

2.8 Transportation and Traffic

This section assesses general transportation and traffic conditions in the County of San Diego (County) and identifies potential transportation and traffic impacts that could occur as a result of implementation of the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment project (proposed project). The information used in this analysis is derived from the Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by Linscott, Law & Greenspan Engineers (LLG), which is included in Appendix F of this environmental impact report (EIR).

2.8.1 Existing Conditions

The proposed project would apply to properties located in the unincorporated portions of the County over which the County has land use jurisdiction. More specifically, the proposed project would apply to properties that are zoned with an Animal Designator, D–J, L–N, U, V, or X, for a total of 344,665 acres, as depicted in Figure 1-2.

Existing Roadway Network

The County Department of Public Works Road Section is responsible for maintaining nearly 2,000 miles of County Mobility Element roadways and other transportation facilities within the unincorporated County. Non-County-maintained roadways include private roads (maintained by adjacent property owners), public roads (maintained by respective municipalities), and state highways (maintained by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)). The County's existing General Plan Mobility Element (County of San Diego 2011a) provides definitions for the roadway classification of County-maintained roads and identifies existing major roadways. Roadways include freeways (also known as state highways), expressways, prime arterials, major roads, collector roads, town collector roads, light collector roads, recreational parkways, rural collector roads, rural light collector roads, and rural mountain roads.

As part of the General Plan Update, the County determined the amount of existing roadway lane miles throughout the County that are operating below County standards (Level of Service (LOS) D) and aggregated this data by community planning area, as shown in Table 2.8-1.

The traffic analysis examines several specific Mobility Element roadways in the following primary planning areas:

1. Alpine Community Planning Area
2. Bonsall Community Planning Area
3. Fallbrook Community Planning Area
4. Jamul Community Planning Area

5. Julian Community Planning Area
6. Lakeside Community Planning Area
7. North County Metro Community Planning Area (e.g., Escondido)
8. Pala–Pauma Community Planning Area
9. Ramona Community Planning Area
10. San Dieguito Community Planning Area
11. Spring Valley Community Planning Area
12. Sweetwater Community Planning Area
13. Valle De Oro Community Planning Area
14. Valley Center Community Planning Area.

Within each community planning area (CPA), key Mobility Element roadways were selected that would be affected by the proposed project in that planning area. Roadway segments were selected for analysis based on several factors, including streets leading to equine facilities and streets with accessibility to arterials and freeways. The following is a description of the key roadway segments located in each community planning area.

1. Alpine

Alpine Boulevard is classified as a Collector Road on the current County of San Diego Mobility Element and is proposed to be classified as a Light Collector (2.2A) as part of the General Plan Update. Alpine Boulevard is currently constructed as a two-lane undivided facility. Bike lanes are provided along both sides of the road, and curbside parking is generally prohibited. The posted speed limit on Alpine Boulevard is 35 miles per hour (mph).

Tavern Road is classified as a Major Road on the current County of San Diego Mobility Element and is proposed to be classified as a Major Road (4.1A) as part of the General Plan Update. Tavern Road is currently constructed as a two-lane undivided facility with a two-way left turn median. No bike lanes are provided, and curbside parking is prohibited along both sides of the roadway. The posted speed limit on Tavern Road is 35 mph.

2. Bonsall

S. Mission Road is classified as a Major Road on the current County of San Diego Mobility Element and is proposed to be classified as a Major Road (4.1B) as part of the General Plan Update. S. Mission Road is constructed as a two-lane undivided facility. No bike lanes are

provided, and curbside parking is prohibited along both sides of the roadway. Generally, the posted speed limit on S. Mission Road is 50 mph.

State Route (SR) 76 has the following classifications on the current County's Mobility Element:

- Expressway from S. Mission Road to south of East Vista Way
- Prime Arterial from Interstate 15 (I-15) to S. Mission Road
- Major Road east of I-15.

Within the Bonsall and Fallbrook CPAs, SR-76 is proposed to be classified as a Major Road (4.1A) as part of the General Plan Update. Currently, SR-76 is a two-lane roadway in the study area with one lane of travel in each direction between East Vista Way and Old Highway 395 and east of I-15. It is a four-lane roadway between Old Highway 395 and I-15. Additionally, four-lanes are provided at key intersections along SR-76 to provide additional capacity at intersections. The posted speed limit in the study area is 40 mph.

3. Fallbrook

Mission Road is classified as a Major Road on the current County of San Diego Mobility Element and is proposed to be classified as a Boulevard (4.2B) as part of the General Plan Update. Mission Road is constructed as a two-lane undivided facility. No bike lanes are provided, and curbside parking is prohibited along both sides of the roadway. Generally, the posted speed limit on Mission Avenue is 40 mph.

SR 76—see Bonsall Community Planning Area for description.

4. Jamul

SR 94 is classified as a Major Road on the current County of San Diego Mobility Element and is proposed to be classified as a Community Collector (2.1D) as part of the General Plan Update. SR 94 is currently constructed as a two-lane undivided facility. No bike lanes are provided, and curbside parking is prohibited along both sides of the roadway. The speed limit along SR 94 is posted at 50 mph.

5. Julian

SR-78 is classified as a State Highway on the current County of San Diego Mobility Element and is proposed to be classified as a Light Collector (2.2D) as part of the General Plan Update. SR-78 is currently constructed as a winding two-lane undivided facility. No bike lanes or curbside parking is provided. The speed limit along SR-78 is posted at 40 mph.

SR-79 is classified as a State Highway on the current County of San Diego Mobility Element and is proposed to be classified as a Light Collector (2.2D) as part of the General Plan Update. SR-79 is currently constructed as a winding two-lane undivided facility. No bike lanes or curbside parking is provided. The speed limit along SR-79 is posted at 55 mph.

6. Lakeside

SR-67 is classified as a State Highway on the current County of San Diego Mobility Element and is proposed to be classified as a Major Road (4.1A) as part of the General Plan Update. SR-67 is currently constructed as a winding two-lane undivided facility. No bike lanes or curbside parking is provided. The speed limit along SR-67 is posted at 55 mph.

Lake Jennings Park Road is classified as a Major Road on the current County of San Diego Mobility Element and is proposed to be classified as a Major Road (4.1B) as part of the General Plan Update. Lake Jennings Park Road is currently constructed as a two-lane undivided facility. Bike lanes are provided along both sides of the road and curbside parking is prohibited. The speed limit along Lake Jennings Park Road is posted at 40 mph.

7. North County Metro (e.g., Escondido)

SR-78 is classified as a Major Road on the current County of San Diego Mobility Element and is proposed to be classified as a Major Road (4.1A) as part of the General Plan Update. SR-78 is currently constructed as a three-lane (two northbound, one southbound) undivided facility. Bike lanes are provided along both sides of the road, and curbside parking is prohibited. The speed limit along SR-78 is posted at 55 mph.

Valley Center Road is classified as a Prime Arterial on the current County of San Diego Mobility Element and is proposed to be classified as a Major Road (4.1A) as part of the General Plan Update. Valley Center Road is currently constructed as a winding four-lane divided facility. Bike lanes are provided along both sides of the road, and curbside parking is prohibited. The speed limit along Valley Center Road is posted at 55 mph.

Bear Valley Parkway is classified as a Major Road on the current County of San Diego Mobility Element, and is proposed to be classified as a Major Road (4.1A) as part of the General Plan Update. Bear Valley Parkway is currently constructed as a two-lane undivided facility. Bike lanes are provided along both sides of the road, and curbside parking is prohibited. The speed limit along Bear Valley Parkway is posted at 50 mph.

8. Pala–Pauma

SR-76 is classified as a State Highway on the current County of San Diego Mobility Element, and is proposed to be classified as a Community Collector (2.1D) as part of the General Plan Update. SR-76 is currently constructed as a winding two-lane undivided facility. No bike lanes or curbside parking is provided. The speed limit along SR-76 is posted at 55 mph.

9. Ramona

SR-67 is classified as a State Highway on the current County of San Diego Mobility Element, and is proposed to be classified as a Major Road (4.1A) as part of the General Plan Update. SR-67 is currently constructed as a two-lane undivided facility. No bike lanes or curbside parking is provided. The speed limit along SR-67 ranges between 40 and 55 mph.

SR-78 is classified as a State Highway on the current County of San Diego Mobility Element and is proposed to be classified as a Light Collector (2.2D) as part of the General Plan Update. SR-78 is currently constructed as a two-lane undivided facility. No bike lanes or curbside parking is provided. The speed limit along SR-78 is posted at 55 mph.

San Vicente Road is classified as a Major Road on the current County of San Diego Mobility Element and is proposed to be classified as a Community Collector (2.1D) as part of the General Plan Update. San Vicente Road is currently constructed as a two-lane undivided facility. No bike lanes or curbside parking is provided. The speed limit along San Vicente Road is posted at 50 mph.

10. San Dieguito

Del Dios Highway is classified as a Light Collector on the current County of San Diego Mobility Element and is proposed to be classified as a Light Collector (2.2D) as part of the General Plan Update. Del Dios Highway is currently constructed as a two-lane undivided facility. Bike lanes are provided along both sides of the road, and curbside parking is prohibited. The speed limit along Del Dios Highway is posted at 55 mph.

Via de La Valle is classified as a Major Road on the current County of San Diego Mobility Element and is proposed to be classified as a Community Collector (2.1E) as part of the General Plan Update. Via de La Valle is currently constructed as a two-lane undivided facility. No bike lanes or curbside parking is provided. The speed limit along Via de La Valle is posted at 50 mph.

Paseo Delicias is classified as a Light Collector on the current County of San Diego Mobility Element and is to continue to be classified as a Light Collector (2.2A) as part of the General Plan

Update. Paseo Delicias is currently constructed as a two-lane undivided facility. No bike lanes or curbside parking is provided. The speed limit along Paseo Delicias is posted at 50 mph.

11. Spring Valley

Jamacha Boulevard is classified as an Expressway on the current County of San Diego Mobility Element and is proposed to be classified as a Major Road (4.1A) as part of the General Plan Update. Jamacha Boulevard is currently constructed as a two-lane undivided facility. Bike lanes are provided along both sides of the road, and curbside parking is prohibited. The speed limit along Jamacha Boulevard is posted at 45 mph.

12. Sweetwater

Bonita Road is classified as a Major Road on the current County of San Diego Mobility Element and is proposed to be classified as a Community Collector (2.1D) as part of the General Plan Update. Bonita Road is currently constructed as a two-lane undivided facility. Bike lanes are provided along both sides of the road, and curbside parking is prohibited. The speed limit along Bonita Road is posted at 45 mph.

Sweetwater Road is classified as a Major Road on the current County of San Diego Mobility Element and is proposed to be classified as a Community Collector (2.1D) as part of the General Plan Update. Sweetwater Road is currently constructed as a two-lane undivided east–west facility. No bike lanes or curbside parking is provided. The speed limit along Sweetwater Road is posted at 45 mph.

13. Valle De Oro

Jamacha Road is classified as a Prime Arterial on the current County of San Diego Mobility Element, and is proposed to be classified as a Prime Arterial (6.2) as part of the General Plan Update. Jamacha Road is currently constructed as a four–lane divided facility. Bike lanes are provided along both sides of the road and curbside parking is prohibited. The speed limit along Jamacha Road is posted at 45 mph.

14. Valley Center

Valley Center Road is classified as a Prime Arterial on the current County of San Diego Mobility Element and is proposed to be classified as a Boulevard (4.2A) as part of the General Plan Update. Valley Center Road is currently constructed as a four-lane divided facility. Bike lanes are provided along both sides of the road, and curbside parking is prohibited. The speed limit along Valley Center Road is posted at 45 mph.

Cole Grade Road is classified as a Collector Road on the current County of San Diego Mobility Element, and is proposed to be classified as a Boulevard (4.2A) as part of the General Plan Update. Cole Grade Road is currently constructed as a two-lane undivided facility. Bike lanes are not provided along the road, and curbside parking is prohibited. The speed limit along Cole Grade Road is posted at 50 mph.

Lilac Road is classified as a Rural Light Collector on the current County of San Diego Mobility Element and is proposed to be classified as a Light Collector (2.2E) as part of the General Plan Update. Lilac Road is currently constructed as a two-lane undivided facility. Bike lanes are not provided, and curbside parking is prohibited. The speed limit along Lilac Road is posted at 50 mph.

