

2.13 Transportation and Traffic

This section summarizes information from the *Traffic Impact Assessment* prepared by RBF Consulting (Attachment A to Appendix D of this SEIR) and updated by the County of San Diego for the proposed Project (Appendix D) and evaluates existing conditions for the transportation facilities within the Project areas addressed in this SEIR, as well as the potential traffic impacts that could result from implementation of the proposed Project.

2.13.1 Existing Conditions

The General Plan Update PEIR included a discussion of existing conditions related to transportation and traffic in Chapter 2.15.1 of the Transportation and Traffic chapter, including the Project areas covered by this project proposal. The transportation and traffic conditions described in the General Plan Update PEIR are the same as the conditions on the ground today. No changes to the existing conditions have been identified that would alter the conclusions in the General Plan Update PEIR. All references used in the General Plan Update PEIR (Chapter 6) were reviewed to ensure they are still valid. In addition, the existing conditions for transportation and traffic within the Project area analyzed in this SEIR area are the same as those provided in the General Plan Update PEIR, and are hereby incorporated by reference.

2.13.2 Regulatory Framework

Chapter 2.15 of the General Plan Update PEIR, pages 2.15-12 through 2.15-16, describes the Regulatory Framework related to transportation and traffic and is hereby incorporated by reference. Applicable Federal regulations discussed include the Americans with Disabilities Act; Highway Capacity Manual; Title 23 Code of Federal Regulations; and the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users. Applicable State regulations discussed include the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Standards, Statewide Transportation Improvement Program, and the Transportation Development Act. Local Applicable regulations include the County of San Diego Community Plans; County Zoning Ordinance, Parking Regulations, Sections 6750-6799; San Diego County Public Road Standards; San Diego County Private Road Standards; County of San Diego Consolidated Fire Code; County of San Diego Regulatory Ordinances, Sections 77.201-77.220, Transportation Impact Fee; County Community Right-of-Way Development Standards; and Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs) and Programs including the 2030 RTP, 2006 Regional Transportation Improvement Program, and Congestion Management Program.

The regulatory framework discussion in the General Plan Update PEIR, as it pertains to transportation and traffic, has not changed since adoption of the General Plan in August 2011. The County of San Diego still utilizes the performance measures provided in the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance, Transportation and Traffic (County of San Diego 2011c), to evaluate traffic impacts. The County still utilizes the same Level of Service

(LOS) measure to describe operational conditions on a transportation facility, such as a roadway or intersection.

2.13.3 Analysis of Project Effects and Cumulative Impacts

The cumulative impact analysis study area for transportation and traffic in the General Plan Update PEIR was identified as the County of San Diego and surrounding jurisdictions (Chapter 2.15). As the current project is applying 2011 General Plan principles to assign land use designations for the Project areas throughout the unincorporated area, the cumulative study area for transportation and traffic is the same as the General Plan Update PEIR and is hereby incorporated by reference. In addition, Section 1.9 of this SEIR (Cumulative Project Assessment Overview) provides an update of new projects since adoption of the 2011 General Plan that are considered in the cumulative analysis in order to make the analysis complete.

2.13.3.1 Traffic and LOS Standards

This section describes potential direct and cumulative impacts on the unincorporated County roadway network capacity and operations from trip generation and LOS as it pertains to the Project areas addressed in this SEIR.

It should be noted that as a result of Senate Bill 743, (SB 743) the California State Office of Planning and Research (OPR) is currently in the process of drafting regulations for traffic analysis under CEQA which would require that public agencies not utilize LOS for traffic analysis and instead rely on another metric—likely vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Therefore, although analysis of traffic using VMT is not yet required (because OPR has not finalized the new regulations and so the Natural Resources Agency has yet to approve them), an analysis of VMT generated by the proposed Project is contained Chapter 2, section 2.15 Global Climate Change, for informational purposes.

Guidelines for the Determination of Significance

Based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines and the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance, Transportation and Traffic, the proposed Project would have a significant impact if it would:

- a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections); or
- b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County Congestion Management Agency for designated roads or highways.

As described in the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance – Transportation and Traffic (County of San Diego 2011c), a traffic volume increase from a project will have a significant traffic volume or LOS traffic impact on a roadway segment if:

SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

- The additional or redistributed ADT generated by the proposed project will significantly increase congestion on a Circulation Element Road or State Highway currently operating at LOS E or LOS F, or will cause a Circulation Element Road or State Highway to operate at a LOS E or LOS F as a result of the proposed project, or
- The additional or redistributed ADT generated by the proposed project will cause a residential street to exceed its design capacity.

Analysis

The General Plan Update PEIR evaluated impacts from the adoption of the goals and policies of the 2011 General Plan countywide, including FCI lands. In addition, the General Plan Update PEIR evaluated buildout of the land use designations applied throughout the unincorporated area. For FCI lands buildout was evaluated based on a density of one dwelling unit per 40 acres. The General Plan Update PEIR determined that buildout under the 2011 General Plan would result in potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts on in a total of 136 deficient roadway segments throughout the unincorporated County (approximately 31 State highway segments and 105 Mobility Element segments). The discussion of impacts can be found in Chapter 2.15, Transportation and Traffic, and is hereby incorporated by reference. This would be considered a significant impact.

In the General Plan Update PEIR, roadway reclassifications were identified to achieve adequate LOS on those Mobility Element roads that were projected to operate at deficient levels. In other cases, no improvements were recommended and the Mobility Element roads were accepted at a deficient LOS. For development within the proposed Project area, a traffic analysis (see Appendix D) was prepared to evaluate the County roads and other roadways in the Mobility Element forecast to operate at LOS E or F at buildout. The Mobility Element roadways forecast in the General Plan Update PEIR to operate at LOS E or F are shown in Table 2.13-1.

The traffic analysis identified the overall traffic impacts relative to the change in land use designations for the proposed Project as a whole. This analysis did not evaluate the detailed impacts of individual Project parcels that may develop within the affected communities in the future. The individual impacts from future development of these parcels would be addressed on a case-by-case basis and reviewed by County of San Diego when applications are filed.

Nine community and subregional planning areas are affected by the Project land use changes: Alpine, Central Mountain, Desert, Jamul, Julian, Mountain Empire, North Mountain, Pendleton/De Luz, and Ramona. Of these nine communities, approximately 95% of this increase in ADT is the result of proposed land use changes in Alpine. Therefore, the traffic impact analysis (Appendix D) determined that Alpine would be the only community with a potential for significant traffic-related impacts. To determine the impacts, the parcels forecast to have substantial increases in trips were grouped together into Focus Areas. The trips forecast for each Focus Area were loaded onto the roadway network and operating conditions were evaluated for Project conditions.

The five Focus Areas in the Alpine community are outlined in red in Figures 1-3 in Appendix D. The outlined areas identify Focus Areas where more than 500 trips per day are generated (collectively or individually by parcel). Table 2.13-2 summarizes the trips by Focus Area for the Alpine community. It should be noted that the sum of the net increase in average daily traffic (ADT) for the five Focus Areas does not match the sum shown in Table 2.13-3 for the Alpine community because not all of the FCI parcels in the Alpine community are located within the five Focus Areas. Therefore, the total net increase in ADT for the Alpine community is higher than the sum of the five focus areas shown in Table 2.13-2.

Table 2.13-4 shows the County of San Diego's traffic significance standards for roadway segments as defined in the Guidelines for Determining Significance – Transportation and Traffic (County of San Diego 2011c). The significance criteria shown in this table are used to determine the Project's traffic impact on the study roadway segments.

Table 2.13-5 summarizes the effects of the proposed land use changes on Mobility Element roadways that are forecast to operate at LOS D, E, or F at buildout under the 2011 General Plan. The buildout ADT volumes on roadways that are forecast to operate at LOS D, E, or F, before the addition of Project traffic, are based on the County of San Diego General Plan Update PEIR (County of San Diego 2011b, Volume IV, Appendix E), the traffic forecast model developed for the County of San Diego General Plan Update PEIR, and for some roadways in the Alpine community the ADT volumes are based on the 2013 County traffic forecast model (see Appendix D).

The proposed Project would result in impacts from both increasing congestion on roadway segments already forecasted to operate at LOS E or LOS F and from causing roadway segments forecasted to operate at an acceptable LOS D or better to operate at a deficient LOS E or LOS F after the addition of Project traffic. These roadway segments impacted by the proposed Project would only occur in the community of Alpine.

