

**APPENDIX I**  
**RATIONALE FOR ACCEPTING ROADWAYS**  
**WITH LEVEL OF SERVICE E/F**

---

## Appendix I. Impacted Roadway Segment and Supporting Rationale for LOS E/F Level Acceptance

Roadway / Segment Limits	Proposed Classification / Forecast	Alternate Classification (Los D or Better)	Rationale for Proposed Classification and LOS E/F
<b>Northwestern Communities</b>			
<b>Bonsall CPA</b>			
<u>Mission Road/SR-76</u> Oceanside city limits to S. Mission Rd	6-Ln State Highway <sup>NOTE</sup> 6.2: 6-Ln Prime Arterial LOS E (58.8K ADT)	6-Ln State Highway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimize Environmental Impacts – Narrower right-of-way (Prime Arterial) recommended due to environmental constraints (San Luis Rey River). Unmet demand could be accommodated by: (1) Gopher Canyon Road or (2) constructing grade-separated intersections.</li> <li>Unfunded Caltrans Improvements – Consistent with Caltrans' Concept Plan for 6-lanes (plans to build 4-lanes and purchase a 6-lane right-of-way). Widening road to six lanes is not programmed in the 2030 RTP.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with Sponsor Group preference only if Caltrans uses the existing alignment.</li> </ul> <p>Note: Although the road was modeled as four lanes, the GPU classification is for a six-lane road. The modeling was restricted to four lanes to be consistent with the 2030 RTP Reasonably Expected Revenue scenario. Six-lane improvement is not funded in SANDAG 2030 RTP</p>
<u>Old Hwy 395</u> Fallbrook boundary to I-15 interchange	2.1D 2 -Ln Community Collector with Improvement Options LOS E (16.3K ADT)	4.2B 4-Ln Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regional Transportation Network Overflow – Excess traffic volume linked to forecast levels of congestion on the parallel I-15. Not appropriate for County road to solve regional traffic volumes.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with Sponsor Group preference.</li> </ul>
<b>Fallbrook CPA</b>			
<u>Pala Road/SR-76</u> Old Hwy 395 to I-15 SB Ramps	4-Ln State Highway 4.1A: 4-Ln Major Road with Raised Median LOS F (37.7K ADT)	6-Ln State Highway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Marginal Deficiency. Short segment. Address traffic congestion through operational improvements such as right-turn lanes.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul>
<u>Alvarado Street</u> Main Ave to Olive Ave	2.2C 2-Ln Light Collector with Intermittent Turn Lanes LOS E (14.6K ADT)	2.1D 2-Ln Community Collector with Improvement Options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Town Center – Within established town center where road widening would require adverse impacts to established development patterns. Community Planning Group will to accept lower LOS.</li> <li>Marginal Deficiency – LOS failing only in short segment. Address traffic congestion through operational improvements such as right-turn lanes.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul>

Appendix I. Impacted Roadway Segment and Supporting Rationale for LOS E/F Level Acceptance

Roadway / Segment Limits	Proposed Classification / Forecast	Alternate Classification (Los D or Better)	Rationale for Proposed Classification and LOS E/F
<u>Del Luz Road</u> Dougherty St to Mission Rd	2.2C 2-Ln Light Collector with Intermittent Turn Lanes LOS E (14.2K ADT)	2.1D 2-Ln Community Collector with Improvement Options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Town Center – Within established town center where road widening would require adverse impacts to established development patterns. Community Planning Group will to accept lower LOS.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul>
<u>E. Fallbrook Street</u> Main Ave to Elbrook Dr	2.2B 2-Ln Light Collector with Continuous Turn Lane LOS E (14.8K ADT)	2.1D 2-Ln Community Collector with Improvement Options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Town Center – Within established town center where road widening would require adverse impacts to established development patterns. Community Planning Group will to accept lower LOS.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul>
<u>E. Mission Road</u> De Luz Rd to Brandon Rd	2.2B 2-Ln Light Collector with Continuous Turn Lane LOS E (13.9 to 15.0K ADT)	2.1D 2-Ln Community Collector with Improvement Options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Town Center – Within established town center where road widening would require adverse impacts to established development patterns. Community Planning Group will to accept lower LOS.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul>
<u>E. Mission Road</u> Hamilton Ln to Old Hwy 395	4.2B 4-Ln Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes LOS E (29.4K – 34.2K ADT)	4.1B 4-Ln Major Road with Intermittent Turn Lanes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic Model Limitation – Boulevard threshold capacity is based on a road in a more urbanized area with significant side friction and intersections. The portion of the road operating at LOS E has little side friction and should be able to accommodate capacities similar to a Major Road. Therefore, LOS deficiency could be overstated and could likely be resolved through operational improvements.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul>
<u>E. Mission Road</u> Old Hwy 395 to I-15 NB Ramps	4.1B 4-Ln Major Road with Intermittent Turn Lanes LOS F (41.3K ADT)	6.2 6-Ln Prime Arterial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Marginal Deficiency – Only short segment, less than 200 feet long, would fail. LOS deficiencies could be resolved through operational improvements, such as right-turn lanes, rather than a six-lane classification.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul>
<u>Old Hwy 395</u> Rainbow CPA boundary to Mission Rd	2.1D 2-Ln Community Collector with Improvement Options LOS F (21.1K ADT)	4.2B 4-Ln Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regional Transportation Network Overflow – Excess traffic volumes linked to regional traffic from Riverside County. Improvement to four-lane road would magnify attraction as road parallels I-15.</li> <li>Sufficient Right-of-Way – Classification provides sufficient right-of-way to add operational improvements to increase road capacity.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul>
<u>Old Hwy 395</u> Mission Rd to Pala Mesa Dr	2.1A 2-Ln Community Collector with Raised Median LOS E/F (17.4K to 22.2K ADT)	4.2B 4-Ln Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regional Transportation Network Overflow – Excess traffic volumes linked to regional traffic from Riverside County. Improvement to 4-lane road would magnify attraction as road parallels I-15.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul>