Existing Volumes

Existing weekday average daily traffic volumes (ADTs) were obtained from several sources including the County's geographic information system (GIS) volume data platform, Caltrans Highway Traffic Volumes website, and recently completed traffic reports by LLG throughout the County. In the case of weekend ADTs, LLG conducted counts at representative locations throughout the County and applied the changes relative to the weekday counts where applicable. Appendix F contains the existing traffic volumes exhibits by CPA.

Existing Roadway Segment Operations

The following is a discussion of the existing daily roadway operations, based on existing weekday and weekend traffic volumes, and existing roadway capacities. Table 2.8-2 summarizes existing roadway segment operations.

Level of service (LOS) is the term used to denote the different operating conditions which occur on a given roadway segment under various traffic volume loads. It is a qualitative measure used to describe a quantitative analysis taking into account factors such as roadway geometries, signal phasing, speed, travel delay, freedom to maneuver, and safety. LOS provides an index to the operational qualities of a roadway segment or an intersection. LOS designations range from A to F, with LOS A representing the best operating conditions and LOS F representing the worst operating conditions. The LOS designation is reported differently for signalized intersections, unsignalized intersections, and roadway segments.

As shown in Table 2.8-2, during the weekday and weekend, 8 of the 14 planning areas have segments that are currently operating at LOS E or LOS F. However, it should be noted that as part of the General Plan Update Goals and Policies, there are instances where the County considers it more appropriate to retain road classifications that could result in a LOS E or F rather than increase the number of travel lanes (see Table 2.8-3). These segments operating at

below an acceptable LOS have been identified in italics. The following is a list of roadway segments currently operating at below an acceptable LOS.

Alpine Community Planning Area

- *Alpine Boulevard: Boulders Road to Louise Drive – LOS F (Both)*
- Tavern Road: Alpine Boulevard to Arnold Way – LOS E (Both).

Bonsall Community Planning Area

- S. Mission Road: S. Via Monserate to SR-76 – LOS F/E (Weekday/Weekend, respectively)
- Mission Road (SR-76): S. Mission Road to Via Monserate – LOS F/E (Weekday/Weekend).

Lakeside Community Planning Area

- *SR-67: Johnson Lake Road to Posthill Road – LOS F (Both)*
- *Lake Jennings Park Road: Blossom Valley Road to I-8 WB Ramps – LOS F/E (Weekday/Weekend).*

North County Metro Community Planning Area

- SR-78: Bear Valley Parkway to San Pasqual Road – LOS E (Both)
- Bear Valley Parkway: SR-78 to Eldorado Drive – LOS F (Both)
- *Via de la Valle: Paseo Delicias to El Camino Real – LOS F (Weekend only).*

Ramona Metro Community Planning Area

- SR-67: Archie Moore Road to Mussey Grade Road – LOS F (Both)
- San Vicente Road: Warnock Drive to Wildcat Canyon Road – LOS E (Weekday only).

San Dieguito Community Planning Area

- *Del Dios Highway: Via Rancho Parkway to Mt. Israel Road – LOS F (Both)*
- *Del Dios Highway: Mt. Israel Road to Calle Ambiente – LOS F (Both)*
- *Del Dios Highway: Calle Ambiente to El Camino Del Norte – LOS F (Both)*
- *Via de la Valle: Paseo Delicias to El Camino Real – LOS F (Weekend only)*
- *Paseo Delicias: Via de la Valle to El Camino Del Norte – LOS F (Both).*

Spring Valley Community Planning Area

- Jamacha Boulevard: Galapago Street to Sweetwater Springs Boulevard – LOS F (Both).

Valle De Oro Community Planning Area

- *Jamacha Road: Campo Road to Fury Lane – LOS F (Both).*

Horizon Year 2030 Forecasts

As part of the General Plan Update, the County determined the amount of Year 2030 roadway lane miles throughout the County that are operating at below County standards (LOS D). This is aggregated by community planning area for the entire county, and presented in total lane miles (see Table 2.8-4). Using this information, a Horizon Year street segment analysis was completed. This analysis assumes roadway capacities based on the County's General Plan Update Mobility Element Framework (accepted August 3, 2011). Therefore, it is reasonably expected that the proposed improvements detailed in the General Plan Mobility Element would be in place. Table 2.8-5 shows the proposed General Plan Update roadway classifications and ADTs.

Year 2030 ADT for weekends is not available from the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) model. Year 2030 weekend ADTs were estimated by utilizing the relationship between existing weekday and weekend ADTs, and applying these existing relationships to the model's weekday ADTs. This methodology provides a reasonable estimation of future volumes within the suburban and rural communities throughout San Diego County. Appendix F contains the buildout (2030) weekday/weekend traffic volumes exhibits by community planning area. Finally, it should be noted that roadway capacity has generally increased for each key street segment. This corresponds to the projected implementation of the General Plan Update Mobility Element.

Horizon Year 2030 Segment Operations

As shown in Table 2.8-5, several of the street segments within the various communities are forecasted to have roadways that operate at LOS E or LOS F, despite the increase in capacity assumed for each segment, as described above. The following is a summary of these projected poorly-operating roadways for a weekday. Several of these roadways also fail under weekend traffic loads:

Alpine Community Planning Area

- *Alpine Boulevard: Boulders Road to Louise Drive – LOS F (Both).*

Bonsall Community Planning Area

- Mission Road (SR-76): S. Mission Road to Via Monserate – LOS F/E (Weekday/Weekend).

Fallbrook Community Planning Area

- SR-76: Old Highway 395 to I-15 SB Ramps – LOS F/E (Weekday/Weekend).

Jamul Community Planning Area

- SR-94: Melody Road to Otay Lakes Road – LOS E (Both).

Lakeside Community Planning Area

- *SR-67: Johnson Lake Road to Posthill Road – LOS F (Both).*

Ramona Metro Community Planning Area

- SR-78: Pine Street to Ninth Street – LOS F / E (Weekday/Weekend)
- San Vicente Road: Warnock Drive to Wildcat Canyon Road – LOS E (Weekday only).

San Dieguito Community Planning Area

- *Del Dios Highway: Via Rancho Parkway to Mt. Israel Road – LOS F (Weekend only)*
- *Del Dios Highway: Mt. Israel Road to Calle Ambiente – LOS F (Both)*
- *Del Dios Highway: Calle Ambiente to El Camino Del Norte – LOS F (Both)*
- *Via de la Valle: Paseo Delicias to El Camino Real – LOS F (Both)*
- *Paseo Delicias: Via de la Valle to El Camino Del Norte – LOS F (Both).*

Valle De Oro Community Planning Area

- *Jamacha Road: Campo Road to Fury Lane – LOS F (Both).*

Trip Generation

There are no published trip generation rates for “horse stables” as proposed by the project, either in the national Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manual, or in the regional SANDAG Brief Guide to Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates for the San Diego Region. Therefore, project trip generation was calculated based on various stables currently operating within the County, and developed from operational data collected in surveys conducted by County staff. Several pieces of information relevant to the trip generation determination included project size (both in acres and horses), the number of employees, the number of deliveries, and the amount of customers which occur on typical days. LLG developed daily (ADT) and peak hour trip generation estimates for the Tier One, Tier Two, and Tier Three projects. Tables 2.8-6a, 2.8-6b, and 2.8-6c show the estimated trip generation for the weekday and weekend for each tier, respectively. Trip generation rates have not been calculated for a Tier Four facility because the potential for Tier Four facilities is limited due to the requirement of more than 10 acres of useable land, and only approximately 0.07% of the properties within the project area are over 10 acres. It is assumed that a Tier Four facility would have slightly greater trip generation rates than Tier Three facilities because they would allow for more horses and people.

2.8.2 Regulatory Setting

State Regulations

California Department of Transportation Standards

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 2012), establishes uniform policies and procedures to carry out the highway design functions of Caltrans. Caltrans has also prepared the 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 2007 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program, 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 federal Code of Regulations. The Statewide Transportation Improvement Program is prepared by Caltrans in cooperation with the Metropolitan Planning Organizations and the Regional Transportation Planning Agencies. In the County, the Metropolitan Planning Organization and Regional Transportation Planning Agency is the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG). The Statewide Transportation Improvement Program 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 United States Code, including federally funded projects.

Transportation Development Act

The Transportation Development Act provides two major sources of funding for public transportation: the Local Transportation Fund and the State Transit Assistance 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 the Local Transportation Fund for local streets and roads projects if they can show there are no unmet transit needs. The branch provides oversight of the public hearing process used to identify unmet transit needs. It provides interpretation of and initiates changes or additions to legislation and regulations concerning all aspects of the Transportation Development Act. It also provides training and documentation regarding Transportation Development Act statutes and regulations. Caltrans ensures local planning agencies complete performance audits required for participation in the Transportation Development Act.

Local Regulations

Mobility Element of the County of San Diego General Plan

The County's General Plan Mobility Element (2011a) provides a framework for a balanced, multi-modal transportation system for the movement of people and goods within the unincorporated areas of the County. The guiding principles focus on a central theme to support 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. A primary goal of the Mobility Element is to achieve a road network that accommodates buildout

of the land use map while operating with acceptable levels of congestion for the efficient and effective movement of people and goods. For example, the Mobility Element requires development projects to provide associated road improvements necessary to achieve an LOS of “D” or higher on all Mobility Element roads, except those where failing LOS has been accepted by the County pursuant to specific criteria. LOS is a quality of service measure that describes the operational conditions on a transportation facility, such as a roadway or intersection. Six LOS capacity thresholds are defined for each type of roadway, with letters A through F used to establish the LOS measure. Criteria for each LOS threshold include speed, travel time, freedom to maneuver, traffic interruptions, comfort, convenience, and safety. LOS A represents free flow, almost complete freedom to maneuver within the traffic stream. LOS F represents forced flow, where more vehicles are attempting to use the road facility than can be served, resulting in stop and go traffic. In circumstances where development is proposed on roads with an accepted failing LOS, mitigation such as road improvements or fair share contribution to a road improvement program is required (County of San Diego 2011b).

County of San Diego Consolidated Fire Code

The County, in collaboration with the local fire protection districts, created the first Consolidated Fire Code in 2001. The Consolidated Fire Code contains the County’s and fire protection districts’ amendments to the California Fire Code. Emergency ingress/egress is established by the 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 Consolidated Fire Code dictates minimum design standards for “Fire Apparatus Access Roads” and includes minimum road standards, secondary access requirements, and restrictions for gated roads and gated communities. Road standard requirements for emergency vehicles specify a minimum 12-foot paved lane or 24-foot travel way.

County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Ordinance

The County has developed an overall programmatic solution that addresses existing and projected future road deficiencies in the unincorporated portion of the County. This program commits the County to construct additional capacity on identified deficient roadways and includes the adoption of a Transportation Impact Fee program to fund improvements to roadways necessary to mitigate potential cumulative impacts caused by traffic from future 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 an adopted planning document that 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 considered

to be a broad-based approach to mitigation of cumulative traffic impacts from additional traffic generated by a project or series of projects.

Regional Transportation Plans and Programs

The County General Plan Update EIR states: “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” (County of San Diego 2011b).

“As the San Diego County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and Regional Transportation Planning Agency, SANDAG has produced the following documents that identify transportation plans and policies in the San Diego area” (County of San Diego 2011b).

Regional Transportation Plan

The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), also known as MOBILITY 2030, serves as a blueprint to address the mobility challenges created by the San Diego region’s growing population and employment. It contains an integrated set of public policies, strategies, and investments to maintain, manage, and improve the transportation system in the region. The 2030 RTP was approved on March 28, 2003. Changes in anticipated cost and revenue have resulted in an update of the RTP that was approved by the SANDAG Board of Directors in 2006. Additional updates and approvals were obtained in late 2007 to incorporate a new regional growth forecast, strategic initiatives, and several other white papers on topics not previously covered in the RTP (County of San Diego 2011b).

2006 Regional Transportation Improvement Program

The Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) is a multi-year program of proposed major highway, arterial, transit, and bikeway projects. The 2006 RTIP is a prioritized program designed to implement the region’s overall strategy for providing mobility and improving the efficiency and safety of efforts to attain federal and state air quality standards for the region. The 2006 RTIP also incrementally implements the latest update to the RTP. The 2006 RTIP covers fiscal years 2007 to 2011. The 2006 RTIP, including an air quality emissions analysis for all regionally significant projects, was adopted on August 4, 2006 (County of San Diego 2011b).

