# Section 2.7
# Transportation and Traffic

This section assesses general transportation and traffic conditions in the County of San Diego and identifies potential transportation- and traffic-related impacts that could occur with implementation of the proposed project. The information provided below is summarized from the Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA) prepared by Chen Ryan Associates, Inc., dated March 17, 2016. The TIA is provided as Appendix E of this EIR.

## 2.7.1 Existing Conditions

### 2.7.1.1 Study Area

The proposed project would apply to properties located within the unincorporated portions of the County. Specifically, the proposed project would primarily apply to properties that are zoned Agriculture (A70 and A72), Specific Plan (S88), Holding Area (S90), and General Rural (S92); however, other zones with agricultural uses would also be affected.

The traffic study area for the proposed project encompasses all Mobility Element roadways within each of the Community Planning Areas (CPAs) of the unincorporated County. These CPAs are served by intersections and roadway segments that are predominantly under the jurisdiction of the County. In addition to County roadway facilities, State Highways provide regional access and circulation for the unincorporated County areas and therefore were also included in the study area. Primary north-south transportation facilities in the County include Interstates 5, 15, and 805, all of which are focused in the western part of the County. Other north-south State Highways include 67, 79, 125, and 163. Major east-west corridors include Interstate 8 and State Highways 54, 76, 78, and 94 and are dispersed throughout the County.

The County's Mobility Element was adopted in association with the currently adopted General Plan. The Mobility Element was designed to accommodate future traffic demands associated with the planned land uses consistent with the County's General Plan. The County's General Plan assumes Mobility Element roads will operate at Level of Service (LOS) D or better, unless a lower LOS was accepted for a particular road segment. As part of the currently adopted General Plan, the County determined the amount of existing roadway lane miles throughout the County that are currently operating below County standards (LOS D) and compiled this data by CPA.

The concept of LOS is defined as a qualitative measure describing operational conditions within a traffic stream, and the motorist's and or passengers' perception of operations. LOS generally describes these conditions in terms of such factors as speed, travel time, freedom to maneuver, comfort, convenience, and safety. Six LOS categories have been established and are assigned a letter grade of A through F. LOS A represents the best operating condition with free flow with no delays while LOS F represents the worst operating condition with long delays where the volume of traffic exceeds the capacity of the roadway. Each LOS represents a range of operating conditions and the driver's perception of those conditions. Methods for identifying LOS vary based upon the type of transportation facility. LOS measurement is used primarily to assess how substantial increases in vehicular traffic may affect traffic congestion on specific transportation facilities, such as freeways,

arterials, and intersections. Table 2.7-1 provides the generalized definitions of LOS categories (A through F) as applied to roadway operations.

### 2.7.1.2 Baseline Traffic Conditions

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15125(a) requires that an EIR includes a description of the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the project as they exist at the time the NOP is published or at the time the environmental analysis is commenced.

There were two recent CEQA cases addressing the types of analysis scenarios to be included in an EIR: (1) *Sunnyvale West Neighborhood Association v. City of Sunnyvale City Council (*6th Dist. 2010) 190 Cal. App.4th 1351 (Sunnyvale West), and (2) *Neighbors for Smart Rail v. Exposition Metro Line Construction Authority* (2013) 5 Cal. 4th 439 (Expo II). The decision in the first CEQA case indicated that impacts resulting from a project should be compared to existing conditions. However, the decision in the second case clarified that this methodology may be omitted from environmental analysis if it can be justified by substantial evidence in the administrative record that an analysis based on existing conditions would tend to be misleading or without informational value to EIR users and decision makers.

The County's General Plan was designed to guide future growth in the unincorporated areas of the County, and assumes full buildout of the General Plan land uses and Mobility Element roadway network. The County's Zoning Ordinance is a vehicle for implementing and enforcing the principles, goals, and policies set forth in the County's General Plan. As such, it is reasonable to assume that buildout of the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment would occur concurrently with the buildout of the General Plan land uses and Mobility Element roadway network. To evaluate the traffic generated by the proposed project against existing conditions would overestimate project-related traffic impacts and create a scenario that is unrealistic. Therefore, for a long-term policy project that would be implemented over a long period of time such as the proposed project, a comparison of full project buildout to existing conditions would be misleading and of no informational value because it would not provide the EIR users or decision makers with an accurate representation of potential project-related traffic impacts.

Moreover, none of the traffic models currently in use have been fully calibrated for existing traffic conditions for County Mobility Element roads. As a result, the only method of documenting existing traffic conditions would be to physically conduct existing traffic counts. However, physically conducting traffic counts would require a substantial effort due to the sheer size of the project study area, which encompasses all unincorporated areas of the County. Therefore, it would not be feasible to obtain existing traffic counts for all Mobility Element roadways throughout the unincorporated County.

For the reasons described above, traffic conditions for the buildout condition are considered the modified baseline for CEQA purposes and were used as a basis for comparison of project-related traffic impacts. A discussion of the traffic modeling approach and methodology is provided in Section 2.7.3.1 below.

# 2.7.2 Regulatory Setting

## 2.7.2.1 Federal Regulations

### Congestion Management

Federal Highway Administration 23 CFR 450.320 requires that each transportation management area (TMA) address congestion management through a process involving an analysis of multimodal metropolitan-wide strategies that are cooperatively developed to foster safety and integrated management of new and existing transportation facilities eligible for federal funding. The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) has been designated as the TMA for the San Diego region.

## 2.7.2.2 State Regulations

### California Department of Transportation Standards

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is responsible for planning, designing, building, operating, and maintaining California's $300 billion, 50,000-lane-mile state road system. Caltrans sets standards, policies, and strategic plans that aim to do the following: (1) provide the safest transportation system in the nation for users and workers, (2) maximize transportation system performance and accessibility, (3) efficiently deliver quality transportation projects and services, (4) preserve and enhance California's resources and assets, and (5) promote quality service. Caltrans has the discretionary authority to issue special permits for the use of California State Highways for other than normal transportation purposes. Caltrans also reviews all requests from utility companies, developers, volunteers, nonprofit organizations, and others desiring to conduct various activities within the California Highway right-of-way. The Caltrans *Highway Design Manual*, prepared by the Office of Geometric Design Standards (Caltrans 2008), establishes uniform policies and procedures to carry out the highway design functions of Caltrans. Caltrans has also prepared a *Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies* (Caltrans 2002). Objectives for the preparation of this guide include providing consistency and uniformity in the identification of traffic impacts generated by local land use proposals.

### Statewide Transportation Improvement Program

The California Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), approved by the U.S. Department of Transportation in October 2006, is a multiyear, statewide, intermodal program of transportation projects that is consistent with the statewide transportation plan and planning processes, metropolitan plans, and Title 23 of the CFR. The STIP is prepared by Caltrans in cooperation with the Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and the Regional Transportation Planning Agencies. In San Diego County, the MPO and Regional Transportation Planning Agency is SANDAG. The STIP contains all capital and non-capital transportation projects or identified phases of transportation projects for funding under the Federal Transit Act and Title 23 of the U.S. Code, including federally funded projects.

### Transportation Development Act

The Transportation Development Act (TDA) provides two major sources of funding for public transportation: the Local Transportation Fund (LTF) and the State Transit Assistance (STA) Fund. These funds are for the development and support of public transportation needs that exist in

California and are allocated to areas of each county based on population, taxable sales, and transit performance. Some counties have the option of using LTF for local streets and roads projects, if they can show there are no unmet transit needs. The Transit Programs Branch provides oversight of the public hearing process used to identify unmet transit needs. The branch provides interpretation of and initiates changes or additions to legislation and regulations concerning all aspects of the TDA. It also provides training and documentation regarding TDA statutes and regulations. Caltrans ensures local planning agencies complete performance audits required for participation in the TDA.

### 2.7.2.3 Regional Regulations

#### Regional Transportation Plans and Programs

SANDAG serves as the forum for decision-making on regional issues such as growth, transportation, land use, the economy, the environment, and criminal justice. SANDAG builds consensus, makes strategic plans, obtains and allocates resources, and provides information on a broad range of topics pertinent to the region's quality of life. SANDAG is governed by a Board of Directors composed of mayors, council members, and supervisors from each of the San Diego region's 19 local governments. As the San Diego County MPO and Regional Transportation Planning Agency, SANDAG has led the following programs that address transportation plans and policies in the San Diego area.

- **2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS):** The 2050 RTP lays out a plan for investing an estimated $214 billion in local, state, and federal transportation funds expected to come to the region over the next 40 years. The 2050 RTP is the blueprint for a regional transportation system that further enhances quality of life, promotes sustainability, and offers more mobility options for people and goods. The plan outlines projects for transit, rail and bus service, express or managed lanes, highways, local streets, bicycling, and walking to provide an integrated, multimodal transportation system by mid-century. Pursuant to Senate Bill (SB) 375, the 2050 RTP also includes the SCS, which details how the region will reduce greenhouse gas emissions to state-mandated levels over time. The 2050 RTP and SCS are components of *San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan* which was adopted by the SANDAG Board of Directors on October 9, 2015
- **Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP):** The RTIP is a multi-billion dollar, 5-year program of major transportation projects funded by federal, state, *TransNet* local sales tax, and other local and private funding. The RTIP is a prioritized program designed to implement the region's overall strategy for providing mobility and improving the efficiency and safety of the transportation system, while reducing transportation-related air pollution in support of the efforts to attain federal and state air quality standards for the region. The RTIP also incrementally implements the 2050 RTP, which is the long-range transportation plan for the San Diego region. The RTIP covers multiple fiscal years and is amended frequently to reflect near term priorities and expenditures.
- **Congestion Management Program (CMP):** State Proposition 111, passed by voters in 1990, established a requirement that urbanized areas prepare and regularly update a CMP, which is a part of SANDAG's RTP. The purpose of the CMP is to monitor the performance of the region's transportation system, develop programs to address near-term and long-term congestion, and better integrate transportation and land use planning. SANDAG provided regular updates for the State CMP from 1991 through 2008. In October 2009, the San Diego region elected to be exempt from the State CMP and, since this decision, SANDAG has been abiding by 23 CFR 450.320 to ensure the region's continued compliance with the federal congestion management process.