As shown in Table 2.13-5, out of the roadway segments in Alpine forecast to operate at deficient LOS E or F conditions under buildout of the 2011 General Plan before the addition of Project traffic, the traffic operations on six of these roadway segments would worsen with the addition of Project traffic. These segments are listed below:

- Alpine Boulevard from Boulders Road to Alpine Special Treatment Center (LOS F)
- Alpine Boulevard from Alpine Special Treatment Center to West Victoria Drive (LOS E)
- Alpine Boulevard from West Victoria Drive to Louise Drive (LOS F)
- Alpine Boulevard from Viejas View Place to West Willows Road (LOS F)
- West Willows Road from Alpine Boulevard to Otto Avenue / Willows Road (LOS F)
- Willows Road from Otto Avenue to Viejas Casino Road (LOS F)

SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

In addition to worsening the traffic operations on these roadway segments with forecasted deficient LOS conditions under buildout of the 2011 General Plan before the addition of Project traffic, the following five segments would deteriorate from a forecasted acceptable LOS D or better to a deficient LOS E or F with the addition of Project traffic:

- Alpine Boulevard from Tavern Road to Boulders Road (LOS E)
- Alpine Boulevard from Louise Drive to Viejas View Place (LOS F)
- Alpine Boulevard from West Willows Road to Willows Road (LOS F)
- South Grade Road from Eltinge Drive to Olive View Road (LOS E)
- Willows Road from Viejas Casino Road to I-8 On-Ramp (LOS F)

The GPU EIR Volume IV Appendix E Technical Memorandum describes the roadway reclassifications needed for roadway segments operating at LOS E or F to achieve LOS D and these reclassifications are shown in Table 2.13-6 for the roadway segments impacted by the proposed Project (refer to the column titled “GPU EIR Reclassification to Achieve LOS D”). After addition of Project traffic nine of the eleven impacted roadway segments would still operate at deficient LOS E or F conditions even with implementation of the roadway reclassifications needed to achieve LOS D identified in the GPU EIR Volume IV Appendix E Technical Memorandum. Therefore, the proposed Project would result in a significant impact to these roadway segments that would still operate at deficient LOS E or F conditions even with implementation of the roadway reclassifications needed to achieve LOS D identified in the GPU EIR Volume IV Appendix E Technical Memorandum. The roadway segments that would still operate at deficient LOS E or F conditions even with implementation of the roadway reclassifications needed to achieve LOS D identified in the GPU EIR Volume IV Appendix E Technical Memorandum are listed below:

- Alpine Boulevard from:
 - Tavern Road to Boulders Road (LOS E)
 - West Victoria Drive to Louise Drive (LOS E)
 - Louise Drive to Viejas View Place (LOS F)
 - Viejas View Place to West Willows Road (LOS F)
 - West Willows Road to Willows Road (LOS F)
- South Grade Road from Eltinge Drive to Olive View Road (LOS E)
- West Willows Road from Alpine Boulevard to Otto Avenue (LOS F)
- Willows Road from:
 - Otto Avenue to Viejas Casino Road (LOS F)
 - Viejas Casino Road to I-8 On-Ramp (LOS F)

Although nine roadway segments forecast to operate at LOS E and F with buildout of the Proposed Project Map, only one road segment would be reclassified. The proposed Project would reclassify Willows Road from Viejas Casino Road east to Interstate 8 on-ramp from a two-lane 2.2E Light Collector to a four-lane 4.2B Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes. However, even with the classification change, this road segment would still operate at LOS F because a 6.2 Prime Arterial classification would be required to fully mitigate forecasted traffic as a result of the land use map changes.

The proposed Project would result in significant traffic impacts on the nine Alpine roadway segments listed above. These impacts would also be cumulative in nature as cumulative projects such as regional transportation projects, development consistent with general plans, and tribal developments would be expected to increase traffic within the region and potentially on these deficient roadway segments. Most cumulative projects would be required to comply with applicable federal, state, and local regulations, including CEQA, which would reduce the potential for cumulative impacts. However, the proposed Project, in combination with cumulative projects, would have the potential to result in a significant cumulative impact associated with traffic in excess of LOS standards, and the proposed Project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, the proposed Project would result in potentially significant impacts from traffic by exceeding a LOS threshold established by the County. However, such potentially significant impacts resulting from implementation of the proposed Project would be reduced by the same regulations, implementation programs (2011 General Plan goals/policies), and mitigation measures from the General Plan Update PEIR and repeated in Section 2.13.4.1 (Traffic and LOS Standards) of this SEIR. However, even with these programs in place, the impacts would not be reduced to below a level of significance due to the infeasibility of mitigation measures as discussed in Section 2.13.4.1, below. As such, implementation of the proposed Project would result in significant and unavoidable direct and cumulative impacts related to traffic in excess of LOS standards.

2.13.3.2 Rural Road Safety

This section describes potential direct and cumulative impacts on rural road safety as it pertains to the Project areas addressed in this SEIR.

Guidelines for the Determination of Significance

Based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines and the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance, Transportation and Traffic, the General Plan would have a significant impact if it would substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).

Analysis

The General Plan Update PEIR evaluated impacts from the adoption of the goals and policies of the 2011 General Plan countywide, including FCI lands. In addition, the General Plan Update

PEIR evaluated buildout of the land use designations applied throughout the unincorporated area with the exception of former FCI lands. The General Plan Update PEIR determined that buildout under the 2011 General Plan would result in the adoption of a Mobility Element network that includes existing roadways with horizontal and vertical curves that are sharper than existing standards, resulting in potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts. The discussion of impacts can be found in Chapter 2.15 Transportation and Traffic and is hereby incorporated by reference. The 2011 General Plan policies and mitigation measures, in addition to compliance with applicable regulations, would reduce 2011 General Plan buildout impacts related to rural road safety, but not to below a level of significance. Therefore, direct and cumulative impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Similar direct and cumulative impacts related to rural road safety would occur with the proposed Project. For example, the proposed Project would increase trips on two lane roads in rural areas that are not developed to current road safety standards. The proposed Project will also add traffic to roads with slow moving agricultural equipment. Additional traffic from the proposed Project would contribute to the road safety conflicts with alternative transportation (pedestrians and bicyclists) and at grade railroad crossings. In addition, there may be older rural roadways surrounding some of the Project areas that would not be adequate by existing roadway standards. Such impacts would also be cumulative in nature; however, such potentially significant impacts resulting from implementation of the proposed Project would be reduced by the same regulations, implementation programs (2011 General Plan goals/policies), and mitigation measures from the General Plan Update PEIR and repeated in Section 2.13.4.2 (Rural Road Safety) of this SEIR. However, even with these programs in place, the impacts would not be reduced to below a level of significance due to the infeasibility of mitigation measures as discussed in Section 2.13.4.2, below. As such, implementation of the proposed Project would result in significant and unavoidable direct and cumulative impacts related to rural road safety.

2.13.3.3 *Emergency Access*

This section describes potential direct and cumulative impacts on emergency access as it pertains to the Project areas addressed in this SEIR.

Guidelines for the Determination of Significance

Based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines and the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance, Transportation and Traffic, the 2011 General Plan would have a significant impact if it would result in inadequate emergency access.

Analysis

The General Plan Update PEIR evaluated impacts from the adoption of the goals and policies of the 2011 General Plan County-wide, including FCI lands. In addition, the General Plan Update PEIR evaluated buildout of the land use designations applied throughout the unincorporated area with the exception of former FCI lands. The General Plan Update PEIR determined that buildout

under the 2011 General Plan would result in existing inadequate roadway widths, dead-end roads, and one-way roads, and gated communities continuing to occur in the unincorporated County, all of which have the potential to impair emergency access. The discussion of impacts can be found in Chapter 2.15, Transportation and Traffic, and is hereby incorporated by reference. However, these potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts to emergency access would be reduced to below a level of significance with implementation of 2011 General Plan policies and mitigation measures, in addition to compliance with applicable regulations.

Similar direct and cumulative impacts related to emergency access would occur as a result of the proposed Project adding additional traffic on a roadway network that is incomplete or not fully connected; on roadways that are dead-end and one-way; or within gated communities. Similar to the 2011 General Plan, the proposed Project would result in a potentially significant direct impact to emergency access; however, such potentially significant impacts resulting from implementation of the proposed Project would be reduced by the same regulations, implementation programs (2011 General Plan goals/policies) and mitigation measures from the General Plan Update PEIR and repeated in Section 2.13.4.3 (Mitigation for Emergency Access) below. Direct impacts associated with emergency access as a result of the proposed Project would be reduced to below a level of significance with implementation of the same applicable 2011 General Plan policies and mitigation measures identified in the General Plan Update PEIR. In addition, cumulative projects in this area would encounter similar emergency access impairment issues as the proposed Project with respect to existing inadequate roadway widths, dead-end roads, one-way roads, and gated communities, all of which have the potential to impair emergency access; however, cumulative emergency access impacts would be limited to the immediate vicinity of the impact, such as multiple obstructions to emergency access along the same route to an emergency care facility hospital. Therefore, cumulative Project impacts would be considered less than significant because emergency access impacts would be limited to the immediate vicinity of the Project area and associated impacts would be considered direct, not cumulative. The proposed project would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact associated with emergency access.

2.13.3.4 *Parking Capacity*

This section describes potential direct and cumulative impacts resulting from parking capacity effects as pertains to the Project areas addressed in this SEIR.

Guidelines for the Determination of Significance

At the time of preparation of the General Plan Update PEIR, Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines (2010) and the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance, Transportation and Traffic included significance criteria to evaluate potential impacts with regard to parking. The Guidelines stated that a project would have a significant impact if it would result in inadequate parking capacity; however, this significance criterion was removed from the Guidelines in 2010. For consistency with the analysis provided in the General Plan

Update PEIR, and to ensure that the proposed Project would not result in adverse effects with regard to parking, the following analysis is therefore included.