Congestion Management Program

State Proposition 111, passed by voters in 1990, established a requirement that urbanized areas prepare and regularly update a Congestion Management Program (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, as the designated Congestion Management Agency for San Diego region, must develop, adopt, and update the CMP in response to specific legislative requirements. SANDAG, local jurisdictions, and transportation operators such as Caltrans, the Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB), and the North County Transit District (NCTD), are responsible for implementing and monitoring the CMP (County of San Diego 2011b).

2.8.3 Analysis of Project Effects and Determination of Significance

The impact analysis below has been separated into Tier One/Tier Two and Tier Three/Tier Four to reflect the distinction in the level of review required for the establishment of each use (non-discretionary versus discretionary).

At this time, the exact number of potential Tier One, Tier Two, Tier Three, and Tier Four facilities that may result from the proposed project is unknown. The traffic report, included as Appendix F to this EIR, uses the Tier Three equine facilities as the representative project, since these are neither the highest traffic-generating (Tier Four) nor the lowest traffic-generating (Tier One) facilities under consideration. Realistically, development of some combination of all four tiers would be expected. Considering the data collected in surveys conducted by County Staff, as described above under the heading Trip Generation in Section 2.8.1 and included as Appendix B to this EIR, most facilities that exist within the County would be classified as Tier Two and Tier Three. Due to the average parcel size within the County, few areas would support Tier Four facilities. Therefore, it should be noted that the worst-case scenario for purposes of this analysis is best represented as Tier Three equine facilities.

2.8.3.1 Conflict with Plan, Policy, or Ordinance

Guidelines for the Determination of Significance

For the purpose of this EIR, the following significance guideline from Appendix G of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) applies to the direct and indirect impact analysis, as well as the cumulative impact analysis. A significant impact would result if:

- The project would conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of the effectiveness of the circulation system performance, 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 created the following guidelines to evaluate likely traffic impacts of a proposed project for road segments and intersections serving that project site, for purposes of determining whether the development would “significantly impact congestion” on the referenced LOS E and F roads. The guidelines are summarized in Table 2.8-7. These thresholds are based upon average operating conditions on County roadways. It should be noted that these thresholds only establish general guidelines, and that the specific project location must be taken into account in conducting an analysis of traffic impact from new development.

Analysis

Tier One and Tier Two

Based on the trip generation estimates described in Section 2.8.1, a single Tier One equine facility would generate 8 ADT (weekday and weekend), and a single Tier Two equine facility would generate 20 ADT (weekday) and 30 ADT (weekend). The addition of a single Tier One or Tier Two facility is not anticipated to result in any significant impacts to roadway segments; however, it is conceivable that multiple facilities within a given community could be located in close proximity, thereby contributing trips to the same road segments or intersections. The impact to existing LOS could be significant depending on the location, site conditions, and development proposed. By revising the existing Zoning Ordinance, the County of San Diego would no longer have the ability to review the specific conditions of a given Tier One or Tier Two facility to ensure adequate mitigation for impacts to specific public roadways, some of which are currently operating at unacceptable levels of service. Consequently, impacts on key Mobility Element roadway segments from the development of multiple Tier One and Tier Two facilities would be **potentially significant (TR-1)**.

Tier Three and Tier Four

A summary of the existing near-term traffic operations is depicted in Table 2.8-8. This table illustrates the “reserve capacity” remaining on each of the key roadways, which is the amount of roadway capacity (in ADT) that is available for development until the LOS E threshold is reached and the segment would operate below county standards. Where roadways are currently operating at LOS E or LOS F, the amount of reserve capacity is measured as the allowable increase in ADT until a significant impact would occur, as stated in the County’s significance criteria.

As described above in Section 2.8.3, the worst-case scenario for purposes of this analysis is best represented as Tier Three equine facilities. Table 2.8-8 also shows how many Tier Three equine

facilities could be developed using a trip generation of 28 ADT/facility (weekday), and 44 ADT/facility (weekend) shown in Table 2.8-6c. To calculate the number of equine facilities that could be constructed in a particular community before a significant impact would occur, the reserve capacity for each roadway was divided by the number of trips per Tier Three facility. This exercise was conducted for both a weekday and weekend day. The lowest number calculated for each community is the number of facilities that could be constructed prior to a significant impact occurring. The following is a summary of the results.

1. **Alpine**—Table 2.8-8 shows that both 2-lane roadway segments in the Alpine CPA are currently operating at LOS E or F. As shown on Table 2.8-8, the reserve capacity is 100 ADT for the Alpine Boulevard segment and 200 ADT along the segment of Tavern Road. The weekday and weekend trip generation was determined to be 28 ADT/facility and 44 ADT/facility, respectively. Therefore, within the Alpine CPA, the lowest weekday reserve capacity was calculated for three Tier Three facilities. Two Tier Three facilities based on the weekend reserve capacity could be constructed before significant impacts would occur. However, it should be noted that the County has determined that the Alpine Boulevard segment has been accepted as operating at LOS F.
2. **Bonsall**—Table 2.8-8 shows that both 2-lane roadway segments in the Bonsall CPA are currently operating at LOS E or F. As shown on Table 2.8-8, the reserve capacity is 100 ADT for the weekday and 200 ADT for the weekend. The weekday and weekend trip generation was determined to be 28 ADT/facility and 44 ADT/facility, respectively. Therefore, within the Bonsall CPA, the weekday reserve capacity was calculated at three Tier Three facilities. Four Tier Three facilities based on the weekend reserve capacity could be constructed before significant impacts would occur.
3. **Fallbrook**—Table 2.8-8 shows that both roadways in the Fallbrook Community Planning Area are calculated to operate at acceptable LOS D or better. The reserve capacity on these roadways could accommodate more than 50 based on the trip generation described previously. However, were 50 stables to be constructed, the collective traffic of these projects would usurp all reserve capacity on the segment of S. Mission Road. While technically feasible, the development of 50 Tier Three facilities is unlikely to occur because this assumes that either construction of all 50 facilities will occur at the same time, or no other projects will absorb the area's reserve roadway capacity.
4. **Jamul**—Table 2.8-8 shows that the SR-94 (2-lane roadway) segment in the Jamul CPA is currently operating at LOS C. As shown on Table 2.8-8, the reserve capacity is 5,670 ADT for the weekday and 6,750 ADT for the weekend. Given the weekday and weekend trip generation for a Tier Three facility from Table 2.8-6c, both the weekday and weekend reserve capacity was calculated at greater than 50 Tier Three facilities within the Jamul CPA.

5. **Julian**—Table 2.8-8 shows that both of the key roadway segments in the community of Julian are currently operating at LOS B or better operations. Technically, greater than 50 additional Tier Three facilities could be accommodated within the key segments' reserve capacity. However, much of Julian's traffic comes through neighboring Ramona, which is constrained by poorly operating segments. Therefore, up to three Tier Three facilities could be constructed before a significant impact would occur to at least one roadway segment in Ramona.
6. **Lakeside**—Table 2.8-8 shows that both key roadway segments in the community of Lakeside are currently operating at LOS E or F. As shown on Table 2.8-8, the lowest reserve capacity is 100 ADT for both the weekday and weekend. Given the weekday and weekend trip generation for a Tier Three facility from Table 2.8-6c, the lowest weekday reserve capacity was calculated at three Tier Three facilities. Two Tier Three facilities based on the weekend reserve capacity could be constructed before significant impacts would occur. However, it should be noted that the County has identified both of these segments as operating at LOS E or F.
7. **North County Metro**—Table 2.8-8 shows that the majority of the key roadway segments in the North County Metro community are currently operating at LOS E or F. As shown on Table 2.8-8, the lowest reserve capacity is 100 ADT for both the weekday and weekend. Given the weekday and weekend trip generation for a Tier Three facility, the lowest weekday reserve capacity was calculated at three Tier Three facilities in the North County Metro Subregional Plan area. Two Tier Three facilities based on the weekend reserve capacity could be constructed before significant impacts would occur.
8. **Pala–Pauma**—Table 2.8-8 shows that the SR-76 roadway segment in the community of Pala–Pauma is currently operating at LOS C. As shown on Table 2.8-8, the reserve capacity is 4,270 ADT for the weekday and 5,620 ADT for the weekend. Given the Tier Three weekday and weekend trip generation, and the reserve capacity, it was calculated that greater than 50 Tier Three facilities could be constructed before significant impacts would occur.
9. **Ramona**—Table 2.8-8 shows that several roadway segments in the Ramona CPA are currently operating at LOS E or F and that the lowest reserve capacity is 100 ADT for both the weekday and weekend. Given the Tier Three weekday and weekend trip generation, the lowest weekday reserve capacity was calculated at three Tier Three facilities. Two Tier Three facilities based on the weekend reserve capacity could be constructed before significant impacts would occur. However, since it is expected that some of Julian's traffic would travel through neighboring Ramona, which is constrained by poorly operating segments, the Tier Three facility limits identified for Ramona stated here should also apply to Julian as well.

10. **San Dieguito**—Table 2.8-8 shows that the majority of 2-lane roadway segments in the San Dieguito CPA are currently operating at LOS E or F. As shown on Table 2.8-8, the lowest reserve capacity is 100 ADT for both the weekday and weekend. Given the Tier Three weekday and weekend trip generation, the lowest weekday reserve capacity was calculated at three Tier Three facilities. Two Tier Three facilities based on the weekend reserve capacity could be constructed before significant impacts would occur. However, it should be noted that the County has identified several of the key segments as operating at LOS E or F.
11. **Spring Valley**—Table 2.8-8 shows that the Jamacha Boulevard roadway segment in the Spring Valley CPA is currently operating at LOS F. As shown on Table 2.8-8, the reserve capacity is 100 ADT for both the weekday and weekend. Given the Tier Three weekday and weekend trip generation, the lowest weekday reserve capacity was calculated at three Tier Three facilities. Two Tier Three facilities based on the weekend reserve capacity could be constructed before significant impacts would occur.
12. **Sweetwater**—Table 2.8-8 shows that both 2-lane roadway segments in the Sweetwater CPA are currently operating at acceptable LOS D. As shown on Table 2.8-8, the lowest reserve capacity is 1,110 ADT for the weekday and 300 ADT for the weekend. Given the Tier Three weekday and weekend trip generation, weekday reserve capacity was calculated at 39 Tier Three facilities. Six Tier Three facilities based on the weekend reserve capacity could be constructed before significant impacts would occur.
13. **Valle De Oro**—Table 2.8-8 shows that the Jamacha Road roadway segment in the Valle De Oro CPA is currently operating at LOS F. As shown on Table 2.8-8, the lowest reserve capacity is 100 ADT for both the weekday and weekend. Given the Tier Three weekday and weekend trip generation, weekday reserve capacity was calculated at three Tier Three facilities. Two Tier Three facilities based on the weekend reserve capacity could be constructed before significant impacts would occur.
14. **Valley Center**—Table 2.8-8 shows that the segments in the Valley Center CPA are currently operating at LOS D or better. As shown on Table 2.8-8, the lowest reserve capacity is 2,620 ADT for the weekday and 3,420 for the weekend. Given the Tier Three weekday and weekend trip generation, and the reserve capacity, approximately 50 Tier Three equine facilities could be constructed before significant impacts would occur.
15. **Private Roads (All Communities)**—Private roads within San Diego County could potentially be impacted by approval of the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment. The County categorizes private roads as local roads that have not been declared or accepted for public use and/or County-maintenance by the County Board of Supervisors. It should be noted that LOS classifications are not applicable to private roads since these roads do not carry through traffic. The design of private roads varies from area to area within the

County. In rural areas such as Bonsall and Julian (and others) these roads are typically designed as two-lane undivided, unpaved roadways ranging in width between 20 and 30 feet. Other areas of the County have private roads paved with concrete or asphalt. It should be noted that once a private road is determined to carry more than 2,500 trips per day, the County may require that the roadway be dedicated and improved to County of San Diego Public Road standards.

Because the number of future Tier Three equine facilities that would result from the project is not currently known, specific impacts to roadway LOS from their development are unknown. As can be seen in Table 2.8-8, all of the key roadways could accommodate at least one Tier Three facility without resulting in a significant impact on those roadways. However, there is minimal reserve capacity remaining for several key roadways in the Alpine, Bonsall, Lakeside, North County Metro, Ramona, San Dieguito, Spring Valley, and Valle De Oro CPAs. An increase in Tier Three equine facilities on these roadways could result in a significant impact. Because this analysis presents a representative sample, significant impacts to other roads with minimal reserve capacity could occur in other locations.