*San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan*, the region's long-range transportation plan and SCS, meets the requirements of 23 CFR 450.320 by incorporating the following federal congestion management process: performance monitoring and measurement of the regional transportation system, multimodal alternatives and non–single-occupancy vehicle analysis, land use impact analysis, the provision of congestion management tools, and integration with the RTIP process.

## 2.7.2.4 Local Regulations

### Mobility Element of the County of San Diego General Plan

The Mobility Element provides a framework for a balanced, multi-modal transportation system for the movement of people and goods within the unincorporated areas of the County of San Diego. A balanced system uses multiple modes of travel including motor vehicles, public transportation, bicycles, pedestrians, and, to a lesser extent, rail and air transportation. The Mobility Element includes several components, including a description of the County's transportation network; the goals and policies that address the safe and efficient operation, maintenance, and management of the transportation network; and the Mobility Element Network Appendix, which depicts the location of road network components. A central theme of the Mobility Element's goals and policies is support for a multi-modal transportation network that enhances connectivity and supports existing development patterns while retaining community character and maintaining environmental sustainability by reducing gasoline consumption and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The Mobility Element balances competing goals of accommodating trips generated by land use, while striving to retain a transportation network that complements, rather than impacts, the character of communities, which is generally rural in much of the unincorporated areas of the County.

### County of San Diego Public Road Standards

The County has developed guidelines for the design and construction of public road improvements projects within the unincorporated areas of the County. These standards apply to County-initiated public road improvement projects as well as privately initiated public road improvement projects. These standards provide minimum design and construction requirements for public roads.

### County of San Diego Private Road Standards

The County has also developed guidelines for the design and construction requirements for private road improvements required as conditions of land development approval in unincorporated areas of the County. Levels of service are not established for private roads. Minimum design and construction requirements, however, are established based upon the projected average daily traffic (ADT) volume on the road.

### County of San Diego Consolidated Fire Code

The County, in collaboration with the local fire protection districts, created the Consolidated Fire Code in 2001. The code contains the County's and fire protection districts' amendments to the California Fire Code. Emergency ingress/egress is established by County's Consolidated Fire Code. Ingress/egress is necessary for both citizen evacuation and to provide access for emergency vehicles in the event of a fire or other emergency. Section 902.2 of the code dictates minimum design standards for "Fire Apparatus Access Roads" and includes minimum road standards, secondary

access requirements, and restrictions for gated communities. Road standard requirements for emergency vehicles specify a minimum 12-foot paved lane or 24-foot travelway.

### County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Ordinance

The County has an overall programmatic solution that addresses projected future road deficiencies in the unincorporated portion of the County. This program enables the County to construct additional capacity on identified deficient roadways and includes the adoption of a Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) program to fund improvements to roadways necessary to mitigate potential cumulative impacts caused by traffic from future County development. The fees are collected at issuance of a development permit (including building permits) and at the time that a change of occupancy occurs. The fees are used to fund identified transportation facilities, or portions thereof, that provide increased road capacity necessitated by the cumulative impacts of future development. This program is based on a summary of projections contained in the General Plan Mobility Element and evaluates regional or area-wide conditions contributing to cumulative transportation impacts. Although the program does not address every road in the unincorporated County (it is limited to Mobility Element roads), it is considered to be a broad-based approach to mitigation of cumulative traffic impacts from additional traffic generated by a project or series of projects.

## 2.7.3 Analysis of Project Effects and Determination of Significance

The proposed project consists of an amendment to the County's Zoning Ordinance related to accessory agricultural uses in unincorporated areas of the County over which the County has land use jurisdictions (see Section 1.4, *Project Description*, for further details). Specifically, the proposed project applies to properties where active agriculture exists within the County or properties where agricultural uses are allowed. During the Initial Study preparation and scoping process for the proposed project, which considered potentially significant environmental impacts and involved a 30-day public comment period, it was determined that the proposed project would not result in significant transportation impacts related to changes in air traffic patterns, hazards due to design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment), inadequate emergency access, or conflicts with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. As such, potential impacts related to these issue areas are not evaluated below. Further discussion of these issue areas is available in the Initial Study and TIA prepared for the proposed project, which are provided as Appendices B and E, respectively, of this EIR. Comments received during the 30-day public comment period regarding traffic included a letter dated June 26, 2015 from John Hicks and a letter dated July 15, 2015 from the City of San Diego. Comments from John Hicks regarding parking and driveway requirements have been noted. No specific CEQA issues were raised and thus no further response was required. The City of San Diego's requested that traffic be analyzed in this EIR, which is discussed here in Section 2.7, Transportation and Traffic. City owned property are identified under Incorporated Cities in Figures 1-2 through 1-4 of this EIR.

## 2.7.3.1 Conflict with a Plan, Policy, or Ordinance

### Guidelines for the Determination of Significance

The following significance guideline from Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines applies to the direct and cumulative impact analyses. A significant impact would result if:

- The project would 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.

The County has developed guidelines to evaluate likely motor vehicle traffic impacts of a proposed project for roadway segments and intersections serving the project site, for the purposes of determining whether the development would "significantly impact congestion" on the referenced LOS E and F roads. The guidelines are summarized in Table 2.7-2. The levels in Table 2.7-2 are based upon average operating conditions on County roadways. It should be noted that these levels only establish general guidelines, and that specific project locations must be taken into account in conducting an analysis of traffic impacts from new development.

Potential roadway deficiencies were determined based on the County's Roadway Segment Daily Capacity and LOS Standards and Caltrans' methodology for evaluating State Highway operations. The thresholds used for determining the significance of project-related impacts on roadways in the County and along State Highway facilities within Caltrans' jurisdiction are provided below.

#### Roadway Segments

Impacts on roadway segments are evaluated using the County's significance determination thresholds, which are based on LOS. Roadway segment LOS standards and thresholds provide the basis for the analysis of arterial roadway segment performance. The analysis of roadway segment LOS is based on the maximum capacity (which accounts for roadway geometrics and other design factors) and ADT volumes.

Traffic volume increases from public or private projects that cause County roadways to meet one or more of the following criteria will have a significant traffic volume or LOS impact on a roadway segment, unless specific facts show that there are other circumstances that mitigate or avoid such impacts.

1. The additional or redistributed ADT generated by the proposed project would significantly increase congestion on a Mobility Element Road or State Highway currently operating at LOS E or LOS F as identified in Table 2.7-3 or will cause a Mobility Element Road or State Highway to operate at LOS E or LOS F as a result of the proposed project.
2. The additional or redistributed ADT generated by the proposed project will cause a residential street to exceed its design capacity.

#### Two-Lane Highways with Signalized Intersection Spacing Over 1 Mile

Impacts on State Highways are evaluated using the methodologies and procedures developed by Caltrans District 11. The procedure for calculating State Highway LOS involves estimating a peak hour volume to capacity (V/C) ratio. The resulting V/C is then compared to acceptable ranges of V/C

values corresponding to the various levels of service for each facility classification. The corresponding LOS represents an approximation of existing or anticipated future State Highway operating conditions in the peak direction of travel during the peak hour. The traffic analysis utilized a threshold of LOS D or better to determine acceptable State Highway operations based on Caltrans and the SANDAG Regional Growth Management Strategy requirements.

Traffic volume increases from public or private projects that cause County highways to meet the following criteria will have a significant traffic volume or LOS traffic impact on a two-lane highway facility with signalized intersection spacing over 1 mile.

1. The additional or redistributed ADT generated by the proposed project will significantly increase congestion on a two-lane highway segment currently operating at LOS E or LOS F, as identified in Table 2.7-4, or will cause a two-lane segment to operate at LOS E or LOS F as a result of the proposed project.

## Traffic Modeling and Forecasting Process

### Background

When the County of San Diego General Plan Update and associated EIR were finalized in 2011, the County utilized the Series 10 Transportation Forecast Model (Series 10 model) developed by SANDAG. However, as SANDAG is no longer able to run the Series 10 model, County staff and the traffic engineering community are no longer able to evaluate future traffic conditions within the unincorporated County in a manner that is consistent with the current General Plan. Therefore, the proposed project can no longer use the Series 10 model to assign project traffic onto the roadway network. As a result, a hybrid approach using both the Series 10 model results and SANDAG Series 12 Transportation Forecast Model (Series 12 model) assignments was used. This method was employed to establish three different scenarios. A detailed discussion of how this approach was developed and implemented to estimate project-related traffic is provided below.

### Modeling Methodology

In order to provide consistency with the current Mobility Element assumptions and use the model as a tool to distribute and assign project trips, a hybrid model was developed to incorporate both the Series 10 and 12 models.

The new project land uses and their corresponding trip generation rates were first coded into SANDAG's Series 12 model creating a "With Project" model. The Series 12 "With Project" model results were then compared to SANDAG's Series 12 baseline model results, which were developed based on the currently adopted Land Use and Mobility Elements. The delta of these two model outputs would determine the project trip assignments, i.e. the new trips associated with the proposed project. This process was conducted for the following scenarios.

1. **Year 2014 General Plan Amendments (GPAs):** Includes the GPAs which were approved by the County Board of Supervisors in 2014. The addition of the traffic associated with the Year 2014 GPAs to the traffic volumes contained in the County's Mobility Element makes up the *Current General Plan Scenario*.
2. **County of San Diego GPAs in Process Model:** Includes the development projects within the County currently under discretionary review that are seeking a GPA to require higher land use densities than permitted in the County's Land Use Element. The addition of the traffic associated

with the GPAs in process to the traffic volumes in the Current General Plan Scenario makes up the *Current General Plan Plus GPAs in Process Scenario*.

3. **Agricultural Promotion Model:** Includes the increased trip generation associated with the enhanced agricultural land uses for all parcels identified to qualify for the program. The location of the enhanced land uses and a unique trip generation rate (by CPA) were coded into the model. Project traffic was added to the traffic volumes in the Current General Plan Scenario and the Current General Plan Plus GPAs in Process Scenario to identify direct and cumulative impacts on the General Plan that may occur with implementation of the proposed project.

The project trip assignments were then added to the Series 10 volumes contained in the County's Mobility Element to establish the final hybrid "With Project" volumes. The different set of results that were generated are as follows.