Analysis

The General Plan Update PEIR evaluated impacts from the adoption of the goals and policies of the 2011 General Plan County-wide, including FCI lands. In addition, the General Plan Update PEIR evaluated buildout of the land use designations applied throughout the unincorporated area with the exception of former FCI lands. The General Plan Update PEIR determined that buildout under the 2011 General Plan would designate land uses throughout the unincorporated County that would require the development of parking facilities. The discussion of impacts can be found in Chapter 2.15, Transportation and Traffic, and is hereby incorporated by reference. All future development of parking facilities associated with these land uses would be required to follow existing parking standards and requirements, such as the County's Zoning Ordinance and roadway standards. The 2011 General Plan policies and mitigation measures, in addition to compliance with existing County parking regulations, would reduce 2011 General Plan buildout impacts related to parking capacity to below a level of significance.

Similar impacts from implementation of the proposed Project would be addressed through parking standards set forth in the County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance, Parking Regulations, Sections 6750-6799 and the County of San Diego Off-Street Parking Design Manual, which implements Section 6793(c) of the County Zoning Ordinance. Almost all land uses under the proposed Project would require parking facilities when developed. The regulations are intended to require projects to provide adequate off-street parking and loading, thereby reducing traffic congestion, allowing more efficient utilization of on-street parking, promoting more efficient loading operations, and reducing the use of public streets for loading purposes. Additionally, the regulations are intended to minimize the secondary effects of vehicles, such as vehicular noise or visual impacts from headlights and unscreened parked vehicles. Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in a potentially significant direct impact with respect to parking capacity with implementation of the 2011 General Plan policies and mitigation measures, in addition to compliance with existing County parking regulations.

The area of analysis for cumulative parking capacity includes the Project area and the immediate vicinity of land uses requiring parking. Cumulative projects in this area would face similar parking capacity issues as the proposed Project. Most future cumulative projects would be required to comply with existing regulations pertaining to parking facilities, such as jurisdictional parking, zoning and road standards. Therefore, cumulative projects would not result in a significant cumulative impact because impacts associated with parking would be limited to the immediate vicinity of the Project area and associated impacts would be considered direct, not cumulative. The proposed Project would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact associated with parking capacity.

2.13.3.5 *Alternative Transportation*

Guidelines for the Determination of Significance

Based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines and the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance, Transportation and Traffic, the 2011 General Plan would have a significant impact if it would conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks).

Analysis

The General Plan Update PEIR evaluated impacts from the adoption of the goals and policies of the General Plan countywide, including FCI lands. In addition, the General Plan Update PEIR evaluated buildout of the land use designations applied throughout the unincorporated area with the exception of former FCI lands. The General Plan PEIR determined that buildout under the General Plan would create provisions for alternative modes of transportation, including bike lanes, bus stops, trails, and sidewalks. The discussion of impacts can be found in Chapter 2.15, Transportation and Traffic, and is hereby incorporated by reference. Many policies in the General Plan require coordination between the County and the agencies responsible for public transportation planning; however, previous alternative transportation plans and policies would require modification to be consistent with the goals and policies contained in the 2011 General Plan. This potentially significant impact would be reduced to below a level of significance through the implementation of policies and mitigation measures, in addition to compliance with applicable regulations the adopted 2011 General Plan goals and policies identified in the General Plan Update PEIR.

Similar impacts on alternative transportation would occur with the proposed Project. While existing County policies and regulations and 2011 General Plan goals and policies are intended to promote alternative transportation plans and policies, implementation of the proposed Project would require coordination between the County and the agencies responsible for public transportation planning, including the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), Caltrans, transit agencies, and adjacent jurisdictions. Therefore, the proposed Project is concluded to result in a potentially significant direct impact to alternative transportation plans and policies; however, such potentially significant impacts resulting from implementation of the proposed Project would be reduced by the same regulations, implementation programs (2011 General Plan goals/policies), and mitigation measures from the General Plan Update PEIR and repeated in Section 2.13.4.5 (Alternative Transportation) in this SEIR.

Similar to the proposed Project, cumulative projects would potentially impair existing alternative transportation plans, policies, or programs. Future development projects, consistent with applicable general plans, would locate land uses that are dependent on alternative transportation in areas that were not planned for in existing public transportation, plans and programs, such as the SANDAG RTP; however, since the majority of cumulative projects would be required to

comply with existing regulations, cumulative project impacts would be considered less than significant. Therefore, the proposed Project would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact associated with alternative transportation.

2.13.4 Mitigation

2.13.4.1 Traffic and LOS Standards

In addition to implementation of the same applicable 2011 General Plan policies and mitigation measures identified in the General Plan Update PEIR, and repeated below, the listed reclassifications of the following Mobility Element roads (to meet the LOS D standards of County Policy M-2.1) would reduce Project traffic impacts to below a level of significance for the roadway segments shown below:

- Alpine Boulevard from Tavern Road to West Victoria Drive: Reclassify roadway segment from a Light Collector with Raised Median (2.2A) to a Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes (4.2B).
- Alpine Boulevard from West Victoria Drive to Louise Drive: Reclassify roadway segment from a Light Collector with Raised Median (2.2A) to a Major Road with Intermittent Turn Lanes (4.1B).
- Alpine Boulevard from Louise Drive to South Grade Road: Reclassify roadway segment from a Light Collector with Raised Median (2.2A) to a Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes (4.2B).
- Alpine Boulevard from South Grade Road to Viejas View Place: Reclassify roadway segment from a Community Collector with Improvement Options (2.1D) to a Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes (4.2B).
- Alpine Boulevard from Viejas View Place to West Willows Road: Reclassify roadway segment from a Community Collector with Improvement Options (2.1D) to a Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes (4.2B).
- Alpine Boulevard from West Willows Road to Willows Road (eastern end): Reclassify roadway segment from a Community Collector with Intermittent Turn Lanes (2.1C) to a Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes (4.2B).
- South Grade Road from Eltinge Drive to Olive View Road: Reclassify roadway segment from a Light Collector with Intermittent Turn Lanes (2.2C) to a Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes (4.2B).
- West Willows Road from Alpine Boulevard to Otto Avenue: Reclassify roadway segment from a Light Collector (2.2E) to a Boulevard with Raised Median (4.2A).
- Willows Road from Otto Avenue to Viejas Casino Road: Reclassify roadway segment from a Light Collector (2.2E) to a Prime Arterial (6.2).

SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

- Willows Road from Viejas Casino Road to I-8 On-Ramp: Reclassify roadway segment from a Light Collector (2.2E) to a Prime Arterial (6.2).

In accordance with Goal M-2 under Policy M-2.1 and shown in Table 2.13-7, the County has determined that it is more appropriate to maintain deficient LOS E or F operations on the following 11 roadway segments:

- Alpine Boulevard from:
 - Tavern Road to Boulders Road
 - Boulders Road to Alpine Special Treatment Center
 - Alpine Special Treatment Center to West Victoria Drive
 - West Victoria Drive to Louise Drive
 - Louise Drive to Viejas View Place
 - Viejas View Place to West Willows Road
 - West Willows Road to Willows Road
- South Grade Road from:
 - Eltinge Drive to Olive View Road
- West Willows Road from Alpine Boulevard to Otto Avenue / Willows Road
- Willows Road from:
 - Otto Avenue to Viejas Casino Road
 - Viejas Casino Road to I-8 On-Ramp

With respect to these 11 roadway segments, the County has established the following LOS E/F criteria to define the conditions where a deficient LOS is acceptable, because mitigation to fully reduce the impact would be infeasible for one or more of the reasons described below:

Environmental Impacts: Construction of some roads would significantly impact important habitats, destroy archaeological sites, impact waterways, or require the demolition of historic landmarks.

Established Land Development: Existing businesses, historic buildings, established neighborhoods, and a pedestrian-friendly environment are essential components of a healthy town center. Road improvements that negatively affect these components can be undesirable. Wider roads may divide a town and change its character.

Town Centers: Roadways may be exempted from County LOS standards when widening the road would obstruct pedestrian movements, impede the economic vitality of existing/planned businesses, require the demolition of historic structures, or negatively alter the overall character of the area.

Marginal Deficiencies: Exempting a road from County LOS standards may be the more preferable choice when a road failure results from only a marginal deficiency in performance. If the projected volume is not anticipated to affect overall traffic operation, planning for a wider road to accommodate the additional traffic may not be required. Acceptance of a lower LOS is particularly appropriate when underutilized, alternate routes are available.

Environmental Constraints: Major physical and environmental constraints can severely hinder construction of needed improvements for some failing roads. The 2011 General Plan policies seek to minimize environmental impacts and minimize road construction costs.

The mitigation measures listed above have been found to be infeasible; therefore, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

2011 General Plan Policies

Implementation of the following policies would reduce Project traffic impacts, but not to below a level of significance for the reasons stated above:

Policy LU-5.1: Reduction of Vehicle Trips within Communities. Incorporate a mixture of uses within Villages and Rural Villages and plan residential densities at a level that support multi-modal transportation, including walking, bicycling, and the use of public transit, when appropriate.

Policy LU-10.4: Commercial and Industrial Development. Limit the establishment of commercial and industrial uses in Semi-Rural and Rural areas that are outside of Villages (including Rural Villages) to minimize vehicle trips and environmental impacts.

Policy LU-11.8: Permitted Secondary Uses. Provide a process where secondary land uses may be permitted when appropriate and compatible with the primary commercial, office, and light industrial uses, in order to better serve the daily needs of employees and to reduce the frequency of related automobile trips. This policy is not intended for high impact industrial uses.

