2.15 Transportation and Traffic

This section summarizes information from the *Transportation Impact Assessment* prepared by Chen Ryan (Appendix E of this SEIR) and evaluates existing conditions for the transportation routes and facilities within the PSR Analysis Areas and the former CGSP Area addressed in this SEIR, as well as the potential traffic impacts that would result from implementation of the Proposed Project. Potential traffic impacts were evaluated based upon the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance Transportation and Traffic (DLPU 2011).

A summary of the transportation and traffic impacts identified in Section 2.15.3 is provided below.

Transportation and Traffic Summary of Impacts

Issue Topic	Project Direct Impact	Cumulative Impact	Impact After Mitigation
Traffic and LOS Standards	Potentially significant	Potentially significant	Significant and unavoidable
Road Safety	Potentially significant	Potentially significant	Significant and unavoidable
Emergency Access	Potentially significant	Less than significant	Less than significant
Alternative Transportation	Potentially significant	Less than significant	Less than significant

2.15.1 Existing Conditions

Section 2.15.1 of the 2011 PEIR included a discussion of existing conditions related to transportation and traffic. The ~~baseline~~ traffic projections from the 2011 PEIR were used as the baseline for projections of future traffic buildout conditions with and without the Proposed Project, as described in Methodology of Traffic and Circulation Assessment under Section 2.15.3 below. All references used in the 2011 PEIR were reviewed to ensure they are still valid today, and are hereby incorporated by reference. As this SEIR is a Plan-to-Plan analysis this approach is the appropriate methodology to compare the Proposed Project against the approved General Plan. ~~No new traffic counts were conducted for this SEIR.~~

2.15.2 Regulatory Framework

Section 2.15.2 of the 2011 PEIR included a discussion of regulatory framework related to transportation and traffic within the County. The regulations described in the 2011 PEIR are the same as the regulations evaluated in this SEIR, with the exception of the 2015 San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan (SANDAG 2015), 2016 Regional Transportation Improvement Program, County General Plan Mobility Element, the Transportation Impact Fee (TIF), and Community Plans, which are described below. No changes to those regulations have been identified that would alter the conclusions from the 2011 PEIR. All references used from the 2011 PEIR were reviewed to ensure they are still valid today, and are hereby incorporated by reference.

San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan

SANDAG adopted San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan on October 9, 2015. Included in the Regional Plan is an update to the San Diego Regional Comprehensive Plan and the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy. The Regional Plan provides a vision for the region's transportation system over the next 35 years, accommodating more than 925,000 new residents, nearly half a million new jobs, and over 300,000 new homes. The foundation of The Regional Plan is the Series 13 Regional Growth Forecast, which identifies future growth in population, housing units, and jobs for the San Diego region from 2012 to 2050.

The forecast is based on the most recent planning assumptions, considering local general plans and other factors, as required by SB 375 (CGC Section 65080(b)(2)(B)). For the development of the Series 13 subregional forecast, SANDAG staff worked with each jurisdiction to collect and verify detailed land use inputs down to the parcel level. The final forecast was accepted for planning in October 2013. However, as described in the methodology provided below in Section 2.15.3, to be consistent with the General Plan, a hybrid of the Series 10 based GP volumes and the Series 12 model was used to determine the traffic volumes that would result from implementation of the Proposed Project.

Regional Transportation Improvement Program

The 2016 Regional Transportation Improvement Program is a multi-billion-dollar five-year program of major transportation projects funded by federal, State, *TransNet* local sales tax, and other local and private funding covering fiscal year 2016/2017 to 2020/2021. The program development process, which includes the air quality emissions analysis for all regionally significant projects, requires approval by the FHWA and the FTA.

The Regional Transportation Improvement Program is a prioritized program designed to implement the region's overall strategy for providing mobility and improving the efficiency and safety of the transportation system, while reducing transportation-related air pollution in support of efforts to attain federal and State air quality standards for the region. The program also incrementally implements San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan, the long-range transportation plan for the San Diego region (SANDAG 2015).

San Diego County General Plan Mobility Element

The County Mobility Element was adopted in association with the 2011 General Plan. The Mobility Element was designed to accommodate future transportation demands associated with the planned land uses consistent with the County General Plan. The County General Plan assumes Mobility Element roads would operate at Level of Service (LOS) D, unless the General Plan determined that LOS E or F was acceptable for the road segment based on a variety of criteria. Roadway classifications needed to mitigate impacts of General Plan buildout are those improvements necessary to meet LOS D or any lower LOS as established by the General Plan. Hence, it is assumed that buildout of the Mobility Element would accommodate the cumulative traffic associated with all future development anticipated by the County General Plan.

Classifications were determined on a segment-by-segment basis for all segments operating below LOS D, unless the segment was accepted to operate at LOS E or F by the General Plan. The required roadway classification was determined by comparing the forecast segment volume to the respective County roadway design capacity (LOS D or better as set by the General Plan) threshold, and selecting the lowest roadway classification that would have sufficient capacity to accommodate the projected General Plan buildout volume of vehicle traffic.

San Diego County Transportation Impact Fee

The Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) program provides funding for mitigation of cumulative impacts and for proportional construction of transportation facilities needed to support traffic generated by new development and to meet State law requirements. Per the County BOS ordinance, effective December 31, 2012, the County will collect TIF at or before building permit issuance for projects that generate new trips.

San Diego County Community/Subregional Plan Policies on Transportation and Traffic

Each of the nine CPAs and Subregions (Bonsall, Crest-Dehesa, Desert, Fallbrook, Mountain Empire, North County Metro, Pala-Pauma, San Dieguito, and Valley Center) containing PSR Analysis Areas and the former CGSP Area have adopted goals and policies related to transportation and traffic as part of their associated Community or Subregional Plan. The Proposed Project does not include an expansion of the circulation system in any of the PSR Analysis Areas or the former CGSP Area; however, the development of land uses allowed in the Proposed Project would require new access roads and driveways.

2.15.3 Analysis of Project Impacts and Determination of Significance

Methodology

As part of the process for the 2011 PEIR, a Traffic and Circulation Assessment was conducted to provide a program-level assessment of traffic operations throughout the unincorporated County. The assessment evaluated projected roadway network performance under implementation of the General Plan Update and was performed in accordance with the requirements of the County of San Diego, the SANDAG Regional Congestion Management Program, and CEQA. General Plan Update traffic volumes were calculated using the SANDAG Series 10 model. The complete Traffic and Circulation Assessment is included in Appendix G of the 2011 PEIR.

The 2011 PEIR Traffic and Circulation Assessment had an extremely large study area encompassing the unincorporated portions of the County. In order to provide a program-level analysis of the project area, traffic operations were evaluated by consideration of daily roadway segment operations rather than peak hour intersection operations. The evaluation of peak hour intersection operations would be appropriate for addressing specific transportation corridors (i.e., intersections) that may be impacted by a proposed project; however, this approach was not feasible for the General Plan, due to its size. Therefore, daily roadway segment operations were evaluated to provide a comprehensive review of the County's roadway facilities. Two sets of roadway segment LOS standards and thresholds were utilized for the roadway analysis in the study. The existing County of San Diego LOS standards and thresholds were used to evaluate existing conditions while the General Plan Mobility Element LOS standards and threshold were used to evaluate future conditions.

Compared to existing standards (2011), the General Plan includes additional roadway classifications and provides variations to existing road classifications that would result in a change in the overall road capacity of several Mobility Element roads. Therefore, the current roadway segment capacity was used for the analysis of existing conditions, while the proposed General Plan roadway segment capacity was used for the analysis of the Proposed Project under buildout conditions. Within the 2011 PEIR, the term buildout refers to a scenario in which the proposed General Plan land uses and the proposed General Plan Mobility Element roadway network have been fully developed within reason, while accounting for developable land and constraints. The scenario in the General Plan is based on the population forecast model, described in Section 1.13 (Project Description) of the 2011 PEIR and Section 1.9 of this SEIR, and correlates with SANDAG's 2030 forecast for the unincorporated County. Detailed information on roadway network and land use assumptions that were incorporated into the traffic forecast model are provided in Appendix G (Traffic and Circulation Assessment) of the 2011 PEIR.

The Proposed Project Traffic Impact Analysis was based on the Series 12 SANDAG Model. The Series 13 model was available for use; however, in order to remain consistent with the 2011

General Plan, the 2011 General Plan land use (which used Series 10) was converted to Series 12 land use for input into the model. This consistency step is not possible with Series 13, as Series 13 uses employment density as an input. SANDAG did not develop a conversion rate between land use and employment density until recently, and its accuracy level for traffic modelling has yet to be determined. Therefore, the hybrid Series 12 and GP traffic modeling methodology was the best available data source at the time of the Proposed Project development.

The *Transportation Impact Assessment* for the Proposed Project (Chen Ryan 2016, 2017) established final "With project" traffic volume effects using a hybrid approach, described above, of the currently available SANDAG Series 12 model and results from the Series 10 model utilized with the 2011 PEIR (refer to Appendix E with this SEIR). The Proposed Project land uses and their corresponding trip generation rates were first coded into SANDAG Series 12 model creating a "With Project" model. The Series 12 "With Project" model results were then compared to SANDAG Series 12 baseline model results, which was developed based on the current adopted Land Use and Mobility Element (County 2011a). The difference between the outputs of the two models shows the number of new trips associated with the Proposed Project. Current General Plan buildout volumes without the Proposed Project were developed by adding buildout traffic in the Series 12 model from the GPA approved in 2014 to the 2011 Series 10 buildout volumes.

2.15.3.1 Issue 1: Traffic and Level of Service Standards

Guidelines for Determination of Significance

Based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines and the County Guidelines for Determining Significance Transportation and Traffic (DPLU 2011), the Proposed Project would have a significant impact if it would:

- Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all the 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;
- Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections); or
- Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County Congestion Management Agency for designated roads or highways.

Roadway Segment Level of Service Standards and Thresholds

LOS is a quality of service measure that describes operational conditions on a transportation facility, such as a roadway or intersection. LOS are established based upon the driver's perspective, with variation based upon the type of transportation facility. This service measure is a general overall measurement of several conditions such as speed and travel time, freedom to maneuver, traffic interruption, and comfort and convenience. Safety is an important concern but, typically, is not included in the measures that establish service levels. Six LOS categories designated by letter from A to F, are defined for each type of transportation facility, with LOS A representing the best operating conditions and LOS F the worst. Criteria for identifying LOS on County of San Diego arterials are provided in the County of San Diego Public Road Standards.

As described in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance, Transportation and Traffic, a traffic volume increase from a project would result in a significant traffic volume or LOS traffic impact on a roadway segment if:

- The additional or redistributed Average Daily Trips (ADT) generated by the Proposed Project would significantly increase congestion on a Circulation Element road or State highway currently operating at LOS E or LOS F or would cause a Circulation Element road or State highway to operate at a LOS E or LOS F as a result of the Proposed Project (refer to Table 2.15-1); or

- The additional or redistributed ADT generated by the Proposed Project will cause a residential street to exceed its design capacity.

Two-Lane Highways with Signalized Intersection Spacing Over One Mile

Traffic volume increases from public or private projects that meet the following significance criterion would have a significant traffic volume or LOS traffic impact on a two-lane highway facility with signalized intersection spacing over one mile.

- The additional or redistributed ADT generated by the Proposed Project would significantly increase congestion on a two-lane highway segment currently operating at LOS E or LOS F, as identified in Table 2.15-2, or would cause a two-lane highway segment to operate at LOS E or LOS F as a result of the Proposed Project.

Impact Analysis

The Mobility Element of the adopted General Plan provides a framework for a balanced, multi-modal transportation system for the movement of people and goods within the unincorporated County of San Diego, including the PSR Analysis Areas and the former CGSP Area. A balanced system uses multiple modes of travel including biking, walking and transit in addition to motor vehicles. For a discussion regarding public transportation, bicycles, pedestrians, and to a lesser extent, rail and air transportation, and associated policies, refer to Section 2.15.3.4 of this SEIR.

The General Plan Mobility Element intends to accommodate future transportation demands associated with the planned land uses consistent with the County General Plan. The Mobility Element assumes roads would operate at LOS D, unless the General Plan determined that LOS E or LOS F is acceptable for the road segment. For example, the Mobility Element roadway segment of Old Highway 395 – from Dulin Road East to Dulin Road West is forecasted to operate at LOS E (Table 2.15-3); however, the General Plan determined this was an acceptable LOS for that roadway segment upon building the road to its ultimate Mobility Element classification. Roadway improvements needed to mitigate impacts are those improvements necessary to meet LOS D or any lower LOS as established by the adopted General Plan. Hence, it is assumed that buildout of the General Plan Mobility Element would accommodate the cumulative traffic associated with all anticipated future development, projected by the County's General Plan. The required roadway classification was determined by comparing the forecast segment volume to the respective County roadway design capacity threshold and selecting the lowest roadway classification that would have sufficient capacity to accommodate the projected volume. The *Transportation Impact Assessment* identifies the overall traffic impacts relative to the change in land use designations for the Proposed Project as a whole (Appendix E with this SEIR). The *Transportation Impact Assessment* identifies the increase in ADT from each PSR Analysis Area (Table 2.15-4), but evaluates the impacts of future development within the PSR Analysis Areas and the former CGSP Area at the CPA/Subregion level. The individual impacts from future development of the Proposed Project parcels would be addressed on a case-by-case basis and

reviewed by the County of San Diego when applications are filed consistent with the mitigation policies identified in the General Plan. The majority of PSR Analysis Areas propose an increase in the number of single-family dwelling units that are allowed to be constructed; however, PSR Analysis Areas SD15, VC67, and former CGSP Subareas CG6 and CG8 would allow the development of commercial or industrial uses in certain portions.

