2.12 Transportation and Traffic

This section summarizes the potential impacts to transportation resources and traffic that could result from implementation of the project.

The County received comments concerning access to transit, expansion of bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, parking, and transportation demand management strategies during the Notice of Preparation (NOP) scoping process. A copy of the NOP and comment letters received in response to the NOP are included in Appendix A of this Draft Supplement to the 2011 General Plan Update (GPU) Program Environmental Impact Report (2011 GPU PEIR) (Draft SEIR).

2.12.1 Existing Conditions

The 2011 GPU PEIR included a discussion of existing conditions related to transportation and traffic in Section 2.15, on pages 2.15-1 through 2.15-103 which includes all roadways within the unincorporated county. Some new ordinances have been adopted (e.g., Agricultural Promotion Ordinance) that resulted in the identification of additional roadway segments at a failing level-of-service (LOS) (LOS "E" or "F") and resulted in an amendment to Table M-4 of the Mobility Element of the 2011 GPU. However, no changes in existing conditions have been identified that would alter the conclusions in the 2011 GPU PEIR. The conclusions of Section 2.15.1 of the 2011 GPU PEIR continue to apply and are hereby incorporated by reference.

Implementation of the project may have a positive impact on traffic because of implementation of greenhouse gas (GHG) Reduction Measures T-2.1, T-2.2, T-2.3, T-2.4 and Supporting Efforts in the Built Environment and Transportation Category that would result in new or expanded park-and-ride facilities, bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, and an emphasis on ridesharing opportunities. In addition, SB 743 was enacted in 2013 and this legislation changes the approach to determining traffic-related impacts in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) from the LOS method which evaluates the amount of delay that drivers experience at intersections and on roadways to a focus on vehicle miles traveled to, in part, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and create multimodal networks. The law requires the Governor's Office of Planning and Research to change the CEQA Guidelines related to traffic impacts that the County would be required to implement.

2.12.2 Regulatory Framework

The 2011 GPU PEIR included a summary of the Regulatory Framework related to transportation and traffic in Chapter 2.15, pages 2.15-12 through 2.15-16, and it is hereby incorporated by reference. Specific regulations discussed in the 2011 GPU PEIR and applicable to the project include the following:

Federal

- Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)

- Highway Capacity Model 2000 (HCM 2000) prepared by the federal Transportation Research Board (TRB)

- Title 23, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 450.220 as revised on April 1, 2005

- Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU)

State

- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Standards
- Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)
- Transportation Development Act (TDA)

Local

- Community Plans

- County Zoning Ordinance, Parking Regulations, Sections 6750 – 6799

- San Diego County Public Road Standards

- San Diego County Private Road Standards

- County of San Diego Consolidated Fire Code (CFC)

- County of San Diego Regulatory Ordinances, Sections 77.201 – 77.220, Transportation Impact Fee (TIF)

- County Community Right-of-Way Development Standards

- Regional Transportation Plans and Programs, including the ~~2030 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)~~San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan, the 20~~0~~16 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), and ~~the Congestion Management Program (CMP)~~amendments.

Since certification of the 2011 GPU PEIR, additional regulatory guidance has been enacted. Relevant additions to the Regulatory Framework as presented in the 2011 GPU PEIR include the following:

- Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) was enacted in 2012 as a replacement for SAFETEA-LU. MAP-21 is a funding and authorization bill to govern United States federal surface transportation spending. While MAP-21 did not substantially alter funding from SAFETEA-LU, it did provide many significant reforms.

- Senate Bill (SB) 743, discussed above, changes the focus of transportation analyses from LOS to focus on other factors.

Adopted 2011 GPU Policies

The policies addressing transportation and traffic that were adopted as part of the 2011 GPU and are applicable to the project include the following:

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

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

Policy LU-5.5: Projects that Impede Non-Motorized Travel. Ensure that development projects and road improvements do not impede bicycle and pedestrian access. Where impacts to existing planned routes would occur, ensure that impacts are mitigated and acceptable alternative routes are implemented.

Policy LU-6.9: Development Conformance with Topography. Require development to conform to the natural topography to limit grading; incorporate and not significantly alter the dominant physical characteristics of a site; and to utilize natural drainage and topography in conveying stormwater to the maximum extent practicable.

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

Policy LU-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-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-11.6: 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 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. Consider narrower rights-of-way, flexibility in design standards, and lower design speeds in areas planned for substantial development in order to avoid bisecting communities or town centers. 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 text box on pages 4-13 through 4-14 (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, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and equestrian.

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

Policy M-4.2: 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-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-4.6: Interjurisdictional Coordination. Coordinate with adjacent jurisdictions so that roads within Spheres of Influence (SOIs) or that cross jurisdictional boundaries are designed to provide a consistent cross-section and capacity. To the extent practical, coordinate with adjacent jurisdictions to construct road improvements concurrently or sequentially to optimize and maintain road capacity.

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; and
- 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-8.1: Maximize Transit Service Opportunities. Coordinate with San Diego Association of Governments (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; and
- 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, whenever possible.

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

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

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

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

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

Policy M-8.8: Shuttles Coordinate with Tribal governments, the Reservation Transportation Authority, and other large employers to provide shuttles and other means of connecting transit stops with job locations, civic, and commercial uses, where appropriate.

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.

Policy M-9.3: Preferred Parking. Encourage and provide incentives for commercial, office, and industrial development to provide preferred parking for carpools, vanpools, electric vehicles and flex cars. [Refer also to Policy COS-16.3 (Low-Emission Vehicles) in the Conservation and Open Space Element.] Encourage parking cash out programs to reimburse employees for the cost of "free" on-site parking to provide incentives to use alternate modes of travel and to reduce parking requirements (see also Policy M-10.5).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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, including both on-street facilities as well as off-street bikeways, to safely serve the full range of intended users, along with 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.