Policy LU-12.2: Maintenance of Adequate Services. Require development to mitigate significant impacts to existing service levels of public facilities or services for existing residents and businesses. Provide improvements for Mobility Element roads in accordance with the Mobility Element Network Appendix matrices, which may result in ultimate build-out conditions that achieve an improved LOS but do not achieve a LOS of D or better.

Policy M-1.1: Prioritized Travel within Community Planning Areas. Provide a public road network that accommodates travel between and within community planning areas rather than accommodating overflow traffic from State highways and freeways that are unable to meet regional travel demands.

Policy M-1.2: Interconnected Road Network. Provide an interconnected public road network with multiple connections that improve efficiency by incorporating shorter routes between trip origin and destination, disperse traffic, reduce traffic congestion in specific areas,

and provide both primary and secondary access/egress routes that support emergency services during fire and other emergencies.

Policy M-1.3: Treatment of High-Volume Roadways. To avoid bisecting communities or town centers, consider narrower rights-of-way, flexibility in design standards, and lower design speeds in areas planned for substantial development. Reduce noise, air, and visual impacts of new freeways, regional arterials, and Mobility Element roads through landscaping, design, and/or careful location of facilities.

Policy M-2.1: Level of Service Criteria. Require development projects to provide associated road improvements necessary to achieve a level of service of “D” or higher on all Mobility Element roads except for those where a failing level of service has been accepted by the County pursuant to the criteria specifically identified in the accompanying text box (Criteria for Accepting a Road Classification with Level of Service E/F). When development is proposed on roads where a failing level of service has been accepted, require feasible mitigation in the form of road improvements or a fair share contribution to a road improvement program, consistent with the Mobility Element road network.

Policy M-2.2: Access to Mobility Element Designated Roads. Minimize direct access points to Mobility Element roads from driveways and other non-through roads to maintain the capacity and improve traffic operations.

Policy M-2.3: Environmentally Sensitive Road Design. Locate and design public and private roads to minimize impacts to significant biological and other environmental and visual resources. Avoid road alignments through floodplains to minimize impacts on floodplain habitats and limit the need for constructing flood control measures. Design new roads to maintain wildlife movement and retrofit existing roads for that purpose. Utilize fencing to reduce road kill and to direct animals to under crossings.

Policy M-3.1: Public Road Rights-of-Way. Require development to dedicate right-of-way for public roads and other transportation routes identified in the Mobility Element roadway network (see Mobility Element Network Appendix), Community Plans, or Road Master Plans. Require the provision of sufficient right-of-way width, as specified in the County Public Road Standards and Community Trails Master Plan, to adequately accommodate all users, including transit riders, pedestrians, bicyclists, and equestrians.

Policy M-3.2: Traffic Impact Mitigation. Require development to contribute its fair share toward financing transportation facilities, including mitigating the associated direct and cumulative traffic impacts caused by their project on both the local and regional road networks. Transportation facilities include road networks and related transit, and pedestrian, bicycle and equestrian facilities.

Policy M-4.2: Interconnected Local Roads. Provide an interconnected and appropriately scaled local public road network in Village and Rural Villages that reinforces the compact development patterns promoted by the Land Use Element and individual community plans.

Policy M-5.1: Regional Coordination. Coordinate with regional planning agencies, transit agencies, and adjacent jurisdictions to provide a transportation system with the following:

- Sufficient capacity consistent with the County General Plan Land Use Map
- Travel choices, including multiple routes and modes of travel to provide the opportunity for reducing vehicle miles traveled
- Facilities sited and designed to be compatible with the differing scales, intensities, and characteristics of the unincorporated communities while still accommodating regional, community, and neighborhood travel demands
- Maximized efficiency to enhance connectivity between different modes of travel

Policy M-5.2: Impact Mitigation for New Roadways and Improvements. Coordinate with Caltrans to mitigate negative impacts from existing, expanded, or new State freeways or highways and to reduce impacts of road improvements and/or design modifications to State facilities on adjacent communities.

Policy M-9.1: Transportation Systems Management. Explore the provision of operational improvements (i.e., adding turn lanes, acceleration lanes, intersection improvements, etc.) that increase the effective vehicular capacity of the public road network prior to increasing the number of road lanes. Ensure operational improvements do not adversely impact the transit, bicycle, and pedestrian networks.

Policy M-9.2: Transportation Demand Management. Require large commercial and office development to use TDM programs to reduce single-occupant vehicle traffic generation, particularly during peak periods to maximize the capacity of existing or improved road facilities.

These policies promote the reduction of vehicle trips, limit high-traffic uses in rural and semi-rural areas, encourage uses that would reduce the frequency of employee vehicle trips, require development to mitigate the significant impacts to existing service levels of public facilities, provide for an interconnected road network, encourage alternative transportation, establish LOS criteria, and apply appropriate road standards to future development. Adherence to these policies will further reduce impacts associated with County traffic and LOS standards from future development.

Mitigation Measures

Implementation of the following mitigation measures would reduce Project traffic impacts, but not to below a level of significance for the reasons stated above:

Tra-1.1 Coordinate with SANDAG and adjacent cities during updates to the RTP to identify a transportation network that maximizes efficiency, enhances connectivity between different modes of travel, and minimizes impacts when locating new freeways and State highways.

SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

- Tra-1.2** Coordinate with Caltrans and adjacent jurisdictions during planning and design for improvements to the freeway and State highway network.
- Tra-1.3** Implement the County Public Road Standards during review of new development projects. Also revise the Public Road Standards to include a range of road types according to Regional Category context.
- Tra-1.4** Implement and revise as necessary the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Transportation and Traffic to evaluate adverse environmental effects of projects and require mitigation when significant impacts are identified.
- Tra-1.5** Implement the Congestion Management Strategies identified in the Regional Transportation Plan and require large projects to mitigate impacts to State highways and freeways.
- Tra-1.6** Develop project review procedures to require large commercial and office development to use Transportation Demand Management Programs to reduce single-occupant vehicle traffic generation and to prepare and forward annual reports to the County on the effectiveness of the program.
- Tra-1.7** 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.

Tra-1.1 maximizes efficiency, enhances connectivity between different modes of travel, and minimizes impacts when locating new freeways and State highways. This will help prevent future exceedance of LOS standards on Mobility Element roads in the County and mitigate potential traffic increases. Tra-1.2 will also help prevent future exceedance of LOS standards on Mobility Element roads in the County and mitigate potential traffic increases. Tra-1.3 will ensure that LOS standards are met when feasible and that appropriate road types are assigned based the specifics of the development. Tra-1.4 will ensure that appropriate site design and mitigating measures are applied to minimize traffic increases and road deficiencies associated with future development under the 2011 General Plan. Tra-1.5 will reduce potential cumulative traffic increases in the County. Tra-1.6 will reduce potential traffic increases in the County associated with commercial and office development under the 2011 General Plan. Tra-1.7 will help reduce financial barriers associated with accommodating increased traffic and/or meeting LOS standards.

2.13.4.2 Rural Road Safety

Direct and cumulative impacts on rural road safety as a result of the proposed Project would be reduced to below a level of significance with implementation of the same applicable 2011 General Plan policies and mitigation measures identified in the General Plan Update PEIR and

SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

repeated below; however, the County determined that implementation of the additional measures would be infeasible for the following reasons:

- The following measures were considered in attempting to reduce impacts to rural road safety to below a level of significance; however, the County has determined that these measures would be infeasible as described below; therefore, because they have been determined to be infeasible, these mitigation measures would not be implemented. Therefore, this mitigation measure would conflict with the proposed project's objective to provide and support a multi-modal transportation network that enhances connectivity and supports community development patterns.
- All transportation facilities within the unincorporated County shall be retrofitted to provide safe bicycle and pedestrian movement corridors. This measure would conflict with the proposed project's objective to minimize public costs of infrastructure and services and correlate their timing with development. In addition, some of the transportation facilities in the unincorporated County are within the jurisdiction of another agency, such as Caltrans.

Because the measures listed above have been found to be infeasible, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

2011 General Plan Policies

The following policies would reduce impacts associated rural road safety, but not to below a level of significance for the reasons stated above:

Policy LU-2.8: Mitigation of Development Impacts. Require measures that minimize significant impacts to surrounding areas from uses or operations that cause excessive noise, vibrations, dust, odor, aesthetic impairment and/or are detrimental to human health and safety.

Policy LU-6.10: Protection from Hazards. Require that development be located and designed to protect property and residents from the risks of natural and man-induced hazards.

Policy M-4.3: Rural Roads Compatible with Rural Character. Design and construct public roads to meet travel demands in Semi-Rural and Rural Lands that are consistent with rural character while safely accommodating transit stops when deemed necessary, along with bicyclists, pedestrians, and equestrians. Where feasible, utilize rural road design features (e.g., no curb and gutter improvements) to maintain community character. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]

Policy M-4.4: Accommodate Emergency Vehicles. Design and construct public and private roads to allow for necessary access for appropriately sized fire apparatus and emergency vehicles while accommodating outgoing vehicles from evacuating residents.

Policy M-4.5: Context Sensitive Road Design. Design and construct roads that are compatible with the local terrain and the uses, scale and pattern of the surrounding development.