Under Tier Three and Tier Four, discretionary review would still be required and projects would be evaluated as part of the County's discretionary environmental review process (CEQA) and would be required to implement measures to minimize impacts to traffic, as necessary. However, as there is ultimately no guarantee on a project-specific level that mitigation measures would reduce impacts to a level below significant, the proposed project may result in **potentially significant impacts (TR-2)**.

2.8.3.2 Conflict with CMP Guidelines for the Determination of Significance

For the purpose of this EIR, the following significance guideline from Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines applies to the direct and indirect impact analysis, as well as the cumulative impact analysis. A significant impact would result if:

- The project would conflict with an applicable CMP, 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 2.8.2, SANDAG is the designated Congestion Management Agency for the San Diego region. The CMP for San Diego 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. The same factors associated with the analysis in Section 2.8.3.1 apply to this analysis.

Under the CMP's Land Use Analysis Program, the CMP requires a review of large projects that generate 2,400 or more average daily trips or 200 or more Peak Hour trips. If the proposed project includes development that would exceed these thresholds, the proposed project could potentially conflict with the CMP. The CMP thresholds are considered on a project-by-project basis, so each future equine facility would be considered separately, rather than cumulatively.

Tier One and Tier Two

As described in Section 2.8.3.1, a Tier One facility would generate approximately 8 weekday and 8 weekend daily trips, and a Tier Two facility would generate approximately 20 weekday and 30 weekend daily trips. Future Tier One and Tier Two facilities would therefore not exceed the CMP thresholds, and a CMP-level analysis would not be required for such facilities. Impacts associated with Tier One and Tier Two projects would be **less than significant**.

Tier Three and Tier Four

As described in Section 2.8.3.1, a Tier Three facility would generate approximately 28 weekday daily trips and 44 weekend daily trips. Trip generation rates have not been calculated for a Tier Four facility since the potential for Tier Four facilities is limited due to the requirement of more than 10 acres of useable land. It is assumed that a Tier Four facility would have slightly greater trip generation rates than Tier Three facilities. Since the trip generation for a Tier Three facility is far below the CMP thresholds, a Tier Four project is not expected to exceed the CMP thresholds. Tier Three and Tier Four facilities would not exceed CMP thresholds, and therefore a CMP-level analysis would not be required. Impacts associated with Tier Three and Tier Four projects would be **less than significant**.

2.8.3.3 Road Safety Guidelines for the Determination of Significance

For the purpose of this EIR, the following significance guideline from Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines applies to the direct and indirect impact analysis, as well as the cumulative impact analysis. A significant impact would result if:

- The proposed project would substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).

Analysis

Potential road hazards can occur due to a design feature or physical configuration of existing or proposed access roads that can adversely affect the safe transport of vehicles along a roadway. The physical conditions of the project site and surrounding area, such as curves, slopes, walls,

landscaping, or other barriers, may also result in vehicle conflicts with other vehicles or stationary objects.

Tier One and Tier Two

Tier One and Tier Two facilities would not alter traffic patterns, roadway design, place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways, or create or place curves, slopes, or walls that impede adequate site distance on a road. The location of Tier One and Tier Two facilities is unknown at this time, and therefore, specific access road design information is not available. However, the design of the access roads would be specific to the needs of the facilities and are not expected to result in unsafe design features or unsafe configurations. Roads would be constructed according to the County's Zoning Ordinance Sections 6750–6799, San Diego County Public Road Standards, San Diego County Private Road Standards, and the San Diego County Consolidated Fire Code. Because Tier One and Tier Two facilities would be required to comply with County standards for any road improvements, the proposed project would not significantly increase hazards due to design features or incompatible uses. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

Tier Three and Tier Four

If road improvements are required for Tier Three and Tier Four equine facilities, they would be constructed according to the San Diego County Public Road Standards, San Diego County Private Road Standards, and the San Diego County Consolidated Fire Code. Additionally, the proposed project would not place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways. Because future Tier Three and Tier Four facilities would be required to comply with County standards for any road improvements, the proposed project would not significantly increase hazards due to design features or incompatible uses. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

2.8.3.4 *Emergency Access*

Guidelines for the Determination of Significance

For the purpose of this EIR, the following significance guideline from Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines applies to the direct and indirect impact analysis, as well as the cumulative impact analysis. A significant impact would result if:

- The project would result in inadequate emergency access.

Analysis

Inadequate emergency access and egress can occur as a result of an incomplete or not fully interconnected roadway network, such as inadequate roadway widths, turning radii, dead ends or gated roads, one-way roads, single ingress and egress routes, or other factors.

Tier One and Tier Two

Multiple regulations are in place to ensure adequate emergency access exists within the County. The proposed project would allow Tier One and Tier Two facilities without discretionary review if they meet the zoning verification requirements in the amended ordinance; however, the development of any associated access roads would be required to comply with the San Diego County Public Road Standards and San Diego County Private Road Standards, which provide guidance for roadway and transportation facility development. Additionally, future Tier One and Tier Two facilities would be required to comply with the San Diego County Consolidated Fire Code, which dictates minimum design standards for “Fire Apparatus Access Roads” and includes minimum road standards, secondary access requirements, and restrictions for gated communities. Therefore, future Tier One and Tier Two facilities developed under the proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access; impacts would be **less than significant**.

Tier Three and Tier Four

Similar to Tier One and Tier Two facilities, as discussed previously, the development of any access roads for future equine facilities would be required to comply with the San Diego County Public Road Standards, San Diego County Private Road Standards, and the San Diego County Consolidated Fire Code. Therefore, future Tier Three and Tier Four facilities developed under the proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access; impacts would be **less than significant**.

2.8.3.5 *Alternative Transportation*

Guidelines for the Determination of Significance

For the purpose of this EIR, the following significance guideline from Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines applies to the direct and indirect impact analysis, as well as the cumulative impact analysis. A significant impact would result if:

- The project would conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

Analysis

Tier One and Tier Two

Any road improvements associated with future Tier One or Tier Two facilities would be for access to the site for construction and operational activities. As discussed in Section 2.8.3.3, any future roads required for Tier One or Tier Two facilities would be improved or constructed according to the San Diego County Public Road Standards, and San Diego County Private Road Standards, which includes standards for associated bicycle or pedestrian pathways. Therefore, future Tier One and Tier Two facilities developed under the proposed project would not decrease the performance or safety of public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, and impacts would be **less than significant**.

Tier Three and Tier Four

Similar to Tier One and Tier Two facilities, the development of any access roads for future Tier Three or Tier Four facilities would be required to comply with the San Diego County Public Road Standards, and San Diego County Private Road Standards. Therefore, future Tier Three and Tier Four facilities would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

2.8.4 Cumulative Impact Analysis

The geographic scope of cumulative impact analysis for transportation and traffic is the San Diego region, including jurisdictions and special districts within and adjacent to the unincorporated County.

Horizon Year Conditions

The County's General Plan Update forecasts were utilized instead of an individual discretionary project list since the proposed project would be enforced at a County-wide level.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15355 defines cumulative impacts as two or more individual effects, which, when considered together, are considerable, or which compound or increase other environmental impacts. The CEQA Guidelines further state that individual effects may be changes resulting from a single project or a number of separate projects, or the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects. CEQA Guidelines Section 15130 allows for the use of two alternative methods to determine the scope of projects to analyze cumulative impacts.

List Method: A list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, including, if necessary, those projects outside the control of the agency.

Summary of Projections Method: A summary of projects contained in an adopted General Plan or related planning document, or in a prior environmental document, that have been adopted or certified, which describes or evaluates regional or area-wide conditions contributing to the cumulative impact.

The cumulative analysis conducted for this analysis is based on both the List Method and Summary of Projections Method. For projects located outside the control of the County of San Diego, such as those located in tribal lands or adjacent counties, the List Method is used.

The assessment of potential cumulative impacts involves consideration of the proposed project in combination with growth in the region. For purposes of the cumulative discussion, the main difference between activities currently allowed under the existing Zoning Ordinance and those proposed under the Zoning Ordinance Amendment is the establishment of a tiered permitting process for the development of horse stables.

2.8.4.1 Conflict with Plan, Policy, or Ordinance

Refer to the significance guideline in Subchapter 2.8.3.1 above. Under the cumulative traffic scenario in the County's General Plan Update, 34 state highways and 124 Mobility Element roads (for a total of 158 roadway segments) would operate at a deficient LOS (County of San Diego 2011b). This would be considered a cumulatively considerable impact. Additionally, 33 roadway segments would be significantly impacted upon build-out of respective adjacent cities' general plans combined with buildout of the County's General Plan Update. Therefore, cumulative projects in the region would have the potential to result in cumulatively considerable impacts due to potential conflicts with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of the effectiveness of the circulation system performance.

Tier One and Tier Two

As described in Section 2.8.3.1, the development of future Tier One and Tier Two facilities, in combination with anticipated buildout of the County's General Plan and cumulative projects, has the potential to exceed LOS levels on key roadway segments in the Near-Term scenario. Therefore, the development of Tier One and Tier Two facilities under the proposed project **would contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact (TR-3).**

Tier Three and Tier Four

Table 2.8-9 shows a summary of the buildout traffic operations in terms of the “reserve capacity” remaining on each of the key roadways. Table 2.8-9 also shows how many Tier Three facilities could be constructed at buildout (Year 2030) assuming a worst-case trip generation of 28 ADT/facility (weekday), and 44 ADT/facility (weekend). As stated above, this exercise was conducted for both a weekday and weekend day. The lowest number calculated for each community is the number of Tier Three facilities that could be constructed prior to significant impacts occurring. The following is a summary of the buildout results by CPA.

1. **Alpine**—Table 2.8-9 shows that the Alpine Boulevard (2-lane roadway) segment in the Alpine CPA is calculated to operate below acceptable LOS with future traffic volumes. The lowest reserve capacity is therefore 100 ADT for both the weekday and weekend. The weekend trip generation is established at 44 ADT/facility. Therefore, two Tier Three facilities based on the weekday and weekend reserve capacity could be constructed before significant impacts would occur. However, it should be noted that the County has accepted this segment of Alpine Boulevard as operating at LOS F.
2. **Bonsall**—Table 2.8-9 shows that the S. Mission Avenue (4-lane roadway) segment in the Bonsall CPA is calculated to operate below acceptable LOS with future traffic volumes. The lowest reserve capacity is therefore 200 ADT for the weekday only as the weekend operations is within acceptable LOS C. Therefore, seven Tier Three facilities based on the weekday reserve capacity could be constructed before significant impacts would occur.
3. **Fallbrook**—Table 2.8-9 shows that the SR-76 (4-lane roadway) segment in the Fallbrook CPA is calculated to operate below acceptable LOS with future traffic volumes. The lowest reserve capacity is therefore 100 ADT for the weekday and 200 ADT for the weekend. The weekend trip generation is established at 44 ADT/facility. Therefore, three Tier Three facilities based on the weekday reserve and four Tier Three facilities based on the weekend reserve capacity could be constructed before significant impacts would occur to at least one roadway segment in Fallbrook. However, it should be noted that the County has accepted this segment of SR-76 as operating at LOS F.
4. **Jamul**—Table 2.8-9 shows that the SR-94 (2-lane roadway) segment in the Jamul CPA is forecasted to operate below acceptable LOS with future traffic volumes. The lowest reserve capacity is therefore 200 ADT for both the weekday and weekend. The weekday trip generation is established at 28 ADT/facility and the weekend trip generation is established at 44 ADT/facility. Therefore, seven Tier Three facilities based on the weekday reserve capacity and four Tier Three facilities based on the weekend reserve capacity could be constructed before significant impacts would occur.