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.

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 GPU PEIR Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures addressing transportation and traffic that were adopted as part of the 2011 GPU PEIR and are applicable to the project include the following:

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

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

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

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

Tra-1.6 Develop project review procedures to require large commercial and office development to use Transportation Demand Management Programs to reduce single-

occupant vehicle traffic generation and to prepare and forward annual reports to the County on the effectiveness of the program.

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

Tra-2.1 Establish coordination efforts with other jurisdictions when development projects will result in a significant impact on city roads. When available, use the applicable jurisdiction's significance thresholds and recommended mitigation measures to evaluate and mitigate impacts.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Tra-6.3 Locate County facilities near transit facilities, whenever feasible.

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

Tra-6.5 Coordinate with SANDAG, Caltrans, and transit agencies to expand the mass transit opportunities in the unincorporated county and to review the location and design of transit stops. Establish a DPLU 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.

2.12.3 Issues Not Discussed Further

As described in Chapter 1.0, Project Description, in response to litigation and considering legislative changes that have occurred since preparation of the 2012 Climate Action Plan (CAP), the County prepared a new CAP (subject of this Draft SEIR). The CAP and the targets and strategies identified therein necessitate changes to Goal COS-20 and Policy COS-20.1 of the 2011 GPU and mitigation adopted in the 2011 GPU PEIR, Mitigation Measures CC-1.2, CC-1.7, and CC-1.8 to attain consistency with current legislative requirements. These changes require a General Plan Amendment to the County's General Plan and revision to the associated mitigation monitoring and reporting program (hereafter these two actions collectively refer to as [GPA]) as part of the administrative approval process. The Draft SEIR evaluates the GPA as part of the actions associated with the CAP because the changes reflected in the GPA support and are consistent with implementation of the CAP and its GHG targets and GHG reduction measures. Therefore, the GPA is not addressed as a separate impact discussion below, but its impacts are included within the overall impact analysis of the CAP.

The Draft SEIR also evaluates the impacts associated with the implementation of proposed GHG Threshold, Guidelines for Determining Significance for Climate Change (Guidelines), and the Report Format and Content Requirements. The proposed GHG Threshold requires consistency with the CAP, and is the level below which a project would be determined to result in less-than-significant GHG impacts. To achieve consistency, a project will be required to implement the applicable GHG reduction measures outlined in

the CAP. All measures have been evaluated throughout the Draft SEIR. Therefore, adoption of a GHG Threshold that establishes a requirement to be consistent with the CAP, the individual measures of which have been evaluated throughout this Draft SEIR, would not require a separate impact analysis because the impacts of establishing that threshold and what it would take to meet the threshold have been fully evaluated.

The Guidelines would provide direction to project applicants on how a project could achieve consistency with the CAP. The Guidelines are proposed to include a checklist that would require applicants to demonstrate how a project would be consistent with the CAP including through implementation of GHG reduction measures. The specific actions that would result from the Guidelines would be project-specific implementation of approved GHG reduction measures, the environmental impacts of which have been evaluated throughout this Draft SEIR. Therefore, evaluation of the Guidelines as a separate impact discussion is not provided below.

Finally, the Report Format and Content Requirements document would not result in any physical impact on the environment as it simply details the format for how reports should be written. As a result, this document is also not separately discussed below.

In summary, the GPA, GHG Threshold, Guidelines and Report Format and Content Requirements are not addressed as a separate impact discussion below. The GPA, GHG Threshold, and Guidelines are combined in the overall impact analysis of the CAP, while the Report Format and Content Requirement document provides technical direction to future project applicants and will not result in any physical impacts.

2.12.4 Analysis of Project and Cumulative Impacts

The project and cumulative impact analysis study area for transportation and traffic in the 2011 GPU PEIR was identified as the entire unincorporated county. The CAP would apply to the unincorporated county, and utilizes the same project and cumulative study area for transportation and traffic as the 2011 GPU PEIR, which is hereby incorporated by reference.

Proposed GHG Reduction Measures

Table 1-1 of this Draft SEIR, provides a list of proposed GHG reduction measures and supporting efforts that would be implemented by the CAP. However, only those measures that are relevant to transportation and traffic and could potentially result in a significant impact within the unincorporated county are described and evaluated below. None of the proposed measures indicate where specific improvements would be constructed, their size, or specific characteristics. As a program EIR, the Draft SEIR does not, and cannot, speculate on the individual environmental impacts of specific future projects/improvements. However, implementation of all GHG reduction measures and supporting efforts were considered during preparation of the Draft SEIR, to the degree specific information about implementation is known. Consistent with the requirements of CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, this Draft SEIR provides a programmatic discussion of the potential general impacts

of implementing these measures, rather than project-level or site-specific physical impacts of such actions. This is consistent with the scope of analysis in the 2011 GPU PEIR.

Strategy T-2: Shift Towards Alternative Modes of Transportation

Measure T-2.1: Improve Roadway Segments as Multi-Modal. Improve roadway segments, intersections, and bikeways to implement multi-modal enhancements for pedestrian and cyclist comfort and safety along County-maintained public roads by improving 700 centerline miles of roadway segments, including 250 intersections and 210 lane miles of bikeway improvements by 2030 and an additional 500 centerline miles of roadway segments, including 250 intersections and 210 lane miles of bikeway improvements by 2050. This measure would implement roadway improvements to reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) by calming traffic and improving the bicyclist and pedestrian infrastructure and would occur as part of resurfacing projects within existing paved areas.