Provide wildlife crossings in road design and construction where it would minimize impacts in wildlife corridors.

Policy M-9.1: Transportation Systems Management. Explore the provision of operational improvements (i.e., adding turn lanes, acceleration lanes, intersection improvements, etc.) that increase the effective vehicular capacity of the public road network prior to increasing the number of road lanes. Ensure operational improvements do not adversely impact the transit, bicycle, and pedestrian networks.

Mitigation Measures

In addition to Mitigation Measures Tra-1.3, Tra-1.4, and 1.7 above, the following mitigation measure would further reduce impacts associated with rural road safety, but not to below a level of significance for the reasons stated above:

Tra-3.1 Coordinate with SANDAG to obtain funding for operational improvements to State highways and freeways in the unincorporated area.

Tra-1.3 will ensure that future public roads meet current safety standards. Tra-1.4 will ensure that appropriate site design and mitigating measures are applied to prevent road hazards associated with future development. Tra-1.7 will reduce potential rural road hazards from features or incompatible uses associated with commercial and office development under the 2011 General Plan. Tra-3.1 will reduce potential incompatibility of alternative transportation facilities with roadway and highway facilities, thereby improving safety for pedestrians and bicyclists.

2.13.4.3 Emergency Access

Direct impacts associated with emergency access as a result of the proposed Project would be reduced to below a level of significance with implementation of the same applicable 2011 General Plan policies and mitigation measures identified in the General Plan Update PEIR and repeated below:

2011 General Plan Policies

Policy LU-2.8: Mitigation of Development Impacts. Require measures that minimize significant impacts to surrounding areas from uses or operations that cause excessive noise, vibrations, dust, odor, aesthetic impairment and/or are detrimental to human health and safety.

Policy LU-6.10: Protection from Hazards. Require that development be located and designed to protect property and residents from the risks of natural and man-induced hazards.

Policy LU-12.2: Maintenance of Adequate Services. Require development to mitigate significant impacts to existing service levels of public facilities or services for existing residents and businesses. Provide improvements for Mobility Element roads in accordance with the Mobility Element Network Appendix matrices, which may result in ultimate build-out conditions that achieve an improved LOS but do not achieve a LOS of D or better.

Policy M-1.2: Interconnected Road Network. Provide an interconnected public road network with multiple connections that improve efficiency by incorporating shorter routes between trip origin and destination, disperse traffic, reduce traffic congestion in specific areas, and provide both primary and secondary access/egress routes that support emergency services during fire and other emergencies.

Policy M-3.3: Multiple Ingress and Egress. Require development to provide multiple ingress/egress routes in conformance with State law, and local regulations.

Policy M-4.4: Accommodate Emergency Vehicles. Design and construct public and private roads to allow for necessary access for appropriately sized fire apparatus and emergency vehicles while accommodating outgoing vehicles from evacuating residents.

Policy S-3.4: Service Availability. Plan for development where fire and emergency services are available or planned.

Policy S-3.5: Access Roads. Require development to provide additional access roads when necessary to provide for safe access of emergency equipment and civilian evacuation concurrently.

Policy S-14.1: Vehicular Access to Development. Require development to provide vehicular connections that reduce response times and facilitate access for law enforcement personnel, whenever feasible.

These policies require that development be located and designed to protect property and residents from the risks of natural and man-induced hazards, require development to mitigate significant impacts to existing service levels of public facilities or services for existing residents and businesses, provide for transportation facilities that can be adequately served by emergency services in the case of a transportation hazard, require that development provide multiple ingress/egress routes whenever feasible, require public and private roads to allow fire apparatus and emergency vehicle access while accommodating outgoing vehicles from evacuating residents, require development to be located near available fire and emergency service, and require development provide secondary access when necessary to ensure adequate fire safety. Adherence to these policies will reduce potential impacts associated with inadequate emergency access.

Mitigation Measures

In addition to Mitigation Measures Tra-1.3, Tra-1.4, and Tra-1.6 above, the following mitigation measures would further reduce impacts associated with emergency access to below a level of significance:

Tra-4.1 Update Community Plans to identify local public road and community emergency evacuation route networks and pedestrian routes as appropriate.

Tra-4.2 Implement the Building and Fire Codes to ensure there are adequate service levels in place associated with the construction of structures and their accessibility and egress.

Tra-4.3 Implement and revise as necessary the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Wildland Fire and Fire Protection to evaluate adverse environmental effects of projects. Require fire protection plans to ensure the requirements of the County Fire Code and other applicable regulations are being met.

Tra-4.4 Implement and revise as necessary the Subdivision Ordinance to ensure that proposed subdivisions meet current design and accessibility standards.

Tra-1.3 will improve circulation and reduce the need for additional emergency access roads. Tra-1.4 will ensure that new development will mitigate or avoid impacts and can have the effect of improving existing conditions. Tra-1.6 will maximize the capacity of road facilities and allow for improved responsiveness of emergency vehicles. Tra-4.1 will help identify and address areas that have inadequate emergency access. Tra-4.2 ensures that there are adequate service levels in place associated with the construction of structures and their accessibility and egress. Tra-4.3 requires the County to implement and revise as necessary the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Wildland Fire and Fire Protection to evaluate adverse environmental effects of projects. Fire protection plans shall also be required to ensure the County Fire Code and other applicable regulations are being met. Tra-4.4 will ensure that new subdivision projects have adequate emergency access.

2.13.4.4 *Parking Capacity*

Direct impacts associated with parking capacity as a result of the proposed Project would be reduced to below a level of significance with implementation of the same applicable 2011 General Plan policies and mitigation measures identified in the 2011 General Plan Update PEIR and repeated below:

2011 General Plan Policies

Policy M-8.6: Park and Ride Facilities. Coordinate with SANDAG, Caltrans, and tribal governments to study transit connectivity and address improving regional opportunities for park-and-ride facilities and transit service to gaming facilities and surrounding rural areas to reduce congestion on rural roads.

Policy M-9.3: Preferred Parking. Encourage and provide incentives for commercial, office, and industrial development to provide preferred parking for carpools, vanpools, electric vehicles and flex cars. Encourage parking cash out programs to reimburse employees for the cost of “free” on-site parking to provide incentives to use alternate modes of travel and to reduce parking requirements.

Policy M-9.4: Park-and-Ride Facilities. Require developers of large projects to provide, or to contribute to, park-and-ride facilities near freeway interchanges and other appropriate locations that provide convenient access to congested regional arterials. Require park-and-ride facilities that are accessible to pedestrians and bicyclists, and include bicycle lockers and transit stops whenever feasible.

Policy M-10.1: Parking Capacity. Require new development to:

- Provide sufficient parking capacity for motor vehicles consistent with the project's location, use, and intensity
- Provide parking facilities for motorcycles and bicycles
- Provide staging areas for regional and community trails

Policy M-10.2: Parking for Pedestrian Activity. Require the design and placement of on-site automobile, motorcycle, and bicycle parking in Villages and Rural Villages that encourages pedestrian activity by providing a clear separation between vehicle and pedestrian areas and prohibit parking areas from restricting pedestrian circulation patterns.

Policy M-10.3: Maximize On-street Parking. Encourage the use of on-street parking in commercial and/or high-density residential town center areas to calm traffic and improve pedestrian interaction. Traffic operations and pedestrian safety must not be compromised.

Policy M-10.4: Shared Parking. Support town center plans when desired by the community that incorporate on-street and/or shared vehicular parking facilities to reduce on-site parking requirements.

These policies improve regional opportunities for park-and-ride facilities, encourage preferred parking, require park-and-ride facilities in certain land uses and development, set standards for parking capacity and design, provide for sufficient parking capacity for motor vehicles consistent with development and use type, and require development to maximize on-street parking and minimize parking where it is not needed. Adherence to these policies will reduce the potential for inadequate parking capacity.

Mitigation Measures

In addition to Mitigation Measure Tra-1.4 above, the following mitigation measures would further reduce impacts associated with parking capacity to below a level of significance:

Tra-5.1 When updating the Zoning Ordinance, review and revise parking regulations for senior housing and affordable housing, utilizing data from studies conducted for these groups.

Tra-5.2 Prepare town center plans for village areas that incorporate shared parking facilities and include in Community Plans or other appropriate documents.

Tra-5.3 Revise the Public Road Standards to include standards for the provision of parallel and diagonal on-street parking, according to Regional Category.

Tra-1.4 requires the County to implement and revise as necessary the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Transportation and Traffic to evaluate adverse environmental effects of projects and require mitigation when significant impacts are identified. This applies to the issue of parking capacity as well as other transportation issues. Tra-5.1 will maximize parking capacity where it is in highest demand and minimize parking where it is not needed. Tra-5.2 will further ensure that there is sufficient parking capacity in areas of high density. Tra-5.3 will ensure that additional parking capacity is provided on public roads with increased traffic.

2.13.4.5 *Alternative Transportation*

Direct impacts associated with alternative transportation as a result of the proposed Project would be reduced to below a level of significance with implementation of the same applicable 2011 General Plan policies and mitigation measures identified in the General Plan Update PEIR, and repeated below:

2011 General Plan Policies

Policy LU-5.1: Reduction of Vehicle Trips within Communities. Incorporate a mixture of uses within Villages and Rural Villages and plan residential densities at a level that support multi-modal transportation, including walking, bicycling, and the use of public transit, when appropriate.