Project-Related Traffic and LOS Standards

The 2011 PEIR evaluated impacts from updated General Plan goals and policies, as well as buildout of land use designations applied throughout the County. The 2011 PEIR determined that buildout would result in potentially significant direct and cumulative impacts to 136 deficient roadway segments throughout the unincorporated County (approximately 31 State highway segments and 105 Mobility Element roadway segments). The full discussion of impacts is included in Section 2.15 of the 2011 PEIR and is hereby incorporated by reference.

The Proposed Project is estimated to result in an additional 1,826 potential dwelling units, 25 acres of commercial land use designations, and 13 acres of industrial land use designations in the PSR Analysis Areas and the former CGSP Area above the amount designated by the adopted General Plan. The proposed increase in land use density/intensity would result in an estimated 35,557 ADT being added onto the County's roadway network (Chen Ryan 2016, 2017). A summary of the anticipated Proposed Project trip generation by CPA/Subregion is shown in Table 2.15-5.

Projected Roadway Segment LOS Levels

Under implementation of the Proposed Project, projected growth within PSR Analysis Areas in Bonsall (BO18+), Fallbrook (FB2+, FB17, FB19+, FB21+), Valley Center (VC7+, VC51, VC57+, VC67), and Pala-Pauma (PP30) would cause segment volume to capacity ratio to fall below LOS D. The road segments to fall below LOS D are listed in Table 2.15-3 and Table 2.15-6.

Land use changes associated with the Proposed Project are anticipated to generate the most vehicular trips in the San Dieguito CPA (PSR Analysis Area SD15) and the Valley Center CPA (PSR Analysis Areas VC7+, VC51, VC57+, VC67), which would increase by 16,231 and 7,570, respectively. The Crest-Dehesa CPA (PSR Analysis Area CD14) would be affected the least with an addition of 70 ADT.

Table 2.15-4 shows the projected traffic operations under the Proposed Project within the PSR Analysis Areas and the former CGSP Area. The Mobility Element roadway segments projected to operate at LOS E or LOS F under the General Plan plus the Proposed Project, where the Proposed Project is anticipated to add additional traffic, were identified as having a project impact. The Proposed Project is considered to have a significant impact to a deficient roadway segment if the increased traffic to a particular roadway segment exceeds the allowable ADT increases on congested road segments (Table 2.15-1).

As shown in Table 2.15-3, the Proposed Project would potentially impact the following roadway segments for which the Mobility Element has not previously identified or accepted as operating at LOS E or LOS F under buildout of the adopted General Plan:

- Old Highway 395 between Fallbrook/Bonsall Boundary and West Lilac Road (LOS E)
- Old Highway 395 between Dulin Road West and Fallbrook/Bonsall Boundary (LOS E)
- Lilac Road between Couser Canyon Road and Keys Creek Road (LOS E)

The Proposed Project would potentially impact the following roadway segment which the Mobility Element has already accepted as operating at LOS E or LOS F under buildout of the adopted General Plan:

- Old Highway 395 between Dulin Road East and Dulin Road West (LOS E)

This segment was determined to be deficient as a result of buildout under the General Plan; therefore, the Proposed Project would contribute to a roadway segment in which a deficiency has already been accepted. The Proposed Project would result in new significant impacts to the other three road segments listed above for a total of two centerline miles, as shown in Table 2.15-7. Daily roadway analysis sheets for all Mobility Element roadways within the County are provided in Appendix E to this SEIR (Chen Ryan 2016, 2017).

State Highways

Table 2.15-6 displays the State highway facilities that are projected to operate at LOS E or LOS F under buildout of the adopted General Plan with the addition of 225 or more trips from the Proposed Project based on the criteria shown in Table 2.15-2. Consistent with Caltrans LOS methods for State highway facilities, roadway segment LOS was determined based on the anticipated peak hour roadway volume to capacity ratio, which was derived from the SANDAG Series 12 Model. Model results for this scenario are provided in Appendix E of this SEIR (Chen Ryan 2016, 2017).

As shown in Table 2.15-6, the Proposed Project would have an impact on one State highway segment, SR-76 from Valley Center Road to South Grade Road, for a total of five centerline miles, as shown in Table 2.15-8. The Mobility Element did not previously accept this roadway segment as operating at LOS E or LOS F under buildout of the adopted General Plan. Therefore, implementation of the Proposed Project would create a new significant impact on this segment:

- SR-76 between Valley Center Road and South Grade Road (LOS E)

Multiple federal regulations exist to ensure transportation facilities are operationally adequate within the County. Additionally, future development of roadways would be required to comply with CFR Title 23, Highways, which regulates the development of statewide transportation plans.

Future roadway development associated with the implementation of the Proposed Project would also be required to comply with existing County roadway standards, such as the San Diego County Public Road Standards, which provide design and construction requirements for public road improvement projects located within the unincorporated areas of San Diego County, and the County TIF Program, which requires residential, commercial, and industrial projects to pay a fee that defrays the costs of constructing planned transportation facilities necessary to accommodate increased traffic generated by future development.

In addition, any future discretionary development would be required to conduct environmental review pursuant to CEQA prior to approval. To adhere to CEQA statutes and guidelines, the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance Transportation and Traffic would be used to evaluate and mitigate project-level and cumulative impacts.

Adoption of the Valley Center Community Plan Residential Policy 8 Revision would allow for additional minimum lot size flexibility for residential clustering only within SR-2 or SR-4 areas and only within the sewer service area; however, the adoption would not result in an increase in the number of allowed dwelling units. Therefore, implementation of Valley Center Community Plan

Residential Policy 8 Revision would not result in a significant impact related to circulation system performance because it would not result in additional traffic.

The proposed increase in land use density/intensity would result in an estimated 35,557 ADT being added onto the County roadway network (Chen Ryan 2016, 2017). The Proposed Project would add new segments to Table M-4 of the Mobility Element, which lists road segments where adding traffic lanes is not justified to benefit increased road capacity. Appendix H provides the list of roads to be accepted or re-accepted to Table M-4 with rationales for acceptance at LOSE/F.

The Proposed Project would be required to comply with applicable federal, State, and local regulations, which would reduce the potential for additional impacts. **However, implementation of the Proposed Project would result in a potentially significant impact to traffic by exceeding an LOS threshold established by the County (Impact TR-1).**

2.15.3.2 Issue 2: Road Safety

Guidelines for Determination of Significance

Based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines and the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance Transportation and Traffic (DPLU 2011), the Proposed Project would have a significant impact if it would substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).