1. **Current General Plan Buildout Volumes:** These volumes were developed by adding the new traffic assigned to the roadway network from the Year 2014 GPAs and the County's Property Specific Requests to the traffic volumes contained in the County's Mobility Element.
2. **Current General Plan Buildout Plus Project Volumes:** These volumes were developed by adding the new traffic assigned to the roadway network from the Agricultural Promotion Model to the Current General Plan Buildout volumes. This is the scenario in which impacts on the General Plan were determined.
3. **Current General Plan Buildout Plus GPAs in Process Volumes:** These volumes were developed by adding the new traffic assigned to the roadway network from the County GPAs in Process Model to the Current General Plan Buildout Plus Project volumes.

## Trip Generation

Trip generation rates were derived from the allowed building size and assumed trip generation rates by land use enhancement type. To be conservative, it was assumed that every eligible agricultural parcel would develop some form of accessory land use enhancement allowed under the proposed project. However, it is not realistic that all parcels eligible for the proposed land use enhancements would develop to their maximum trip generating potential (i.e., not every agriculturally zoned parcel would develop a microbrewery generating 800 trips per day or a large agricultural store generating 120 trips per day). Therefore, the potential trip generation associated with all land use enhancements was averaged across all parcels with similar zoning and sizes to develop an average trip generation rate for the group. It was assumed that the commercial components of the proposed land use enhancements (agriculture stores and the commercial components of creameries) would not be sustainable along non-Mobility Element roads due to their remote locations. Therefore, separate average trip generation rates, by parcel, are provided for parcels located along Mobility Element roadways and non-Mobility Element roadways.

Due to the associated high trip generation rates and sporadic nature of brewery and winery development, the trips associated with these land use enhancements were not included in average parcel trip generation rates and were included in a separate step of the analysis.

To determine the total number of new trips generated by the proposed project, the average per parcel trip generation rates were applied to every eligible parcel, by size and zone, within the County. To develop a standard trip generation rate for each community the total number of new trips was then summed by community, and divided by the total number of eligible parcels within

that community. The assumed new breweries and wineries were assigned to communities based on the eligible agricultural acreage. Traffic generated by these uses was then added to the total number of new trips generated within that community from the enhanced agricultural land uses, and revised community based trip generation rates were developed. Table 2.7-5 provides the final trip generation rates and project trip generation for each CPA, with the brewery and winery uses incorporated. In total, based on this approach, the proposed project is calculated to generate approximately 379,899 new daily trips spanning across the entire unincorporated County. The total new ADT would be a result of traffic generated by the buildout of all proposed accessory agricultural uses on all eligible agricultural parcels. This is considered to be a very conservative and long-term estimate but is used to ensure that the reasonably possible environmental impacts resulting from the project are considered.

## Analysis

### Current General Plan Buildout Plus Project Conditions

A discussion of accessory agricultural uses is provided below and indicates the potential project-level impacts that may result from development projects allowed under the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment. However, to fully capture the potential impacts of the proposed project, it was assumed that all eligible agricultural parcels were built out with the proposed eligible accessory agricultural uses. This scenario assumes the addition of project-related traffic at buildout of the proposed land use enhancements onto traffic volumes associated with the buildout of both the current General Plan land uses and the County's Mobility Element. Given the programmatic nature of the proposed project and the large study area (encompassing the unincorporated portions of the County), traffic operations for County roads were evaluated by considering the daily roadway segment operations rather than peak hour intersection operations. As such, intersection operations were not included in this analysis. Additionally, potential impacts on State Highways as a result of the proposed project were also analyzed, due to their important access and circulation functions for unincorporated County areas.

Roadway segments projected to operate at LOS E or F, on which the proposed project is anticipated to add traffic to, were considered to result in significant impacts. It should be noted that the County's Mobility Element has already identified and accepted a list of LOS E or F roadway segments throughout the County. However, the proposed project would add additional traffic to these segments beyond what was originally anticipated when the deficient LOS on these segments were adopted. Therefore, these roadway segments were considered to be affected by the proposed project.

For County roadways, the trip assignment for the proposed project adds a total of approximately 133,123 ADT to, and would have an impact on traffic operations on, 52 deficient roadway segments throughout the unincorporated County (43.8 total centerline miles). Although the County's Mobility Element has identified and accepted 29 of the 52 impacted segments operating at LOS E or F under buildout of the County's General Plan, the proposed project would be adding additional traffic onto a deficient roadway, and, as explained above, this is considered a significant impact. Therefore, the proposed project would result in impacts on all 52 roadway segments. Table 2.7-3 displays the roadway segments identified as operating at LOS E or F under this scenario, in which the proposed project is anticipated to add traffic. To address consistency with the County's General Plan, the proposed project includes a General Plan Amendment to accept all 52 impacted segments at the

resulting level of service. This amendment would occur to Mobility Element Table M-4 as shown in Appendix F.

In regards to State Highway operations, State Highway LOS was determined based on the anticipated peak hour roadway V/C, which is derived from the SANDAG Series 12 model. This approach is consistent with Caltrans' LOS methodology for State Highways. Utilizing these methods, it was determined that the proposed project would result in significant impacts on 17 deficient State Highway segments throughout the County (45.8 centerline miles) due to the addition of approximately 58,733 ADT. Although the County's Mobility Element has identified and accepted 12 of the 17 impacted highway segments as operating at LOS E or F under buildout of the County General Plan, the proposed project would be adding additional traffic onto a deficient State Highway. Therefore, the proposed project would result in significant impacts on all 17 State Highway segments. Table 2.7-6 displays the State Highway segments identified as operating at LOS E or F under this scenario.

Of the total ADT estimated to be generated by the proposed project, 191,856 ADT would be distributed on either existing deficient roadway or State Highway facilities, or would cause facilities currently operating at an acceptable LOS to degrade to LOS E or F. As a result, the proposed project would contribute to increased congestion on 52 County roadway and 17 State Highway segments, and thus would conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or ordinance establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. **Therefore, impacts on County roadway segments and State Highways associated with full buildout of the proposed project are considered to be potentially significant (Impact T-1).**

### Project-Level Impacts of Individual Accessory Agricultural Uses

The accessory agricultural uses included as part of the proposed update to the County's Zoning Ordinance would generally increase activities on agricultural properties and could potentially result in significant traffic impacts. For all proposed accessory agricultural uses, direct project-level traffic impacts could occur if ADT generated by an individual project would result in either of the following.

- Cause a County roadway facility or State Highway to degrade to LOS E or F.
- Exceed the ADT thresholds provided in Table 2.7-2 for County roadways, or Table 2.7-4 for State Highways, which are currently operating at LOS E or F.

Table 2.7-7 summarizes these 15 accessory agricultural uses, specifies the key changes in the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment that would induce increases in traffic, and identifies the associated trip generation rates. The categories are grouped based on location (occur in the same zone as accessories to commercial agricultural uses), size (similar footprint restrictions), and trip generation (generate a similar amount of vehicle trips). The proposed uses are grouped into the following three categories, with the individual uses anticipated to generate additional daily trips in parentheses.

1. Agricultural Tourism (Agricultural Homestay).
2. Alcoholic Beverages (Microbrewery [small and large] and Winery [small, boutique, and wholesale]).
3. Horticulture Retail and Food Production (Creamery/Dairy, Agricultural Store [small and large]).

Animal raising, aquaponics/fish market, roadside sales, and mobile butchering are not a significant factor for traffic and would not consistently add a considerable number of new daily trips when considering the various possible operations that would be promoted. As such, these uses are not discussed further below. Each of the accessory agricultural uses that would generate project-related ADT and, as such, would have the potential to result in significant traffic impacts are described below.

Agricultural homestays include short-term (fewer than 14 days) lodging for guests at a working farm or ranch that provides bedrooms for rent and can provide meals. Under existing County regulations, a maximum of three bedrooms in a farmer- or rancher-occupied residence can be made available for rent. Additionally, a detached cabin can be used in lieu of the ranch or farmhouse if the structure does not exceed 500 square feet. The proposed amendment to the County's Zoning Ordinance would not result in any changes to these limitations, but rather would promote agricultural homestay uses (which are currently regulated and defined in the County's Zoning Ordinance) by reducing the level of review required for operations similar to existing homestay operations. As a result, such uses are anticipated to generally increase throughout the County. Specifically, the level of permitting required for an agricultural homestay would be reduced from a Minor Use Permit to a Zoning Verification Permit, subject to certain criteria, and permit approval for an agricultural homestay would therefore change from a Discretionary Permit to a Ministerial Permit. This use would be allowed in the A70, A72, and S92 zones, similar to existing conditions, and would also be expanded to allow for properties in the RR and S90 zones to operate an agricultural homestay subject to approval of a Zoning Verification Permit. Because the permit approval process for this accessory agricultural use would change from discretionary to ministerial with implementation of the proposed project, future individual agricultural homestay projects would not be subject to additional or subsequent environmental review under CEQA. However, for some uses that would require a Ministerial Permit, a Discretionary Grading Permit may be required depending on the amount of earthwork involved (e.g., 200 cubic yards of import or export is needed or more than 2,500 cubic yards of grading is proposed), and additional environmental review pursuant to CEQA would be required.

As shown in Table 2.7-7, an agricultural homestay use is assumed to generate 8 trips per room, which is based on trip generation rates for a Resort Hotel. Utilizing these trip generation rates, the maximum ADT that could be generated by an agricultural homestay project would be 24 trips. As such, an individual agricultural homestay project that includes the maximum allowable number of rooms would not exceed any of the ADT thresholds for County roadway segments or State Highways currently operating at LOS E or F. Additionally, it is unlikely that traffic generated by an individual agricultural homestay project would cause a County roadway facility or State Highway to degrade to LOS E or F. Therefore, it is not anticipated that an individual agricultural homestay project would result in significant traffic impacts.

Agricultural microbreweries, cideries, and micro-distilleries are not currently regulated in the County's Zoning Ordinance, and the proposed project would permit large operations under a Discretionary Permit (Administrative Permit) and small operations under a Ministerial Permit (Zoning Verification Permit). Implementation of the proposed agricultural microbrewery, cidery, and micro-distillery uses could include individual development projects involving land clearing to support up to 5,000 square feet of building space, construction of ancillary parking areas, driveways, fences, and outdoor seating, and an increase in the number of visitors and employees in agricultural areas. Buildings associated with agricultural microbreweries, cideries, and micro-distilleries would

be developed to house brewing equipment and machinery, as well as provide for retail sales and a tasting room for large microbreweries, cideries, and micro-distilleries.