Policy LU-5.4: Planning Support. Undertake planning efforts that promote infill and redevelopment of uses that accommodate walking and biking within communities.

Policy LU-5.5: Projects that Impede Non-Motorized Travel. Ensure that development projects and road improvements do not impede bicycle and pedestrian access. Where impacts to existing planned routes would occur, ensure that impacts are mitigated and acceptable alternative routes are implemented. Examples include large parking areas that cannot be crossed by non-motorized vehicles, and new developments that block through access on existing or potential bicycle and pedestrian routes.

Policy LU-9.8: Village Connectivity and Compatibility with Adjoining Areas. Require new development within Villages to include road networks, pedestrian routes, and amenities that create or maintain connectivity; and site, building, and landscape design that is compatible with surrounding areas. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]

Policy LU-11.6: Office Development. Locate new office development complexes within village areas where services are available, in proximity to housing, and along primary vehicular arterials (ideally with transit access) with internal vehicular and pedestrian linkages that integrate the new development into the multi-modal transportation network where feasible.

Policy M-3.1: Public Road Rights-of-Way. Require development to dedicate right-of-way for public roads and other transportation routes identified in the Mobility Element roadway network (see Mobility Element Network Appendix), Community Plans, or Road Master Plans. Require the provision of sufficient right-of-way width, as specified in the County Public Road Standards and Community Trails Master Plan, to adequately accommodate all users, including transit riders, pedestrians, bicyclists, and equestrians.

Policy M-3.2: Traffic Impact Mitigation. Require development to contribute its fair share toward financing transportation facilities, including mitigating the associated direct and cumulative traffic impacts caused by their project on both the local and regional road networks. Transportation facilities include road networks and related transit, pedestrian, bicycle, and equestrian facilities.

Policy M-4.3: Rural Roads Compatible with Rural Character. Design and construct public roads to meet travel demands in Semi-Rural and Rural Lands that are consistent with rural character while safely accommodating transit stops when deemed necessary, along with bicyclists, pedestrians, and equestrians. Where feasible, utilize rural road design features (e.g., no curb and gutter improvements) to maintain community character. [See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.]

Policy M-8.1: Maximize Transit Service Opportunities. Coordinate with SANDAG, the Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA), North County Transit District (NCTD), and Metropolitan Transit Service (MTS) to provide capital facilities and funding, where appropriate, to:

- Maximize opportunities for transit services in unincorporated communities
- Maximize the speed and efficiency of transit service through the development of transit priority treatments such as transit signal priority, transit queue jump lanes, and dedicated transit only lanes
- Provide for transit-dependent segments of the population, such as the disabled, seniors, low income, and children, where possible
- Reserve adequate rights-of-way to accommodate existing and planned transit facilities including bus stops

Policy M-8.2: Transit Service to Key Community Facilities and Services. Locate key county facilities, healthcare services, educational institutions, and other civic facilities so that they are accessible by transit in areas where transit is available. Require those facilities to be designed so that they are easily accessible by transit.

Policy M-8.3: Transit Stops That Facilitate Ridership. Coordinate with SANDAG, NCTD, and MTS to locate transit stops and facilities in areas that facilitate transit ridership, and designate such locations as part of planning efforts for town centers, transit nodes, and large-scale commercial or residential development projects. Ensure that the planning of town centers

and village cores incorporates uses that support the use of transit, including multi-family residential and mixed-use transit-oriented development, when appropriate.

Policy M-8.4: Transit Amenities. Require transit stops that are accessible to pedestrians and bicyclists; and provide amenities for these users' convenience.

Policy M-8.5: Improved Transit Facilities. Require development projects, when appropriate, to improve existing nearby transit and/or park and ride facilities, including the provision of bicycle and pedestrian facilities, provisions for bus transit in coordination with NCTD and MTS as appropriate including, but not limited to, shelters, benches, boarding pads, and/or trash cans, and to provide safe, convenient, and attractive pedestrian connections.

Policy M-8.6: Park and Ride Facilities. Coordinate with SANDAG, Caltrans, and tribal governments to study transit connectivity and address improving regional opportunities for park-and-ride facilities and transit service to gaming facilities and surrounding rural areas to reduce congestion on rural roads.

Policy M-8.7: Inter-Regional Travel Modes. Coordinate with SANDAG, Caltrans, and the California High-Speed Rail Authority, where appropriate, to identify alternative methods for inter-regional travel to serve the unincorporated County residents.

Policy M-9.2: Transportation Demand Management. Require large commercial and office development to use TDM programs to reduce single-occupant vehicle traffic generation, particularly during peak periods to maximize the capacity of existing or improved road facilities.

Policy M-9.4: Park-and-Ride Facilities. Require developers of large projects to provide, or to contribute to, park-and-ride facilities near freeway interchanges and other appropriate locations that provide convenient access to congested regional arterials. Require park-and-ride facilities that are accessible to pedestrians and bicyclists, and include bicycle lockers and transit stops whenever feasible.

Policy M-11.1: Bicycle Facility Design. Support regional and community-scaled planning of pedestrian and bicycle networks.

Policy M-11.2: Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities in Development. Require development and town center plans in villages and rural villages to incorporate site design and on-site amenities for alternate modes of transportation, such as comprehensive bicycle and pedestrian networks and facilities. This will include both on-street facilities as well as off-street bikeways, to safely serve the full range of intended users. Also designate areas for transit facilities, where appropriate and coordinated with the transit service provider.

Policy M-11.3: Bicycle Facilities on Roads Designated in the Mobility Element. Maximize the provision of bicycle facilities on County Mobility Element roads in semi-rural and rural lands to provide a safe and continuous bicycle network in rural areas that can be used for recreation or transportation purposes, while retaining rural character.

Policy M-11.4: Pedestrian and Bicycle Network Connectivity. Require development in Villages and Rural Villages to provide comprehensive internal pedestrian and bicycle networks that connect to existing or planned adjacent community and countywide networks.

Policy M-11.5: Funding for Bicycle Network Improvements. Seek outside funding opportunities for bicycle and pedestrian network improvement projects, particularly those that provide safe and continuous pedestrian and bicycle routes to schools, town centers, parks, park-and-ride facilities, and major transit stops.

Policy M-11.6: Coordination for Bicycle and Pedestrian Facility Connectivity. Coordinate with Caltrans to provide alternate connections for past, existing, or planned bicycle and pedestrian routes that were or would be severed by State freeway and highway projects that intersect pathways or divide communities. Caltrans endeavors to provide safe mobility for all users, including bicyclists, pedestrians, transit riders, and motorists appropriate to the function and context of the facility. Caltrans is committed to working with the County to complete bicycle and pedestrian.

Policy M-11.7: Bicycle and Pedestrian Facility Design. Promote pedestrian and bicycle facility standards for facility design that are tailored to a variety of urban and rural contexts according to their location within or outside a village or rural village.

The policies in the Land Use Element reduce vehicle trips within communities, promote infill and redevelopment, prohibit projects that impede bicycle or walking access, require development within villages to include pedestrian routes, and direct new office development to be located in areas where public transit and vehicular linkages exist. Within the Mobility Element, these policies require development projects to contribute their fair share toward financing transportation facilities, encourage development that accommodates alternative transportation, require incorporation of alternative modes of transportation in new development, encourage rural roads that safely accommodate multiple types of transportation, promote transit service for transit-dependent populations, provide for transit service to key community facilities and services, provide for transit stops that facilitate ridership, require transit stops to provide amenities, require and improve transit and park-and-ride facilities, improve inter-regional travel modes, require coordination with large employers to provide shuttles and other means of transportation, facilitate transportation demand management, provide for new and expanded pedestrian and bicycle networks, and improve funding and coordination for bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Adherence to these policies will minimize potential conflicts with programs supporting alternative transportation.

Mitigation Measures

In addition to Mitigation Measures Tra-5.1 and Tra-5.2 above, the following mitigation measures would further reduce impacts associated with alternative transportation to below a level of significance:

SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

- Tra-6.1** During Community Plan updates, establish policies and design guidelines that encourage commercial centers in compact walkable configurations and discourage “strip” commercial development.
- Tra-6.2** Establish comprehensive planning principles for transit nodes such as the SPRINTER Station located in North County Metro.
- Tra-6.3** Locate County facilities near transit facilities, whenever feasible.
- Tra-6.4** Coordinate with SANDAG, Caltrans, and tribal governments to maximize opportunities to locate park and ride facilities.
- Tra-6.5** Coordinate with SANDAG, Caltrans, and transit agencies to expand the mass transit opportunities in the unincorporated county and to review the location and design of transit stops. Establish a Planning and Development Services transit coordinator to ensure land use issues are being addressed.
- Tra-6.6** Review the improvement plans for railroad facilities in the unincorporated County.
- Tra-6.7** Implement and revise the County Bicycle Transportation Plan every five years, or as necessary, to identify a long range County bicycle network and qualify for State or other funding sources. Coordinate revisions to the County Bicycle Transportation Plan with the County Trails Program.
- Tra-6.8** Coordinate with SANDAG in the development of a Regional Bicycle Plan to ensure consistency with County transportation plans. Coordinate revisions to the SANDAG Regional Bicycle Plan with the County Trails Program.
- Tra-6.9** Implement and revise as necessary the County Trails Program for trail development and management. Implement and revise as necessary the Community Trails Master Plan, which incorporates adopted individual community trail and pathway plans, based on community goals, policies, and implementation criteria.

Tra-5.1 will maximize parking capacity where it is in highest demand and minimize parking where it is not needed. Tra-5.2 will help identify alternative transportation needs in high density areas. Tra-6.1 can reduce vehicle trips and promote access to services via alternative modes of transportation such as walking or bicycling. Tra-6.2 will allow for greater consistency between the 2011 General Plan and plans addressing alternative transportation such as mass transit. Tra-6.3 will facilitate use of alternative transportation among County employees as well as among people needing County services. Tra-6.4 will enhance alternative transportation opportunities for County residents in areas where it would substantially reduce vehicle miles traveled. Tra-6.5 will

SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

further ensure consistency between County land use decisions and adopted policies, plans and programs that support alternative transportation. Tra-6.6 will further correlate rail planning with land use planning. Tra-6.7 requires the County to regularly update the Bicycle Transportation Plan, which will allow the County to promote alternative transportation while ensuring that conflicts do not occur between adopted land use plans and transportation plans/programs. Tra-6.8 will prevent potential conflicts between land use plans and the Regional Bicycle Plan, as well as ensure consistency with the County Trails Program which supports multiple types of alternative transportation. Tra-6.9 will ensure that the County continues to support and expand upon alternative transportation opportunities through the CTP and CTMP consistent with implementation of the 2011 General Plan.

**TABLE 2.13-1
MOBILITY ELEMENT ROADWAYS FORECAST TO OPERATE AT LOS E OR LOS F
IN THE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PEIR**

Roadway	Segment Limits	Current GPU ME Classification	LOS D Threshold	ADT	LOS	GPU EIR Reclassification to Achieve LOS D
Alpine						
Alpine Boulevard	Boulders Rd. to Alpine Special Treatment Center	2.2A	13,500	20,300	F	4.2B
	Alpine Special Treatment Center to W. Victoria Dr.	2.2A	13,500	15,200	E	4.2B
	W. Victoria Dr. to Louise Dr.	2.2A	13,500	20,400	F	4.2B
West Willows Road	Alpine Blvd to Otto Ave. / Willows Rd.	2.2E	10,900	13,945 ⁽¹⁾	E	2.1C
Willows Road	Otto Ave. to Viejas Grade Rd.	2.2E	10,900	20,745 ⁽¹⁾	F	4.1B
Jamul						
Lyons Valley Road	Campo Rd. to Skyline Truck Trail	2.2B	13,500	18,200	E	4.2B
Ramona						
Main Street/ SR-78	9 th St. to 11 th St.	4-Ln State Highway	NA ⁽²⁾	29,300	E ⁽²⁾	6-Ln State Highway
7 th Street	Elm St. to A St.	2.2E	10,900	12,900	E	2.1D
	Main St. to D St.	2.2E	10,900	14,500	F	2.1D
Wildcat Canyon Rd	Harry Hertzberg Rd. to Lakeside/ Ramona CPA	2.1D	13,500	35,100	F	6.2

Source: County of San Diego 2011b, Volume IV Appendix E and Traffic Impact Assessment Technical Memorandum (Appendix D).

⁽¹⁾ ADT is different than volumes reported in General Plan Update PEIR due to updated Viejas tribal gaming assumptions (See Appendix D, Table D-4)

⁽²⁾ Note: State Route LOS is based on peak demand rather than ADTs.

SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

**TABLE 2.13-2
FCI TRIP GENERATION FOR FOCUS AREAS IN ALPINE COMMUNITY**

Focus Area	Total Acres Affected	2011 General Plan ADT	FCI General Plan Amendment ADT	Net Increase in ADT
Focus Area A-1	523	1,406	6,029	4,623
Focus Area A-2	252	554	84,457	83,903
Focus Area A-3	921	3,225 ⁽¹⁾	16,300	13,075
Focus Area A-4	791	1,776	6,765	4,989
Focus Area A-5	1,324	4,284	5,520	1,236

Source: Appendix D; County of San Diego 2015c.

(1) Figure was adjusted to include APN 404-050-34-00, which was inadvertently left out of RBF TIA.

**TABLE 2.13-3
FCI FORECAST TRIP GENERATION BY COMMUNITY**

Community	Total Acres Affected	2011 General Plan ADT	FCI General Plan Amendment ADT	Net Increase in ADT
Alpine	13,725	18,937	127,159 ⁽¹⁾	108,222 ⁽¹⁾
Central Mountain	27,086	13,222	14,863	1,641
Desert	188	26	26	0
Jamul	1,330	804	732	(72) ⁽²⁾
Julian	8,465	4,056	4,612	556
Mountain Empire	2,036	216	231	15
North Mountain	17,298	11,044	14,704	3,660
Pendleton/De Luz	1,020	336	264	(72) ⁽²⁾
Ramona	832	2,296	2,610	314

Source: Appendix D; County of San Diego 2015c.

(1) This does not include the 8,607 ADT forecasted reduction in trips generated by Viejas tribal gaming facilities (refer to Appendix D, Table D-5).

(2) Parentheses (XXX) indicate negative values.

**TABLE 2.13-4
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO PROJECT TRAFFIC SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA**

Level of Service	2-Lane Road	4-Lane Road	6-Lane Road
LOS E	200 ADT	400 ADT	600 ADT
LOS F	100 ADT	200 ADT	300 ADT

Source: County of San Diego 2011c.

SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

**TABLE 2.13-5
PROJECT IMPACTS ON GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PEIR FORECASTED LOS D, E, OR F ROADWAYS**

Roadway	Segment Limits	Current GPU ME Classification	LOS D Threshold	GPU EIR		FCI (ADT)			Significant Impact ?
				ADT	LOS	Added	Total	LOS	
Alpine									
Alpine Boulevard	Tavern Rd. to Boulders Rd.	2.2A	13,500	13,500 ⁽²⁾	D	≤2,849	≤16,349	E	Yes
	Boulders Rd. to Alpine Special Treatment Center	2.2A	13,500	20,300 ⁽¹⁾	F	≤3,251	≤23,551	F	Yes
	Alpine Special Treatment Center to W. Victoria Dr.	2.2A	13,500	15,200 ⁽¹⁾	E	≤3,654	≤18,854	E	Yes
	W. Victoria Dr. to Louise Dr.	2.2A	13,500	20,400 ⁽¹⁾	F	≤7,339	≤27,739	F	Yes
	Louise Dr. to Viejas View Pl.	2.1D	13,500	12,200	D	≤10,097	≤22,297	F	Yes
	Viejas View Pl. to West Willows Rd.	2.1D	13,500	14,300	E	11,023	25,323	F	Yes
	West Willows Rd. to Willows Rd.	2.1C	13,500	1,300	A	23,171	24,471	F	Yes
Harbison Canyon Rd	Arnold Way to Bridle Run	2.2A	13,500	9,900	D	0	9,900	D	No
South Grade Road	Eltinge Dr. to Olive View Rd.	2.2C	13,500	13,500 ⁽²⁾	D	2,296	15,796	E	Yes
Tavern Road	Victoria Park Terrace to Alpine Blvd.	4.1A	33,400	30,100	D	588	30,688	D	No
	Arnold Way to Huey Ln/White Oak Dr.	2.2D	13,500	9,900	D	1,839	11,739	D	No
Victoria Park Terrace	New Road 11 to Gentian Way	2.2A	13,500	9,900	D	0	9,900	D	No
Viejas Casino Rd.	Entire segment	4.2B	25,000	13,293 ⁽⁴⁾	A	7,627	20,920	C	No
West Willows Road	Alpine Blvd. to Otto Ave. / Willows Road	2.2E	10,900	13,945 ⁽⁴⁾	E	13,275	27,720	F	Yes
Willows Road	Otto Ave. to Viejas Grade Rd.	2.2E	10,900	20,745 ⁽⁴⁾	F	18,261	39,006	F	Yes
	Viejas Casino Rd. to I-8 on ramp	2.2E	10,900	7,148 ⁽⁴⁾	D	36,270	43,418	F	Yes
Desert									
Borrego Springs Road	Cloudy Moon Dr. to Diamond Bar Dr.	2.2D	13,500	13,200	D	0	13,200	D	No
	Diamond Bar Rd. to Tilting T Dr.	2.2D	13,500	13,500 ⁽²⁾	D	0	13,500	D	No
	Tilting T Dr. to Country Club Dr.	2.2D	13,500	9,900	D	0	9,900	D	No
Palm Canyon Drive	Ocotillo Cir. to Borrego Springs Rd.	2.2A	13,500	13,500 ⁽²⁾	D	0	13,500	D	No
	Borrego Springs Rd. to Stirrup Rd.	2.2A	13,500	11,200	D	0	11,200	D	No
Jamul									
Lyons Valley Road	Campo Rd. to Skyline Truck Trail	2.2B	13,500	18,200 ⁽¹⁾	E	0	18,200	E	No
North Mountain									
East Grade Rd/S7	Will Valley Rd. to SR 76	2.3C	7,000	6,000	D	0	6,000	D	No

SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

TABLE 2.13-5, CONTINUED

Roadway	Segment Limits	Current GPU ME Classification	LOS D Threshold	GPU EIR	FCI (ADT)	Significant Impact ?
Ramona						
Julian Road/ SR-67	Poway city limits to Archie Moore Rd.	4-Ln State Highway	NA ⁽³⁾	32,300	D ⁽³⁾	No
	Rancho de Oro Rd. to Mussey Grade Rd.	4-Ln State Highway	NA ⁽³⁾	32,200	D ⁽³⁾	No
	Mussey Grade Rd. to Highland Valley Rd.	4-Ln State Highway	NA ⁽³⁾	28,600	D ⁽³⁾	No
Main Street/ SR-78	Ramona St. to Montecito Rd.	4-Ln State Highway	NA ⁽³⁾	28,900	D ⁽³⁾	No
	9 th St. to 11 th St.	4-Ln State Highway	NA ⁽³⁾	29,300 ⁽¹⁾	E ⁽³⁾	No
Julian Road/ SR-78	3 rd St. to East Julian Rd.	2-Ln State Highway	NA ⁽³⁾	9,800	D ⁽³⁾	No
	Amigos Rd. to Magnolia Ave.	2-Ln State Highway	NA ⁽³⁾	9,800	D ⁽³⁾	No
3 rd Street	SR 78 to Via Aligre Dr.	2.2E	10,900	8,200	D	No
7 th Street	Elm St. to A St.	2.2E	10,900	12,900 ⁽¹⁾	E	No
	Main St. to D St.	2.2E	10,900	14,500 ⁽¹⁾	E	No
	E St. to G St.	2.2E	10,900	10,800	D	No
10 th Street	SR 67 / Main St. to H St.	2.1B	13,500	12,500	D	No
San Vicente Rd	H St. to 11 th St.	2.1B	13,500	13,500 ⁽¹⁾	D	No
	11 St. to Warnock Dr.	2.1B	13,500	12,500	D	No
	Warnock Dr. to Vicente Meadow Dr.	2.1B	13,500	12,500	D	No
Wildcat Canyon Rd	San Vicente Rd. to Painted Rock Rd.	2.1D	13,500	10,200	D	No
	Painted Rock Rd. to Harry Hertzberg Rd.	2.1D	13,500	13,500 ⁽¹⁾	D	No
	Harry Hertzberg Rd. to Lakeside/ Ramona CPA	2.1D	13,500	35,100 ⁽¹⁾	F	No

(1) Source: County of San Diego 2011b, Volume IV, Appendix D; County of San Diego 2015c.

(2) The General Plan Update (EIR Volume IV Appendix E, July 5, 2011) identified these segments at LOS D; however, the volumes on these segments were not specifically reported. It was determined that the volumes are approaching the LOS D threshold. Therefore, for this analysis, the GPU EIR volumes are assumed to be equal to the LOS D capacity. The FCI Lands volumes were then added to the LOS D capacity to determine the GPA ADT volumes for the study roadway segments.

(3) State Route LOS is based on peak demand rather than ADTs.

(4) The Viejas tribal gaming trip generation assumption used in the General Plan Update PEIR were based on the 2008 County traffic model and have been updated here based on the new 2013 County traffic model (see Table D-5 in Appendix D for further details).

SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

**TABLE 2.13-6
ROADWAY SEGMENT LOS WITH GPU EIR RECLASSIFICATION
ALPINE COMMUNITY**

Roadway	Segment Limits	GPU EIR				FCI			
		GPU EIR ADT	GPU EIR LOS	GPU EIR Reclassification to Achieve LOS D	LOS D Threshold	FCI Added ADT	FCI Total ADT	FCI LOS After GPU EIR Reclassification	Would FCI Impact Be Mitigated?
Alpine Boulevard	Tavern Rd. to Boulders Rd.	13,500 ⁽²⁾	D	N/A	13,500	≤2,849	≤16,349	E	No
	Boulders Rd. to Alpine Special Treatment Center	20,300	F	4.2B	25,000	≤3,251	≤23,551	D	Yes
	Alpine Special Treatment Center to W. Victoria Dr.	15,200	E	4.2B	25,000	≤3,654	≤18,854	C	Yes
	W. Victoria Dr. to Louise Dr.	20,000	F	4.2B	25,000	≤7,339	≤27,739	E	No
	Louise Dr. to Viejas View Pl.	12,200	D	N/A	13,500	≤10,097	≤22,297	F	No
	Viejas View Pl. to West Willows Rd.	14,300	E	2.1A ⁽²⁾	13,500	11,639	25,323	F	No
	West Willows Rd. to Willows Rd.	1,300	A	N/A	13,500	23,171	24,471	F	No
South Grade Road	Eltinge Dr. to Olive View Rd.	13,500 ⁽²⁾	D	N/A ⁽²⁾	13,500	<2,296	<15,796	E	No
Viejas Casino Rd.	Entire segment	13,293 ⁽³⁾	A ⁽⁴⁾	N/A ⁽⁴⁾	25,000	7,627	20,920	C	N/A
West Willows Road	Alpine Blvd. to Otto Ave. / Willows Rd.	13,945 ⁽³⁾	N/A ⁽⁴⁾	2.1C ⁽⁴⁾	13,500	13,775	27,720	F	No
Willows Road	Otto Ave. to Viejas Casino Rd.	20,745 ⁽³⁾	F ⁽⁴⁾	4.1B ⁽⁴⁾	27,000	18,261	39,006	F	No
	Viejas Casino Rd. to I-8 on ramp	7,148 ⁽³⁾	D	N/A ⁽⁴⁾	10,900	36,270	43,418	F	No

Source: County of San Diego 2011b, Volume IV, Appendix D; County of San Diego 2015c.

- (1) The General Plan Update PEIR (EIR Volume IV Appendix E (July 5, 2011) identified these segments at LOS D; however, the volumes on these segments were not specifically reported. It was determined that the volumes are approaching the LOS D threshold. Therefore, for this analysis, the GPU EIR volumes are assumed to be equal to the LOS D capacity. The FCI Lands volumes were then added to the LOS D capacity to determine the GPA ADT volumes for the study roadway segments.
- (2) Exceeds LOS threshold, but within 10% margin of error.
- (3) The Viejas tribal gaming trip generation assumption used in the General Plan Update PEIR were based on the 2008 County traffic model and have been updated here based on the new 2013 County traffic model (see Table D-5 in Appendix D for further details).
- (4) Due to the Viejas tribal gaming trip generation assumptions being updated in the 2013 County traffic model (the 2008 Country traffic model was used for the 2011 General Plan) the GPU EIR reclassifications to reach LOS D for these roadway segments are no longer applicable.

SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

**TABLE 2.13-7
ROADWAY SEGMENT LOS WITH FCI RECLASSIFICATIONS TO MEET POLICY M.2-1 (LOS D):
ALPINE COMMUNITY**

Segment	Location	FCI Reclassification to Achieve LOS D	FCI Reclassification LOS D Threshold	FCI ADT	FCI LOS After Reclassification to Achieve LOS D	FCI Proposed Classification	LOS With FCI Proposed Classification
Alpine Boulevard	Tavern Rd. to Boulders Rd.	4.2B	25,000	≤16,349	A	2.2A	E ⁽²⁾
	Boulders Rd. to Alpine Special Treatment Center	4.2B	25,000	≤23,551	D	2.2A	F ⁽²⁾
	Alpine Special Treatment Center to W. Victoria Dr.	4.2B	25,000	≤18,854	B	2.2A	E ⁽²⁾
	W. Victoria Dr. to Louise Dr.	4.1B	30,800	≤27,739	D	2.2A	F ⁽²⁾
	Louise Dr. to South Grade Rd.	4.2B	25,000	≤22,297	C	2.2A	F ⁽²⁾
	South Grade Rd. to Viejas View Pl.	4.2B	25,000	≤22,297	C	2.1D	F ⁽²⁾
	Viejas View Pl. to West Willows Rd.	4.2B	25,000	25,323 ⁽³⁾	D	2.1D	F ⁽²⁾
	West Willows Rd. to eastern end of Willows Rd.	4.2B	25,000	24,471	D	2.1C	F ⁽²⁾
South Grade Road	Eltinge Dr. to Olive View Rd.	4.2B	25,000	<15,796	A	2.2C	E ⁽²⁾
Viejas Casino Rd.	Entire segment	N/A	27,000	20,920	B	4.2A	B
West Willows Road	Alpine Blvd. to Otto Ave. / Willows Rd.	4.2A	27,000	27,720 ⁽¹⁾	D	2.2C	F ⁽²⁾
Willows Road	Otto Ave. to Viejas Grade Rd.	6.2	50,000	39,006	C	2.2E	F ⁽²⁾
	Viejas Casino Rd. to I-8 on ramp	6.2	50,000	43,418	C	4.2B	F ⁽²⁾

Source: Appendix D; County of San Diego 2015c.

(1) The Viejas tribal gaming trip generation assumption used in the 2011 General Plan were based on the 2008 County traffic model and have been updated here based on the new 2013 County traffic model (see Table D-5 in Appendix D for further details).

(2) Road segment is being accepted at LOS E or F (will be added to Mobility Element Table M-4).

(3) Exceeds LOS threshold, but within 10% margin of error.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.