5. **Julian**—Table 2.8-9 shows that both roadways in the Julian CPA are forecasted to operate at acceptable LOS B. The lowest reserve capacity is therefore 9,300 ADT during the weekday and 9,070 ADT during the weekend. Therefore, these roadways could accommodate more than 50 Tier Three facilities based on the trip generation established in this report.
6. **Lakeside**—Table 2.8-9 shows that the SR-67 (4-lane roadway) segment in the Lakeside CPA is forecasted to operate at below acceptable LOS with future traffic volumes. The lowest reserve capacity is therefore 100 ADT for both the weekday and weekend. The weekday trip generation is established at 28 ADT/facility, and the weekend trip generation is established at 44 ADT/facility. Therefore, three Tier Three facilities based on the weekday reserve capacity and two Tier Three facilities based on the weekend reserve capacity could be constructed before significant impacts would occur. However, it should be noted that the County has accepted this segment of SR-76 as operating at LOS F.
7. **North County Metro**—Table 2.8-9 shows that the Del Dios Highway (2-lane roadway) segment in the North County Metro CPA is forecasted to operate at below acceptable LOS with future traffic volumes. The lowest reserve capacity is therefore 100 ADT for both the weekday and weekend. The weekday trip generation is established at 28 ADT/facility, and the weekend trip generation is established at 44 ADT/facility. Therefore, three Tier Three facilities based on the weekday reserve capacity and two Tier Three facilities based on the weekend reserve capacity could be constructed before significant impacts would occur.
8. **Pala–Pauma**—Table 2.8-9 shows that the SR-76 roadway in the Pala–Pauma CPA is forecasted to operate at acceptable LOS C or better. The lowest reserve capacity is therefore 7,300 ADT during the weekday and 5,490 ADT during the weekend. Therefore, these roadways could accommodate more than 50 Tier Three facilities based on the trip generation established in this report.
9. **Ramona**—Table 2.8-9 shows that several segments in the Ramona CPA are forecasted to operate at below acceptable LOS with future traffic volumes. The lowest reserve capacity is therefore 100 ADT for the weekday and 200 ADT for the weekend. The weekday trip generation is established at 28 ADT/facility, and the weekend trip generation is established at 44 ADT/facility. Therefore, three Tier Three facilities based on the weekday reserve capacity and four Tier Three facilities based on the weekend reserve capacity could be constructed before significant impacts would occur. However, it should be noted that the County has accepted this segment of SR-78 as operating at LOS F.
10. **San Dieguito**—Table 2.8-9 shows that all segments in the San Dieguito CPA are forecasted to operate at below acceptable LOS with future traffic volumes. The lowest reserve capacity is therefore 100 ADT for both the weekday and weekend. The weekday

trip generation is established at 28 ADT/facility, and the weekend trip generation is established at 44 ADT/facility. Therefore, three Tier Three facilities based on the weekday reserve capacity and two Tier Three facilities based on the weekend reserve capacity could be constructed before significant impacts would occur. However, it should be noted that the County has determined that all key segments have been accepted as operating at LOS F.

11. **Sweetwater**—Table 2.8-9 shows that the Sweetwater Road (2-lane roadway) segment in the Sweetwater CPA is calculated to operate at below acceptable LOS with future traffic volumes. The lowest reserve capacity is therefore 200 ADT for the weekday only as the weekend operations is within acceptable LOS D. Therefore, seven Tier Three facilities based on the weekday reserve capacity could be constructed before significant impacts would occur.
12. **Valle De Oro**—Table 2.8-9 shows that the Jamacha Road (6-lane roadway) segment in the Valle De Oro CPA is forecasted to operate at below acceptable LOS with future traffic volumes. The lowest reserve capacity is therefore 100 ADT for both the weekday and weekend. The weekday trip generation is established at 28 ADT/facility, and the weekend trip generation is established at 44 ADT/facility. Therefore, three Tier Three facilities based on the weekday reserve capacity and two Tier Three facilities based on the weekend reserve capacity could be constructed before significant impacts would occur. However, it should be noted that the County has accepted this segment of Jamacha Road as operating at LOS F.
13. **Valley Center**—Table 2.8-9 shows that all of the roadways in the Valley Center CPA are forecasted to operate at acceptable LOS D or better. The lowest reserve capacity is therefore 3,000 ADT during the weekday and 3,750 ADT during the weekend. Therefore, these roadways could accommodate more than 50 Tier Three facilities based on the trip generation established in this report.

The analysis shows several lane miles of County roadways (and discusses specific roadways) that currently operate below County of San Diego standards or which are forecasted to operate below standards in the long-term scenario. Because the development of specific future Tier Three equine facilities is not currently known, specific impacts to roadway LOS from their development are unknown. However, as can be seen in Table 2.8-9, there is minimal reserve capacity remaining for several key roadways in the Alpine, Bonsall, Fallbrook, Jamul, Lakeside, Ramona, San Dieguito, Sweetwater, and Valle De Oro CPAs. An increase in traffic from Tier Three or Tier Four equine facilities on these roadways in combination with buildout of the General Plan and other cumulative projects could result in a significant cumulative impact. Significant cumulative impacts to other roads with minimal reserve capacity could also occur in

other locations. Therefore, the development of future Tier Three or Tier Four projects under the proposed project **would potentially contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact (TR-4)**.

2.8.4.2 Conflict with CMP

Refer to the significance guideline in Subchapter 2.8.3.2 above. Because the cumulative traffic scenario in the County's General Plan Update would result in deficient roadway segments, cumulative projects in the region would have the potential to result in cumulatively considerable impacts due to conflicts with SANDAG's CMP.

Tier One and Tier Two

As described in Section 2.8.3.2, traffic generated by individual Tier One and Tier Two projects would not generate 2,400 or more ADT and would therefore not require a CMP analysis since the CMP thresholds are considered on a project-by-project basis. Therefore, Tier One and Tier Two facilities developed under the proposed project **would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact**.

Tier Three and Tier Four

As described in Section 2.8.3.2, individual Tier Three and Tier Four projects would not generate 2,400 ADT or more and would therefore not require a CMP analysis, which is considered on a project-by-project basis. In addition, Tier Three and Tier Four projects would require project-specific traffic analysis, which would evaluate the potential of those projects to contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. Therefore, in combination with other past, present, and foreseeable future projects, the future Tier Three or Tier Four projects allowed under the proposed project **would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact**.

2.8.4.3 Road Safety

Refer to the significance guideline in Section 2.8.3.3 above. Cumulative projects in the region include surrounding jurisdictions' general plans and regional roadway plans such as the SANDAG RTP and Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) RTP. It is possible that older roadways in the region may not be adequate by existing roadway standards. Additionally, many unincorporated areas that surround the County, including areas within the Counties of Riverside and Imperial, have rural roadway conditions similar to the unincorporated County. Therefore, cumulative projects in these areas would face the same traffic operational concerns such as roadway networks that include existing roadways with horizontal and vertical curves sharper than existing standards, increased traffic on rural roads with slow moving agricultural vehicles, increased risk to pedestrians and bicyclists by increasing and/or redistributing traffic patterns, or hazards from at-grade rail crossings. While cumulative projects

would not preclude improvements to roadways with potential hazards, there is no guarantee that these improvements would be constructed concurrently with the anticipated increase in vehicle trips on these roadways. Therefore, cumulative projects would result in a cumulatively considerable impact to road safety.

Tier One and Tier Two

As described in Section 2.8.3.3, access roads would be specific to the needs of the project and are not expected to result in unsafe design features or unsafe configurations because they would be constructed according to the San Diego County Public Road Standards, San Diego County Private Road Standards, and the San Diego County Consolidated Fire Code. Therefore, Tier One and Tier Two facilities developed under the proposed project **would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact.**

Tier Three and Tier Four

As described in Section 2.8.3.3, all future Tier Three and Tier Four projects will be subject to discretionary review. If road improvements are required, they would be constructed according to the San Diego County Public Road Standards, San Diego County Private Road Standards, and the San Diego County Consolidated Fire Code. Additionally, the proposed project would not place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways. Therefore, Tier Three and Tier Four facilities developed under the proposed project **would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact.**

2.8.4.4 *Emergency Access*

Refer to the significance guideline in Section 2.8.3.4 above. Cumulative projects include those in the County and surrounding jurisdictions. Existing conditions in these areas may include 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. In addition, most cumulative projects, such as those identified in the SANDAG RTP, SCAG RTP, and applicable general plans, which propose the construction of new roadways, would be required to meet current state and applicable jurisdictional standards, in addition to CEQA requirements. Community plans would also be required to consider local public and fire access roads to fully address emergency access requirements. The exception to this would be projects on tribal land; however, it would be unlikely for cumulative projects on tribal lands to occur simultaneously and in close enough proximity to one another to create a potentially cumulatively significant emergency access impact on roadways in the County (County of San Diego 2011b). Therefore,

cumulative project impacts would be considered less than significant because emergency access impacts would be limited to the immediate vicinity of a project area and associated impacts would be considered direct, not cumulative.

Tier One and Tier Two

As described in Section 2.8.3.4, the development of any access roads would be required to comply with the San Diego County Public Road Standards and San Diego County Private Road Standards, which provide guidance for roadway and transportation facility development and require that sufficient emergency access is provided in new development. Additionally, the proposed project would be required to comply with the San Diego County Consolidated Fire Code for projects with building permits, which dictates minimum design standards for “Fire Apparatus Access Roads” and includes minimum road standards, secondary access requirements, and restrictions for gated communities. Therefore, Tier One and Tier Two facilities developed under the proposed project **would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact** associated with emergency access.

Tier Three and Tier Four

As described in Section 2.8.3.4, all future Tier Three and Tier Four projects will be subject to discretionary review. If road improvements are required, they would be constructed according to the San Diego County Public Road Standards, San Diego County Private Road Standards, and the San Diego County Consolidated Fire Code. Therefore, Tier Three and Tier Four facilities developed under the proposed project **would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact** associated with emergency access.

2.8.4.5 *Alternative Transportation*

Refer to the significance guideline in Section 2.8.3.5 above. Cumulative projects, consistent with applicable general plans, could locate land uses that are dependent on alternative transportation in areas that were not planned for in existing public transportation, plans, or programs such as SANDAG RTP and SCAG RTP. If cumulative projects in surrounding jurisdictions are not effectively communicated and planned with agencies managing alternative transportation in the region, conflicts would occur. However, most cumulative projects would be required to comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations, such as the Americans with Disabilities Act, Highway Capacity Manual 2000, Transportation Development Act funds, 2030 RTP, 2006 RTIP, and any applicable community plans or jurisdictional standards, such as a zoning ordinance (County of San Diego 2011b). However, since the majority of cumulative projects would be required to comply with existing regulations, cumulative project impacts would be considered **less than significant**.

Tier One and Tier Two

As described in Section 2.8.3.5, future Tier One and Tier Two facilities would not decrease the performance or safety of public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. Therefore, Tier One and Tier Two facilities developed under the proposed project **would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact** associated with alternative transportation.

Tier Three and Tier Four

As described in Section 2.8.3.5, future Tier Three and Tier Four facilities would not decrease the performance or safety of public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. Therefore, Tier Three and Tier Four facilities developed under the proposed project **would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact** associated with alternative transportation.

2.8.5 Significance of Impacts Prior to Mitigation

The proposed project would result in potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts associated with conflicts with a plan, policy, or ordinance that establishes measures of the effectiveness of the circulation system performance due to the development of multiple Tier One, Two, Three, and Four facilities (**TR-1** through **TR-4**). The proposed project would not result in potentially significant impacts relative to conflicts with the CMP, road safety, emergency access, and alternative transportation.

2.8.6 Mitigation Measures

The proposed project consists of an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance related to equine uses and is not project-specific. There is no way to know at this stage which specific future equine uses may result in direct and cumulative impacts caused by adoption of the proposed project due to variables such as facility size, access road conditions, and existing roadway LOS. However, it has been determined that there is potential for significant impacts to occur as a result of the development of future Tier One, Tier Two, Tier Three, and Tier Four equine uses allowed under the proposed project (**TR-1** through **TR-4**).

The County of San Diego has developed an overall programmatic solution that addresses existing and projected future road deficiencies in the unincorporated portion of San Diego County. This program 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 development. Based on SANDAG regional growth and land use forecasts, the SANDAG Regional Transportation Model was utilized to analyze projected buildout (year 2030) development conditions on the existing mobility element roadway network throughout the unincorporated area of the County.

M TR-1: Payment of the appropriate Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) shall be required at issuance of any building permits for Tier One through Four equine facilities.

2.8.7 Conclusion

The following discussion provides a synopsis of the conclusion reached in each of the above impact analyses, and the level of impact that would occur after mitigation measures are implemented.

Conflict with Plan, Policy, or Ordinance

The proposed project could result in the development of several stables which would add traffic to roadway segments in the County that are either currently operating below acceptable LOS, or forecasted to operate below acceptable LOS. Based on these operations and the limited reserve capacity to accept additional traffic volumes, potentially significant impacts have been identified on several segments within the various CPAs studied (**TR-1** through **TR-4**). Payment of the County's TIF **would reduce potentially significant impacts to a less-than-significant level.**

Conflict with CMP

The proposed project would not result in significant impacts relative to conflicts with the CMP.

