Permit for any work that encroaches on Caltrans ROW (e.g., "class II buffered bicycle lane along SR 12").

- Provide any information on how the construction of the project may affect the operations of SR 12.

Existing Traffic Operations and Existing Plus Project Traffic Operations

- Intersection #1: Table 4 vs. Table 6 – Level of Service (LOS) changes from C to F in the AM and PM. Delays increase from 17.5 to 61.8 in AM, and 17.3 to 63.5 in PM. These are significant increases in delay, but there are no corresponding

queues or queue increases shown. Please provide the corresponding queues in Tables 5 and 7. The results show that the roundabout will fail with the project trips, which may lead to safety issues in the future. Please include suggestions for future mitigation such as a 2-lane roundabout or other control types.

- Intersection #2: Table 4 v. Table 6 - LOS changes from D to F in AM and remains at F in the PM. Delays increase from 34.3 to 65.4 in the AM and from 121.7 to 386.1 in the PM. These are significant increases in delay. Please provide more information on why the corresponding EB, WB, NB, and SB queues do not increase significantly. Table 9 states "Only two vehicles … would experience significant delays…" Please explain the discrepancy in queue units (feet or cars) and/or correct the queue entries.

- Intersection #6: Table 4 v. Table 6 - LOS changes from C to F in AM and PM. The delay increases from 23.7 to 139.1 for AM and 12.3 to 110.5 for PM. The intersection will fail with the project trips. Mitigation is proposed via restriping of the intersection and intersection approaches. Please coordinate improvements with Caltrans ROW Office.

- Intersection #7: Table 4 v. Table 6 - LOS changes from A to B for AM and A to F for PM. Delays increase from 7.6 to 11.2 for PM and 10.2 to 107.4 for PM. These are significant increases in delay, but corresponding increases in queue lengths are not provided in the queue Tables. Please provide queues and confirm all queue lengths on Table 5 and Table 7.

- Intersection #8: Table 4 v. Table 6 - LOS changes from C to D for AM, and C to F for PM. Delays increase from 20.3 to 48.5 for AM and 14.7 to 83.1 for PM. These are significant increases in delay. Please verify corresponding queue length increases. The results show that the signalized intersection will fail with the project trips, which can lead to safety issues in the future when the intersection fails.

- Intersection #9: Table 4 v. Table 6 - LOS remains at C for AM and remains at F for PM. Delay increases from 16.9 to 22.0 for AM and from 81.9 to and 164.1 for PM. The delays are significant for the PM. Please provide queues in Tables 5 and 7.

Cumulative No Project Traffic Operations and Cumulative Plus Project Traffic Operations

- Intersection #1: Table 11 v. Table 13 - LOS changes from E to F for AM and E to F for PM. The delays increase from 43.8 to 121.5 for AM, and from 49.7 to 130.6 for PM. These are significant increases in delay. Please provide corresponding queue lengths in Tables 12 and 14. The results show that the roundabout will fail

with the project trips, which may lead to safety issues in the future. Please include suggestions for future mitigation such as a 2-lane roundabout or other control types.

- Intersection #2: Table 11 v. Table 13 - LOS is F for AM and PM. The delays increase from 67.7 to 171.1 for AM and 354.8 to 1358.6 for PM. The 1003.8 (17 minute) delay increase in the PM is an extremely large increase in delay. Please provide more information on why the provided corresponding EB, WB, NB, and SB queues do not increase at a corresponding rate. Table 9 states "Only three vehicles … would experience significant delays…" Please explain the discrepancy in queue units (feet or cars) and/or correct the queue entries.

- Intersection #3: Table 11 v. Table 13 - LOS remains A for AM and F for PM. The delay remains 8.4 in the AM and 59.9 in the PM. Please provide storage lengths and queue lengths for all approaches in Tables 12 and 14.

- Intersection #6: Table 11 v. Table 13 - LOS changes from D to F for AM and from B to F for PM. The delay increases from 52.7 to 182.2 for AM and from 13.8 to 143.6 for PM. The intersection will fail with the project trips. Mitigation is proposed via restriping of EB and WB SR 12. Please coordinate improvements with Caltrans ROW Office.

- Intersection #7: Table 11 v. Table 13 - LOS changes from A to B for AM and remains F for PM. The delay increases from 8.4 to 13.4 for AM. Please confirm whether the delay shown as decreasing from 228.7 to 194.6 in the PM is correct and confirm all queue lengths on Table 12 and Table 14.

- Intersection #8: Table 11 v. Table 13 - LOS changes from E to F for AM, and D to F for PM. The delays increase from 56.5 to 119.2 for AM and from 37.9 to 147.3 for PM. These are significant increases in delay. The queue lengths do not increase in proportion to the delays. Please verify corresponding queue length increases. The results show that the signalized intersection will fail with the project trips, which can lead to safety issues in the future when the intersection fails.

- Intersection #9: Table 11 v. Table 13 - LOS changes from C to D for AM and remains at F for PM. The delay increases from 20.8 to 29.9 for AM and in increases from 310.8 to 471.7 for PM. The PM delay increase is significant. Please provide the queues lengths, in Tables 12 and 14, for these scenarios.

Mitigation

- All proposed roadway improvements on state ROW should be coordinated with Caltrans. Additionally, these improvements should be in place BEFORE the new development is opened to the public. The project should consider paying fair share mitigation fees for future improvements on state ROW.

Lead Agency
As the Lead Agency, the City is responsible for all project mitigation, including any needed improvements to the State Transportation Network (STN). The project's fair share contribution, financing, scheduling, implementation responsibilities and lead agency monitoring should be fully discussed for all proposed mitigation measures.

Landscape Architecture
Visual analysis included states that the soundwall treatment will produce similar effect to the adjacent development. No plans or aesthetic treatment boards are included for review. Provide design treatments on the soundwall to harmonize with the adjacent development (architectural design, color and texture). Provide vegetative screening of the soundwall of similar intent and character to vegetative treatments used at adjacent development to the east, in order to provide a similar visual character.

Thank you again for including Caltrans in the environmental review process. Should you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Llisel Ayon, Associate Transportation Planner, via LDR-D4@dot.ca.gov. For future early coordination opportunities or project referrals, please visit Caltrans LDR website (*link*) or contact LDR-D4@dot.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

YUNSHENG LUO
Branch Chief, Local Development Review
Office of Regional and Community Planning

c: State Clearinghouse