Measure T-2.4: Shared and Reduced Parking in New Non-Residential Development. Require shared and reduced parking for all new non-residential development to reduce new commute VMT by 10% by 2030. This measure would result in increased opportunities to minimize the amount of required parking with new non-residential development through a coordinated effort to share parking as feasible. This would result in typical construction activities at the time of new development.

Strategy T-3: Decarbonize On-Road and Off-Road Vehicle Fleet

Measure T-3.5: Install Electric Vehicle Charging Stations. Install a total of 2,040 Level 2 electric vehicle charging stations (EVCS) through public-private partnerships at priority locations in the unincorporated county by 2030. Implementation of this measure could result in nominal construction activities.

Supporting Efforts for the Built Environment and Transportation Category

- Collaborate with incorporated cities, California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), and SANDAG to consider additional park-and-ride facilities.

- Collaborate with SANDAG to encourage installation of EV charging stations in new residential and non-residential developments.

Strategy E-2: Increase Renewable Energy Use

Measure E-2.1: Increase Renewable Electricity. Achieve 90% renewable electricity for the unincorporated county by 2030. Would require the County to establish a renewable energy program. This could result in the construction of distributed generation (small-scale renewables) on new and existing buildings, including solar, wind-turbines, and energy storage solutions. This measure may

directly or indirectly contribute to the development of large-scale renewable energy facilities that could affect local roadways.

Supporting Effort for the Water and Wastewater Category

Work with Padre Dam Municipal Water District (MWD) to advance the East County Advanced Water Purification (AWP) Program

2.12.4.1 Issue 1: LOS and Conflicts with Plans, Ordinances, or Policies Establishing Measures of Effectiveness for Circulation System

This section describes potential project and cumulative impacts related to transportation and traffic including increases in traffic or exceedance of LOS standards within the county or in adjacent cities, conflicts with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of the effectiveness of the circulation system and conflicts with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. The evaluation of transportation-related topics has been consolidated into one discussion for the sake of brevity because the physical changes resulting from implementation of the GHG reduction measures and supporting efforts are confined to construction activities and would result in the same discussion for each issue area.

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, the project would have a significant impact if it would:

- Cause an increase in traffic (within the unincorporated county or in adjacent cities) 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).

- Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard (within the unincorporated county or in adjacent cities) established by the County Congestion Management Agency for designated roads or highways.

- Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.

- Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of the effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to

intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths and mass transit.

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

Impact Analysis

2011 GPU PEIR Determination

The 2011 GPU PEIR evaluated impacts related to unincorporated county traffic and LOS standards, adjacent cities traffic and LOS standards, parking capacity, and alternative transportation related to the adoption of the goals and policies contained within the plan and buildout of the land use map. The 2011 GPU PEIR determined that buildout under the 2011 GPU would result in significant and unavoidable project and cumulative impacts related to traffic and LOS standards, but that mitigation would reduce project and cumulative impacts related to parking capacity and alternative transportation to less-than-significant levels.

The 2011 GPU PEIR determined that while mitigation measures would reduce potentially significant impacts related to traffic and LOS standards, mitigation could not be guaranteed and impacts would, therefore, be significant and unavoidable. Regarding parking capacity and alternative transportation, impacts would be reduced to less than significant following compliance with the mitigation measures discussed in the analysis. The discussion of impacts can be found in Chapter 2.15, Transportation and Traffic, pages 2.15-17 through 2.15-30; and 2.15-35 through 2.15-39, and is hereby incorporated by reference. Specific 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures related to transportation and traffic are listed above under Section 2.12.2, Regulatory Framework.

CAP Impact Analysis

Implementation of the CAP has the potential to result in significant impacts related to conflicts with transportation and traffic policies and plans from GHG reduction measures and supporting efforts would include construction and operation of bicycle, pedestrian, EVCS, park-and-ride, and shared parking facilities; and large-scale renewable energy systems including photovoltaic solar, concentrated solar, wind turbines, and geothermal systems that were not explicitly evaluated within the 2011 GPU PEIR. The County's 2012 Wind Energy Ordinance EIR (2012 Wind Energy EIR) evaluated impacts specifically related to the development of large-scale wind turbines and impacts from that document are summarized below and hereby incorporated by reference (San Diego County 2012). Additionally, the Padre Dam MWD's Comprehensive Facilities Master Plan PEIR (Padre Dam PEIR) evaluated impacts related to the development/expansion of water purification infrastructure and impacts that are associated with the Supporting Effort for the Water and Wastewater Category. The analysis from that document is summarized below and hereby incorporated by reference (Padre Dam MWD 2017).

The following section describes the potentially significant impacts related to transportation and traffic that could result from the implementation of the CAP.

Bicycle, Pedestrian, EVCS, Park-and-Ride, and Shared Parking Projects

Implementation of GHG Reduction Measures T-2.1, T-2.4, T-3.5 and Supporting Efforts within the Built Environment and Transportation Category could result in bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, installation of new EVCS, new or expanded park-and-ride facilities, and shared parking. Implementation of small traffic infrastructure projects such as bicycle, pedestrian, EVCS, park-and-ride, or shared parking projects may result in temporary construction-related impacts or minor delays/detours, but would not result in conflicts with plans, policies, or regulations intended to manage circulation, or conflict with transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. Additionally, these projects would not result in operational conflicts with any plans, policies, or regulations intended to manage circulation because the intent of the projects is to provide expanded or new multi-modal transportation infrastructure that would accommodate non-automotive forms of transportation and reduce the number of vehicles on the road. The fundamental purpose of these projects would be to reduce VMT within the county by expanding transportation opportunities.

Future discretionary projects would be required to be evaluated for project-specific impacts under CEQA at the time of application and project-specific mitigation would minimize or eliminate impacts related to conflicts with plans, policies, or regulations intended to manage circulation and provide bicycle and pedestrian facilities to the extent feasible in compliance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4. As explained in the 2011 GPU PEIR, implementation of the 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures listed above would reduce potential impacts. With implementation of the applicable 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures; compliance with existing federal, state, and local regulations that regulate traffic; and completion of subsequent project-level planning and environmental review, potential transportation impacts because of the construction and operation of bicycle, pedestrian, EVCS, park-and-ride, and shared parking projects would be **less than significant.**

Cumulative Impacts

Impacts would be cumulative in nature if construction or operation impacts associated with cumulative regional land use projects combined with the project would have the potential to exceed traffic standards, conflict with plans, ordinances, or policies establishing measures of effectiveness for circulation systems, or the use of adopted projections from a general plan, other regional planning document, or a certified EIR for such a planning document. This analysis uses a combination of the list and planning document approach, as described in Chapter 1, Project Description. Physical improvements resulting from implementation of the CAP have the potential to combine with the physical impacts of other past, present, or probable future projects in the County and could result in a cumulative impact based upon proximity and construction schedule. **Table 1-3** in the Project Description contains a list of past, present, and probable future projects that when combined with the project, could result in a cumulatively considerable effect. Cumulative impacts could also result when the physical improvements resulting

from implementation of the CAP interact with development associated with build-out of the County's General Plan and potentially increase those impacts resulting in a cumulatively considerable effect.

The 2011 GPU PEIR concluded transportation and traffic impacts would be potentially significant and unavoidable because the 2011 GPU would result in increased traffic delays and deterioration of LOS. With implementation of mitigation from the 2011 GPU PEIR, these impacts would be reduced, but not to a less-than-significant level. As discussed above, small traffic infrastructure projects such as bicycle, pedestrian, EVCS, park-and-ride, and shared parking projects would result in construction-related impacts but would have limited if any operational impacts because they would be facilities that enhance the overall functionality of the transportation network. Further, with implementation of the applicable 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures; compliance with existing federal, state, and local regulations that regulate traffic; and completion of subsequent project-level planning and environmental review, potential transportation conflicts with plans, policies, or regulations intended to manage circulation, and the provision of bicycle and pedestrian facilities would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of bicycle, pedestrian, EVCS, park-and-ride, and shared parking projects **would not result in a considerable contribution** to a significant cumulative impact**.**

Large-Scale Renewable Energy Projects

Implementation of GHG Reduction Measure E-2.1 could result in the construction of new large-scale renewable energy systems, including large-scale photovoltaic solar, concentrated solar, geothermal systems, and/or wind turbines. Because the amount of demand generated by such a program and the mix of renewable energy types that would be constructed to satisfy demand is unknown, this Draft SEIR evaluates the potential for impacts at the program level. Specific locations for projects have not been identified. While the potential for the construction of large-scale renewable energy infrastructure was not evaluated in the 2011 GPU PEIR, potential wind energy impacts were evaluated in the 2012 Wind Energy EIR and a summary of that analysis is provided below and is hereby incorporated by reference.

Large-scale renewable energy infrastructure would generally be constructed in undeveloped locations that are productive for generating the renewable energy source. Specific locations that may be chosen for these large-scale utility projects are unknown; however, it is likely that suitable locations would include areas that are not highly developed with residential and commercial uses because of the size, massing, coverage, and scale of this type of infrastructure which relies upon large amounts of land unencumbered by buildings or shadowed by buildings or trees. Solar fields, geothermal infrastructure, and wind turbines typically require large swaths of land and may require multiple access points and/or new access roads. In addition, they would typically result in a large construction effort with staging areas, heavy equipment, the use of large semi-tractor trailers to deliver construction materials and equipment, and a substantial number of employees and their vehicles that would access the site during the construction phase of a project. Operations and maintenance of a large-scale

renewable energy project typically requires few operational staff and would not require the routine use of heavy machinery.

As described on pages 2.9-7 through 2.9-11 of the 2012 Wind Energy EIR, implementation of large turbine projects could adversely affect existing traffic loads or exceed County LOS thresholds, because of the number of construction worker trips that may be needed, dependent upon the size of the project. The 2012 Wind Energy EIR included Mitigation Measure M-TRAF-1 to reduce potentially significant impacts that would require projects to implement standard mitigation measures such as roadway improvements, payment of fair share contributions, and transportation demand management plans. However, because there was no guarantee that all future project-specific impacts could be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, the impact was determined to be significant and unavoidable. Because of the minimal operational activities associated with these types of facilities, operational impacts would be less than significant.

Future discretionary large-scale renewable energy projects would be required to be evaluated for project-specific impacts under CEQA at the time of application and project-specific mitigation would minimize or eliminate impacts to conflicts with plans, policies, and regulations intended to manage circulation and the functionality of pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure to the extent feasible in compliance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4. Additionally, all large-scale renewable energy projects are required to obtain a Major Use Permit (MUP) which requires projects to undergo the County's discretionary review process. Implementation of the 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures listed above would reduce potential impacts to transportation and traffic as part of the County's discretionary review process; however, construction of facilities associated with GHG Reduction Measure E-2.1 could still result in temporary conflicts with circulation management and bicycle and pedestrian functionality because of the amount of vehicle trips that may be generated during the construction phase. At the programmatic level, it is not possible to determine with certainty that impacts related to circulation management from construction of large-scale renewable energy projects would be reduced to a level below significance. Therefore, impacts related to conflicts with plans, policies, regulations for circulation management and bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure functionality would be **potentially significant (Impact TRA-1).**

Cumulative Impacts

Impacts would be cumulative in nature if construction or operation impacts associated with cumulative regional land use projects combined with the project would have the potential to exceed traffic standards, conflict with plans, ordinances, or policies establishing measures of effectiveness for circulation systems, or the use of adopted projections from a general plan, other regional planning document, or a certified EIR for such a planning document. The methodology for determining the cumulative environment described in Chapter 1, Project Description, and summarized above in Section 2.12.4.1 applies for this cumulative discussion.

As described above, the 2011 GPU PEIR concluded transportation and traffic impacts would be potentially significant because the 2011 GPU would result in increased traffic

delays and deterioration of LOS. With implementation of mitigation from the 2011 GPU PEIR, these impacts would be reduced, but would remain significant and unavoidable. As discussed above, future large-scale renewable energy projects would be discretionary projects and would be subject to CEQA review. Even with implementation of the 2011 GPU policies, 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation, and 2012 Wind Energy EIR Mitigation Measure M-TRA-1, additional significant cumulative impacts could result from GHG Reduction Measure E-2.1 because of the number of employee trips that may occur during the construction period and the possibility of construction of multiple projects within a localized area. Because there is no guarantee that future projects would be able to mitigate impacts to a less-than-significant level, implementation of GHG Reduction Measure E-2.1 could result in temporary conflicts with circulation management plans, policies, or regulations and therefore, impacts **would result in a considerable contribution** to a significant cumulative impact **(Impact TRA-2)**.

Padre Dam Water and Wastewater Supporting Effort

As described in Chapter 1, Project Description, the CAP includes a Water and Wastewater Supporting Effort, that would support participation in the Padre Dam AWP project. The Padre Dam MWD prepared the Padre Dam PEIR and that analysis is hereby incorporated by reference. As described on pages 4.12-3 through 4.12-9 of the Padre Dam PEIR, potentially significant direct and indirect impacts were identified for traffic. However, all impacts were reduced to a level below significance with implementation of Mitigation Measure TRA-1 as described in the Padre Dam PEIR. Therefore, the potential impacts related to traffic because of the Padre Dam AWP would be **less than significant.**

Cumulative Impacts

The Padre Dam PEIR evaluated the cumulative impacts of the project related to traffic and level of service on pages 6-28 and 6-29. As described therein, the AWP project would result in less-than-significant impacts to transportation and traffic with implementation of mitigation measure TRA-1, and it **would not have a considerable contribution** to a significant cumulative impact

Impact Summary

Because of their small size and the traffic benefits they provide, construction of bicycle, pedestrian, EVCS, park-and-ride, and shared parking projects would result in **less-than-significant** impacts related to conflicts with traffic plans and policies and **would not have a considerable contribution** to a significant cumulative impact. The County's participation in the AWP project would result in **less-than-significant** transportation impacts, and **would not have a considerable contribution** to a significant cumulative impact to transportation.

Regarding large-scale renewable energy systems, implementation of 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures may reduce project and cumulative impacts that could impede the effectiveness of circulation systems. However, because project-level mitigation cannot be guaranteed because complete mitigation was determined to be

infeasible, project impacts related to implementation of GHG Reduction Measure E-2.1 would remain **potentially significant**. Likewise, these measures **would result in a considerable contribution** to a significant cumulative impact.

2.12.4.2 Issue 2: Emergency Access

This section describes potential project and cumulative impacts related to conflicts with emergency access with implementation of the project.

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, the project would result in a significant impact if it would:

- Result in inadequate emergency access.

Impact Analysis

2011 GPU PEIR Determination

The 2011 GPU PEIR evaluated impacts from the 2011 GPU goals and policies, and build-out of the land use map, related to emergency access for the unincorporated county. Impacts were determined to be less than significant for project and cumulative impacts with implementation of adopted 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures listed above. The discussion of impacts can be found in Chapter 2.15 Transportation and Traffic, pages 2.15-32 through 2.15-30, and is hereby incorporated by reference.

CAP Impact Analysis

Implementation of the CAP has the potential to result in significant impacts related to emergency access from GHG reduction measures and supporting efforts that would include construction and operation of bicycle, pedestrian, EVCS, park-and-ride, and shared parking facilities; and large-scale renewable energy systems including photovoltaic solar, concentrated solar, wind turbines, and geothermal systems that were not explicitly evaluated within the 2011 GPU PEIR. The 2012 Wind Energy EIR evaluated impacts specifically related to the development of small and large-scale wind turbines and impacts from that document are summarized below and hereby incorporated by reference (San Diego County 2012).

The following section describes the potentially significant impacts related to transportation and traffic that could result from the implementation of the measures.

Bicycle, Pedestrian, EVCS, Park-and-Ride, and Shared Parking Projects

Implementation of GHG Reduction Measures T-2.1, T-2.4, and Supporting Efforts within the Built Environment and Transportation Category could result in bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, installation of new EVCS, new or expanded park-and-ride facilities, and

shared parking. Implementation of small traffic infrastructure projects such as bicycle, pedestrian, EVCS, park-and-ride, or shared parking projects may result in temporary construction-related impacts or minor delays/detours, but would not result in conflicts or impediments to emergency access within the county. These projects would also not exacerbate inadequate road widths, result in dead-end roads, one-way roads, or gated communities, nor would they result in any other obstruction to emergency access. The intent of the projects would be to provide expanded or new multi-modal transportation infrastructure that would accommodate non-automotive forms of transportation and reduce the number of vehicles on the road. The fundamental purpose of these projects would be to reduce VMT within the county by expanding transportation opportunities.

Future discretionary projects would be required to be evaluated for project-specific impacts under CEQA at the time of application and project-specific mitigation would minimize or eliminate impacts related to emergency access to the extent feasible in compliance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4. As explained in the 2011 GPU PEIR, implementation of the 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures listed above would reduce potential impacts. With implementation of the applicable 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures; compliance with existing federal, state, and local regulations that regulate traffic; and completion of subsequent project-level planning and environmental review, potential impacts to emergency access because of the construction and operation of bicycle, pedestrian, EVCS, park-and-ride, and shared parking projects would be **less than significant.**

Cumulative Impacts

Impacts would be cumulative in nature if construction or operation impacts associated with cumulative regional land use projects combined to create multiple obstructions to emergency access along the same road. The methodology for determining the cumulative environment described in Chapter 1, Project Description, and summarized above in Section 2.12.4.1 applies for this cumulative discussion.

As discussed above, small traffic infrastructure projects such as bicycle, pedestrian, EVCS, park-and-ride, and shared parking projects would result in some construction-related impacts but would have limited if any operational impacts because they would be facilities that enhance the overall functionality of the transportation network. Further, with implementation of the applicable 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures; compliance with existing federal, state, and local regulations that regulate traffic; and completion of subsequent project-level planning and environmental review, cumulative impacts related to emergency access would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of bicycle, pedestrian, EVCS, park-and-ride, and shared parking projects **would not result in a considerable contribution** such that a new significant cumulative impact would occur.

Large-Scale Renewable Energy Infrastructure

As described in detail above in Section 2.12.4.1, implementation of GHG Reduction Measure E-2.1 could result in the construction of new large-scale renewable energy

systems, including large-scale photovoltaic solar, concentrated solar, geothermal systems, and/or wind turbines. Because the amount of demand generated by such a program and the mix of renewable energy types that would be constructed to satisfy demand is unknown, this Draft SEIR evaluates the potential for impacts at the program level.

Large-scale renewable energy infrastructure would generally be constructed in undeveloped locations that are productive for generating the renewable energy source. Specific locations that may be chosen for these large-scale utility projects are unknown; however, it is likely that suitable locations would include areas that are not highly developed with residential and commercial uses because of the size, massing, coverage, and scale of this type of infrastructure which relies upon large amounts of land unencumbered by buildings or shadowed by buildings or trees. Solar fields, geothermal infrastructure, and wind turbines typically require large swaths of land and may require multiple access points and/or new access roads.

As described on pages 2.9-14 through 2.9-15 of the 2012 Wind Energy EIR, construction and operation of large turbine projects would result in less-than-significant impacts with regard to emergency access because projects would be mitigated through the discretionary review process.

Future discretionary large-scale renewable energy projects would be required to be evaluated for project-specific impacts under CEQA at the time of application and project-specific mitigation would minimize or eliminate impacts related to emergency access to the extent feasible in compliance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4. Additionally, all large-scale renewable energy projects are required to obtain a MUP which requires projects to undergo the County's discretionary review process. Implementation of the 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures listed above would reduce potential impacts to transportation and traffic as part of the County's discretionary review process. Therefore, impacts related to emergency access would be **less than significant** with implementation of GHG Reduction Measure E-2.1.

Cumulative Impacts

Impacts would be cumulative in nature if construction or operation impacts associated with cumulative regional land use projects would have the potential to impede emergency access. The methodology for determining the cumulative environment described in Chapter 1, Project Description, and summarized above in Section 2.12.4.1 above applies for this cumulative discussion.

As described above, the 2011 GPU PEIR concluded impacts related to emergency access would be less than significant with implementation of 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures. As discussed above, future large-scale renewable energy projects would be discretionary projects and would be subject to CEQA review. As a result, future projects would be required to mitigate impacts to a less-than-significant level related to emergency access. Therefore, impacts **would not result in a considerable contribution** such that a new significant cumulative impact would occur.

Padre Dam Water and Wastewater Supporting Effort

As described in Chapter 1, Project Description, the CAP includes a Water and Wastewater Supporting Effort, that would support participation in the Padre Dam AWP project. The Padre Dam MWD prepared the Padre Dam PEIR and that analysis is hereby incorporated by reference. As described on page 4.12-8 of the Padre Dam PEIR, less-than-significant direct and indirect impacts were identified for emergency access. Therefore, the potential impacts related to emergency access because of the Padre Dam AWP would be **less than significant.**

Cumulative Impacts

The Padre Dam PEIR evaluated the cumulative impacts of the project related to emergency access on page 6-30. As described therein, the AWP project would result in less-than-significant impacts to emergency access and it **would not have a considerable contribution** such that a new significant cumulative impact would occur**.**

Impact Summary

Implementation of 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures would reduce project and cumulative impacts associated with emergency access. Therefore, project impacts related to implementation of GHG Reduction Measure E-2.1 would be **less than significant.** and **would not result in a considerable contribution** such that a new significant cumulative impact would occur.

2.12.4.3 Issue 3: Substantially Increase Design Hazards

This section describes potential project and cumulative impacts related to hazards because of a design feature with implementation of the project.

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, the project would result in a significant impact if it would:

- Substantially increase hazards because of a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).

Impact Analysis

2011 GPU PEIR Determination

The 2011 GPU PEIR evaluated impacts related to design hazards with the adoption of the goals and policies contained within the plan and buildout of the land use map. The 2011 GPU PEIR determined that buildout under the 2011 GPU would result in significant and unavoidable project and cumulative impacts related to rural road safety, and that even with adoption of 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures,

project and cumulative impacts related to roadway design hazards would remain significant and unavoidable because the county's existing roadway network includes roads that were constructed previous to existing regulations and some of the roads include horizontal and vertical curves that are sharper than existing standards. The discussion of impacts can be found in Chapter 2.15, Transportation and Traffic, pages 2.15-30 through 2.15-32, and is hereby incorporated by reference.

CAP Impact Analysis

Bicycle, Pedestrian, EVCS, Park-and-Ride, and Shared Parking Projects

Implementation of GHG Reduction Measures T-2.1, T-2.4, and Supporting Efforts within the Built Environment and Transportation Category could result in bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, installation of new EVCS, new or expanded park-and-ride facilities, and shared parking. Implementation of small traffic infrastructure projects such as bicycle, pedestrian, EVCS, park-and-ride, or shared parking projects may result in temporary construction-related impacts or minor delays/detours, but would not result in increased design hazards across the county's roadway network. The project would result in the implementation of additional bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure across the roadway network which would improve the infrastructure that is available for bicyclists and pedestrians. These projects would also not exacerbate inadequate road widths, or construct new roadways with sharp curves or in any way conflict with existing regulations. The intent of this class of projects is to provide expanded or new multi-modal transportation infrastructure that would accommodate non-automotive forms of transportation and reduce the number of vehicles on the road. The fundamental purpose of these projects would be to reduce VMT within the county by expanding transportation opportunities.

Future discretionary projects would be required to be evaluated for project-specific impacts under CEQA at the time of application and project-specific mitigation would minimize or eliminate impacts related to conflicts with plans, policies, or regulations intended to manage circulation and provide bicycle and pedestrian facilities to the extent feasible in compliance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4. As explained in the 2011 GPU PEIR, implementation of the 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures listed above would reduce potential impacts. With implementation of the applicable 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures; compliance with existing federal, state, and local regulations that regulate traffic; and completion of subsequent project-level planning and environmental review, potential transportation impacts related to design hazards because of the construction and operation of bicycle, pedestrian, EVCS, park-and-ride, and shared parking projects would be **less than significant.**

Cumulative Impacts

Impacts would be cumulative in nature if construction or operation impacts associated with cumulative regional land use projects combined to exacerbate design hazards such that a new hazard is created. The methodology for determining the cumulative environment described in Chapter 1, Project Description, and summarized above in Section 2.12.4.1 applies for this cumulative discussion.

The 2011 GPU PEIR concluded transportation impacts related to design hazards would be significant and unavoidable even with implementation of 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures because the county's roadway network contains roads that do not meet existing roadway standards. As discussed above, small traffic infrastructure projects such as bicycle, pedestrian, EVCS, park-and-ride, and shared parking projects would result in some construction-related impacts but would have limited if any operational impacts because they would be facilities that enhance the overall functionality of the transportation network. Further, with implementation of the applicable 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures; compliance with existing federal, state, and local regulations that regulate traffic; and completion of subsequent project-level planning and environmental review, cumulative impacts from transportation impacts related to design hazards would be less than significant. Therefore, implementation of bicycle, pedestrian, EVCS, park-and-ride, and shared parking projects **would not result in a considerable contribution** to a significant cumulative impact**.**

Large-Scale Renewable Energy Infrastructure

As described in detail above in Section 2.12.4.1, implementation of GHG Reduction Measure E-2.1 could result in the construction of new large-scale renewable energy systems, including large-scale photovoltaic solar, concentrated solar, geothermal systems, and/or wind turbines. Because the amount of demand generated by such a program and the mix of renewable energy types that would be constructed to satisfy demand is unknown, this Draft SEIR evaluates the potential for impacts at the program level.

Large-scale renewable energy infrastructure would generally be constructed in undeveloped locations that are productive for generating the renewable energy source. Specific locations that may be chosen for these large-scale utility projects are unknown; however, it is likely that suitable locations would include areas that are not highly developed with residential and commercial uses because of the size, massing, coverage, and scale of this type of infrastructure which relies upon large amounts of land unencumbered by buildings or shadowed by buildings or trees. Solar fields, geothermal infrastructure, and wind turbines typically require large swaths of land and may require multiple access points and/or new access roads. Depending upon the location of future projects, it is possible that road improvements would be required, however, all roadway improvements would be implemented in accordance with existing County regulations. The projects would be prohibited from placing any incompatible uses near roadways.

As described on pages 2.9-12 through 2.9-14 of the 2012 Wind Energy EIR, construction and operation of large turbine projects would result in less-than-significant impacts with regard to roadway design hazards because projects would be mitigated through the discretionary review process.

Future discretionary large-scale renewable energy projects would be required to be evaluated for project-specific impacts under CEQA at the time of application and project-specific mitigation would minimize or eliminate impacts related to emergency access to the extent feasible in compliance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4. Additionally, all large-scale renewable energy projects are required to obtain a MUP which requires

projects to undergo the County's discretionary review process. Implementation of the 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures listed above would reduce potential impacts related to roadway design hazards as part of the County's discretionary review process. Therefore, impacts related to roadway design hazards would be **less than significant** with implementation of GHG Reduction Measure E-2.1.

Cumulative Impacts

Impacts would be cumulative in nature if construction or operation impacts associated with cumulative regional land use projects combined to exacerbate design hazards such that a new hazard is created. The methodology for determining the cumulative environment described in Chapter 1, Project Description, and summarized above in Section 2.12.4.1 applies for this cumulative discussion.

As described above, the 2011 GPU PEIR concluded impacts related to design hazards would be significant and unavoidable even with implementation of 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures because the county's existing roadway network contains roads that do not meet existing regulations. However, as discussed above, future large-scale renewable energy projects would be discretionary projects and would be subject to CEQA review. As a result, future projects would be required to mitigate impacts to a less-than-significant level related to any road improvements that would occur with projects. Therefore, implementation of GHG Reduction Measure E-2.1 **would not result in a considerable contribution** such that a new significant cumulative impact would occur.

Padre Dam Water and Wastewater Supporting Effort

As described in Chapter 1, Project Description, the CAP includes a Water and Wastewater Supporting Effort, that would support participation in the Padre Dam AWP project. The Padre Dam MWD prepared the Padre Dam PEIR and that analysis is hereby incorporated by reference. As described on pages 4.12-6 through 4.12-7 of the Padre Dam PEIR, potentially significant direct and indirect impacts were identified for traffic. However, all impacts were reduced to a level below significance with implementation of mitigation measure TRA-1 as described in the Padre Dam PEIR. Therefore, the potential impacts related to design hazards because of the Padre Dam AWP would be **less than significant**.

Cumulative Impacts

The Padre Dam PEIR evaluated the cumulative impacts of the project related to traffic and level of service on pages 6-29 and 6-30. As described therein, the AWP project would result in less-than-significant impacts to transportation and traffic with implementation of mitigation measure TRA-1, and it **would not have a considerable contribution** such that a new significant cumulative impact would occur**.**

Impact Summary

Implementation of 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures would reduce project and cumulative impacts associated with design hazards. Therefore, implementation of GHG Reduction Measure E-2.1 would result in **less-than-significant**

design hazard impacts and the project **would not have a considerable contribution** to a significant cumulative impact.

2.12.5 Mitigation

2.12.5.1 Issue 1: LOS and Conflicts with Plans, Ordinances, or Policies Establishing Measures of Effectiveness for Circulation System

The 2012 Wind Energy EIR included the following mitigation measure to minimize potentially significant impacts related to effectiveness of circulation systems:

> **Mitigation Measure M-TRAF-1:** During the environmental review process for future Major Use Permits for wind turbines, the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Transportation and Traffic shall be applied. When traffic impacts are determined to be significant, feasible and appropriate project-specific mitigation measures shall be incorporated. Examples of standard mitigation measures within the County Guidelines include: traffic signal improvements; physical road improvements; street re-striping and parking prohibitions; fair share contributions toward identified, funded and scheduled projects; and transportation demand management programs.

As described in Section 2.12.4.1, additional wind turbine mitigation was considered but rejected as infeasible through the 2012 Wind Energy EIR. Mitigation Measure M-TRAF-1 shall be incorporated into the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the CAP and shall be applied to all large-scale renewable energy projects including but not limited to solar photovoltaic, solar concentrator, wind turbine, and utility-scale geothermal systems during the discretionary review process which would occur as a condition of receiving a MUP. As described during the impacts analysis, future discretionary large-scale renewable energy projects would be required to be evaluated for project-specific impacts under CEQA at the time of application and project-specific mitigation would minimize or eliminate impacts to related to transportation and traffic to the extent feasible in compliance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4. However, because of the uncertainty of the types, locations, and scale of future renewable energy projects, it is not possible to guarantee that all impacts to transportation and traffic would be reduced to a level below significance. Mitigation Measure M-TRAF-1 from the 2012 Wind Energy Ordinance EIR has been revised to include all large-scale renewable energy projects as follows:

> **CAP Mitigation Measure M-TRAF-1:** During the environmental review process for future Major Use Permits for all large-scale renewable energy projects, the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Transportation and Traffic shall be applied. When traffic impacts are determined to be significant, feasible and appropriate project-specific mitigation measures shall be incorporated. Examples of standard mitigation measures within the County Guidelines include: traffic signal improvements; physical road improvements; street re-striping and parking prohibitions; fair share contributions toward identified, funded and scheduled projects; and transportation demand management programs.

Additional mitigation was contemplated as part of this Draft SEIR that would implement a development cap upon large-scale renewable energy projects. This mitigation was rejected as infeasible because it may reduce the effectiveness of GHG Reduction Measure E-2.1 and achievement of the County's 2030 GHG emissions reduction target. It is unknown how many numbers and types of renewable large-scale renewable energy facilities would be required to meet the GHG reduction goals of the CAP because the design, siting, and economic feasibility characteristics of the options under consideration vary widely. No other additional feasible mitigation is available. Therefore, as described above in Section 2.12.4.1, even with implementation of the adopted 2011 GPU policies and 2011 GPU PEIR mitigation measures and CAP Mitigation Measure M-TRAF-1 that reduce impacts related to transportation and traffic, additional significant project and cumulative impacts to transportation and traffic could occur from implementation of GHG Reduction Measure E-2.1 because of the scale and nature of the projects and possibility of the construction of multiple projects in a similar vicinity.

No other feasible project-related mitigation beyond existing local, state, and federal permitting requirements and compliance with the County's adopted 2011 GPU policies or mitigation measures is available and could be applied to individual projects under the CAP. Therefore, the project would have a **significant and unavoidable impact** and **would result in a considerable contribution** to a significant cumulative impact related to transportation and traffic.

2.12.5.2 Issue 2: Emergency Response

Project level impacts and contributions to cumulative impacts were determined to be less than significant; therefore, no mitigation measures in addition those identified in the 2011 GPU EIR were discussed or required.

2.12.5.3 Issue 3: Substantially Increase Design Hazards

Project level impacts and contributions to cumulative impacts were determined to be less than significant; therefore, no mitigation measures in addition those identified in the 2011 GPU EIR were discussed or required.