Road Safety

The proposed project would not result in significant impacts relative to road safety.

Emergency Access

The proposed project would not result in significant impacts relative to emergency access.

Alternative Transportation

The proposed project would not result in significant impacts relative to alternative transportation.

**Table 2.8-1
Roadway Lane Miles by Level of Service
Existing Conditions**

| Community Planning Area | Lane Miles | | | | | |
|------------------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|
| | LOS E | | | LOS F | | |
| | State Highway | ME Roads | Total | State Highway | ME Roads | Total |
| <i>Northwestern</i> | | | | | | |
| Bonsall | 3.0 | 7.0 | 10.0 | 9.0 | 0.0 | 9.0 |
| Fallbrook | 0.0 | 23.0 | 23.0 | 1.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 |
| N.C. Metro | 0.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Pala-Pauma Valley | 2.0 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 |
| Pendleton/De Luz | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Rainbow | 0.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| San Dieguito | 0.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 | 0.0 | 24.0 | 24.0 |
| Valley Center | 0.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 | 0.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 |
| <i>Northwestern Subtotal</i> | <i>5.0</i> | <i>61.0</i> | <i>66.0</i> | <i>14.0</i> | <i>49.0</i> | <i>63.0</i> |
| <i>Southwestern</i> | | | | | | |
| Alpine | 0.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 0.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| County Islands | 0.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Crest/Dehesa | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Jamul/Dulzura | 4.0 | 3.0 | 7.0 | 14.0 | 0.0 | 14.0 |
| Lakeside | 3.0 | 8.0 | 11.0 | 6.0 | 14.0 | 20.0 |
| Otay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Ramona | 1.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 6.0 |
| Spring Valley | 0.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Sweetwater | 0.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Valle de Oro | 5.0 | 5.0 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| <i>Southwestern Subtotal</i> | <i>13.0</i> | <i>37.0</i> | <i>50.0</i> | <i>22.0</i> | <i>33.0</i> | <i>55.0</i> |
| <i>Eastern</i> | | | | | | |
| Central Mountain | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Desert | 0.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Julian | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Mountain Empire | 5.0 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 9.0 | 0.0 | 9.0 |
| North Mountain | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| <i>Eastern Subtotal</i> | <i>5.0</i> | <i>4.0</i> | <i>9.0</i> | <i>9.0</i> | <i>1.0</i> | <i>10.0</i> |
| Total | 23.0 | 102.0 | 125.0 | 45.0 | 83.0 | 128.0 |

Source: County of San Diego 2011c, General Plan Update EIR (adopted August 3, 2011)

General Notes:

Values shown are miles of roadway.

ME Roads = Mobility Element Roadways

**Table 2.8-2
Existing Roadway Segment Operations**

| Community Planning Area/Street Segment | Existing Capacity (LOS E) ^a | Existing Traffic Volumes | | | |
|--|--|--------------------------|------------------|---------|-----|
| | | Weekday | | Weekend | |
| | | ADT ^b | LOS ^c | ADT | LOS |
| <i>Alpine</i> | | | | | |
| Alpine Boulevard: Boulders Road to Louise Drive | 16,200 | 24,260 | F | 26,270 | F |
| Tavern Road: Alpine Boulevard to Arnold Way | 16,200 | 12,930 | E | 14,000 | E |
| <i>Bonsall</i> | | | | | |
| S. Mission Road: S. Via Monserate to SR-76 | 16,200 | 18,280 | F | 13,140 | E |
| Mission Road (SR 76): Mission Road to Via Monserate | 16,200 | 17,290 | F | 12,430 | E |
| <i>Fallbrook</i> | | | | | |
| S. Mission Road: Via Encinas Drive to S. Via Monserate | 16,200 | 24,000 | F | 21,260 | F |
| SR-76: Old Highway 395 to I-15 SB Ramps | 34,200 | 25,130 | C | 21,290 | B |
| <i>Jamul</i> | | | | | |
| SR-94: Melody Road to Otay lakes Road | 16,200 | 6,230 | C | 6,750 | C |
| <i>Julian</i> | | | | | |
| SR-78: SR79 to Whispering Pines Drive | 16,200 | 3,870 | B | 5,240 | C |
| SR-79: Main Street to Oak Land Road | 16,200 | 1,760 | A | 2,380 | B |
| <i>Lakeside</i> | | | | | |
| SR-67: Johnson Lake Road to Posthill Road | 16,200 | 21,510 | F | 18,930 | F |
| Lake Jennings Park Road: Blossom Valley Road to I-8 WB Ramps | 16,200 | 16,250 | F | 14,300 | E |
| <i>North County Metro</i> | | | | | |
| SR-78: Bear Valley Parkway to San Pasqual Road | 16,200 | 15,680 | E | 13,500 | E |
| Valley Center Road: Woods Valley Road to City Limits | 34,200 | 21,320 | B | 18,300 | B |
| Valley Center Road: City Limits to Lake Wohlford Road (S.) | 34,200 | 24,930 | C | 21,400 | B |
| Bear Valley Parkway: SR-78 to Eldorado Drive | 16,200 | 25,880 | F | 22,300 | F |
| <i>Pala-Pauma</i> | | | | | |
| SR-76: Cole Grade Road to Valley Center Road | 16,200 | 6,630 | C | 5,620 | C |
| <i>Ramona</i> | | | | | |
| SR-67: Archie Moore Road to Mussey Grade Road | 16,200 | 24,220 | F | 21,310 | F |
| SR-78: Pine Street to Ninth Street | 37,000 | 23,820 | B | 20,970 | B |
| San Vicente Road: Warnock Drive to Wildcat Canyon Road | 16,200 | 11,280 | E | 9,920 | D |
| <i>San Dieguito</i> | | | | | |
| Del Dios Highway: Via Rancho Parkway to Mt. Israel Road | 16,200 | 19,350 | F | 20,220 | F |
| Del Dios Highway: Mt. Israel Road to Calle Ambiente | 16,200 | 20,700 | F | 21,630 | F |
| Del Dios Highway: Calle Ambiente to El Camino Del Norte | 16,200 | 19,350 | F | 20,220 | F |
| Via de la Valle: Paseo Delicias to El Camino Real | 16,200 | 10,620 | D | 11,100 | E |
| Paseo Delicias: Via de la Valle to El Camino Del Norte | 16,200 | 22,670 | F | 23,690 | F |
| <i>Spring Valley</i> | | | | | |
| Jamacha Boulevard: Galopago Street to Sweetwater Springs Blvd. | 16,200 | 28,470 | F | 30,830 | F |

**Table 2.8-2
Existing Roadway Segment Operations**

| Community Planning Area/Street Segment | Existing Capacity (LOS E) ^a | Existing Traffic Volumes | | | |
|--|--|--------------------------|------------------|---------|-----|
| | | Weekday | | Weekend | |
| | | ADT ^b | LOS ^c | ADT | LOS |
| <i>Sweetwater</i> | | | | | |
| Bonita Road: San Miguel Road to Central Avenue | 16,200 | 9,790 | D | 10,600 | D |
| Sweetwater Road: Plaza Bonita Centerway to Willow Street | 16,200 | 8,070 | D | 8,740 | D |
| <i>Valle De Oro</i> | | | | | |
| Jamacha Road: Campo Road to Fury Lane | 57,000 | 63,240 | F | 68,490 | F |
| <i>Valley Center</i> | | | | | |
| Valley Center Road: Lilac Road to Woods Valley Road | 37,000 | 24,930 | C | 22,560 | B |
| Cole Grade Road: Cool Valley Road to Valley Center Road | 16,200 | 8,280 | D | 7,480 | D |
| Lilac Road: W. Lilac Road to Old Castle Road | 16,200 | 5,700 | C | 5,150 | C |

Footnotes:

^a Roadway capacity based on the County of San Diego Standard Street Classification, Average Daily Vehicle Trips table.

^b Average Daily Traffic volumes

^c Level of Service

General Notes:

County of San Diego accepts segments in *italics* at LOS E or F operations.

**Table 2.8-3
Roadway Segments Where Adding Travel Lanes is Not Justified**

| Community/Street Segment | GP Update Classification | From | To |
|--------------------------|---|---------------------|---------------------|
| <i>Alpine</i> | | | |
| Alpine Boulevard | 2.2A: Light Collector w/Raised Median | Boulders Road | Louise Drive |
| <i>Fallbrook</i> | | | |
| SR-76 | 4.1A: 4-Ln Major Road w/Raised Median | Old Highway 395 | I-15 SB Ramps |
| <i>Lakeside</i> | | | |
| SR-67 | 4.1A: 4-Ln Major Road w/Raised Median | Johnson Lake Road | Posthill Road |
| Lake Jennings Park Road | 4.1B: 4-Ln Major Road w/Intermittent Turn Lanes | Blossom Valley Road | I-8 WB Ramps |
| <i>Ramona</i> | | | |
| SR-78 | 4.2B: Boulevard | Pine Street | Ninth Street |
| <i>San Dieguito</i> | | | |
| Del Dios Highway | 2.2D: Community Collector w/Passing Lane | Via Rancho Parkway | Mt. Israel Road |
| Del Dios Highway | 2.1D: Community Collector w/Passing Lane | Mt. Israel Road | El Camino Del Norte |
| Via de la Valle | 2.1E: Light Collector | Paseo Delicias | El Camino Del Norte |
| Paseo Delicias | 2.2A: Light Collector w/Raised Median | Via de la Valle | El Camino Del Norte |

**Table 2.8-3
Roadway Segments Where Adding Travel Lanes is Not Justified**

| Community/Street Segment | GP Update Classification | From | To |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------|-------------------|
| <i>Valle De Oro</i> | | | |
| Jamacha Road | 6.2: Prime Arterial | Campo Road | Fury Lane |
| <i>Valley Center</i> | | | |
| Valley Center Road | 4.2A: Boulevard | Lilac Road | Woods Valley Road |

Source: County of San Diego 2011a, General Plan Mobility Element – Appendix I

**Table 2.8-4
Roadway Lane Miles by Level of Service
Buildout Conditions**

| Community Planning Area | Lane Miles | | | | | |
|-------------------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|
| | LOS E | | | LOS F | | |
| | State Highway | ME Roads | Total | State Highway | ME Roads | Total |
| <i>North County</i> | | | | | | |
| 1. Bonsall | 3.0 | 7.0 | 10.0 | 9.0 | 0.0 | 9.0 |
| 2. Fallbrook | 0.0 | 23.0 | 23.0 | 1.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 |
| 3. N.C. Metro | 0.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| 4. Pala–Pauma | 2.0 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 |
| 5. San Dieguito | 0.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 | 0.0 | 24.0 | 24.0 |
| 6. Valley Center | 0.0 | 11.0 | 11.0 | 0.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 |
| <i>Southwestern</i> | | | | | | |
| 7. Alpine | 0.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 0.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| 8. Jamul | 4.0 | 3.0 | 7.0 | 14.0 | 0.0 | 14.0 |
| 9. Julian | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 10. Lakeside | 3.0 | 8.0 | 11.0 | 6.0 | 14.0 | 20.0 |
| 11. Ramona | 1.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 6.0 |
| 12. Spring Valley | 0.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| 13. Sweetwater | 0.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 14. Valle de Oro | 5.0 | 5.0 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Total | 18.0 | 94.0 | 112.0 | 36.0 | 80.0 | 116.0 |

Source: County of San Diego 2011d, General Plan (adopted August 3, 2011)

General Notes:

Values shown are miles of roadway.