Impact Analysis

The 2011 PEIR determined that General Plan buildout would result in the adoption of a Mobility Element network that includes existing roadways with horizontal and vertical curves that are sharper than existing standards, resulting in potentially significant direct impacts. The discussion of impacts is included in Section 2.15 of the 2011 PEIR and is hereby incorporated by reference.

Project-Related Road Safety Impacts

Similar to the 2011 PEIR, direct impacts related to rural road safety would occur as a result of the Proposed Project through increased trips on two lane roads in rural areas that are not developed to current road safety standards. This includes existing roadways with horizontal and vertical curves that are sharper than existing standards. The Proposed Project would add traffic to roads with slow moving agricultural equipment. Traffic from the Proposed Project would also contribute to road safety conflicts with alternative transportation (pedestrians and bicyclists) and at-grade railroad crossings. In addition, there may be older rural roadways surrounding the PSR Analysis Areas and the former CGSP Area which would not be adequate according to existing roadway standards.

Adoption of the Valley Center Community Plan Residential Policy 8 Revision would allow for additional minimum lot size flexibility for residential clustering only within SR-2 or SR-4 areas and only within the sewer service area; however, the adoption would not result in an increase in the number of allowed dwelling units. Therefore, implementation of Valley Center Community Plan Residential Policy 8 Revision would not result in an impact related to hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses.

Multiple federal, State, and local regulations exist to prevent transportation hazards from occurring within the County. Federal regulations pertaining to transportation safety include those such as the American with Disabilities Act, which ensures disabled populations are safely and adequately provided with transportation facilities, and the Highway Capacity Manual, which provides safety

standards for transit throughout the Nation. The future roadway projects would also be required to comply with the existing County Zoning Ordinance Sections 6750-6799, the San Diego County Public Road Standards, and the San Diego County Private Road Standards which provide guidance for roadway and transportation facility development in an effort to ensure a safe roadway system throughout the County. **Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in potentially significant impact to transportation hazards due to design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) (Impact TR-2)**.

2.15.3.3 Issue 3: Emergency Access

Guidelines for Determination of Significance

Based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines the Proposed Project would have a significant impact if it would result in inadequate emergency access.

Impact Analysis

Section 2.15 (Transportation and Traffic), and hereby incorporated by reference, the 2011 PEIR determined that buildout under the adopted General Plan would result in existing inadequate roadway widths, dead-end roads, one-way roads, and gated communities continuing to occur in the unincorporated County, all of which would have the potential to impair emergency access. Section 2.7.3.7 (Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Issue 7: Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans) of this SEIR addresses potential impacts related to emergency response and evacuation plans, and is hereby incorporated by reference.

Project-Related Emergency Access Impacts

Impacts associated with emergency access would result in an adverse physical effect to people or the environment by potentially increasing the loss of life and property in the event of a disaster. Development that proposes large concentrations of people or special needs individuals, such as stadiums or hospitals, in an area with increased hazards, such as a dam inundation area, would potentially lead to adverse effects related to emergency access. Failure to provide reasonable access for emergency equipment and evacuation of civilians can also result in the major loss of life, property, and natural resources. Additionally, certain tall structures can physically interfere with the implementation of an emergency response if the height of the structure or tower interferes with the ability of emergency air support services to carry out missions associated with an emergency response (County 2011a).

Construction activities associated with development within the PSR Analysis Areas and the former CGSP Area would have the potential to interfere with emergency plans and procedures if authorities are not properly notified, or multiple projects are constructed during the same time and multiple roadways used for emergency routes are concurrently blocked. The growth associated with the Proposed Project (estimated increase of 1,826 potential dwelling units which translates to a potential population increase of 4,946) is not accounted for in current emergency response planning documents and would potentially need to be updated. PSR Analysis Areas located in rural areas that do not have existing high levels of density may not have the infrastructure required to provide adequate emergency response. PSR Analysis Areas including DS8, DS24, FB2+, FB17, FB19+, FB21+, ME26, ME30A, and PP30 may experience effects on emergency response as a result of the Proposed Project due to the low density character of these areas and a potential lack of infrastructure to facilitate emergency access. In addition, many of the PSR Analysis Areas contain dead end roads. This would cause an inadvertent impairment of the abilities of emergency

responders to respond to emergencies, potentially increasing the risk to loss of life and property in the event of an emergency.

Adoption of the Valley Center Community Plan Residential Policy 8 Revision would allow for additional minimum lot size flexibility for residential clustering only within SR-2 or SR-4 areas and only within the sewer service area; however, the adoption would not result in an increase in the number of allowed dwelling units. Therefore, implementation of Valley Center Community Plan Residential Policy 8 Revision would not result in an impact related to emergency access.

Multiple regulations relevant to the Proposed Project exist to ensure adequate emergency access exists within the County. The development of future roadway facilities would be required to comply with the County's Zoning Ordinance Sections 6750-6799, 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 be provided in new development. Additionally, the Proposed Project 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. Development under the General Plan would also be required to comply with CEQA, which requires that projects identify any potential emergency access hazards. Mitigation measures would be required for any significant impacts.

Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in the potential for inadequate emergency access due to increased traffic on a roadway network that is incomplete or not fully connected, or on dead-end or one-way roads. **Therefore, implementation of the Proposed Project would result in a potentially significant impact to emergency access (Impact TR-3).**

2.15.3.4 Issue 4: Alternative Transportation

Guidelines for Determination of Significance

Based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines and the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance Transportation and Traffic (DPLU 2011), the Proposed Project would have a significant impact if it would conflict with adopted General Plan policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

Impact Analysis

The 2011 PEIR determined that buildout under the General Plan would create provisions for alternative modes of transportation, including bike lanes, bus stops, trails, and sidewalks. The discussion of impacts can be found in Section 2.15 (Transportation and Traffic) and is hereby incorporated by reference. Many policies in the General Plan require coordination between the County and the agencies responsible for public transportation planning; however, previous alternative transportation plans and policies require modification to be consistent with the goals and policies contained in the adopted General Plan. In addition, many roadways and intersections in the County do not currently have pedestrian or bicycle facilities. The roadways and intersections designed prior to adoption of current road standards may have conditions that would potentially pose an increased risk if traffic volumes, pedestrian volumes, or bicycle volumes substantially increase along a road segment or at an intersection as a result of the Proposed Project. Thus, increased traffic generated by the Proposed Project would potentially cause a significant traffic operational impact to people walking or cycling.

The Proposed Project would not change any roadway, pedestrian or bicycle facilities within the PSR Analysis Areas or the former CGSP Area, but would allow for increased density and population growth that would increase demand for alternative modes of transportation within the Proposed Project areas. CPA/Subregions containing the PSR Analysis Areas and the former CGSP Area that would likely experience the greatest growth and thus greatest increase in demand for these facilities include Valley Center, Desert, and San Dieguito.

Adoption of the Valley Center Community Plan Residential Policy 8 Revision would allow for additional minimum lot size flexibility for residential clustering only within SR-2 or SR-4 areas and only within the sewer service area; however, the adoption would not result in an increase in the number of allowed dwelling units. Therefore, implementation of Valley Center Community Plan Residential Policy 8 Revision would not result in an impact related to alternative transportation.

Federal, State, and local regulations exist to promote alternative transportation development. Policies and regulations pertaining to alternative transportation include the following: the American with Disabilities Act, which requires pedestrian facility design to comply with accessibility standards; the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM 2010), which contains concepts, guidelines, and computational procedures for computing the capacity and quality of service of various roadway facilities, and the effects of transit, pedestrians, and bicycles on the performance of these systems; Transportation Development Act funds, which are used for the development and support of public transportation in California and are allocated to areas of each county based on population, taxable sales, and transit performance; and the County Zoning Ordinance which provides standards for bicycle parking and sidewalks. While existing County policies and regulations and adopted General Plan goals and policies are intended to promote alternative transportation plans and policies, implementation of the Proposed Project would require coordination between the County and the agencies responsible for public transportation planning, including SANDAG, Caltrans, transit agencies, and adjacent jurisdictions.

The Proposed Project would allow for increased density and population growth within the PSR Analysis Areas and the former CGSP Area that would increase demand for alternative modes of transportation. **Therefore, the Proposed Project would result in a potentially significant direct impact to alternative transportation plans and policies (Impact TR-4).**

2.15.4 Cumulative Impacts

The geographic scope for transportation routes and facilities within this cumulative analysis is the San Diego region, including both incorporated and unincorporated areas, and surrounding counties, unless otherwise stated below. Section 1.11 (Cumulative Project Assessment Overview) of this SEIR provides an update of new projects since the adoption of the General Plan that are considered in this cumulative analysis.

2.15.4.1 Issue 1: Traffic and Level of Service Standards

There are currently several development projects within the County that are seeking GPAs to request higher land use densities or increased intensity of land uses than currently permitted under the adopted General Plan. Tables 1-11 through 1-14 lists current projects seeking approval, such as Newland Sierra, Lilac Plaza, and Warner Springs Resort. At this time, it is unknown if these GPAs would be approved as currently proposed, revised to propose lower densities, or ultimately denied. It is also not known for certain how these projects would mitigate any new traffic related impacts associated with higher land use densities or if there would be associated changes to the County General Plan Mobility Element. Therefore, accurate cumulative impacts associated

with the GPAs in process cannot be determined at this time. However, as a worst-case scenario, traffic operations were evaluated assuming buildout of the adopted General Plan (including the approved 2014 GPAs) plus buildout of all the GPA projects currently in process, as well as the implementation of the Proposed Project.

The TIA identified the following 21 roadway segments as operating at LOS E or F under the cumulative conditions, including 2011 General Plan buildout, current GPAs in process, and the Proposed Project scenario (Chen Ryan 2016, 2017):

- Old Highway 395 between Fallbrook/Bonsall CPA Boundary and West Lilac Road (LOS F)
- Old Highway 395 between West Lilac Road and I-15 Northbound Ramp (LOS E)
- West Lilac Road between Old Highway 395 and Shirley Road (LOS F)
- Mission Road between Davis Drive and Stage Coach Lane (LOS F)
- Old Highway 395 between Mission Road and Reche Road (LOS F)
- Old Highway 395 between Dulin Road East and Dulin Road West (LOS F)
- Old Highway 395 between Dulin Road West and Fallbrook/Bonsall CPA Boundary (LOS F)
- Pala Mesa Drive between Daisy Lane and Old Highway 395 (LOS F)
- Del Dios Highway between West Via Rancho and San Dieguito CPA Boundary (LOS F)
- Deer Springs Road between I-15 Northbound Ramp and North Centre City Parkway (LOS F)
- Del Dios Highway between Luna De Miel and Elm Lane (LOS F)
- El Camino Del Norte between Val Sereno Drive and Via Roswitha (LOS F)
- La Bajada/La Granada between Rancho Santa Fe Road and Los Morros (LOS F)
- La Bajada/La Granada between Los Morros and Rambla De Las Flores (LOS F)
- Los Morros between La Bajada and La Granada (LOS F)
- Paseo Delicias between Del Dios Roundabout 3 and Del Dios Roundabout 1 (LOS F)
- Rancho Santa Fe Road between Community Boundary and La Bajada (LOS F)
- Jamacha Road between SR-125 Ramps and Sweetwater Road (LOS F)
- Lilac Road between Couser Canyon Road and Keys Creek Road (LOS F)
- Valley Center Road between Road 17 and Lilac Road (LOS E)
- West Lilac Road between Shirley Lane and Lilac Road (LOS F)

Cumulative projects would result in similar impacts to traffic and LOS standards as identified for the Proposed Project and would be expected to increase traffic within the region and potentially on these deficient roadway segments. As discussed in Section 2.15.3.1, the Proposed Project would conflict with the adopted Mobility Element or applicable CPA Mobility Element plans and policies establishing effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system and impacts would be potentially significant. Most cumulative projects would be required to comply with applicable federal, State, and local regulations, which would reduce impacts, although not to a level below significant. **Therefore, the Proposed Project, in combination with cumulative projects, would have the potential to result in a significant cumulative impact associated with traffic in excess of LOS standards, and thus the Proposed Project's contribution would be cumulatively considerable (Impact TR-5).**

2.15.4.2 Issue 2: Road Safety

Cumulative projects would result in similar impacts to rural road safety as identified for the Proposed Project. Cumulative projects would result in a potential increase in trips on two lane roads in rural areas that are not developed to current road safety standards and additional

cumulative traffic would contribute to increased road safety conflicts with alternative transportation (pedestrians and bicyclists) and at grade railroad crossings. Potentially significant impacts would be reduced with implementation of adopted General Plan policies, plans or programs and 2011 PEIR mitigation measures. However, cumulative impacts would not be reduced to a level below significant due to the infeasibility of mitigation measures as discussed in Section 2.15.5.2 below. **Therefore, the Proposed Project, in combination with cumulative projects, would contribute to a significant cumulative impact as a result of increased hazards due to a design feature or incompatible use (Impact TR-6).**

2.15.4.3 Issue 3: Emergency Access

Cumulative projects would encounter similar emergency access impairment issues as the Proposed Project with respect to existing inadequate roadway widths, dead-end roads, one-way roads and gated communities, all of which have the potential to impair emergency access. Although cumulative emergency access impacts would be limited to the immediate vicinity of the impact, multiple obstructions to emergency access along the same route to an emergency care facility may result in impaired emergency access. Most cumulative projects and applicable general plans, which propose the construction of new roadways, would be required to meet current State and applicable jurisdictional standards for emergency access. Community plans would also be required to consider local public and fire access roads to fully address emergency access requirements. Similar to cumulative projects, and discussed above in Section 2.15.3.3, the Proposed Project would result in direct impacts associated with emergency plans; however, the impacts to emergency access would be limited to the immediate vicinity of the project area, and impacts would be considered direct, not cumulative. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact.

2.15.4.4 Issue 4: Alternative Transportation

As with the Proposed Project, cumulative projects would potentially conflict with existing alternative transportation plans, policies, or programs. Future development projects that are inconsistent with the applicable general plan and require a GPA would create growth in areas that are not prepared to accommodate the alternative transportation needs of the increased population. Cumulative projects included in this category are the Warner Ranch development and Newland Sierra project, both of which propose a substantial increase in dwelling units and population in rural areas. The implementation of these projects may result in the increased need for alternative transportation as prescribed under the Regional Plan (SANDAG 2015); however, cumulative projects would be required to comply with existing regulations such as the Transportation Development Act which provides funds for the development and support of public transportation needs, and the County Zoning Ordinance, Sections 6750-6799, which sets the standards for parking (including bicycle space and storage) requirements for new land uses and structures. This would reduce the impacts associated with alternative transportation to a level below significant. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact associated with alternative transportation.

2.15.5 Mitigation

2.15.5.1 Issue 1: Traffic and Level of Service Standards

Implementation of the following adopted General Plan policies and 2011 PEIR mitigation measures would reduce direct **Impacts TR-1** and cumulative **Impact TR-5** but **not to a level below significant; therefore, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.**

Direct impacts conflicting with applicable plans, ordinances or policies establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system as a result of the Proposed Project would be significant and unavoidable. The reclassifications of the Mobility Element roads (to meet the LOS D standards of County Policy M-2.1) listed below would be necessary to reduce project traffic impacts to a level below significant:

- Old Highway 395 from the Fallbrook/Bonsall CPA Boundary to West Lilac Road: Reclassify roadway segment from a Community Collector with improvement options (2.1D) to a Boulevard with intermittent turn lane (4.2B).
- Old Highway 395 from Dulin Road East to Dulin Road West: Reclassify roadway segment from a Community Collector with improvement options (2.1D) to a Boulevard with intermittent turn lane (4.2B).
- Old Highway 395 from Dulin Road West to Fallbrook/Bonsall CPA Boundary: Reclassify roadway segment from a Community Collector with improvement options (2.1D) to a Boulevard with intermittent turn lane (4.2B).
- Lilac Road from Couser Canyon Road to Keys Creek Road: Reclassify roadway segment from a Minor Collector (2.3C) to a Minor Collector with intermittent turn lane (2.3B).
- Pala Road/SR-76 from Valley Center Road to South Grade Road: Reclassify roadway segment from Community Collector to (2.1D) to a 4-Lane State Highway (4.1A).

Table 2.15-9 lists and defines the Mobility Element roadway classifications; however, the Proposed Project is not proposing any reclassification of Mobility Element roadways. In accordance with adopted General Plan Goal M-2 under Policy M-2.1, the County has determined that it is more appropriate to maintain deficient LOS E or LOS F operations on the above list of roads.

The Proposed Project would have a direct impact to the following roadway segment that has already been accepted by the General Plan as operating at LOS E/F at buildout.

- Old Highway 395 from Dulin Road East to Dulin Road West

With respect to these roadway segments, the County has established the following LOS E/F criteria to define the conditions where a deficient LOS is acceptable because mitigation (increase in ME classification (i.e. wider road)) to fully reduce the impact would be infeasible for one or more of the reasons described below.

Impacts to Environmental and Cultural Resources: Construction of some roads would significantly impact important habitats, destroy archaeological sites, impact waterways, or require the demolition of historic landmarks. In addition, major physical and environmental constraints can severely hinder construction of needed improvements for some deficient roads. The adopted

General Plan policies seek to minimize environmental impacts and minimize road construction costs.

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

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

Regional Connectivity: Regional connectivity issues would apply when congestion on State freeways and highways causes regional travelers to use county roads, resulting in congestion on the county road network. Rather than widening county roads to accommodate this traffic, the deficiencies in the regional road network should be addressed.

Appendix G of the 2011 PEIR identifies the rationale by which the roadways were accepted at LOS E/F. Appendix H of this SEIR provides the rationales for acceptance at LOS E/F for the impacted roads associated with the Proposed Project.

Therefore, as stated above, the Proposed Project does not propose any increase in classification to Mobility Element Roadways, but instead will add the impacted road segments to the County's list of roadways accepted at LOS E/F (Table M-4).

Adopted General Plan Policies

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Sufficient capacity consistent with the County General Plan Land Use Map.

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

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

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

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

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

Adopted 2011 PEIR Mitigation Measures

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

Tra-1.3: Implement the County Public Road Standards during review of new development projects. In addition, revise the Public Road Standards to include a range of road types according to Regional Category context.

Tra-1.4: Implement and revise as necessary the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Transportation and Traffic to evaluate adverse environmental effects of projects and require mitigation when significant impacts are identified.

Tra-1.5: Implement the Congestion Management Strategies identified in the Regional Transportation Plan and require large projects to mitigate impacts to State highways and freeways.

Tra-1.6: Develop project review procedures to require large commercial and office development to use Transportation Demand Management Programs to reduce single-occupant vehicle traffic generation and to prepare and forward annual reports to the County on the effectiveness of the program.

Tra-1.7: Implement the San Diego County TIF Ordinance, which defrays the costs of constructing planned transportation facilities necessary to accommodate increased traffic generated by future development.

2.15.5.2 Issue 2: Road Safety

The following adopted General Plan policies would reduce direct **Impact TR-2** and cumulative **Impact TR-6** but **not to a level below significant; therefore, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable**.

Adopted General Plan Policies

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

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

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

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

Policy M-4.5: Context Sensitive Road Design. Design and construct roads that are compatible with the local terrain and the uses, scale and pattern of the surrounding development. Provide wildlife crossings in road design and construction where it would minimize impacts in wildlife corridors.

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

Adopted 2011 PEIR Mitigation Measures

In addition to the mitigation measure listed below, mitigation measures Tra-1.3, Tra-1.4, and Tra-1.7 listed in Section 2.15.5.1 for Issue 1 would further reduce **Impact TR-2** and **Impact TR-6** but not to a level below significant and are incorporated here by reference.

Tra-1.2: Coordinate with Caltrans and adjacent jurisdictions during planning and design for improvements to the freeway and State highway network.

2.15.5.3 Issue 3: Emergency Access

Implementation of the following adopted General Plan policies and 2011 PEIR mitigation measures would reduce direct **Impact TR-3** to a level below significant.

Adopted General Plan Policies

In addition to the adopted General Plan policies listed below, General Plan policies LU-12.2 and M-1.2 listed in Section 2.15.5.1 for Issue 1 and LU-2.8, LU-6.10, and M-4.4 listed in Section 2.15.5.2 for Issue 2 would further reduce impacts to a level below significant and are incorporated here by reference.

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

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

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

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

Adopted 2011 PEIR Mitigation Measures

In addition to the mitigation measures listed below, mitigation measures Tra-1.3, Tra-1.4, and Tra-1.6 listed above in Section 2.15.5.1 for Issue 1 would further reduce direct **Impact TR-3** to a level below significant.

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

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

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

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

2.15.5.4 Issue 4: Alternative Transportation

Implementation of the following adopted General Plan policies and 2011 PEIR mitigation measures would reduce direct **Impact TR-4** to a level below significant.

Adopted General Plan Policies

In addition to the adopted General Plan policies listed below, General Plan policies LU-5.1, M-4.3, and M-9.2 listed above under Issues 1 through 3 would further reduce impacts to a level below significant and are incorporated here by reference.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Policy M-8.1: Maximize Transit Service Opportunities. Coordinate with SANDAG, the CTSA, NCTD, and MTS to provide capital facilities and funding, where appropriate, to:

- Maximize opportunities for transit services in unincorporated communities.
- Maximize the speed and efficiency of transit service through the development of transit priority treatments such as transit signal priority, transit queue jump lanes, and dedicated transit only lanes.
- Provide for transit-dependent segments of the population, such as the disabled, seniors, low income, and children, where possible.

- Reserve adequate rights-of-way to accommodate existing and planned transit facilities including bus stops.

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

Policy M-8.3: Transit Stops That Facilitate Ridership. Coordinate with SANDAG, NCTD, and MTS to locate transit stops and facilities in areas that facilitate transit ridership, and designate such locations as part of planning efforts for town centers, transit nodes, and largescale commercial or residential development projects. Ensure that the planning of town centers and village cores incorporates uses that support the use of transit, including multi-family residential and mixed-use transit-oriented development, when appropriate.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Adopted 2011 PEIR Mitigation Measures

In addition to the mitigation measures listed below, mitigation measures Tra-4.1 and Tra-4.2 listed above in Section 2.15.5.1 and 2.15.5.3 for Issues 1 and 3 would further reduce direct **Impact TR-4** associated with alternative transportation to a level below significant.

Tra-6.1: During Community Plan updates, establish policies and design guidelines that encourage commercial centers in compact walkable configurations and discourage “strip” commercial development.

Tra-6.2: Establish comprehensive planning principles for transit nodes such as the SPRINTER Stations located in North County Metro.

Tra-6.3: Locate county facilities near transit facilities, whenever feasible.

Tra-6.4: Coordinate with SANDAG, Caltrans, and tribal governments to maximize opportunities to locate park and ride facilities.

Tra-6.5: Coordinate with SANDAG, Caltrans, and transit agencies to expand the mass transit opportunities in the unincorporated county and to review the location and design of transit stops. Establish a Planning and Development Services transit coordinator to ensure land use issues are being addressed.

Tra-6.6: Review the improvement plans for railroad facilities in the unincorporated county.

Tra-6.7: Implement and revise the County Bicycle Transportation Plan every five years, or as necessary, to identify a long-range county bicycle network and qualify for State or other funding sources. Coordinate revisions to the County Bicycle Transportation Plan with the County Trails Program.

Tra-6.8: Coordinate with SANDAG in the development of a Regional Bicycle Plan to ensure consistency with County transportation plans. Coordinate revisions to the SANDAG Regional Bicycle Plan with the County Trails Program.

Tra-6.9: Implement and revise as necessary the County Trails Program for trail development and management. Implement and revise as necessary the Community Trails Master Plan, which incorporates adopted individual community trail and pathway plans, based on community goals, policies, and implementation criteria.

2.15.6 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. Section 1.11 (Cumulative Project Assessment Overview) of this SEIR provides an update of new projects since the adoption of the General Plan that are considered in this cumulative analysis.

2.15.6.1 Issue 1: Traffic and Level of Service Standards

Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in a potentially significant impact to traffic by exceeding an LOS threshold established by the County (Impact TR-1). The Proposed Project would accept the four newly deficient roads at failing LOS and accept new trips on an already accepted deficient road per the General Plan Mobility Element criteria for acceptance of LOS E/F; however, these actions would not reduce traffic impacts related to LOS standards. Additionally, the Proposed Project, in combination with cumulative projects, would have the potential to result in a significant cumulative impact associated with traffic in excess of LOS standards, and thus the Proposed Project contribution would be cumulatively considerable (Impact TR-5). **Implementation of adopted General Plan policies and 2011 PEIR mitigation measures would reduce direct Impact TR-1 and cumulative Impact TR-5 but not to a level below significant; therefore, the Proposed Project's impacts would remain significant and unavoidable**.

2.15.6.2 Issue 2: Road Safety

Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in a potentially significant impact to hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses (Impact TR-2). Additionally, the Proposed Project would contribute to a significant cumulative impact as a result of increased hazards due to a design feature or incompatible use (Impact TR-6). With the implementation of the adopted General Plan policies and 2011 PEIR mitigation measures, as well as additional mitigation, Impact TR-2 and Impact TR-6 would be reduced but not to a level below significant. **Therefore, direct Impact TR-2 and cumulative Impact TR-6 associated with road safety under implementation of the Proposed Project would remain significant and unavoidable.**

2.15.6.3 Issue 3: Emergency Access

Direct impacts related to emergency access within the Proposed Project areas would occur resulting in a potentially significant direct impact (Impact TR-3). The Proposed Project would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact as a result of impaired emergency access. Implementation of the adopted General Plan policies and 2011 PEIR mitigation measures would reduce Impact TR-3 to a level below significant**.**

2.15.6.4 Issue 4: Alternative Transportation

The Proposed Project would allow for increased density and population growth in the Project areas that would increase demand for alternative modes of transportation, requiring coordination between the County and the agencies responsible for public transportation planning, including SANDAG, Caltrans, transit agencies, and adjacent jurisdictions. In addition, the Proposed Project includes private and dead-end roads, which would complicate alternative transportation means within those areas. Therefore, the Proposed Project would result in a potentially significant direct impact to alternative transportation plans and policies (Impact TR-4). Implementation of the adopted General Plan policies and 2011 PEIR mitigation measures would reduce Impact TR-4 to a level below significant. The Proposed Project would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact to alternative transportation plans and policies.

Table 2.15-1 Allowable Average Daily Trips Increases on 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

ADT = Average Daily Trips; LOS = Level of Service
Source: County 2011a

Table 2.15-2 Allowable Average Daily Trips on Two Lane Highways with Signalized Intersection Spacing Over One Mile

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

ADT = Average Daily Trips; LOS = Level of Service
Source: County 2011a

Table 2.15-3 Deficient Roadway Segments – 2011 General Plan Buildout Plus Proposed Project

CPA/ Subregion	Road Segment	Mobility Element Classification	Capacity	Total ADT	LOS	Project ADT	General Plan Accepted Deficient Roadway?
Bonsall	Old Highway 395 – from Fallbrook/Bonsall Boundary to West Lilac Road	2.1D	19,000	18,400	E	825	No
Fallbrook	Old Highway 395 – from Dulin Road East to Dulin Road West	2.1D	19,000	18,900	E	805	Yes
	Old Highway 395 – from Dulin Road West to Fallbrook/ Bonsall Boundary	2.1D	19,000	18,900	E	805	No
Valley Center	Lilac Road – from Couser Canyon Road to Keys Creek Road	2.3C	8,000	7,800	E	350	No

ADT = Average Daily Trips; LOS = Level of Service
Source: Chen Ryan 2016, 2017

Table 2.15-4 Proposed Project Trip Generation by PSR Analysis Area/Former CGSP Area

CPA/Subregion	PSR Analysis Area/ Former CGSP Area	Additional Land Use	Dwelling Unit Increase or Acreage Associated w/Proposed Project	Daily Trip Generation Rate per Dwelling Unit or Acre	Additional ADT
Bonsall	BO18+	Single Family	67	10	670
	CG1, CG6, CG7, CG8 (Referral Map and preliminary staff rec)	Single Family	7	10	70
	CG6, CG8 (Referral Map and preliminary staff rec)	Rural Commercial(1)	6 acres	246/acre	1,476
Crest-Dehesa	CD14	Single Family	7	10	70
Desert	DS8	Single Family	389	10	3,890
	DS24	Single Family	153	10	1,530
Fallbrook	FB2+	Single Family	16	10	160
	FB17	Single Family	33	10	330
	FB19+	Single Family	1	10	10
	FB21+	Single Family	7	10	70
Mountain Empire	ME26	Single Family	26	10	260
	ME30A	Single Family	29	10	290
North County Metro	NC3A	Single Family	11	10	110
	NC18A	Single Family	34	10	340
	NC22	Single Family	52	10	520
	NC37	Single Family	12	10	120
	NC38+	Single Family	38	10	380
	CG5 (Referral Map)	Single Family	5	10	50
Pala-Pauma	PP30	Single Family	122	10	1,220
San Dieguito	SD15	Single Family	301	10	3,010
	SD15	General Commercial(1)	19 acres	685/acre	13,221
Valley Center	VC7+	Single Family	253	10	2,530
	VC51	Single Family	13	10	130
	VC57+	Single Family	231	10	2,310
	VC67	Medium Impact Industrial	13 acres	200/acre	2,600
	CG2, CG3, CG4 (Referral Map)	Single Family	19	10	190
				Total:	**35,557**

ADT = Average Daily Trips

(1) No trip generation rate for rural or general commercial is provided in the SANDAG Not So Brief Guide to Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates; therefore, the trip generation rate is based on the rate used in the SANDAG Series 12 Transportation Forecast Model.

Source: Chen Ryan 2016, 2017

Table 2.15-5 Proposed Project Trip Generation by CPA/Subregion

CPA/Subregion	Additional Average Daily Trips
Bonsall	670
Crest-Dehesa	70
Desert	5,420
Fallbrook	570
Mountain Empire	550
North County Metro	1,470
Pala-Pauma	1,220
San Dieguito	16,231
Valley Center	7,570
Champagne Gardens (Bonsall, North County Metro and Valley Center)	1,786
Total:	**35,557**

Source: Chen Ryan 2016, 2017

Table 2.15-6 Deficient State Highways – 2011 General Plan Buildout Plus Proposed Project Conditions

Community	Road Segment	Mobility Element Classification	Capacity	Total ADT	LOS	Project ADT	General Plan Accepted Deficient Roadway?
Pala-Pauma	SR-76 –from Valley Center Road to South Grade Road	2.1D	19,000	18,900	E	491	No

ADT = Average Daily Trips; LOS = Level of Service
Source: Chen Ryan 2016, 2017

Table 2.15-7 Impacted County Roadway Centerline Miles by CPA/Subregion

	Mobility Element Accepted as Deficient?		
CPA/Subregion	**No (Miles)**	**Yes (Miles)**	**Total (Miles)**
Bonsall	1.0	0.0	1.0
Fallbrook	0.4	0.2	0.6
Valley Center	0.6	0.0	0.6
Total:	2.0	0.2	2.2

Source: Chen Ryan 2016, 2017

Table 2.15-8 Impacted State Highway Centerline Miles by CPA/Subregion

	Mobility Element Accepted as Deficient?		
CPA/Subregion	**No (Miles)**	**Yes (Miles)**	**Total (Miles)**
Pala-Pauma	5.0	0.0	5.0
Total:	5.0	0.0	5.0

Source: Chen Ryan 2016, 2017

Table 2.15-9 Mobility Element Road Classifications

Mobility Element Classification	Road Classification	Description
2.1A	Community Collector with Raised Median	The raised median provides more capacity, controls turn movements, and improves flow.
2.1D	Community Collector with Improvement Options	Road type with wider ROW for added flexibility to accommodate improvement options such as turn lanes, medians, or passing lanes.
2.2A	Light Collector with Raised Median	The median provides a separation between travel lanes; controls turn movements, and improves traffic flow.
2.2C	Light Collector with Intermittent Turn Lanes	Dedicated intermittent turn lanes provide more capacity and improve traffic flow.
2.2D	Light Collector with Improvement Options	Has a wider ROW for added flexibility to accommodate improvement options such as turn lanes, medians, or passing lanes.
2.2E	Light Collector	Roadway has no special features and accommodates low to medium traffic volumes, where turning movements are infrequent, and where non-motorized traffic and physical constraints are limited.
2.2F	Light Collector with Reduced Shoulder	Roadway with two-foot shoulder, a rolled curb with graded pathway, and a narrow ROW. In some instances, the shoulder can be widened to six feet to serve as a bicycle lane.
2.3C	Minor Collector	No additional features and is primarily intended for residential neighborhoods or for rural areas with steep slopes and physical constraints.
4.1A	Major Road with Raised Median	Appropriate for regional travel between communities where higher traffic volumes are forecast.
4.1B	Major Road with Intermittent Turn Lanes	Typically used in areas where turning movements are infrequent or where ROW is limited
4.2A	Boulevard with Raised Median	Increased road capacity and access control by providing a separation between travel lanes and dedicated turn lanes, along with a wide parkway to accommodate non-motorized circulation.
4.2B	Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes	Typically used where turning movements are infrequent or where ROW is limited.

Source: Chen Ryan 2016, 2017

This page intentionally left blank.