Appendix I. Impacted Roadway Segment and Supporting Rationale for LOS E/F Level Acceptance

Roadway / Segment Limits	Proposed Classification / Forecast	Alternate Classification (Los D or Better)	Rationale for Proposed Classification and LOS E/F
<u>Old Hwy 395</u> Pala Rd to Dublin (W) Rd	2.1D 2-Ln Community Collector with Improvement Options LOS E/F (14.8 to 16.9 K ADT)	4.2B 4-Ln Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sufficient Right-of-Way – Classification provides sufficient right-of-way to add operational improvements to increase road capacity and resolve LOS deficiencies.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with planning group preference.</li> </ul>
<u>Pala Mesa Drive</u> Daisy Ln to Pankey Rd	2.2F 2-Ln Light Collector with Reduced Shoulder LOS E (11.0K ADT)	2.2C 2-Ln Light Collector with Intermittent Turn Lanes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environmental Constraints – Located in area with steep slopes that would involve excessive grading</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul>
<u>Pankey Road</u> Pala Mesa Dr to Pala Rd	2.1A 2-Ln Community Collector with Raised Median LOS E/F (15.8 to 17.4 K ADT)	4.2B 4-Ln Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Marginal Deficiency – Although road would be approximately 2,000K ADT over capacity, alternative routes with excess capacity are available.</li> </ul> <p>Note: Road segment is subject to further refinement during project processing (following project-level analysis).</p>
<u>Reche Road</u> Fallbrook St to Green Canyon Rd	2.2C 2-Ln Light Collector with Intermittent Turn Lanes LOS E (14.1K ADT)	2.1D 2-Ln Community Collector with Improvement Options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Marginal Deficiency – LOS failing only in short segment. Address traffic congestion through operational improvements such as right-turn lanes.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul>
<u>Pepper Tree Lane</u> Mission Rd to Woodbrook Ln	2.2E 2-Ln Light Collector LOS E (14.3K ADT)	2.1D 2-Ln Community Collector with Improvement Options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Marginal Deficiency – LOS failing only in short segment. Address traffic congestion through operational improvements such as right-turn lanes. Alternative routes with excess capacity are available.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul>
<b>North County Metro Subregion</b>			
<u>SR-78</u> Sycamore Ave to Smilax Rd	6-Ln State Highway LOS E	8-Ln State Highway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Roadway – Consistent with 2030 RTP. Next update of RTP will address any road deficiencies.</li> </ul>
<u>Deer Springs Road</u> Mesa Rock Rd to I-15 NB Ramps	6.2 6-Ln Prime Arterial LOS E (53.7K ADT)	6.1 6-Ln Expressway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Marginal Deficiency – LOS failing only in short segment. Address traffic congestion through operational improvements such as right-turn lanes.</li> </ul>
<u>Deer Springs Road</u> I-15 NB Ramps to N Centre City Pkwy	4.1B 4-Ln Major Road with Intermittent Turn Lanes LOS F (46.5K ADT)	6.2 6-Ln Prime Arterial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Marginal Deficiency – LOS failing only in short segment. Address traffic congestion through operational improvements such as right-turn lanes.</li> </ul>

Appendix I. Impacted Roadway Segment and Supporting Rationale for LOS E/F Level Acceptance

Roadway / Segment Limits	Proposed Classification / Forecast	Alternate Classification (Los D or Better)	Rationale for Proposed Classification and LOS E/F
<u>Mountain Meadow Road</u> North Broadway to Valley Center CPA boundary	2.1D 2-Ln Community Collector with Improvement Options LOS F (20.9K ADT)	4.2B 4-Ln Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environmental Constraints – Located in area with steep slopes that would involve excessive grading.</li> </ul>
<u>Bear Valley Parkway</u> Eldorado Dr to San Pasqual Valley Rd	4.1A 4-Ln Major Road with Raised Median LOS E (36.0K ADT)	6.2 6-Ln Prime Arterial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Marginal Deficiency – LOS failing only in short segment. Address traffic congestion through operational improvements such as right-turn lanes.</li> </ul>
<b>Pala-Pauma Valley Subregion</b>			
<u>Pala Road/SR-76</u> Pala Del Norte Rd to Lilac Rd	2-Ln State Highway 2.1D Community Collector with Improvement Options LOS E/F (16.1k – 24.3K ADT)	4-Ln State Highway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sufficient Right-of-Way – Classification provides sufficient right-of-way to accommodate a four-lane road or improvement options, if necessary.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul>
<u>Valley Center Road</u> Valley Center CPA boundary to Harrah's Rincon Casino	2.1D 2-Ln Community Collector with Improvement Options LOS E (15.5K ADT)	4.2B 4-Ln Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Marginal Deficiency – Forecast LOS is only 500 ADT above threshold capacity for road classification with raised median. Classification provides sufficient right-of-way for improvement options to resolve capacity deficiencies.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul>
<b>Rainbow CPA</b>			
<u>Old Hwy 395</u> 5th St to Rainbow Glenn Rd	2.2D 2-Ln Light Collector with Improvement Options LOS E/F (17.7K to 20.8K ADT)	4.2B 4-Ln Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regional Transportation Network Overflow – Excess traffic volumes linked to regional traffic from Riverside County. Improvement to four-lane road would magnify attraction as road parallels I-15.</li> <li>Sufficient Right-of-Way – Classification provides sufficient right-of-way to add operational improvements to increase road capacity.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul>
<u>Old Hwy 395</u> Rainbow Glenn Rd to Fallbrook CPA boundary	2.1D 2-Ln Community Collector with Improvement Options LOS F (20.8K ADT)	4.2B 4-Ln Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regional Transportation Network Overflow – Excess traffic volumes linked to regional traffic from Riverside County. Improvement to four-lane road would magnify attraction as road parallels I-15.</li> <li>Sufficient Right-of-Way – Classification provides sufficient right-of-way to add operational improvements to increase road capacity.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul>

Appendix I. Impacted Roadway Segment and Supporting Rationale for LOS E/F Level Acceptance

Roadway / Segment Limits	Proposed Classification / Forecast	Alternate Classification (Los D or Better)	Rationale for Proposed Classification and LOS E/F
<b>San Dieguito CPA</b>			
<u>Del Dios Highway</u> Via Rancho Pkwy to El Camino Del Norte	2.1D 2-Ln Community Collector with Improvement Options at LOS F (31.2K ADT)	4.1A 4-Ln Major Road with Raised Median	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regional Transportation Network Overflow – Traffic forecast modeling has shown that widening the road would attract an additional 5K to 8K ADT of regional traffic through the community.</li> <li>Environmental Constraints – Further road widening would impact granite rock outcroppings and biologically sensitive lands.</li> <li>Sufficient Right-of-Way – Classification provides sufficient right-of-way to add operational improvements to increase road capacity to four lanes.</li> </ul>
<u>Paseo Delicias</u> La Granada to El Camino del Norte	2.2A 2-Ln Light Collector with Raised Median LOS E/F (14.9K to 24.1K ADT)	4.2B 4-Ln Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Town Center – Two-lane road classification is consistent with State historic landmark status.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul>
<u>El Camino Del Norte</u> Aliso Canyon Rd to Del Dios Hwy/Paseo Delicias	2.2F 2-Ln Light Collector with Reduces Shoulder LOS E (13.5K ADT)	2.2C 2-Ln Light Collector with Intermittent Turn Lanes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Town Center – Two-lane road classification with reduced shoulder is consistent with State historic landmark status.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul>
<u>La Bajada / La Granada</u> Rancho Santa Fe Rd to Paseo Delicias	2.2F 2-Ln Light Collector with Reduces Shoulder LOS E/F (15.2K to 25.8K ADT)	4.2B 4-Ln Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support Land Use Goals - Two-lane road classification is consistent with State historic landmark status.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul>
<u>Linea Del Cielo</u> El Camino Real to Rambla De Las Flores	2.2F 2-Ln Light Collector with Reduces Shoulder LOS E (11.2K ADT)	2.2C 2-Ln Light Collector with Intermittent Turn Lanes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support Land Use Goals - Two-lane road classification with reduced shoulder is consistent with State historic landmark status.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul>
<u>Via De la Valle</u> San Diego city limits to Las Planideras	2.1B 2-Ln Community Collector with Continuous Turn Lane LOS F (24.5 K -25.4K ADT)	4.2B / 4.2A 4-Ln Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support Land Use Goals – Additional road widening would adversely impact established semi-rural character along with landscape and structural improvements along the road that are prevalent in the area.</li> </ul>
<u>Via De la Valle</u> Las Planideras to Paseo Delicias	2.1E 2-Ln Community Collector with Continuous Turn Lane LOS E/F (16.1 K -25.4K ADT)	4.2B 4-Ln Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support Land Use Goals - Two-lane road classification is consistent with State historic landmark status.</li> <li>Environmental Constraints – Located in area with biologically sensitive vegetation.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul>

Appendix I. Impacted Roadway Segment and Supporting Rationale for LOS E/F Level Acceptance

Roadway / Segment Limits	Proposed Classification / Forecast	Alternate Classification (Los D or Better)	Rationale for Proposed Classification and LOS E/F
<u>El Apajo</u> Villa De La Valle to Via De Santa Fe	2.1A 2-Ln Community Collector with Raised Median LOS E (16.8K ADT)	4.2B 4-Ln Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Marginal Deficiency - LOS failing only in short segment. Address traffic congestion through operational improvements such as right-turn lanes.</li> </ul>
<u>San Dieguito Road</u> El Apajo to San Diego city limits	2.1A 2-Ln Community Collector with Raised Median LOS E (17.5K ADT)A	4.2B 4-Ln Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environmental Constraints – Located in area with biologically sensitive vegetation.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul>
<b>Valley Center</b>			
<u>Mountain Meadow Road/ Mirar De Valle Road</u> Hidden Meadows community boundary to New Road 19	2.1D 2-Ln Community Collector with Improvement Options LOS F (27.6K ADT)	4.1B 4-Ln Major Road with Intermittent Turn Lanes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Network Overflow – Traffic forecast modeling has shown that widening the road to four lanes would attract additional traffic where the road would still fail. There are alternate routes with excess capacity to accommodate some of this overflow traffic.</li> <li>Environmental Constraints – Two lanes are less impactful than four lanes where road traverses through steep terrain.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference. Community is willing to accept a lower LOS.</li> </ul>
<u>Lilac Road</u> New Road 19 to Valley Center Rd	4.2A 4-Ln Boulevard with Raised Median LOS F (38.1K ADT)	6.2 6-Ln Prime Arterial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Marginal Deficiency - LOS failing only in short segment. Address traffic congestion through operational improvements such as right-turn lanes.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul>
<u>Valley Center Road</u> Sunday Dr to Lilac Rd	4.2A 4-Ln Boulevard with Raised Median LOS E (28.4K ADT)	4.1B 4-Ln Major Road with Intermittent Turn Lanes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Town Center – Route passes through planned town center where alternate routes are planned.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul>
<u>Valley Center Road</u> Lilac Rd to Miller Rd	4.1A 4-Ln Major Road with Raised Median LOS F (38.6K ADT)	6.2 6-Ln Prime Arterial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impacts to Established Development – Widening of road to six lanes would adversely impact or require removing a significant number of existing businesses.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul>
<u>Valley Center Road</u> Miller Rd to Indian Creek Rd	4.2A 4-Ln Boulevard with Raised Median LOS F (37.K ADT)	6.2 6-Ln Prime Arterial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Town Center – Route passes through planned town center where a bypass road and other alternate routes are also planned.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul>

Appendix I. Impacted Roadway Segment and Supporting Rationale for LOS E/F Level Acceptance

Roadway / Segment Limits	Proposed Classification / Forecast	Alternate Classification (Los D or Better)	Rationale for Proposed Classification and LOS E/F
<u>Valley Center Road</u> Highpoint Dr to Harrah's Rincon casino	2.1D 2-Ln Community Collector with Improvement Options LOS E (15.7K – 18.8K ADT)	4.2B 4-Ln Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environmental Constraints – Two lanes are less impactful than four lanes where road traverses through sensitive biological resources and prime agricultural lands.</li> <li>Community consensus – Prefers network of two-lane roads.</li> <li>Classification would reserve R.O.W. necessary for four-lane road.</li> </ul>
<u>Woods Valley Road</u> Oakmont Rd to Karibu Ln	2.2C 2-Ln Light Collector with Intermittent Turn Lanes LOS E (17.5K – 14.1K ADT)	4.2B 4-Ln Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environmental Constraints – Located in area with biologically sensitive vegetation.</li> <li>Community consensus – Prefers network of two-lane roads.</li> </ul>
<b>Southwestern Communities</b>			
<b>Alpine</b>			
<u>Alpine Boulevard</u> Tavern Rd to South Grade Rd	2.2A 2-Ln Light Collector with Raised Median LOS E/F (14.7K – 22.9K ADT)	2.1A 4-Ln Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Town Center – Widening Alpine Boulevard to four lanes in many areas would adversely impact existing businesses.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Planning Group does not support widening road to four lanes</li> </ul>
<u>Alpine Boulevard</u> South Grade Rd to Willows Rd	2.1D 2-Ln Community Collector with Improvement Options LOS E/F (16.2K – 20.3K ADT)	4.2B 4-Ln Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sufficient Right-of-Way – Classification provides sufficient right-of-way to accommodate a four-lane road, if necessary.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<u>South Grade Road</u> Eltinge Dr to Olive View Rd	2.2C 2-Ln Light Collector with Intermittent Turn Lanes LOS E (15.6K ADT)	2.2D 2-Ln Light Collector with Improvement Options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Marginal Deficiency – LOS failing only in short segment. Address traffic congestion through operational improvements such as right-turn lanes.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul>
<u>New Viejas Road at New Interchange</u> Willows Rd to Alpine Blvd	4.1A 4-Ln Major Road with Raised Median LOS F (63.5K ADT)	6.1 6-Ln Expressway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Marginal Deficiency with a Change in Classification to 6.2 Prime Arterial – With change in classification, failing LOS only occurs in short segment. Address traffic congestion through operational improvements such as right-turn lanes.</li> </ul>



Appendix I. Impacted Roadway Segment and Supporting Rationale for LOS E/F Level Acceptance

Roadway / Segment Limits	Proposed Classification / Forecast	Alternate Classification (Los D or Better)	Rationale for Proposed Classification and LOS E/F
<u>West Willows Road</u> Alpine Blvd to Viejas Grade Rd	2.2C 2-Ln Light Collector with Intermittent Turn Lanes LOS F (20.5K ADT)	4.2B 4-Ln Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tribal Gaming – Proposed Ewiiapaayp Casino is included in the traffic model on the site of the existing Indian Health Center, but actual site for proposed casino has not been determined. There is a good probability that the casino will be located further east, near Viejas Casino. Should this occur, then traffic would access the facility either from East Willows or the New Interchange. If the 8.5K ADT associated with this proposed casino were relocated, West Willows Road would operated as LOS D. Should this not occur and the casino is located where shown on the traffic model, then the classification for West Willows Road may need to be reevaluated.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul>
<u>Tavern Road</u> I-8 EB Ramps to Alpine Blvd	4.1A 4-Ln Major Road with Raised Median LOS E (35.7K ADT)	6.2 6-Ln Prime Arterial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Marginal Deficiency - LOS failing only in short segment. Address traffic congestion through operational improvements such as right-turn lanes.</li> <li>Town Center – Widening to four would adversely impact existing businesses.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul>
<b>County Islands</b>			
<u>Pomerado Road</u> I-15 NB Ramps to Willow Creek Rd	4.1A 4-Ln Major Road with Raised Median LOS E (34.8K ADT)	6.2 6-Ln Prime Arterial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consistent with Adjacent Jurisdiction – Classification is consistent with City of San Diego classification.</li> </ul>
<b>Jamul - Dulzura</b>			
<u>Campo Road/SR-94</u> Valle de Oro CPA boundary to Melody Rd	4-Ln State Highway 4.1A: 4-Ln Major Road with Raised Median LOS E/F (20.3K – 31.4K ADT)	4-Ln State Highway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unfunded State Facilities – Road would not be failing if County Mobility Element classification and 2030 RTP planned improvements were consistent (2030 RTP funds two-lane roadway only).</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul> <p>Note: Traffic model forecast LOS is based on a two-lane State highway to be consistent with 2030 RTP. Previous traffic models with SR-94 included as a four-lane roads resulted in LOS A-C.</p>
<u>Campo Road/SR-94</u> Barrett Lake Rd to Tecate Sub-Group Area boundary	2-Ln State Highway 2.1D: 2-Ln Community Collector with Improvement Options LOS E/F (17.2K – 19.5K ADT)	4-Ln State Highway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environmental Constraints – Located in area with steep slopes and biologically sensitive vegetation.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul> <p>NOTE - Traffic model does not reflect changes in capture rate between Tecate, USA and Tecate, Mexico based on the Kimley-Horn analysis of the Tecate Sponsor Group land use plan and traffic model, along with changes made to the Tecate Sponsor Group land use plan as a result of this analysis. Continued coordination with the Tecate Sponsor Group is required to ensure SR-94 will operate at LOS A-D at build-out of the Land Use Map.</p>

Appendix I. Impacted Roadway Segment and Supporting Rationale for LOS E/F Level Acceptance

Roadway / Segment Limits	Proposed Classification / Forecast	Alternate Classification (Los D or Better)	Rationale for Proposed Classification and LOS E/F
<u>Lyons Valley Road</u> Campo Rd to Skyline Truck Trail	2.2D 2-Ln Light Collector with Improvement Options LOS E (17.2K ADT)	4.2B 4-Ln Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marginal Deficiency - Address traffic congestion through operational improvements such as right-turn lanes.</li> <li>• Community Consensus - Desire to maintain rural community character by restricting road to two lanes.</li> </ul>
<b>Lakeside</b>			
<u>SR-67</u> Poway city limits to Scripps Poway Pkwy	4-Ln State Highway 4.1B 4-Ln Major Road with Intermittent Turn Lanes LOS F (35.8K ADT)	6-Ln State Highway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental Constraints – Located in area with steep slopes and biologically sensitive vegetation.</li> <li>• 2030 RTP – Proposed classification is consistent with 2030 Regional Transportation Plan.</li> </ul>
<u>SR-67</u> Scripps Poway Pkwy to Mapleview St	6-Ln State Highway 6.2 6-Ln Prime Arterial LOS F (44.5K – 55.3ADT)	6-Ln State Highway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unfunded State Facilities – Road would not be failing if County Mobility Element and 2030 RTP planned improvements were consistent (2030 RTP funds 4 lane conventional roadway only).</li> <li>• Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul> <p>Note: Traffic model forecast LOS is based on a four-lane State highway to be consistent with 2030 RTP. Previous traffic models with SR-67 included as a six-lane road resulted in LOS A-C.</p>
<u>Maine Avenue</u> Mapleview St to Woodside Ave	2.2E 2-Ln Light Collector LOS E (15.4K ADT)	4.2B 4-Ln Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marginal Deficiency - LOS failing only in short segment. Address traffic congestion through operational improvements such as right-turn lanes.</li> <li>• Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul> <p>Note: Most of the road would not operate at a failing LOS (as shown on the traffic model map) because River Street, a parallel road that is not included in the traffic model, would accommodate the excess traffic on most of Maine Ave.</p>
<u>Los Coches Road</u> Woodside Ave to I-8 Business Route	2.1D 2-Ln Community Collector with Improvement Options LOS E (14.2K –17.7K ADT)	4.2B 4-Ln Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sufficient Right-of-Way – Proposed classification provides sufficient right-of-way to accommodate operational improvements and widening to four lanes, if necessary.</li> <li>• Community Consensus - Desire to maintain rural community character by restricting road to two lanes.</li> </ul>

Appendix I. Impacted Roadway Segment and Supporting Rationale for LOS E/F Level Acceptance

Roadway / Segment Limits	Proposed Classification / Forecast	Alternate Classification (Los D or Better)	Rationale for Proposed Classification and LOS E/F
<u>Willow Road</u> SR-67 to Ashwood St	2.2E 2-Ln Light Collector LOS E (13.7K –15.3K ADT)	2.1D 2-Ln Community Collector with Improvement Options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unfunded State Facilities – Traffic model forecast does not include improvements that are not included on the 2030 RTP which would extend SR-67 as a freeway north of Willow Road, construct an overpass at Willow Road, and construct a full SR-67 interchange at Winter Gardens Boulevard.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Community prefers the proposed unfunded improvements to the State highway network in lieu of widening Willow road.</li> </ul> <p>Note: Traffic model forecast LOS is based on a two-lane road, without overpass at Willow Road and a full SR-67 interchange at Winter Gardens Boulevard, since these improvements are not included in the 2030 RTP. Previous traffic models with that included these improvements resulted in LOS A-C.</p>
<u>Wildcat Canyon Road</u> Willow Rd to Ramona/Barona CPA boundary	2.1D 2-Ln Community Collector with Improvement Options LOS F (34.9K ADT)	6.2 6-Ln Prime Arterial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environmental Constraints – Wildcat is a narrow, winding road that is overburdened with traffic to Barona Casino. It travels through very steep terrain and environmentally sensitive areas. A recent project to provide a limited passing lane has been difficult and costly.</li> <li>Community Consensus – The Planning Group does not want to see significant expansion on Wildcat. They would rather deal with the forecasted unacceptable level of service.</li> </ul>
<u>Mapleview Street</u> State Route 67 to Ashwood St	4.1A 4-Ln Major Road with Raised Median LOS F (39.3K ADT)	6.2 6-Ln Prime Arterial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unfunded State Facilities – The traffic model does not include SR-67 improved as a freeway and an overpass at Mapleview Street, since they are not included in the 2030 RTP.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul> <p>Note: Previous traffic models include the above improvements, resulting in Mapleview Street operating at LOS D.</p>
<u>Lake Jennings Park Road</u> I-8 Business Route to I-8 WB Off-Ramp	4.1B 4-Ln Major Road with Intermittent Turn Lanes LOS F (37.8K ADT)	6.2 6-Ln Prime Arterial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Marginal Deficiency - LOS failing only in short segment. Address traffic congestion through operational improvements such as right-turn lanes.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul>
<u>Woodside Avenue</u> Winter Gardens Blvd. to Shamrock Ln	4.2A 4-Ln Boulevard with Raised Median LOS E (29.7K ADT)	4.1B 4-Ln Major Road with Intermittent Turn Lanes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Marginal Deficiency - LOS failing only in short segment. Address traffic congestion through operational improvements such as right-turn lanes.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul>

Appendix I. Impacted Roadway Segment and Supporting Rationale for LOS E/F Level Acceptance

Roadway / Segment Limits	Proposed Classification / Forecast	Alternate Classification (Los D or Better)	Rationale for Proposed Classification and LOS E/F
<b>Otay</b>			
<u>Siempre Viva Road</u> SR-11 EB Ramps to Loop Rd	4.1A 4-Ln Major Road with Raised Median LOS F (39.4K ADT)	6.2 6-Ln Prime Arterial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Marginal Deficiency - LOS failing only in short segment. Address traffic congestion through operational improvements such as right-turn lanes.</li> <li>Unfunded State Facilities – The 2030 RTP includes only a half interchange for SR-11 at Siempre Viva Road, where a full interchange would improve traffic flow.</li> </ul>
<b>Ramona</b>			
<u>Julian Rd/SR-67</u> Mussey Grade Rd to Highland Valley Rd	4-Ln State Highway 4-Ln Major Road with Raised Median LOS F (28.7K ADT)	6-Ln State Highway 6.2: 6-Ln Prime Arterial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Marginal Deficiency - LOS failing only in short segment. Address traffic congestion through operational improvements such as right-turn lanes.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul>
<u>Main Street/SR-78</u> 9th St to 11th St	4-Ln State Highway 4.1B: 4-Ln Major Road with Intermittent Turn Lanes / 4.2B: 4-Ln Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes LOS E (31.0K ADT)	4-Ln State Highway 4.1A: 4-Ln Major Road with Raised Median	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Town Center – Widening Main Street / SR-78 to six lanes would adversely impact existing businesses.</li> <li>Marginal Deficiency - LOS failing only in short segment. Address traffic congestion through operational improvements such as right-turn lanes.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Planning Group preference is to retain road at four lanes.</li> </ul>
<u>Julian Road/SR-78</u> 3rd St to Earham St	2-Ln State Highway 2-Ln Community Collector with Improvement Options LOS E (17.4K ADT)	4-Ln State Highway 4.2B: 4-Ln Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Marginal Deficiency - LOS failing only in short segment. Address traffic congestion through operational improvements such as right-turn lanes.</li> <li>Sufficient Right-of-Way – Proposed classification requires sufficient right-of-way to accommodate operational improvements, if necessary.</li> </ul>
<u>7th Street</u> Elm St to G St	2.2E 2-Ln Light Collector LOS E/F (14.9K – 15.4K ADT)	2.1D 2-Ln Community Collector with Improvement Options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Town Center – Widening 7th Street to four lanes would adversely impact existing development.</li> <li>Community Consensus – The Planning Group is willing to accept a lower level of service rather than adversely impact existing development.</li> </ul>
<u>Wildcat Canyon Road / Barona Road</u> Lakeside CPA boundary to Barona Casino	2.1D 2-Ln Community Collector with Improvement Options LOS E/F (34.9K ADT)	6.2 6-Ln Prime Arterial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environmental Constraints – Wildcat is a narrow, winding road that is overburdened with traffic to Barona Casino. It travels through very steep terrain and environmentally sensitive areas. A recent project to provide a limited passing lane has been difficult and costly.</li> </ul>
<b>Spring Valley</b>			
<u>Paradise Valley Road</u> Elkelton Blvd to Sweetwater Rd	4.1B 4-Ln Major Road with Intermittent Turn Lanes LOS F (35.5K ADT)	6.2 6-Ln Prime Arterial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unfunded State Facilities – Congestion in this area is primarily due to unfunded deficiencies with the SR-125 interchange and Paradise Valley Road.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul>

Appendix I. Impacted Roadway Segment and Supporting Rationale for LOS E/F Level Acceptance

Roadway / Segment Limits	Proposed Classification / Forecast	Alternate Classification (Los D or Better)	Rationale for Proposed Classification and LOS E/F
<u>Jamacha Road</u> SR-125 SB Ramps to Sweetwater Rd	4.1B 4-Ln Major Road with Intermittent Turn Lanes LOS F (39.9K ADT)	6.2 6-Ln Prime Arterial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marginal Deficiency - LOS failing only in short segment. Address traffic congestion through operational improvements such as right-turn lanes.</li> <li>• Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul>
<u>Kenwood Drive</u> Andreen St to SR-94 EB Ramps	2.2D 2-Ln Light Collector with Improvement Options LOS E/F (14.6K ADT)	2.1D 2-Ln Community Collector with Improvement Options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unfunded State Facilities – Congestion in this area is primarily due to unfunded deficiencies with the SR-94 interchange at Kenwood Drive.</li> <li>• Sufficient Right-of-Way – Proposed classification provides sufficient right-of-way to accommodate operational improvements, such as right-turn lanes.</li> </ul>
<u>Bancroft Drive</u> Troy St to SR-94 EB Ramps	2.2D 2-Ln Light Collector with Improvement Options LOS E/F (17.2K – 20.0K ADT)	4.2B 4-Ln Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Established Land Development Patterns – Widening road to four lanes would adversely impact existing businesses, an elementary school, and County park</li> <li>• Community Consensus – Planning Group supports maintaining this as a two-lane road to minimize impacts to existing development.</li> </ul>
<b>Sweetwater</b>			
<u>Briarwood Road</u> SR-54 WB Ramps to Robinwood Rd	2.1D 2-Ln Community Collector with Improvement Options LOS E (18.7K ADT)	4.2B 4-Ln Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marginal Deficiency - LOS failing only in short segment. Address traffic congestion through operational improvements such as right-turn lanes.</li> <li>• Sufficient Right-of-Way – Proposed classification provides sufficient right-of-way to accommodate operational improvements, such as right-turn lanes.</li> </ul>
<u>Sweetwater Road</u> Willow St to Orchard Hill Rd	2.1C 2-Ln Community Collector with Intermittent Turn Lanes LOS E (16.5K ADT)	4.2B 4-Ln Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Established Land Development Patterns – Widening road to four lanes would adversely impact existing dwelling units and County Park.</li> <li>• Community Consensus – Consistent with community preference.</li> </ul>
<u>Central Avenue</u> Sweetwater Rd to Bonita Rd	2.2B 2-Ln Light Collector with Continuous Turn Lane LOS E (17.1K ADT)	4.2B 4-Ln Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marginal Deficiency - LOS failing only in short segment. Address traffic congestion through operational improvements such as right-turn lanes.</li> <li>• Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul>
<b>Valle De Oro</b>			
<u>Campo Road/SR-94</u> Avocado Blvd to Jamacha Rd	6-Ln State Highway 6.2 6-In Prime Arterial and Interchange with Jamacha Road LOS E (70.9K – 79.6K ADT)	6-Ln Freeway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unfunded State Facilities – Improvements to this segment are not included in the 2030 RTP. With these improvements, including interchange, road should function similar to a freeway and operate at LOS D.</li> </ul> <p>Note: Traffic model included segment as four-lane Major Road since 6-lane freeway improvements are not programmed in the 2030 RTP.</p>

Appendix I. Impacted Roadway Segment and Supporting Rationale for LOS E/F Level Acceptance

Roadway / Segment Limits	Proposed Classification / Forecast	Alternate Classification (Los D or Better)	Rationale for Proposed Classification and LOS E/F
<u>Jamacha Road</u> Campo Rd/SR-94 to Fury Ln	6.2 6-Ln Prime Arterial LOS F (70.1K ADT)	6.1 6-Ln Freeway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Established Land Development Patterns – Six lanes retains R.O.W. for the existing development. Operational improvements, such as right-turn lanes are necessary to improve traffic flow.</li> <li>Unfunded State Facilities – Grade separation will be needed for ramps connecting this road to State Route 94/Campo Road.</li> </ul>
<u>Campo Road</u> Kenwood Dr to Conrad Dr	4.2B 4-Ln Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes LOS F (47.5K ADT)	6.2 6-Ln Prime Arterial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Marginal Deficiency - LOS failing only in short segment. Address traffic congestion through operational improvements such as right-turn lanes.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul>
<u>Fuerte Drive</u> Bancroft Dr to Avocado Blvd	2.1E 2-Ln Community Collector LOS E/F (13.4K – 19.3K ADT)	4.2B 4-Ln Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Established Land Development Patterns – Widening road to four lanes would adversely impact existing dwelling units.</li> <li>Environmental Constraints – Located in area with steep slopes where widening the road would require excessive grading.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul>
<b>Eastern Communities</b>			
<b>Desert</b>			
<u>Borrego Springs Road</u> Diamond Bar Rd to Tilting T Dr	2.2D 2-Ln Light Collector with Improvement Options LOS E (14.1K ADT)	2.1D 2-Ln Community Collector with Improvement Options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sufficient Right-of-Way – Traffic model forecast this road segment with 600 ADT above the Los D threshold. Proposed classification provides sufficient right-of-way to accommodate operational improvements, such as right-turn lanes, if necessary.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul>
<u>Palm Canyon Drive</u> Ocotillo Cir to Stirrup Rd	2.2A 2-Ln Light Collector with Raised Median LOS E/F (18.8K – 19.4K ADT)	4.2B 4-Ln Boulevard with Intermittent Turn Lanes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Established Land Development Patterns – Widening road to four lanes would adversely impact existing development, while underutilized alternate route exist.</li> <li>Community Consensus – Consistent with Planning Group preference.</li> </ul>
<b>Mountain Empire</b>			
<u>Tecate Road/SR-188</u> Campo Rd to USA/Mexico Border	4-Ln State Highway 4-Ln Major Road with Raised Median LOS F (37.2 K ADT)	4-Ln State Highway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Incomplete Road Network – Regional traffic model does not include a network of local public roads that would be necessary to support the proposed development. The more established network should improve traffic operations on SR-188.</li> </ul> <p>Note: Traffic model does not reflect changes in capture rate between Tecate, USA and Tecate, Mexico based on the Kimley-Horn analysis of the Tecate Sponsor Group land use plan and traffic model, along with changes made to the Tecate Sponsor Group land use plan as a result of this analysis. Continued coordination with the Tecate Sponsor Group is required to ensure SR-94 will operate at LOS A-D at build-out of the Land Use Map.</p>

Appendix I. Impacted Roadway Segment and Supporting Rationale for LOS E/F Level Acceptance

Roadway / Segment Limits	Proposed Classification / Forecast	Alternate Classification (Los D or Better)	Rationale for Proposed Classification and LOS E/F
<p><u>Campo Road/SR-94</u> Jamul CPA to Potrero Valley Rd</p>	<p>2-Ln State Highway 2-Ln Light Collector with Improvement Options LOS F (23.4 ADT)</p>	<p>4-Ln State Highway</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimize Environmental Impacts – SR- 94 passes through a number of wildlife preserves containing sensitive species and habitats. Additionally, visual impacts would be significant.</li> <li>• Community Consensus – The Policy Advisory Committee recommended that CALTRANS plan SR- 94 as a two-lane road.</li> </ul> <p>Note: Traffic model does not reflect changes in capture rate between Tecate, USA and Tecate, Mexico based on the Kimley-Horn analysis of the Tecate Sponsor Group land use plan and traffic model, along with changes made to the Tecate Sponsor Group land use plan as a result of this analysis. Continued coordination with the Tecate Sponsor Group is required to ensure SR-94 will operate at LOS A-D at build-out of the Land Use Map.</p>

Source: County of San Diego; May 2009