ME Roads = Mobility Element Roadways

**Table 2.8-5
Horizon Year 2030 Roadway Segment Operations**

| Community Planning Area/Street Segment | Mobility Element Classification | Buildout Capacity (LOS D) ^a | Buildout (GP Update) Traffic Volumes | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|------------------|---------|-----|
| | | | Weekday | | Weekend | |
| | | | ADT ^b | LOS ^c | ADT | LOS |
| <i>Alpine</i> | | | | | | |
| Alpine Boulevard: Boulders Road to Louise Drive | Light Collector (2.2A) | 13,500 | 20,300 | F | 19,590 | F |
| Tavern Road: Alpine Boulevard to Arnold Way | Major Road (4.1A) | 33,400 | 23,200 | B | 22,390 | B |
| <i>Bonsall</i> | | | | | | |
| S. Mission Road: S. Via Monserate to SR-76 | Boulevard (4.2B) | 25,000 | 25,500 | E | 21,500 | C |
| Mission Road (SR-76): Mission Road to Via Monserate | Major Road (4.1A) | 33,400 | 43,300 | F | 36,500 | E |
| <i>Fallbrook</i> | | | | | | |
| S. Mission Road: Via Encinas Drive to S. Via Monserate | Boulevard (4.2B) | 25,000 | 24,000 | D | 21,260 | C |
| SR-76: Old Highway 395 to I-15 SB Ramps | Major Road (4.1A) | 33,400 | 40,400 | F | 35,790 | E |
| <i>Jamul</i> | | | | | | |
| SR-94: Melody Road to Otay lakes Road | Community Collector (2.1D) | 13,500 | 15,300 | E | 14,760 | E |
| <i>Julian</i> | | | | | | |
| SR-78: SR-79 to Whispering Pines Drive | Light Collector (2.2D) | 13,500 | 3,800 | B | 4,010 | B |
| SR-79: Main Street to Oak Land Road | Light Collector (2.2D) | 13,500 | 4,200 | B | 4,430 | B |
| <i>Lakeside</i> | | | | | | |
| SR-67: Johnson Lake Road to Posthill Road | Major Road (4.1A) | 33,400 | 48,900 | F | 43,860 | F |
| Lake Jennings Park Road: Blossom Valley Road to I-8 WB Ramps | Major Road (4.1B) | 30,800 | 8,100 | A | 7,270 | A |
| <i>North County Metro</i> | | | | | | |
| SR-78: Bear Valley Parkway to San Pasqual Road | Major Road (4.1A) | 33,400 | 15,400 | B | 13,720 | A |
| Valley Center Road: Woods Valley Road to City Limits | Major Road (4.1A) | 33,400 | 26,900 | C | 23,940 | B |
| Valley Center Road: City Limits to Lake Wohlford Road (S.) | Major Road (4.1A) | 33,400 | 26,900 | C | 23,940 | B |
| Bear Valley Parkway: SR-78 to Eldorado Drive | Major Road (4.1A) | 33,400 | 24,400 | B | 21,740 | B |
| <i>Pal-Pauma</i> | | | | | | |
| SR-76: Cole Grade Road to Valley Center Road | Community Collector (2.1D) | 13,500 | 6,200 | C | 5,490 | B |

**Table 2.8-5
Horizon Year 2030 Roadway Segment Operations**

| Community Planning Area/Street Segment | Mobility Element Classification | Buildout Capacity (LOS D) ^a | Buildout (GP Update) Traffic Volumes | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|------------------|---------|-----|
| | | | Weekday | | Weekend | |
| | | | ADT ^b | LOS ^c | ADT | LOS |
| <i>Ramona</i> | | | | | | |
| SR-67: Archie Moore Road to Mussey Grade Road | Major Road (4.1A) | 33,400 | 32,100 | D | 28,790 | C |
| SR-78: Pine Street to Ninth Street | Boulevard (4.2B) | 25,000 | 28,900 | F | 25,920 | E |
| San Vicente Road: Warnock Drive to Wildcat Canyon Road | Community Collector (2.1D) | 13,500 | 14,700 | E | 13,190 | D |
| <i>San Dieguito</i> | | | | | | |
| Del Dios Highway: Via Rancho Parkway to Mt. Israel Road | Light Collector (2.2D) | 13,500 | 31,200 | D | 29,700 | F |
| Del Dios Highway: Mt. Israel Road to Calle Ambiente | Community Collector (2.1D) | 13,500 | 25,500 | F | 24,280 | F |
| Del Dios Highway: Calle Ambiente to El Camino Del Norte | Community Collector (2.1D) | 13,500 | 27,800 | F | 26,470 | F |
| Via de la Valle: Paseo Delicias to El Camino Real | Light Collector (2.2A) | 13,500 | 25,200 | F | 23,990 | F |
| Paseo Delicias: Via de la Valle to El Camino Del Norte | Light Collector (2.2A) | 13,500 | 23,200 | F | 22,090 | F |
| <i>Spring Valley</i> | | | | | | |
| Jamacha Boulevard: Galopago Street to Sweetwater Springs Blvd. | Major Road (4.1A) | 33,400 | 27,000 | C | 26,050 | C |
| <i>Sweetwater</i> | | | | | | |
| Bonita Road: San Miguel Road to Central Avenue | Community Collector (2.1D) | 13,500 | 6,900 | C | 6,660 | C |
| Sweetwater Road: Plaza Bonita Centerway to Willow Street | Community Collector (2.1D) | 13,500 | 13,800 | E | 13,320 | D |
| <i>Valle De Oro</i> | | | | | | |
| Jamacha Road: Campo Road to Fury Lane | Prime Arterial (6.2) | 50,000 | 62,300 | F | 67,470 | F |
| <i>Valley Center</i> | | | | | | |
| Valley Center Road: Lilac Road to Woods Valley Road | Boulevard (4.2A) | 27,000 | 17,100 | A | 15,480 | A |
| Cole Grade Road: Cool Valley Road to Valley Center Road | Boulevard (4.2A) | 27,000 | 17,900 | A | 16,200 | A |
| Lilac Road: W. Lilac Road to Old Castle Road | Light Collector (2.2E) | 10,900 | 7,900 | D | 7,150 | D |

Footnotes:

^a Roadway capacity based on the County's GP Update Mobility Element Framework (accepted August 3, 2011).

^b Average Daily Traffic volumes

^c Level of Service

General Notes:

County of San Diego accepts segments in *italics* at LOS E or F operations.

**Table 2.8-6a
Project Trip Generation: Tier One**

| Trip Type | Weekday | | | Weekend | | |
|-------------------------|---------|------|-----|---------|------|-----|
| | Number | Rate | ADT | Number | Rate | ADT |
| Employees | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Deliveries ^a | 1 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 4 |
| Customers | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Total | — | — | 8 | — | — | 8 |

Footnotes:

^a A rate of four trips/delivery assumed the delivery vehicle is a large truck. This rate of two trips/vehicle (one trip in, one trip out) includes a 2.0 passenger car equivalent (PCE) factor to account for the added effect of the heavy vehicle on traffic flow.

General Notes:

A Tier One site allows boarding only of up to three horses not owned by the property owner.

**Table 2.8-6b
Project Trip Generation: Tier Two**

| Trip Type | Weekday | | | Weekend | | |
|-------------------------|---------|------|-----|---------|------|-----|
| | Number | Rate | ADT | Number | Rate | ADT |
| Employees | 3 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 6 |
| Deliveries ^a | 1 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 4 |
| Customers | 5 | 2 | 10 | 10 | 2 | 20 |
| Total | — | — | 20 | — | — | 30 |

Footnotes:

^a A rate of four trips/delivery assumed the delivery vehicle is a large truck. This rate of two trips/vehicle (one trip in, one trip out) includes a 2.0 PCE factor to account for the added effect of the heavy vehicle on traffic flow.

General Notes:

A Tier Two site allows 10 horses per acre of useable area up to 50 horses and 5 acres.

**Table 2.8-6c
Project Trip Generation: Tier Three**

| Trip Type | Weekday | | | Weekend | | |
|-------------------------|---------|------|-----|---------|------|-----|
| | Number | Rate | ADT | Number | Rate | ADT |
| Employees | 4 | 2 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 8 |
| Deliveries ^a | 1 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 4 |
| Customers | 8 | 2 | 16 | 16 | 2 | 32 |
| Total | — | — | 28 | — | — | 44 |

Footnotes:

^a A rate of four trips/delivery assumed the delivery vehicle is a large truck. This rate of two trips/vehicle (one trip in, one trip out) includes a 2.0 PCE factor to account for the added effect of the heavy vehicle on traffic flow.

General Notes:

A Tier Three site allows 10 horses per acre of useable area up to 100 horses and 10 acres.

Table 2.8-7
Measure of Significant Project Impacts to Congestion of
Road Segments: Allowable Increases on Congested Road Segments

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

General Notes:

1. By adding proposed project trips to all other trips from a list of projects, this same table must be used to determine if total cumulative impacts are significant. If cumulative impacts are found to be significant, each project that contributes any trips must mitigate a share of the cumulative impacts.
2. The County may also determine impacts have occurred on roads even when a project's traffic or cumulative impacts do not trigger an unacceptable LOS, for example, when such traffic accounts for a significant amount of the remaining road capacity.

Table 2.8-8
Near-Term Roadway Segment Operations

| Community Planning Area/Street Segment | Existing Capacity (LOS D) ^a | Weekday | | | | Weekend | | | |
|--|--|------------------|------------------|---|---|----------|-----|------------------------------------|---|
| | | Existing | | Reserve Capacity (ADT until LOS E) ^d | # Facilities before Significant Impact ^f | Existing | | Reserve Capacity (ADT until LOS E) | # Facilities before Significant Impact ^g |
| | | ADT ^b | LOS ^c | | | ADT | LOS | | |
| <i>Alpine</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| Alpine Boulevard: Boulders Road to Louise Drive | 10,900 | 24,260 | F | 100 | 3 | 26,270 | F | 100 | 2 |
| Tavern Road: Alpine Boulevard to Arnold Way | 10,900 | 12,930 | E | 200 | 7 | 14,000 | E | 200 | 4 |
| <i>Bonsall</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| S. Mission Road: S. Via Monserate to SR-76 | 10,900 | 18,280 | F | 100 | 3 | 13,140 | E | 200 | 4 |
| Mission Road (SR-76): Mission Road to Via Monserate | 10,900 | 17,290 | F | 100 | 3 | 12,430 | E | 200 | 4 |
| <i>Fallbrook</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| S. Mission Road: Via Encinas Drive to S. Via Monserate | 10,900 | | | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| SR-76: Old Highway 395 to I-15 SB Ramps | 30,800 | 25,130 | C | 5,670 | >50 | 21,290 | B | 9,510 | >50 |
| <i>Jamul</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| SR-94: Melody Road to Otay Lakes Road | 10,900 | 6,230 | C | 4,670 | >50 | 6,750 | C | 4,150 | >50 |

**Table 2.8-8
Near-Term Roadway Segment Operations**

| Community Planning Area/Street Segment | Existing Capacity (LOS D) ^a | Weekday | | | | Weekend | | | |
|--|--|------------------|------------------|---|---|----------|-----|------------------------------------|---|
| | | Existing | | Reserve Capacity (ADT until LOS E) ^d | # Facilities before Significant Impact ¹ | Existing | | Reserve Capacity (ADT until LOS E) | # Facilities before Significant Impact ² |
| | | ADT ^b | LOS ^c | | | ADT | LOS | | |
| <i>Julian</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| SR-78: SR-79 to Whispering Pines Drive | 10,900 | 3,870 | B | 7,030 | >50 | 5,240 | C | 5,660 | >50 |
| SR-79: Main Street to Oak Land Road | 10,900 | 1,760 | A | 9,140 | >50 | 2,380 | B | 8,520 | >50 |
| <i>Lakeside</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| SR-67: Johnson Lake Road to Posthill Road | 10,900 | 21,510 | F | 100 | 3 | 18,930 | F | 100 | 2 |
| Lake Jennings Park Road: Blossom Valley Road to I-8 WB Ramps | 10,900 | 16,250 | F | 100 | 3 | 14,300 | E | 200 | 4 |
| <i>North County Metro</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| SR-78: Bear Valley Parkway to San Pasqual Road | 10,900 | 15,680 | E | 200 | 7 | 13,500 | E | 200 | 4 |
| Valley Center Road: Woods Valley Road to City Limits | 30,800 | 21,320 | B | 9,480 | >50 | 18,300 | B | 12,500 | >50 |
| Valley Center Road: City Limits to Lake Wohlford Road (S.) | 30,800 | 24,930 | C | 5,870 | >50 | 21,400 | B | 9,400 | >50 |
| Bear Valley Parkway: SR-78 to Eldorado Drive | 10,900 | 25,880 | F | 100 | 3 | 22,300 | F | 100 | 2 |
| <i>Pala-Pauma</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| SR-76: Cole Grade Road to Valley Center Road | 10,900 | 6,630 | C | 4,270 | >50 | 5,620 | C | 5,280 | >50 |
| <i>Ramona</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| SR-67: Archie Moore Road to Mussey Grade Road | 10,900 | 24,220 | F | 100 | 3 | 21,310 | F | 100 | 2 |
| SR-78: Pine Street to Ninth Street | 37,000 | 23,820 | B | — | — | 20,970 | B | 16,030 | >50 |