As shown in Table 2.7-7, both small and large microbreweries, cideries, and micro-distilleries are assumed to generate 160 trips per 1,000 square feet of building space, which is based on trip generation rates for a High Turnover Restaurant. Utilizing these trip generation rates, the minimum ADT that could be generated by an individual microbrewery, cidery, or micro-distillery project would be 320 trips, while the maximum ADT generated would be 800 trips. As such, development of a small microbrewery, cidery, or micro-distillery project consisting of 2,000 square feet of building space would potentially generate project-related trips that would exceed the ADT thresholds for County roadway facilities and State Highways currently operating at LOS F. Additionally, a large microbrewery, cidery, or micro-distillery project consisting of the maximum allowable building space (5,000 square feet) would potentially generate traffic that would exceed the ADT thresholds for County roadway facilities and State Highways currently operating at either LOS E or F. Furthermore, it is possible that both small and large microbrewery, cidery, or micro-distillery projects could potentially generate traffic volumes that could cause a County roadway facility or State Highway to degrade to LOS E or F. In the event an individual microbrewery, cidery, or micro-distillery project triggers any of these thresholds, a significant project-level traffic impact would occur. Therefore, due to the programmatic nature of the proposed project, development of individual microbrewery, cidery, and micro-distillery projects has the potential to result in significant traffic impacts.

The proposed changes to wineries included as part of the project could include individual development projects involving land clearing to support up to 5,000 square feet of building space; construction of ancillary parking areas, driveways, fences, and outdoor seating; and an increase in visitors and employees in agricultural areas. Future development would be necessary to house various equipment associated with winemaking, to store wine during the aging process, and to provide for tasting rooms and other retail space. As shown in Table 2.7-7, both small and large wineries are assumed to generate 160 trips per 1,000 square feet of building space, which is based on trip generation rates for a High Turnover Restaurant. Utilizing these trip generation rates, the minimum ADT that could be generated by an individual winery project would be 160 trips, while the maximum ADT generated would be 800 trips. As such, development of a small winery project consisting of 1,000 square feet of building space would potentially generate traffic that would only exceed the ADT threshold for a two-lane County roadway currently operating at LOS F. However, similar to a large microbrewery, cidery, and micro-distillery, development of a large winery consisting of the maximum allowable building space (5,000 square feet) would have the potential to generate traffic that would exceed the ADT thresholds for County roadway facilities and State Highways currently operating at either LOS E or F. Additionally, it is possible that both small and large winery projects could potentially generate traffic volumes that could cause a County roadway facility or State Highway to degrade to LOS E or F. In the event an individual winery project triggers any of these thresholds, a significant project-level traffic impact would occur.

The proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment would allow for the development of some winery projects by-right, and therefore may not require additional or subsequent environmental review under CEQA. However, there is still a potential that a Discretionary Grading Permit may be required depending on the amount of earthwork involved (e.g., 200 cubic yards of import or export is needed or more than 2,500 cubic yards of grading is proposed), and additional environmental review pursuant to CEQA would be required. At this time, details on future individual winery projects are unknown, and it cannot be determined if they would be subject to a Discretionary or Ministerial

Permit process. Therefore, future winery projects allowed under the proposed project have the potential to result in significant traffic impacts.

Implementation of the proposed creamery/dairy uses could result in individual development projects involving land clearing to support 2,000 to 5,000 square feet of building space; construction of ancillary parking areas, driveways, fences, and outdoor seating; and an increase in site activity related to additional visitors and new employees. Creamery/dairy uses would require the development of non-residential structures to support the production of butter, cream, milk, or cheese within an enclosed building, and would also require indoor space for product storage intended for wholesale sales as well as retail sales. Parking areas, driveways, and fences would also be included as typical site improvements associated with the development of new structures with retail components.

As shown in Table 2.7-7, creamery/dairy uses are assumed to generate 16 trips per 1,000 square feet of building space along Mobility Element roadways and 8 trips per 1,000 square feet of building space on Non-Mobility Element roadways, which are based on trip generation rates for Industrial (including Commercial) uses. Utilizing these trip generation rates, the maximum ADT that could be generated by an individual creamery/dairy project would be 80 trips along a Mobility Element roadway. As such, an individual creamery/dairy project that consists of the maximum allowable building space (5,000 square feet) would not exceed any of the ADT thresholds for County roadway segments or State Highways currently operating at LOS E or F. Additionally, it is unlikely that traffic generated by an individual creamery/dairy project would cause a County roadway facility or State Highway to degrade to LOS E or F. Therefore, it is not anticipated that an individual creamery/dairy project would result in significant traffic impacts.

Project approval also would promote agricultural and horticultural retail uses, including agricultural stands and agricultural stores, and would involve ministerial and discretionary review depending on the size of the proposed agricultural store (see Section 1.4, *Project Description*, for more information on the proposed permitting requirements for agricultural stores). For agricultural stores, the level of environmental review would depend on the size of the operation (see Section 1.4 for more information on the proposed permitting requirements for agricultural stores). Similar to the analysis above for agricultural microbreweries, cideries, and micro-distilleries, larger operations would require a Discretionary Permit and CEQA review; however, for smaller operations not requiring a Major Grading Permit, a Ministerial Permit would be required and therefore would not be subject to CEQA. Buildings associated with agricultural retail stores would be developed to house agricultural retail items.

As shown in Table 2.7-7, both small and large agricultural retail stores are assumed to generate 40 trips per 1,000 square feet of building space, which is based on trip generation rates for Commercial Shop. Utilizing these trip generation rates, the maximum ADT that could be generated by an individual agricultural store (large) project would be 120 trips. As such, an individual agricultural store project that consists of the maximum allowable building space (3,000 square feet) may exceed ADT thresholds for County roadway segments or State Highways currently operating at LOS F if all 120 trips are loaded onto the failing (LOS F only) segment of a two-lane roadway. Similarly, it is unlikely that traffic generated by an individual agricultural store project would cause a County roadway facility or State Highway to degrade to LOS E or F unless the roadway was close to failing and all trips were loaded to that road. Therefore, while it is not anticipated that an individual small or large agricultural store project would commonly result in significant traffic impacts there is a possibility that significant impacts may occur.

In summary, implementation of the proposed project would promote the development of various accessory agricultural uses throughout the unincorporated areas of the County. As a result of the occupancy and/or square footage limitations included in the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment, it is not anticipated that individual development of a majority of the accessory agricultural uses would result in significant traffic impacts. However, as further discussed above under the current General Plan Buildout Plus Project analysis, full buildout of the accessory uses promoted by the proposed project has the potential to result in significant traffic impacts on County roadways and State Highways. Under the proposed project, accessory agricultural uses would be subject to either discretionary or ministerial approval. For projects requiring only ministerial approval, additional environmental review under CEQA would not be required. As such, there is the potential that individual ministerial accessory agricultural use projects could generate traffic volumes that could contribute to congestion on County roadways and State Highways when combined with development of other uses promoted under the proposed project. The results of the Current General Plan Buildout Plus Project Scenario demonstrates that although an individual accessory agricultural use project may not result in project-level traffic impacts, it is likely that development of multiple accessory agricultural use projects in the same vicinity would increase congestion on County roadways and State Highways that would exceed the allowable thresholds.

Any future accessory agricultural use projects allowed under the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment and subject to discretionary approval would be evaluated on a project-by-project basis to determine the significance of impacts and what mitigation, if any, may be required to reduce impacts to below a level of significance. However, due to the programmatic nature of the proposed project, it is unknown at this time whether future individual projects would be subject to discretionary or ministerial approval and what the outcome of any project-specific analysis might be. **Therefore, project-level impacts on County roadways and State Highways from future individual accessory agricultural use projects, particularly microbrewery, cidery, micro-distillery, or winery projects, would be potentially significant (Impact T-2).**

## 2.7.3.2 Conflict with a Congestion Management Program

### Guidelines for the Determination of Significance

The following significance guideline from Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines applies to both the direct and cumulative impact analyses. A significant impact would result if:

- The project would 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.

### Analysis

As described in Section 2.7.2, *Regulatory Setting*, SANDAG is the lead agency for congestion management compliance for the San Diego region. In 2009, the San Diego region elected to be exempt from the State CMP and, since this decision, SANDAG has been abiding by 23 CFR 450.320 to ensure the region's continued compliance with the federal congestion management process. *San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan*, the region's RTP and SCS, meets the requirements of 23 CFR 450.320.

Therefore, to determine if the proposed project would conflict with an applicable congestion management program, the proposed Zoning Ordinance amendments were reviewed for consistency with *The Regional Plan*, which is a land use and transportation planning documentation that discusses land use policy at a very general level. Further, the plan mostly incorporates the land use policies of the local jurisdictions and focuses on transportation infrastructure and management programs to support those policies. As a result, no directly applicable policies were identified that pertain to the proposed project because the project is not proposing changes in overall land use designations or transportation infrastructure. Additionally, the proposed project would not interfere with the policies or projects identified in *The Regional Plan*. **Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with *The Regional Plan*, and impacts would be less than significant**.

## 2.7.4 Cumulative Impact Analysis

### 2.7.4.1 Conflict with a Plan, Policy, or Ordinance

The cumulative scenario assumes the buildout of the current General Plan land uses, the buildout of the County's Mobility Element, as well as the buildout of all development projects currently seeking a GPA from the County. There are several development projects within the County that are currently in the Discretionary Permit process and are seeking a GPA to request higher land use densities than currently permitted in the County's Land Use Element. At this time, it is unknown if these GPAs will be accepted as currently proposed, changed to provide lower densities, or simply will not be approved. It is also unknown how these projects will mitigate any new traffic-related impacts associated with higher land use densities or if there will be associated changes to the County's Mobility Element. Therefore, cumulative impacts associated with the proposed project, assuming the addition of these development projects seeking a GPA, cannot be accurately determined at this time. However, to be conservative, the traffic analysis evaluates the traffic operations under buildout of the current General Plan plus the full development of all of the GPA projects currently in process, as well as the implementation of the proposed project.

As discussed above, it is not anticipated that individual accessory agricultural use projects would result in significant traffic impacts. However, the combined development of multiple uses throughout the unincorporated County would potentially contribute to congestion on County roadways and State Highways. Roadway segments in which full buildout of the proposed project is anticipated to add traffic to and are projected to operate at LOS E or F were considered to be cumulatively impacted. It should be noted that the County's Mobility Element has already identified and accepted a list of LOS E or F roadway segments throughout the County. However, the proposed project would add additional traffic to these segments beyond what was originally anticipated when the deficient LOS on these segments were adopted. For County roadways, the proposed project would have a cumulatively considerable impact on traffic operations for 60 roadway segments through the unincorporated County (47.6 total centerline miles). Table 2.7-8 displays the roadway segments identified as operating at LOS E or F under the cumulative scenario. To address consistency with the County's General Plan, the proposed project includes a General Plan Amendment to accept all 60 impacted segments at the resulting level of service. This amendment would occur to Mobility Element Table M-4 as shown in Appendix F.

In regards to State Highway operations, the proposed project would result in cumulatively considerable impacts on 17 State Highway segments throughout the unincorporated County

(45.8 centerline miles), which is the same number of impacted segments identified under the current General Plan Buildout Plus Project Scenario.

**The cumulative addition of traffic from individual agricultural accessory use projects, when combined with all past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the County, would result in a cumulatively considerable impact on County roadway segments and State Highways (Impact T-3).**

### 2.7.4.2 Conflict with a Congestion Management Program

As discussed above, the proposed project would not conflict with *The Regional Plan* as it is a regional planning document that is focused on general land use policy and regional transportation projects. As noted in Section 2.7.2.3, SANDAG opted out of the CMP in 2008. **Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with a congestion management program, and thus would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact.**

## 2.7.5 Significance of Impacts Prior to Mitigation

The proposed project would result in potentially significant transportation and traffic impacts associated with conflicts with a plan, policy, or ordinance establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system (**Impacts T-1, direct; T-2, direct;** and **T-3, cumulative**).

## 2.7.6 Mitigation Measures

The proposed project is a zoning ordinance amendment and is not project specific. Therefore, the impacts of specific future agricultural projects cannot be determined at this stage, nor can appropriate mitigation measures be identified or enforced.

Some of the future agriculture projects allowed under the proposed project, such as agricultural and horticultural retail (large), agricultural microbreweries, cideries, and micro-distilleries (large), and animal raising may be required to obtain a Discretionary Permit such as a Grading Permit, which would trigger CEQA review of the specific proposed project. For such projects, feasible mitigation measures could be included in the permit, thus making them enforceable. There may also be future projects for which related Discretionary Permits are required, but for which mitigation would not be feasible or for which no related Discretionary Permit is required at all. For example, it may not be feasible to require a future agriculture project needing a Grading Permit to fund public or private roadway improvements due to cost based on existing road conditions, topography, and other site conditions such as adjacent slopes, stream crossings, and the length of required improvements. In addition, no Grading Permit would be required where grading is less than 200 cubic yards. For such by-right projects, either appropriate mitigation would not be feasible, or CEQA review would not be required and no mitigation would be identified.

If project[specific impacts were identified during a project-level analysis, then specific road segment or intersection improvements for direct impacts, such as providing a turn lane, signalization, signage, road widening, re-striping, paving, or other road enhancements to accommodate project-related traffic, would mitigate project-specific impacts to the extent feasible.

The County has developed an overall programmatic solution that addresses projected future road LOS deficiencies (i.e., cumulative) in the unincorporated portion of San Diego County. This program includes the adoption of a TIF program to fund improvements to roadways necessary to mitigate

potential cumulative impacts caused by traffic from future County development. As such, typical mitigation measures for future agriculture projects allowed under the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment could include payment of TIF for cumulative impacts. As a result, most cumulative traffic impacts would be mitigated for by all projects (including those that are by-right) if they require a Building Permit and have associated TIF fees.

Because the outcome of specific future projects, their potential traffic impacts, and mitigation is unknown, and because some projects may not be subject to a process that requires analysis and/or payment of the TIF fee, it cannot be concluded at this stage that impacts on traffic from all future agriculture projects allowed under the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment would be avoided or mitigated. Table 2.7-9 displays the required roadway classification for each impacted roadway segment to improve daily operating conditions to LOS D or better. It should be noted that as the County does not have authority over State Highway facilities, the implementation of improvements also cannot be guaranteed. **Therefore, impacts on County roadways and State Highways would remain significant and unavoidable.**

### 2.7.6.1 Conflict with a Plan, Policy, or Ordinance

The proposed project would amend current regulations related to accessory agricultural projects that may directly result in a traffic impacts (**Impacts T-1, direct; T-2, direct;** and **T-3, cumulative**). Mitigation measures described below have been identified that would reduce impacts but not below a significant level. **Therefore, these impacts would remain significant and unavoidable**. Chapter 4, *Project Alternatives*, provides a discussion of alternatives to the proposed project that would result in some reduced impacts associated with traffic as compared to the proposed project.

#### Mitigation Measures

**M-T-1:** During the environmental review process for future discretionary approval for accessory agricultural uses, the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Transportation and Traffic shall be applied.

**M-T-2:** Implement the County Mobility Element and Public Road Standards during review of new development projects.

**M-T-3**: Implement the San Diego County TIF Ordinance, which defrays the costs of constructing planned transportation facilities necessary to accommodate increased traffic generated by future development.

### 2.7.6.2 Conflict with a Congestion Management Program

As discussed above, the proposed project would not conflict with *The Regional Plan* as it is a regional planning document that is focused on general land use policy and regional transportation projects. Therefore, impacts would not be significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

## 2.7.7 Conclusion

Development of future accessory agricultural operations within the project area and enabled by adoption of the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment could result in significant direct and cumulative unmitigated transportation and traffic impacts by conflicting with a plan, policy, or

ordinance establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system **(Impacts T-1** and **T-2, direct;** and **T-3, cumulative)**.

**Table 2.7-1. LOS Definitions**

| LOS Category | Definition of Operation |
|---|---|
| A | This LOS represents a completely free-flow condition, where the operation of vehicles is virtually unaffected by the presence of other vehicles and only constrained by the geometric features of the highway and by driver preferences. |
| B | This LOS represents a relatively free-flow condition, although the presence of other vehicles becomes noticeable. Average travel speeds are the same as in LOS A, but drivers have slightly less freedom to maneuver. |
| C | At this LOS the influence of traffic density on operations becomes marked. The ability to maneuver within the traffic stream is clearly affected by other vehicles. |
| D | At this LOS, the ability to maneuver is notably restricted due to traffic congestion, and only minor disruptions can be absorbed without extensive queues forming and the service deteriorating. |
| E | This LOS represents operations at or near capacity. LOS E is an unstable level, with vehicles operating with minimum spacing for maintaining uniform flow. At LOS E, disruptions cannot be dissipated readily thus causing deterioration down to LOS F. |
| F | At this LOS, forced or breakdown of traffic flow occurs, although operations appear to be at capacity, queues form behind these breakdowns. Operations within queues are highly unstable, with vehicles experiencing brief periods of movement followed by stoppages. |

Source: Appendix E.

**Table 2.7-2. Allowable Increases on Congested Road Segments**

| LOS | Two-Lane Road | Four-Lane Road | Six-Lane Road |
|---|---|---|---|
| E | 200 ADT | 400 ADT | 600 ADT |
| F | 100 ADT | 200 ADT | 300 ADT |

Source: County of San Diego 2011a.

**Table 2.7-3. Current General Plan Buildout Plus Project Conditions – Roadway Segments**

| Community | Road | From | To | Number of Lanes | Capacity | Baseline ADT | Project ADT | Baseline with Project ADT | With Project LOS | Project Level Impact | GP Accepted Failing Roadway |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alpine | Willows Road | Hillcrest Drive | Otto Avenue | 2 | 10,900 | 27,260 | 737 | 28,000 | F | Yes | Yes |
| | | Viejas Grade Road | Willowside Terrace | 2 | 10,900 | 27,310 | 687 | 28,000 | F | Yes | Yes |
| Bonsall | Old Highway 395 | West Lilac Road | Dulin Road | 2 | 13,500 | 18,460 | 3,543 | 22,000 | F | Yes | No |
| Fallbrook | Mission Road | I-15 Ramps | Macadamia Drive | 4 | 25,000 | 32,240 | 8,161 | 40,400 | F | Yes | Yes |
| | | Hamilton Lane | El Paisano Drive | 4 | 25,000 | 29,570 | 5,534 | 35,100 | F | Yes | Yes |
| | | Stage Coach Road | Davis Drive | 4 | 25,000 | 27,990 | 3,508 | 31,500 | F | Yes | No |
| | | Old Stage Coach Road | Ohearn Road | 4 | 25,000 | 30,870 | 2,729 | 33,600 | F | Yes | No |
| | Old Highway 395 | Sterling View Road | Mission Road | 2 | 13,500 | 17,130 | 5,470 | 22,600 | F | Yes | No |
| | | Stewart Canyon Road | Reche Road | 2 | 15,000 | 23,840 | 3,062 | 26,900 | F | Yes | Yes |
| | | Dulin Road | Dulin Road | 2 | 13,500 | 18,930 | 3,670 | 22,600 | F | Yes | Yes |
| | Olive Hill Road | White Horse Lane | Ingold Sports Park Driveway | 2 | 8,700 | 8,600 | 3,105 | 11,700 | F | Yes | No |
| | Pala Mesa Drive | Daisy Lane | Wilt Road | 2 | 8,700 | 9,020 | 2,985 | 12,000 | F | Yes | No |
| | | Old Highway 395 | Daisy Lane | 2 | 8,700 | 10,630 | 2,771 | 13,400 | F | Yes | Yes |
| | Pankey Road | Pala Road | Pankey Place | 2 | 15,000 | 19,310 | 1,988 | 21,300 | F | Yes | No |
| | North Pico Avenue | East Kalmia Street | Mission Road | 2 | 13,500 | 14,680 | 6,324 | 21,000 | F | Yes | No |

| Community | Road | From | To | Number of Lanes | Capacity | Baseline ADT | Project ADT | Baseline with Project ADT | With Project LOS | Project Level Impact | GP Accepted Failing Roadway |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sandia Creek Drive | Riverside County Boundary | Kalmia Street | 2 | 7,000 | 1,930 | 7,869 | 9,800 | F | Yes | No |
| Jamul | Jamacha Road | Campo Road | Cuyamaca College East | 6 | 50,000 | 67,580 | 1,022 | 68,600 | F | Yes | No |
| Lakeside | Lake Jennings Park Road | I-8 Ramps | I-8 Business | 4 | 30,800 | 37,170 | 1,135 | 38,300 | F | Yes | Yes |
| | Mapleview Street | Ashwood Street | SR-67 | 4 | 33,400 | 46,300 | 3,203 | 49,500 | F | Yes | Yes |
| | Wildcat Canyon Road | Willow Road | Muth Valley Road | 2 | 13,500 | 31,860 | 4,344 | 36,200 | F | Yes | Yes |
| North County Metro | 17th Avenue | San Pasqual Valley Road | Lendee Drive | 2 | 13,500 | 19,950 | 947 | 20,900 | F | Yes | No |
| | Del Dios Highway | Via Rancho Parkway | Country Club Drive | 2 | 13,500 | 31,660 | 939 | 32,600 | F | Yes | Yes |
| | Mirar De Valle Road | Valley Center CPA Boundary | North Broadway | 2 | 13,500 | 20,380 | 3,624 | 24,000 | F | Yes | Yes |
| | Deer Springs Road | North Centre City | I-15 Ramps | 4 | 30,800 | 45,670 | 3,128 | 48,800 | F | Yes | Yes |
| | San Pasqual | Via Rancho Parkway | Zermatt Lane | 2 | 8,700 | 17,920 | 3,477 | 21,400 | F | Yes | No |
| Rainbow | Old Highway 395 | Mission Road | Rainbow Valley Road | 2 | 13,500 | 16,460 | 5,737 | 22,200 | F | Yes | No |
| | W. Rainbow Valley Boulevard | Old Highway 395 | I-15 Ramps | 2 | 13,500 | 18,920 | 4,979 | 23,900 | F | Yes | No |
| San Dieguito | Del Dios Highway | Elm Lane | Luna De Miel | 2 | 13,500 | 27,400 | 1,000 | 28,400 | F | Yes | Yes |
| | El Camino Del Norte | Via Roswitha | Val Sereno Drive | 2 | 8,700 | 10,860 | 639 | 11,500 | F | Yes | No |
| | | Del Dios Roundabout | Aliso Canyon Road | 2 | 8,700 | 13,880 | 420 | 14,300 | F | Yes | Yes |

| Community | Road | From | To | Number of Lanes | Capacity | Baseline ADT | Project ADT | Baseline with Project ADT | With Project LOS | Project Level Impact | GP Accepted Failing Roadway |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | #3 | | | | | | | | | |
| | La Bajada/La Granada | Los Morros | Rancho Santa Fe Road | 2 | 8,700 | 22,170 | 126 | 22,300 | F | Yes | Yes |
| | | Rambla De Las Flores | Los Morros | 2 | 8,700 | 19,040 | 56 | 19,100 | F | No | Yes |
| | | Paseo Delicias | Sobre Los Cerros | 2 | 8,700 | 15,740 | 156 | 15,900 | F | Yes | Yes |
| | Linea Del Cielo | El Camino Real | Calzada Del Bosque | 2 | 8,700 | 11,390 | 310 | 11,700 | F | Yes | Yes |
| | Los Morros | La Granada | La Bajada | 2 | 8,700 | 19,640 | 62 | 19,700 | F | No | Yes |
| | Paseo Delicias | Del Dios Roundabout #1 | Del Dios Roundabout# 3 | 2 | 13,500 | 23,980 | 722 | 24,700 | F | Yes | Yes |
| | Via De La Valle | Calzada Del Bosque | Via De Santa Fe | 2 | 10,900 | 29,450 | 953 | 30,400 | F | Yes | No |
| | | El Camino Real | Calzada Del Bosque | 2 | 13,500 | 25,640 | 365 | 26,000 | F | Yes | Yes |
| Spring Valley | Jamacha Boulevard | Sweetwater Road | SR-125 Ramps | 2 | 30,800 | 39,700 | 197 | 39,900 | F | Yes | Yes |
| | Kenwood Drive | SR-94 EB Ramp | SR- 94 WB Ramp | 2 | 13,500 | 23,780 | 318 | 24,100 | F | Yes | No |
| | Paradise Valley Road | Spring Valley Center Driveway | Sweetwater Road | 2 | 30,800 | 39,530 | 471 | 40,000 | F | Yes | No |
| Valle de Oro | Campo Road | Conrad Drive | Kenwood Drive | 2 | 25,000 | 47,790 | 107 | 47,900 | F | Yes | Yes |
| | Fuerte Drive | Grandview Drive | Lemon Drive | 2 | 10,900 | 18,900 | 305 | 19,200 | F | Yes | Yes |
| | New Road 14 | Juba Road | Ballarena Lane | 2 | 8,000 | 8,810 | 1,393 | 10,200 | F | Yes | No |
| | Couser Canyon Road | Paula Loma Drive | Pala Road | 2 | 7,000 | 6,700 | 3,704 | 10,400 | F | Yes | No |

| Community | Road | From | To | Number of Lanes | Capacity | Baseline ADT | Project ADT | Baseline with Project ADT | With Project LOS | Project Level Impact | GP Accepted Failing Roadway |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | New Road 19 | Sunday Drive | Lilac Road | 2 | 25,000 | 30,560 | 4,142 | 34,700 | F | Yes | No |
| Valley Center | Lilac Road | Anthony Road | Couser Canyon Road | 2 | 7,000 | 8,050 | 4,053 | 12,100 | F | Yes | No |
| | | Valley Center Road | Cypress Ridge Drive | 2 | 25,000 | 34,670 | 2,329 | 37,000 | F | Yes | Yes |
| | Mirar De Valle Road | Cypress Ridge Drive | North County Metro CPA Boundary | 2 | 13,500 | 25,120 | 3,481 | 28,600 | F | Yes | Yes |
| | | Valley Center Road | Cypress Ridge Drive | 2 | 13,500 | 27,670 | 326 | 28,000 | F | Yes | No |
| | Valley Center Road | Lilac Road | Road 17 | 2 | 27,000 | 33,800 | 4,605 | 38,400 | F | Yes | Yes |
| | | North County Metro CPA Boundary | Miller Road | 2 | 33,400 | 36,100 | 8,205 | 44,300 | F | Yes | Yes |

**Table 2.7-4. Allowable Increases on Two-Lane Highways with Signalized Intersection Spacing Over 1 Mile**

| LOS | LOS Criteria | Impact Significance Level |
|---|---|---|
| E | > 16,200 ADT | > 325 ADT |
| F | > 22,900 ADT | > 225 ADT |

Source: County of San Diego 2011a.

**Table 2.7-5. Land Use Enhancement Trip Generation Rates**

| CPA | Total Trip Generation | Agricultural Use Trip Generation Rate Per Acre |
|---|---|---|
| Alpine | 9,695 | 1.5 |
| Bonsall | 18,968 | 3.5 |
| Central Mountain | 1,128 | 0.2 |
| County Islands | 0 | 0.0 |
| Crest - Dehesa | 8,880 | 1.3 |
| Desert | 3,471 | 0.5 |
| Fallbrook | 57,167 | 6.9 |
| Jamul-Dulzura | 27,800 | 1.0 |
| Julian | 6,665 | 0.9 |
| Lakeside | 17,291 | 1.6 |
| Mountain Empire | 15,711 | 0.7 |
| North County Metro | 26,269 | 1.8 |
| North Mountain | 17,216 | 0.2 |
| Otay | 2,608 | 0.4 |
| Pala - Pauma | 10,537 | 1.0 |
| Pendleton - De Luz | 17,815 | 0.2 |
| Rainbow | 12,869 | 3.8 |
| Ramona | 43,365 | 1.8 |
| San Dieguito | 9,529 | 2.7 |
| Spring Valley | 168 | 0.8 |
| Sweetwater | 1,016 | 0.5 |
| Valle De Oro | 1,479 | 2.3 |
| Valley Center | 70,253 | 4.6 |
| Total | 379,899 | 1.1 |

Source: Appendix E.

**Table 2.7-6. Current General Plan Buildout Plus Project Conditions – State Highways**

| Community | Highway | To | From | Mobility Element Classification | LOS | Project ADT | GP Accepted Deficient Roadway? |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bonsall | SR-76 | East Vista Way | Mission Road | 6.2 | F | 4,184 | Yes |
| Fallbrook | SR-76 | Gird Road | Old Highway 395 | 4.1A | E | 2,250 | No |
| | SR-76 | Old Highway 395 | I-15 Ramps | 4.1A | F | 2,358 | Yes |
| Jamul-Dulzura | SR-94 | Steele Canyon Road | Lyons Valley Road | 4.1A | F | 3,443 | Yes |
| | SR-94 | Campo Road | Barrett Smith Road | 2.1D | F | 1,239 | Yes |
| Lakeside | SR-67 | Iron Mountain Drive | Scripps Poway Parkway | 4.1B | F | 7,053 | Yes |
| | SR-67 | Scripps Poway Parkway | Slaughterhouse Canyon Road | 4.1A | E | 8,478 | Yes |
| | SR-67 | Slaughterhouse Canyon Road | Mapleview Street | 4.1A | F | 4,583 | Yes |
| | SR-67 | Willows Road | SR-67 | 4.1A | F | 4,355 | Yes |
| Mountain Empire | SR-94 | Barrett Smith Road | Tecate Road | 2.1D | E | 611 | Yes |
| North Mountain | SR-79 | San Felipe Street | SR-76 | 2.1D | F | 931 | No |
| Pala-Pauma | SR-76 | Valley Center Road | South Grade Road | 2.1D | F | 1,106 | No |
| Ramona | SR-67 | Dye Street | Dye Street | 4.1A | F | 4,443 | Yes |
| | SR-78 | 9th Street | 11th Street | 4.2B | F | 1,403 | Yes |
| | SR-67 | Julian Road | Rockhouse Road | 4.1A | F | 7,126 | No |
| | SR-78 | San Pasqual Valley Road | Haverford Road | 2.1D | F | 1,411 | No |
| Valle de Oro | SR-94 | Avocado Boulevard | Jamacha Road | 6.1 | F | 3,759 | Yes |

Source: Appendix E.

## Table 2.7-7. Summary of Proposed Agricultural Land Use Enhancements

| Group | Use | Zones Allowed | Maximum Building Size | Trip Generation Assumption |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Agricultural Tourism | *Agricultural Tourism* | RR, A70, A72, S88, S90 and S92 | N/A | No New Trips |
| | *Homestay* | RR, A70, A72, S90 or S92 | 500 sf if detached (opposed to part of farmhouse) | Resort Hotel:<br>8 trips/room |
| | *Farm Employee Housing* | RR, A70, A72, S90, S87, S88, S90, and S92 | N/A | No New Trips |
| Alcoholic Beverages | *Microbrewery, Small* | Commercial Agriculture | 2,000 sf / 0–2 acres<br>3,000 sf / 2–4 acres<br>5,000 sf / 4+ acres | High Turnover Restaurant:<br>160 trips / 1,000 sf |
| | *Microbrewery, Large* | Commercial Agriculture | 3,000 sf / 0–2 acres<br>4,000 sf / 2–4 acres<br>5,000 sf / 4+ acres | |
| | *Winery, Small* | S92 | 1,000 sf / 0–1 acres<br>1,500 sf / 1–2 acres<br>2,000 sf / 2–4 acres<br>5,000 sf / 4+ acres | High Turnover Restaurant:<br>160 trips / 1,000 sf |
| | *Winery, Boutique* | S92 | | |
| | *Winery, Wholesale* | S92 | | |
| Horticulture Retail and Food Production | *Animal Raising* | | | No New Trips |
| | Aquaponics/ Fish Markets | C31, C32, C34, C35, C36, C37, C40 or C42 or S88 | N/A | No New Trips |
| | Creamery/Dairy | M50, M52, M54, M58, A70, A72, S90, S92 | 2,000 sf / 0–1 acre<br>3,000 sf / 1–2 acres<br>5,000 sf / 2–4 acres | Along CE Road:<br>Industrial (Commercial Included):<br>16 trips / 1,000 sf<br><br>Along Non CE Road<br>Industrial (No Commercial)<br>8 trips / 1,000 sf |
| | *Roadside Sales* | RR on lots one acre or larger, and in A70, A72, S88, S90 and S92. | 300 sf limit | No New Trips |
| | *Agricultural Store (Small)* | RR on lots of 2 acres or larger, and in A70, A72, S88, S90 and S92. | 1,500 sf limit | Commercial Shops:<br>40 trips / 1,000 sf |
| | *Agricultural Store (Large)* | RR on lots of 4 acres or larger, and A70, A72, S88, S90 and S92. | 3,000 sf limit | Commercial Shops:<br>40 trips / 1,000 sf |
| | *Mobile Butchering* | All | N/A | No New Trips |

Source: Appendix E.
sf = square feet

**Table 2.7-8. Current General Plan Buildout Plus GPAs in Process Plus Project Conditions**

| Community | Road | From | To | Mobility Element Classification | Capacity | Total ADT | LOS | Project ADT | Mobility Element Accepted as Deficient? |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alpine | Willows Road | Hillcrest Drive | Otto Avenue | 2.2E | 10,900 | 28,000 | F | 737 | Yes |
| | | Viejas Grade Road | Willowside Terrace | 2.2E | 10,900 | 28,000 | F | 687 | Yes |
| Bonsall | Old Highway 395 | I-15 Ramps | Dulin Road | 4.2B | 25,000 | 29,100 | F | 5,053 | No |
| | West Lilac Road | Shirley Road | Old Highway 395 | 2.2C | 13,500 | 31,000 | F | 5,091 | No |
| Fallbrook | Mission Road | I-15 Ramps | Macadamia Drive | 4.2B | 25,000 | 40,400 | F | 8,161 | Yes |
| | | Hamilton Lane | El Paisano Drive | 4.2B | 25,000 | 35,100 | F | 5,534 | Yes |
| | | Stage Coach Road | Davis Drive | 4.2B | 25,000 | 31,800 | F | 3,508 | No |
| | | Old Stage Road | Ohearn Road | 4.2B | 25,000 | 33,600 | F | 2,729 | No |
| Fallbrook | Old Hwy 395 | Sterling View Road | Mission Road | 2.1A | 15,000 | 22,000 | F | 3,297 | No |
| | | Stewart Canyon Road | Reche Road | 2.1A | 15,000 | 27,100 | F | 3,062 | Yes |
| | | Dulin Road | Dulin Road | 2.1D | 13,500 | 25,600 | F | 3,670 | Yes |
| | Olive Hill Road | Mission Road | White Horse Lane | 2.2F | 8,700 | 12,000 | F | 3,105 | No |
| | | White Horse Lane | Ingold Sports Park Driveway | 2.2F | 8,700 | 11,600 | F | 2,761 | No |

| Community | Road | From | To | Mobility Element Classification | Capacity | Total ADT | LOS | Project ADT | Mobility Element Accepted as Deficient? |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Gateview Drive | Puerta De Lomas | 2.2F | 8,700 | 10,800 | F | 3,960 | No |
| | Pala Mesa Drive | Daisy Lane | Wilt Road | 2.2F | 8,700 | 12,100 | F | 2,985 | No |
| | | Old Highway 395 | Daisy Lane | 2.2F | 8,700 | 13,500 | F | 2,771 | Yes |
| | Pankey Road | Pala Road | Pankey Place | 2.1A | 15,000 | 21,900 | F | 1,988 | No |
| | North Pico Avenue | East Kalmia Street | Mission Road | 2.2C | 13,500 | 21,000 | F | 6,324 | No |
| | Sandia Creek Drive | Riverside County Boundary | Kalmia Street | 2.3C | 7,000 | 13,600 | F | 7,354 | No |
| Jamul | Jamacha Road | Campo Road | Cuyamaca College East | 6.2 | 50,000 | 68,600 | F | 1,022 | No |
| Lakeside | Lake Jennings Park Road | Sierra Alta Way | I-8 | 4.1B | 30,800 | 40,700 | F | 1,135 | Yes |
| | | I-8 | I-8 Business | 4.1B | 30,800 | 37,600 | E | 1,548 | Yes |
| | Mapleview St | Ashwood Street | SR-67 | 4.1A | 33,400 | 49,800 | F | 3,681 | Yes |
| | Lake Jennings Park Road | I-8 Ramps | Lake Jennings Park | 4.1B | 30,800 | 37,600 | E | 1,548 | No |
| | Wildcat Canyon Road | Willow Road | Muth Valley Road | 2.1D | 13,500 | 36,200 | F | 4,344 | Yes |
| North County Metro | 17th Avenue | San Pasqual Valley Road | Lendee Drive | 2.2D | 13,500 | 22,000 | F | 947 | No |
| North County Metro | Del Dios Highway | Via Rancho Parkway | Country Club Drive | 2.2D | 13,500 | 33,000 | F | 939 | Yes |

| Community | Road | From | To | Mobility Element Classification | Capacity | Total ADT | LOS | Project ADT | Mobility Element Accepted as Deficient? |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Country Club Drive | Date Lane | 2.2D | 13,500 | 32,800 | F | 939 | Yes |
| | Mirar De Valle Road | Valley Center CPA Boundary | North Broadway | 2.1D | 13,500 | 25,500 | F | 3,706 | Yes |
| | Deer Springs Road | N Centre City | I-15 Ramps | 4.1B | 30,800 | 49,800 | F | 3,128 | Yes |
| | San Pasqual | Via Rancho Parkway | Zermatt Lane | 2.2F | 8,700 | 21,400 | F | 3,477 | No |
| | Valley Center Road | Valley Center CPA Boundary | Engelmann Road | 4.1A | 33,400 | 41,600 | F | 12,556 | No |
| Otay | Otay Mesa Road | Enrico Fermi Drive | Faraday Drive | 4.1A | 33,400 | 42,200 | F | 455 | No |
| Rainbow | Old Highway 395 | Mission Road | Rainbow Valley Road | 2.1D | 13,500 | 22,200 | F | 5,737 | No |
| | W Rainbow Valley Boulevard | Old Highway 395 | I-15 Ramps | 2.2D | 13,500 | 23,900 | F | 4,979 | No |
| San Dieguito | Del Dios Highway | Elm Lane | Luna De Miel | 2.1D | 13,500 | 28,700 | F | 1,000 | Yes |
| | El Camino Del Norte | Via Roswitha | Val Sereno Drive | 2.2F | 8,700 | 11,600 | F | 639 | No |
| | | Del Dios Roundabout #3 | Aliso Canyon Road | 2.2F | 8,700 | 14,400 | F | 420 | Yes |
| | La Bajada/La Granada | Los Morros | Rancho Santa Fe Road | 2.2F | 8,700 | 22,300 | F | 126 | Yes |

| Community | Road | From | To | Mobility Element Classification | Capacity | Total ADT | LOS | Project ADT | Mobility Element Accepted as Deficient? |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Rambla De Las Flores | Los Morros | 2.2F | 8,700 | 19,100 | F | 56 | Yes |
| | | Paseo Delicias | Sobre Los Cerros | 2.2F | 8,700 | 15,900 | F | 156 | Yes |
| | Linea Del Cielo | El Camino Real | Calzada Del Bosque | 2.2F | 8,700 | 11,900 | F | 310 | Yes |
| | Los Morros | La Granada | La Bajada | 2.2F | 8,700 | 19,700 | F | 62 | Yes |
| | Paseo Delicias | Del Dios Roundabout #1 | Del Dios Roundabout #3 | 2.2A | 13,500 | 25,100 | F | 722 | Yes |
| San Dieguito | Via De La Valle | Calzada Del Bosque | Via De Santa Fe | 2.1E | 10,900 | 28,100 | F | 674 | Yes |
| | | El Camino Real | Calzada Del Bosque | 2.1B | 13,500 | 26,100 | F | 164 | Yes |
| Spring Valley | Jamacha Boulevard | Sweetwater Road | SR-125 Ramps | 4.1B | 30,800 | 40,200 | F | 197 | Yes |
| | Kenwood Drive | SR-94 EB Ramp | SR-94 WB Ramp | 2.2D | 13,500 | 24,200 | F | 318 | No |
| | Paradise Valley Road | Spring Valley Center Driveway | Sweetwater Road | 4.1B | 30,800 | 40,200 | F | 471 | No |
| Valle de Oro | Campo Road | Conrad Drive | Kenwood Drive | 4.2B | 25,000 | 47,900 | F | 107 | Yes |
| | Fuerte Drive | Grandview Drive | Lemon Drive | 2.2E | 10,900 | 19,200 | F | 305 | Yes |
| Valley Center | New Road 14 | Juba Road | Ballarena Lane | 2.3B | 8,000 | 10,300 | F | 1,393 | No |
| | Couser Canyon Road | Paula Loma Drive | Pala Road | 2.3C | 7,000 | 10,500 | F | 3,704 | No |

| Community | Road | From | To | Mobility Element Classification | Capacity | Total ADT | LOS | Project ADT | Mobility Element Accepted as Deficient? |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | New Road 19 | Sunday Drive | Lilac Road | 4.2B | 25,000 | 34,700 | F | 4,142 | No |
| | Lilac Road | Anthony Road | Couser Canyon Road | 2.3C | 7,000 | 12,900 | F | 4,053 | No |
| | | Valley Center Road | New Road 19 | 4.2B | 25,000 | 37,200 | F | 2,329 | Yes |
| | Mirar De Valle Road | Cypress Ridge Drive | North County Metro CPA Boundary | 2.1D | 13,500 | 28,600 | F | 3,435 | Yes |
| | | Valley Center Road | Cypress Ridge Drive | 2.1D | 13,500 | 28,200 | F | 326 | No |
| | Valley Center Road | Lilac Road | Road 17 | 4.1A | 33,400 | 42,200 | F | 6,405 | No |
| | | North County Metro CPA Boundary | Woods Valley Road | 4.1A | 33,400 | 41,100 | F | 12,428 | No |
| | W Lilac Road | Lilac Road | Shirley Road | 2.2C | 13,500 | 21,000 | F | 5,230 | No |

Source: Appendix E.

Grey highlight indicates a segment that is projected to operate at LOS E or F under Current Plan Buildout Plus GPAs in Process Plus Project that was not identified to fail without the addition of the GPAs in Process.

**Table 2.7-9. Roadway Improvements to Mitigate Cumulative Impacts**

| Community | Road | From | To | Mobility Element Classification | Total ADT | Improved Classification | Improved LOS | Mobility Element Accepted as Deficient |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alpine | Willows Road | Hillcrest Drive | Otto Avenue | 2.2E | 28,000 | 4.1B | D | Yes |
| | | Viejas Grade Road | Willowside Terrace | 2.2E | 28,000 | 4.1B | D | Yes |
| Bonsall | Old Highway 395 | I-15 Ramps | Dulin Road | 4.2B | 29,100 | 4.1A | C | No |
| | West Lilac Road | Shirley Road | Old Highway 395 | 2.2C | 31,000 | 4.1A | D | No |
| Fallbrook | Mission Road | I-15 Ramps | Macadamia Drive | 4.2B | 40,400 | 6.2 | C | Yes |
| | | Hamilton Lane | El Paisano Drive | 4.2B | 35,100 | 6.2 | B | Yes |
| | | Stage Coach Road | Davis Drive | 4.2B | 31,800 | 4.1A | D | No |
| | | Old Stage Road | Ohearn Road | 4.2B | 33,600 | 6.2 | B | No |
| | Old Hwy 395 | Sterling View Road | Mission Road | 2.1A | 22,000 | 4.2B | C | No |
| | | Stewart Canyon Road | Reche Road | 2.1A | 27,100 | 4.1B | C | Yes |
| | | Dulin Road | Dulin Road | 2.1D | 25,600 | 4.2A | D | Yes |
| | Olive Hill Road | Mission Road | White Horse Lane | 2.2F | 12,000 | 2.2D | D | No |
| | | White Horse Lane | Ingold Sports Park Driveway | 2.2F | 11,600 | 2.2E | D | No |

| Community | Road | From | To | Mobility Element Classification | Total ADT | Improved Classification | Improved LOS | Mobility Element Accepted as Deficient |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Gateview Drive | Puerta De Lomas | 2.2F | 10,800 | 2.2D | D | No |
| | Pala Mesa Drive | Daisy Lane | Wilt Road | 2.2F | 12,100 | 2.1A | D | No |
| | | Old Highway 395 | Daisy Lane | 2.2F | 13,500 | 4.2B | C | Yes |
| | Pankey Road | Pala Road | Pankey Place | 2.1A | 21,900 | 4.2B | C | No |
| | North Pico Avenue | East Kalmia Street | Mission Road | 2.2C | 21,000 | 2.1A | D | No |
| | Sandia Creek Drive | Riverside County Boundary | Kalmia Street | 2.3C | 13,600 | 6.1 | C | No |
| Jamul | Jamacha Road | Campo Road | Cuyamaca College East | 6.2 | 68,600 | 6.2 | C | No |
| Lakeside | Lake Jennings Park Road | Sierra Alta Way | I-8 | 4.1B | 40,700 | 6.1 | B | Yes |
| | | I-8 | I-8 Business | 4.1B | 37,600 | 6.2 | C | Yes |
| | Mapleview Street | Ashwood Street | SR-67 | 4.1A | 49,800 | 6.2 | B | Yes |
| | Lake Jennings Park Road | I-8 Ramps | Lake Jennings Park | 4.1B | 37,600 | 4.2B | C | No |
| | Wildcat Canyon Road | Willow Road | Muth Valley Road | 2.1D | 36,200 | 4.1A | D | Yes |
| North County Metro | 17th Avenue | San Pasqual Valley Road | Lendee Drive | 2.2D | 22,000 | 4.2A | D | No |
| | Del Dios Highway | Via Rancho Parkway | Country Club Drive | 2.2D | 33,000 | 6.2 | D | Yes |

| Community | Road | From | To | Mobility Element Classification | Total ADT | Improved Classification | Improved LOS | Mobility Element Accepted as Deficient |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Country Club Drive | Date Lane | 2.2D | 32,800 | 4.2B | C | Yes |
| | Mirar De Valle Road | Valley Center CPA Boundary | North Broadway | 2.1D | 25,500 | 6.2 | C | Yes |
| | Deer Springs Road | North Centre City | I-15 Ramps | 4.1B | 49,800 | 6.2 | C | Yes |
| | San Pasqual | Via Rancho Parkway | Zermatt Lane | 2.2F | 21,400 | 4.2B | C | No |
| | Valley Center Road | Valley Center CPA Boundary | Engelmann Road | 4.1A | 41,600 | 4.2B | D | No |
| Otay | Otay Mesa Road | Enrico Fermi Drive | Faraday Drive | 4.1A | 42,200 | 4.1A | C | No |
| Rainbow | Old Highway 395 | Mission Road | Rainbow Valley Road | 2.1D | 22,200 | 2.2D | D | No |
| | W Rainbow Valley Boulevard | Old Highway 395 | I-15 Ramps | 2.2D | 23,900 | 2.1A | D | No |
| San Dieguito | Del Dios Highway | Elm Lane | Luna De Miel | 2.1D | 28,700 | 4.2B | C | Yes |
| | El Camino Del Norte | Via Roswitha | Val Sereno Drive | 2.2F | 11,600 | 4.2B | B | No |
| | | Del Dios Roundabout #3 | Aliso Canyon Road | 2.2F | 14,400 | 4.2B | A | Yes |
| | La Bajada/La Granada | Los Morros | Rancho Santa Fe Road | 2.2F | 22,300 | 2.2D | D | Yes |
| | | Rambla De Las Flores | Los Morros | 2.2F | 19,100 | 4.2B | C | Yes |
| | | Paseo Delicias | Sobre Los Cerros | 2.2F | 15,900 | 4.2A | D | Yes |

| Community | Road | From | To | Mobility Element Classification | Total ADT | Improved Classification | Improved LOS | Mobility Element Accepted as Deficient |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Linea Del Cielo | El Camino Real | Calzada Del Bosque | 2.2F | 11,900 | 4.1B | D | Yes |
| | Los Morros | La Granada | La Bajada | 2.2F | 19,700 | 4.2A | D | Yes |
| | Paseo Delicias | Del Dios Roundabout #1 | Del Dios Roundabout #3 | 2.2A | 25,100 | 6.2 | C | Yes |
| | Via De La Valle | Calzada Del Bosque | Via De Santa Fe | 2.1E | 28,100 | 4.2B | D | Yes |
| | | El Camino Real | Calzada Del Bosque | 2.1B | 26,100 | 6.2 | C | Yes |
| Spring Valley | Jamacha Boulevard | Sweetwater Road | SR-125 Ramps | 4.1B | 40,200 | 6.2 | D | Yes |
| | Kenwood Drive | SR-94 EB Ramp | SR- 94 WB Ramp | 2.2D | 24,200 | 4.2B | B | No |
| | Paradise Valley Road | Spring Valley Center Driveway | Sweetwater Road | 4.1B | 40,200 | 4.2B | A | No |
| Valle de Oro | Campo Road | Conrad Drive | Kenwood Drive | 4.2B | 47,900 | 6.2 | D | Yes |
| | Fuerte Drive | Grandview Drive | Lemon Drive | 2.2E | 19,200 | 6.2 | B | Yes |
| Valley Center | New Road 14 | Juba Road | Ballarena Lane | 2.3B | 10,300 | 2.2D | D | No |
| | Couser Canyon Road | Paula Loma Drive | Pala Road | 2.3C | 10,500 | 6.2 | C | No |
| | New Road 19 | Sunday Drive | Lilac Road | 4.2B | 34,700 | 4.1A | C | No |
| | Lilac Road | Anthony Road | Couser Canyon Road | 2.3C | 12,900 | 4.1B | D | No |
| | | Valley Center Road | New Road 19 | 4.2B | 37,200 | 6.2 | C | Yes |

| Community | Road | From | To | Mobility Element Classification | Total ADT | Improved Classification | Improved LOS | Mobility Element Accepted as Deficient |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mirar De Valle Road | Cypress Ridge Drive | North County Metro CPA Boundary | 2.1D | 28,600 | 6.2 | C | Yes |
| | | Valley Center Road | Cypress Ridge Drive | 2.1D | 28,200 | 4.2B | C | No |
| | Valley Center Road | Lilac Road | Road 17 | 4.1A | 42,200 | 4.2B | C | No |
| | | North County Metro CPA Boundary | Woods Valley Road | 4.1A | 41,100 | 2.2D | D | No |
| | W Lilac Road | Lilac Road | Shirley Road | 2.2C | 21,000 | 6.2 | C | No |

Source: Appendix E.