**Table 2.8-8
Near-Term Roadway Segment Operations**

| Community Planning Area/Street Segment | Existing Capacity (LOS D) ^a | Weekday | | | | Weekend | | | |
|--|--|------------------|------------------|---|---|----------|-----|------------------------------------|---|
| | | Existing | | Reserve Capacity (ADT until LOS E) ^d | # Facilities before Significant Impact ¹ | Existing | | Reserve Capacity (ADT until LOS E) | # Facilities before Significant Impact ² |
| | | ADT ^b | LOS ^c | | | ADT | LOS | | |
| San Vicente Road: Warnock Drive to Wildcat Canyon Road | 10,900 | 11,280 | E | 200 | 7 | 9,920 | D | 980 | 21 |
| <i>San Dieguito</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| Del Dios Highway: Via Rancho Parkway to Mt. Israel Road | 10,900 | 19,350 | F | 100 | 3 | 20,220 | F | 100 | 2 |
| Del Dios Highway: Mt. Israel Road to Calle Ambiente | 10,900 | 20,700 | F | 100 | 3 | 21,630 | F | 100 | 2 |
| Del Dios Highway: Calle Ambiente to El Camino Del Norte | 10,900 | 19,350 | F | 100 | 3 | 20,220 | F | 100 | 2 |
| Via de la Valle: Paseo Delicias to El Camino Real | 10,900 | 10,620 | D | 280 | 10 | 11,100 | E | 200 | 4 |
| Paseo Delicias: Via de la Valle to El Camino del Norte | 10,900 | 22,670 | F | 100 | 3 | 23,690 | F | 100 | 4 |
| <i>Spring Valley</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| Jamacha Boulevard: Galopago Street to Sweetwater Springs Blvd. | 10,900 | 28,470 | F | 100 | 3 | 30,830 | F | 100 | 2 |
| <i>Sweetwater</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| Bonita Road: San Miguel Road to Central Avenue | 10,900 | 9,790 | D | 1,110 | 39 | 10,600 | D | 300 | 6 |
| Sweetwater Road: Plaza Bonita Centerway to Willow Street | 10,900 | 8,070 | D | 2,830 | 101 | 8,740 | D | 2,160 | 48 |
| <i>Valle De Oro</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| Jamacha Road: Campo Road to Fury Lane | 57,000 | 63,240 | F | 100 | 3 | 68,490 | F | 100 | 2 |

**Table 2.8-8
Near-Term Roadway Segment Operations**

| Community Planning Area/Street Segment | Existing Capacity (LOS D) ^a | Weekday | | | | Weekend | | | |
|---|--|------------------|------------------|---|---|----------|-----|------------------------------------|---|
| | | Existing | | Reserve Capacity (ADT until LOS E) ^d | # Facilities before Significant Impact ¹ | Existing | | Reserve Capacity (ADT until LOS E) | # Facilities before Significant Impact ² |
| | | ADT ^b | LOS ^c | | | ADT | LOS | | |
| <i>Valley Center</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| Valley Center Road: Lilac Road to Woods Valley Road | 37,000 | 24,930 | C | 12,070 | >50 | 22,560 | B | 14,440 | >50 |
| Cole Grade Road: Cool Valley Road to Valley Center Road | 10,900 | 8,280 | D | 2,620 | >50 | 7,480 | D | 3,420 | >50 |
| Lilac Road: W. Lilac Road to Old Castle Road | 10,900 | 5,700 | C | 5,200 | >50 | 5,150 | C | 5,750 | >50 |

Footnotes:

^a Roadway capacity based on the County of San Diego Standard Street Classification, Average Daily Vehicle Trips table.

^b Average Daily Traffic volumes

^c Level of Service

^d Or until significant impact if already LOS E or LOS F.

General Notes:

1. Worst-case weekday trip generation is 28 ADT for a Tier Three equine facility.
2. Worst-case weekend trip generation is 44 ADT for a Tier Three equine facility.
3. County of San Diego accepts segments in *italics* at LOS E or F operations.

**Table 2.8-9
Buildout Roadway Segment Operations**

| Community Planning Area/Street Segment | Mobility Element Capacity (LOS D) ^a | Weekday | | | | Weekend | | | |
|---|--|------------------|------------------|---|---|---------------|-----|---|---|
| | | Buildout 2030 | | Reserve Capacity (ADT until LOS E) ^d | # Facilities before Significant Impact ¹ | Buildout 2030 | | Reserve Capacity (ADT until LOS E) ^d | # Facilities before Significant Impact ² |
| | | ADT ^b | LOS ^c | | | ADT | LOS | | |
| <i>Alpine</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| Alpine Boulevard: Boulders Road to Louise Drive | 13,500 | 20,300 | F | 100 | 3 | 19,590 | F | 100 | 2 |
| Tavern Road: Alpine Boulevard to Arnold Way | 33,400 | 23,200 | B | 15,800 | >50 | 22,390 | B | 11,010 | >50 |

**Table 2.8-9
Buildout Roadway Segment Operations**

| Community Planning Area/Street Segment | Mobility Element Capacity (LOS D) ^a | Weekday | | | | Weekend | | | |
|--|--|------------------|------------------|---|---|---------------|-----|---|---|
| | | Buildout 2030 | | Reserve Capacity (ADT until LOS E) ^d | # Facilities before Significant Impact ¹ | Buildout 2030 | | Reserve Capacity (ADT until LOS E) ^d | # Facilities before Significant Impact ² |
| | | ADT ^b | LOS ^c | | | ADT | LOS | | |
| <i>Bonsall</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| S. Mission Road: S. Via Monserate to SR-76 | 25,000 | 25,500 | E | 200 | 7 | 21,500 | C | 3,500 | >50 |
| Mission Road (SR-76): Mission Road to Via Monserate | 33,400 | 43,300 | F | 100 | 3 | 36,500 | E | 200 | 4 |
| <i>Fallbrook</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| S. Mission Road: Via Encinas Drive to S. Via Monserate | 25,000 | 24,000 | D | 1,000 | 35 | 21,260 | C | 3,740 | >50 |
| SR-76: Old Highway 395 to I-15 SB Ramps | 33,400 | 40,400 | F | 100 | 3 | 35,790 | E | 200 | 4 |
| <i>Jamul</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| SR-94: Melody Road to Otay Lakes Road | 13,500 | 15,300 | E | 200 | 7 | 14,760 | E | 200 | 4 |
| <i>Julian</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| SR-78: SR-79 to Whispering Pines Drive | 13,500 | 3,800 | B | 9,700 | >50 | 4,010 | B | 9,490 | >50 |
| SR-79: Main Street to Oak Land Road | 13,500 | 4,200 | B | 9,300 | >50 | 4,430 | B | 9,070 | >50 |
| <i>Lakeside</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| SR-67: Johnson Lake Road to Posthill Road | 33,400 | 48,900 | F | 100 | 3 | 43,860 | F | 100 | 2 |
| Lake Jennings Park Road: Blossom Valley Road to I-8 WB Ramps | 30,800 | 8,100 | A | 22,700 | >50 | 7,270 | A | 23,530 | >50 |
| <i>North County Metro</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| SR78: Bear Valley Parkway to San Pasqual Road | 33,400 | 15,400 | B | 18,000 | >50 | 13,720 | A | 19,680 | >50 |
| Valley Center Road: Woods Valley Road to City Limits | 33,400 | 26,900 | C | 6,500 | >50 | 23,940 | B | 9,460 | >50 |
| Valley Center Road: City Limits to Lake Wohlford Road (S.) | 33,400 | 26,900 | C | 6,500 | >50 | 23,940 | B | 9,460 | >50 |
| Bear Valley Parkway: SR-78 to Eldorado Drive | 33,400 | 24,400 | B | 9,000 | >50 | 21,740 | B | 11,660 | >50 |

**Table 2.8-9
Buildout Roadway Segment Operations**

| Community Planning Area/Street Segment | Mobility Element Capacity (LOS D) ^a | Weekday | | | | Weekend | | | |
|--|--|------------------|------------------|---|---|---------------|-----|---|---|
| | | Buildout 2030 | | Reserve Capacity (ADT until LOS E) ^d | # Facilities before Significant Impact ¹ | Buildout 2030 | | Reserve Capacity (ADT until LOS E) ^d | # Facilities before Significant Impact ² |
| | | ADT ^b | LOS ^c | | | ADT | LOS | | |
| <i>Pala-Pauma</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| SR-76: Cole Grade Road to Valley Center Road | 13,500 | 6,200 | C | 7,300 | >50 | 5,490 | B | 8,010 | >50 |
| <i>Ramona</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| SR-67: Archie Moore Road to Mussey Grade Road | 33,400 | 32,100 | D | 1,300 | 46 | 28,790 | C | 4,610 | >50 |
| SR-78: Pine Street to Ninth Street | 25,000 | 28,900 | F | 100 | 3 | 25,920 | E | 200 | 4 |
| San Vicente Road: Warnock Drive to Wildcat Canyon Road | 13,500 | 14,700 | E | 200 | 7 | 13,190 | D | 310 | 7 |
| <i>San Dieguito</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| Del Dios Highway: Via Rancho Parkway to Mt. Israel Road | 13,500 | 31,200 | F | 100 | 3 | 29,700 | F | 100 | 2 |
| Del Dios Highway: Mt. Israel Road to Calle Ambiente | 13,500 | 25,500 | F | 100 | 3 | 24,280 | F | 100 | 2 |
| Del Dios Highway: Calle Ambiente to El Camino Del Norte | 13,500 | 27,800 | F | 100 | 3 | 26,470 | F | 100 | 2 |
| Via de la Valle: Paseo Delicias to El Camino Real | 10,900 | 25,200 | F | 100 | 3 | 23,990 | F | 100 | 2 |
| Paseo Delicias: Via de la Valle to El Camino del Norte | 13,500 | 23,200 | F | 100 | 3 | 22,090 | F | 100 | 2 |
| <i>Spring Valley</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| Jamacha Boulevard: Galopago Street to Sweetwater Springs Blvd. | 33,400 | 27,000 | C | 6,400 | >50 | 26,050 | C | 7,350 | >50 |

**Table 2.8-9
Buildout Roadway Segment Operations**

| Community Planning Area/Street Segment | Mobility Element Capacity (LOS D) ^a | Weekday | | | | Weekend | | | |
|--|--|------------------|------------------|---|---|---------------|-----|---|---|
| | | Buildout 2030 | | Reserve Capacity (ADT until LOS E) ^d | # Facilities before Significant Impact ¹ | Buildout 2030 | | Reserve Capacity (ADT until LOS E) ^d | # Facilities before Significant Impact ² |
| | | ADT ^b | LOS ^c | | | ADT | LOS | | |
| <i>Sweetwater</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| Bonita Road: San Miguel Road to Central Avenue | 13,500 | 6,900 | C | 6,600 | >50 | 6,660 | C | 6,840 | >50 |
| Sweetwater Road: Plaza Bonita Centerway to Willow Street | 13,500 | 13,800 | E | 200 | 7 | 13,320 | D | 180 | 4 |
| <i>Valle De Oro</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| Jamacha Road: Campo Road to Fury Lane | 50,000 | 62,300 | F | 100 | 3 | 67,470 | F | 100 | 2 |
| <i>Valley Center</i> | | | | | | | | | |
| Valley Center Road: Lilac Road to Woods Valley Road | 27,000 | 17,100 | A | 9,900 | >50 | 15,480 | A | 11,520 | >50 |
| Cole Grade Road: Cool Valley Road to Valley Center Road | 27,000 | 17,900 | A | 9,100 | >50 | 16,200 | A | 10,800 | >50 |
| Lilac Road: W. Lilac Road to Old Castle Road | 10,900 | 7,900 | D | 3,000 | >50 | 7,150 | D | 3,750 | >50 |

Footnotes:

^a Roadway capacity based on the County's General Plan Update Mobility Element Framework (accepted August 3, 2011).

^b Average Daily Traffic volumes

^c Level of Service

^d Or until significant impact if already LOS E or LOS F.

General Notes:

1. Worst-case weekday trip generation is 28 ADT for a Tier Three equine facility.
2. Worst-case weekend trip generation is 44 ADT for a Tier Three equine facility.
3. County of San Diego accepts the segments in *italics* at LOS E or F operations.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK