# Section 5.0

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS



# 5.2 TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION/PARKING

This section evaluates potential traffic-related and parking impacts associated with the proposed project. The following discussion is based on the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) prepared by Urban Systems Associates, Inc. (USAI) in 2012 (Draft EIR Appendix C), as well as the parking analysis prepared by Walker Parking Consultants (December 2011; Draft EIR Appendix D) and the Sight Visibility Analysis prepared by Leppert Engineering Corporation (Leppert; July 27, 2011; Draft EIR Appendix E).

# 5.2.1 Existing Conditions

# Methodology and Approach

Street system operating conditions are typically described in terms of level of service (LOS). LOS is a qualitative measure of a roadway's operating performance and of the motorists' perception of roadway performance, expressed as a letter designation from A to F, with A representing the best operating conditions and F the worst. This measure considers factors such as roadway geometrics, signal phasing, speed, travel delay, and freedom to maneuver. Unlike most street system analysis, the freeway ramp metering analysis is based on vehicle delay and queues, not LOS.

The City considers LOS D to be the minimum performance standard in the study area for roadways, intersections, and freeways. Based on the City's guidelines, ramp meter delays greater than 15 minutes are not acceptable.

# Roadway Segment Analysis Methodology

Street segments were analyzed based upon the comparison of average daily traffic (ADT) volumes to the roadway design capacity. The significance of a project's traffic impact is measured in terms of the change in the volume-to-capacity ratio (V/C) caused by the addition of project traffic.

# Intersection Analysis Methodology

The LOS at City intersections was determined based on the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM; Transportation Research Board 2000) methodology. Intersection LOS is measured in terms of seconds of delay experienced by motorists during the morning and afternoon peak hours. The morning peak hours are typically between 7:00 AM and 9:00 AM, and the afternoon peak hours are typically between 4:00 PM and 6:00 PM. Peak hour intersection capacity is a key indicator of overall transportation network performance because intersections accommodate a number of conflicting traffic flows (e.g., left turns versus opposing through movements) as motorists proceed to their various destinations. If the conflicting flows are not managed efficiently, intersections may create "bottlenecks," which limit mobility throughout the network. On most major thoroughfares, intersection traffic controls (e.g., stop signs and traffic signals) are used to ensure safe and efficient movement of vehicles through intersections. Delays occur as motorists wait for vehicles making conflicting movements to pass through the intersection. These delays become especially pronounced during peak commuting periods, when the greatest demand is placed on the transportation system. LOS D is the minimum peak hour performance standard. LOS E and F reflect heavily congested conditions.

LOS criteria differ for signalized and unsignalized intersections. For signalized intersections, LOS criteria are stated in terms of the average control delay per vehicle for a 15-minute analysis period. Control delay includes initial deceleration delay, queue move-up time, stopped delay, and final acceleration delay. For unsignalized intersections, LOS is determined by the computed or measured control delay and is defined for each minor movement; LOS is not defined for the intersection as a whole. Table 5.2-1, *LOS Criteria for Intersections*, provides the LOS criteria for intersections.

Table 5.2-1 LOS CRITERIA FOR INTERSECTIONS										
LOS	LOS Delay (seconds)									
LUS	Signalized	Unsignalized								
А	<u>&lt;</u> 10.0	<u>&lt;</u> 10								
В	>10 and <u>&lt;</u> 20	>10 and <u>&lt;</u> 15								
С	>20 and <35	>15 and <25								
D	>35 and <55	>25 and <35								
E	>55 and <80	>35 and <50								
F	>80	>50								

Source: HCM 2000

# Freeway Segment Analysis Methodology

The freeway mainline segments were analyzed during the AM and PM peak hours based on a methodologies developed by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) District 11. This method consists of determining the LOS based on V/C as outlined in the HCM. Freeways operations at LOS D or better are considered acceptable, while operations of LOS E and F are considered unacceptable.

# Freeway Ramp Metering Analysis

The freeway on-ramps with 20 or more project trips were analyzed based on the methodology outlined in the City's Traffic Impact Study Guidelines for ramp metering. Ramp delays and queues were calculated using a calculated delay and queue approach. The calculated delay and queue approach is based solely on the specific time intervals at which the ramp meter is programmed to release traffic.

# **Traffic Study Area**

The study area for traffic was defined in consultation with City transportation staff by intersections and roadway segments within the project area with at least 50 project-generated trips in one direction during a peak hour, freeway segments with at least 50 peak direction trips, and ramp meters with at least 20 peak trips. The traffic study area includes a total of 31 roadway segments, 36 intersections, 7 freeway segments (in both directions), and 3 ramp meters. These

analyzed facilities are identified in Tables 5.2-2 through 5.2-5 and their locations are shown on Figure 5.2-1, *Traffic Study Area*.

# **Existing Roadway Network**

Figure 5.2-2, *Existing ADT Volumes*, depicts the existing roadway system within the project area. The key roadways in the project area are described below.

# Interstate 5

I-5 is a north-south Interstate Freeway with a posted speed limit of 65 miles per hour (mph). This freeway provides direct access to the cities of Encinitas, Carlsbad, Oceanside and San Diego, as well as Los Angeles and Orange, counties. Within the study area (Lomas Santa Fe to the I-805 merge), I-5 varies between 8 and 20 lanes.

# State Route 56

SR 56 is a six-lane east-west highway that connects I-5 with I-15. The posted speed limit is 65 mph.

# Del Mar Heights Road

Del Mar Heights Road is generally an east-west trending roadway within the study area (Mango Drive to Carmel Canyon Road). Between Mango Drive and Portofino Drive, it has a functional classification of a five-lane major roadway. From Portofino Drive to the I-5 northbound (NB) ramps, it has a functional classification of a five-lane prime arterial, and a six-lane major roadway between the I-5 NB ramps to High Bluff Drive. From High Bluff Drive to Carmel Canyon Road, Del Mar Heights is functionally and ultimately classified as a six-lane prime arterial. The roadway width within the traffic study area is 102 feet and the posted speed limit is 40 mph. No parking is allowed along this section of the roadway. Class II bike lanes<sup>1</sup> are located along both sides of the road.

# El Camino Real

El Camino Real is a generally north-south trending roadway within the study area. This roadway has a functional classification of a two-lane collector from Via de la Valle to San Dieguito Road, an ultimate classification of a four-lane major from San Dieguito Road to Del Mar Heights Road, a functional classification of a six-lane major from Del Mar Heights Road to Valley Centre Drive, and a functional classification of a five-lane major from Valley Centre Drive to Carmel Valley Road. El Camino Real varies in width from 40 to 102 feet based on the roadway classification. The posted speed limit is 50 mph. No parking is allowed along this roadway. Class II bike lanes are located along both sides of the road, except from Via de la Valle to San Dieguito Road.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Class II bike lanes provide a striped lane for one-way bike travel on a street.

### Carmel Country Road

Carmel Country Road is functionally classified as a four-lane major within the study area. It is a generally north-south trending roadway and extends between Del Mar Heights Road and Carmel Mountain Road with a posted speed limit of 40 mph. No parking is allowed along this roadway. Class II bike lanes are located along both sides of the road.

### Carmel Canyon Road

Carmel Canyon Road is a generally north-south trending roadway. It is functionally classified as a four-lane major between Del Mar Heights Road and Carmel County Road. The posted speed limit is 30 mph. No parking is allowed along this roadway. Class II bike lanes are located along both sides of the road.

### Carmel Creek Road

Carmel Creek Road is functionally classified as a four-lane major between Carmel Country Road and SR 56 westbound (WB) ramps. No parking is allowed along the roadway. The roadway width is 78 feet and the posted speed limit is 30 mph. Class II bike lanes are included on the roadway.

### Valley Centre Drive

Valley Centre Drive is a generally east-west trending roadway and is functionally classified as a four-lane collector between Carmel View Road and Carmel Creek Road. The roadway width is 73 feet and the post speed limit is 30 mph. No parking is allowed along this roadway. Class II bike lanes are located along both sides of the road.

# Carmel Valley Road

Carmel Valley Road is a generally east-west trending roadway and is functionally classified as a six-lane prime arterial between the I-5 NB ramps and El Camino Real. The roadway width of Carmel Valley Road is 102 feet. No parking is allowed along this roadway, and no bike lanes are present.

# High Bluff Drive

High Bluff Drive is a generally north-south trending roadway and is constructed as a three-lane collector on the northern portion of the segment between Del Mar Heights Road and El Camino Real), and a four-lane collector on the southern portion of this segment. The posted speed limit is 30 mph. No parking is allowed along this roadway. Class II bike lanes are located along both sides of the road.



# **Traffic Study Area**

ONE PASEO

Figure 5.2-1



#### I:\ArcGIS\K\KIL-03 SDCorporateCenter\Map\ENV\EIR\Fig5.2-2\_Existing\_Traffic.indd -KF

# **Existing ADT Volumes**

ONE PASEO Figure 5.2-2

## Via de la Valle

Via de la Valle is a generally east-west trending roadway and has a functional classification of a two-lane collector between San Andres Drive and El Camino Real and an ultimate classification of a four-lane major roadway. The width of the roadway is 40 feet. No parking is allowed along this roadway. Class II bike lanes are located along portions of both sides of the road.

### **Existing Roadway Conditions**

Table 5.2-2, *Existing Conditions – Roadway Segments*, shows the classification, capacity, ADT, LOS, and V/C for each analyzed roadway segment under existing conditions. Figure 5.2-2 depicts the ADT of each analyzed roadway segment. Currently, all analyzed roadway segments operate at LOS D or better, with the exception of the following:

- El Camino Real from Via de la Valle to San Dieguito Road (LOS F); and
- Via de la Valle from San Andres Drive to El Camino Real (West) (LOS F).

### **Existing Intersection Conditions**

Table 5.2-3, *Existing Conditions – Intersections*, shows the average vehicle delay and LOS at each of the 36 analyzed intersections. As shown in the table, all analyzed intersections operate at LOS D or better during AM and PM peak hours under existing conditions, with the exception of the following intersection:

Table 5.2-2   EXISTING CONDITIONS – ROADWAY SEGMENTS									
Roadway Segment	Functional Classifi- cation <sup>1</sup>	Capacity	ADT	V/C	LOS				
Del Mar Heights Road									
Mango Drive to Portofino Drive	5-M	45,000	21,314	0.47	В				
Portofino Drive to I-5 SB ramps	5-PA	50,000	36,086	0.72	С				
I-5 SB ramps to I-5 NB ramps	5-PA	50,000	40,090	0.80	D				
I-5 NB ramps to High Bluff Drive	PA	60,000	51,625	0.86	D				
High Bluff Drive to Third Avenue	PA	60,000	37,910	0.63	С				
Third Avenue to First Avenue	PA	60,000	37,910	0.63	С				
First Avenue to El Camino Real	PA	60,000	37,910	0.63	С				
El Camino Real to Carmel Country Road	PA	60,000	32,674	0.54	В				
Carmel Country Road to Torrey Ridge Road	PA	60,000	21,658	0.36	Α				
Torrey Ridge Road to Lansdale Drive	PA	60,000	19,071	0.32	Α				
Lansdale Drive to Carmel Canyon Road	PA	60,000	15,188	0.25	Α				
El Camino Real									
Via de la Valle to San Dieguito Road	2-Ca	15,000	15,579	1.04	F				
San Dieguito Road to Derby Downs Road	4-M	40,000	13,915	0.35	Α				
Derby Downs Road to Half Mile Drive	4-M	40,000	15,333	0.38	В				
Half Mile Drive to Quarter Mile Drive	4-M	40,000	13,516	0.34	A				

• Carmel Creek Road/Del Mar Trail (LOS E during the AM peak hour)

EXISTING CONDITIONS – ROADWAY SEGMENTS										
Roadway Segment	Functional Classifi- cation <sup>1</sup>	Capacity	ADT	V/C	LOS					
El Camino Real (cont.)					_					
Quarter Mile Drive to Del Mar Heights Road	4-M	40,000	14,925	0.37	Α					
Del Mar Heights Road to Townsgate Drive	6-M	50,000	14,731	0.29	Α					
Townsgate Drive to High Bluff Drive	6-M	50,000	15,425	0.31	Α					
High Bluff Drive to Valley Centre Drive	6-M	50,000	19,364	0.39	Α					
Valley Centre Drive to Carmel Valley Road	5-M	45,000	27,589	0.61	С					
Carmel Country Road										
Del Mar Heights Road to Townsgate Drive	4-M	40,000	15,932	0.40	В					
Townsgate Drive to Carmel Creek Road	4-M	40,000	13,878	0.35	Α					
Carmel Creek Road to Carmel Canyon Road	4-M	40,000	13,137	0.33	Α					
Carmel Canyon Road to SR 56 WB ramps	4-M	40,000	20,553	0.51	В					
Carmel Canyon Road										
Del Mar Heights Road to Carmel County Road	4-M	40,000	12,224	0.31	Α					
Carmel Creek Road										
Carmel Country Road to Carmel Grove Road	4-M	40,000	11,206	0.28	Α					
Carmel Grove Road to SR 56 WB ramps	4-M	40,000	14,862	0.37	Α					
Valley Centre Drive										
Carmel View Road to Carmel Creek Road	4-C	30,000	10,875	0.36	В					
Carmel Valley Road										
I-5 NB ramps to El Camino Real	PA	60,000	43,375	0.72	С					
High Bluff Drive										
Del Mar Heights Road to El Camino Real	2-Ca	15,000	9,842	0.66	С					
Via de la Valle										
San Andres Drive to El Camino Real (West)	2-Cb	10,000	24,400	2.44	F					

T 11 500(

1.

Source: USAI 2012 <sup>1</sup> 2-Ca = two-lane collector, 2-Cb = two-lane collector with no fronting property, 4-C = four-lane collector, 4-M = 5-M = five-lane major, 5-PA = five-lane Prime Arterial, 6-M = six-lane major; PA = six-lane Prime Arterial Shaded cells indicate roadway segments currently operating at an LOS E or F.

	Table 5.2-3   EXISTING CONDITIONS – INTERSECTIONS									
		AM Peak	Hour	PM Peak Hour						
No. <sup>1</sup>	Intersection <sup>2</sup>	Delay (seconds)	LOS	Delay (seconds)	LOS					
1	El Camino Real/Via de la Valle	27.7	С	30.0	С					
2	El Camino Real/San Dieguito Road	16.6	В	23.8	С					
3	El Camino Real/Derby Downs Road	4.3	Α	3.3	Α					
4	El Camino Real/Half Mile Drive	19.6	В	16.8	В					
5	El Camino Real/Quarter Mile Drive	20.0	В	14.0	В					
6	Del Mar Heights Road/Mango Drive	31.7	С	29.7	С					
7	Del Mar Heights Road/Portofino Drive*	9.3	Α	9.1	Α					
8	Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 SB ramps	22.5	С	20.3	С					
9	Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 NB ramps	35.1	D	37.5	D					
10	Del Mar Heights Road/High Bluff Drive	26.1	С	28.9	C					
11	Del Mar Heights Road/Third Avenue	DNE	DNE	DNE	DNE					

	Table 5.2-3 (cont.) EXISTING CONDITIONS – INTER	SECTION	S		
		AM Peak	Hour	PM Peak	Hour
No. <sup>1</sup>	Intersection <sup>2</sup>	Delay (seconds)	LOS	Delay (seconds)	LOS
12	Del Mar Heights Road/First Avenue	DNE	DNE	DNE	DNE
13	Del Mar Heights Road/El Camino Real	27.2	С	26.9	C
14	Del Mar Heights Road/Carmel Country Road	22.1	С	24.3	С
15	Del Mar Heights Road/Torrey Ridge Road	22.7	С	14.9	В
16	Del Mar Heights Road/Lansdale Drive	20.4	С	19.8	В
17	Del Mar Heights Road/Carmel Canyon Road	13.4	В	9.8	Α
18	El Camino Real/Del Mar Highland Town Center	7.2	Α	12.4	В
19	Carmel County Road/Townsgate Drive	25.8	С	20.2	С
20	El Camino Real/Townsgate Drive	18.2	В	13.0	В
21	Carmel Country Road/Carmel Creek Road	45.3	D	23.2	С
22	El Camino Real/High Bluff Drive	25.2	С	27.9	С
23	Carmel View Road/High Bluff Drive*	8.3	Α	9.0	Α
24	Carmel Creek Road/Carmel Grove Road	26.8	С	17.2	В
25	Carmel Valley Road/I-5 SB ramps	19.6	В	27.0	С
26	Carmel Valley Road/I-5 NB ramps	12.6	В	18.2	В
27	El Camino Real/Valley Centre Drive	20.9	С	19.7	В
28	El Camino Real/Carmel Valley Road	14.0	В	16.8	В
29	El Camino Real/SR 56 EB on-ramp	15.4	В	24.4	С
30	Carmel View Road/Valley Centre Drive	6.7	Α	7.8	Α
31	Carmel Creek Road/SR 56 WB ramps	37.0	D	20.7	С
32	Carmel Creek Road/SR 56 EB ramps	11.6	В	19.5	В
33	Carmel Country Road/Carmel Canyon Road	31.9	С	23.2	С
34	Carmel Country Road/SR 56 WB ramps	15.7	В	10.9	В
35	Carmel Country Road/SR 56 EB ramps	13.4	В	11.5	В
36	Carmel Creek Road/Del Mar Trail*	41.6	Е	20.1	С

Number corresponds with intersection location on Figure 5.2-1.

<sup>2</sup> All intersections were analyzed as signalized unless otherwise noted by \*

DNE = does not exist

Shaded cells indicate intersections currently operating at an LOS E or F.

### **Freeway Segments**

Table 5.2-4, Existing Conditions – Freeway Segments, shows the peak hour volumes, V/C, and LOS of the seven analyzed freeway segments (in both directions). As the table indicates, the analyzed freeway segments currently operate at LOS D or better during the peak hour.

Table 5.2-4   EXISTING CONDITIONS – FREEWAY SEGMENTS									
Segment	Direction	ADT	Peak Hour Volume	V/C	LOS				
1-5									
Lomos Santa Eo Drivo to Via do la Vallo	NB	222,000	8,089	0.632	С				
Lonias Santa Fe Drive to via de la valle	SB	222,000	8,350	0.652	С				
Via da la Valla ta Dal Mar Haighta Road	NB	238,000	8,672	0.645	С				
via de la valle lo Del Mai Heights Road	SB	238,000	8,951	0.666	С				
Dal Mar Haights Road to SR 56	NB	241,000	8,781	0.556	В				
Dei Mai neights Koad to SK 50	SB	241,000	9,064	0.574	В				
SP 56 to Cormol Mountain Boad	NB	288,000	13,118	0.575	В				
SK 50 to Carmer Mountain Road	SB	288,000	12,883	0.629	С				
Cormal Mountain Road to I 805 marga	NB	288,000	13,118	0.558	В				
Carmer Mountain Road to 1-803 merge	SB	288,000	12,883	0.548	В				
SR 56									
El Comino Pool to Cormol Crook Pood	EB	81,000	5,294	0.814	D				
El Camino Real to Camiel Cleek Road	WB	81,000	5,429	0.835	D				
Cormel Creek Pood to Cormel Country Pood	EB	76,000	4,967	0.764	С				
Carmer Creek Road to Carmer Country Road	WB	76,000	5,093	0.784	С				

### **Freeway Ramp Metering**

Table 5.2-5, *Existing Conditions – Freeway Ramp Meters*, shows the peak hour demand, meter rate, and excess demand, as well as the calculated and observed delay and queue length, for the three analyzed ramp meters. As shown in the table, the delays for NB and SB ramps are minimal.

Table 5.2-5   EXISTING CONDITIONS – FREEWAY RAMP METERS									
Location	Peak Hour	Demand (vehicles per hour)	Meter Rate <sup>1</sup> (vehicles per hour)	Excess Demand (vehicles per hour)	Calcu- lated Delay (minutes)	Calcu- lated Queue (feet)	Observed Delay (minutes)	Observed Queue (feet)	
Del Mar Heights Road/	AM	406	368	38	6.2	1,102	1.0	261	
I-5 SB on-ramp (WB)	PM	242	368	0	0	0	1.0	145	
Del Mar Heights Road/	AM	360	499	0	0	0	2.0	319	
I-5 SB on-ramp (EB)	PM	204	499	0	0	0	1.0	58	
Del Mar Heights Road/	AM			Me	ter not turned	l on			
I-5 NB on-ramp	PM	516	593	0	0	0	1.5	203	

<sup>1</sup>Meter rate is based on the most restrictive meter rate provided by Caltrans. Source: USAI 2012

### 5.2.2 <u>Impact</u>

- Issue 1: Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of 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?
- Issue 2: Would the project 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?

### **Impact Thresholds**

In accordance with the City's Significance Determination Thresholds, traffic/circulation impacts would be significant if the project would result in any of the following conditions:

- The LOS at an intersection, roadway segment, or freeway segment would decrease from A through D to E or F;
- Any intersection, roadway segment, or freeway segment affected by the project would operate at LOS E or F under either direct or cumulative conditions, and the project exceeds the thresholds shown in Table 5.2-6, *Traffic Significance Thresholds*; and/or
- A substantial amount of traffic would be added to a congested freeway segment, interchange, or ramp exceeding the values shown in Table 5.2-6.

Table 5.2-6 TRAFFIC SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS										
	Fre	A	llowable Chai Roadway	ige Due to Pro Segments	oject Impact**	Ramn				
Level of Service With Project*	V/C	Speed (mph)	V/C	Speed (mph)	Intersections Delay (seconds)	Metering Delay (minutes)				
E (or ramp meter delays above 15 minutes)	0.010	1.0	0.02	1.0	2.0	2.0				
F (or ramp meter delays above 15 minutes)	0.005	0.5	0.01	0.5	1.0	1.0				

Source: City 2011a

Note 1: The allowable increase in delay at a ramp meter with more than 15 minutes delay and freeway LOS E is 2 minutes.

Note 2: The allowable increase in delay at a ramp meter with more than 15 minutes delay and freeway LOS F is 1 minute.

- <sup>\*</sup> All LOS measurements are based upon HCM procedures for peak-hour conditions. However, V/C ratios for roadway segments are estimated on an ADT/24-hour traffic volume basis (using Table 2 of the City's Traffic Impact Study Manual) (1998). The acceptable LOS for freeways, roadways, and intersections is generally "D" ("C" for undeveloped locations). For metered freeway ramps, LOS does not apply. However, ramp meter delays above 15 minutes are considered excessive.
- \*\* If a proposed project's traffic causes the values shown in the table to be exceeded, the impacts are determined to be significant. The project applicant shall then identify feasible improvements (within the Traffic Impact Study) that will restore/and maintain the traffic facility at an acceptable LOS. If the LOS with the proposed project becomes unacceptable (see above \* note), or if the project adds a significant amount of peak-hour trips to cause any traffic queues to exceed on- or off-ramp storage capacities, the project applicant shall be responsible for mitigating the project's direct significant and/or cumulatively considerable traffic impacts.

5.2-9

The Congestion Management Program (CMP) regional guidelines were developed by SANDAG to provide a set of procedures for enhanced CEQA review for certain projects. These guidelines stipulate that projects that would generate 2,400 or more ADT, or 200 or more peak hour trips, must be evaluated in accordance with the requirements of the CMP. The CMP analysis must include the LOS impacts on affected freeways and Regionally Significant Arterial systems. The proposed project exceeds these thresholds for ADT and peak hour trips and therefore, a CMP level analysis is required. The City of San Diego guidelines are consistent with the methodologies contained in the CMP. Further, the City's Significance Determination Thresholds pertaining to traffic/circulation (as identified above) are more restrictive than those contained in the CMP. Therefore, CMP requirements are met through the analysis below that is based on City significance thresholds.

# Impact Analysis

The baseline for purposes of this traffic analysis is the date of the NOP, May 25, 2010. This constitutes the baseline physical conditions against which project traffic impacts are determined. An Existing Plus Project analysis for Phase 1, Phases 1 and 2, and Project Buildout (Phases 1, 2, and 3) was conducted to compare existing conditions without the project to existing conditions with all three phases of the project.

In addition, the traffic study analyzed Near-term scenarios and Long-term Cumulative (Year 2030) scenarios. A Near-term analysis was conducted that evaluated Phase 1, Phases 1 and 2, and Phases 1, 2, and 3 of the proposed project plus other approved, pending, or planned projects in the project vicinity (identified in Section 7.0 of the TIA: Draft EIR Appendix C). The City requires a Near-term analysis that describes the effects of the project on conditions anticipated to occur prior to the time of the anticipated date of EIR certification. Within that period, other developers could implement previously proposed and/or approved projects, potentially resulting in rapid changes to traffic conditions that existed at the time of circulation of the NOP. Both the impacts identified in the Near-term analysis and impacts identified in the Existing Plus Project analysis are considered direct project impacts by the City.

Two additional variants of the Near-term analysis were also completed to describe the potential effects of constructing the proposed cinema in Phase 1 or 2 instead of Phase 3 of the project. However, these variants do not form the basis of impact conclusions or required mitigation. They are provided solely for informational purposes.

Finally, the *Long-term Cumulative (Year 2030)* represents traffic conditions in the year 2030 and comprises the basis of cumulative impact determinations in this analysis.

In sum, the analyzed scenarios include:

- Existing Conditions
- Existing Plus Project (Phase 1);
- Existing Plus Project (Phases 1 and 2);
- Existing Plus Project Buildout;
- Near-term Without Project;
- Near-term With Project (Phase 1);

- Near-term With Project (Phases 1 and 2);
- Near-term With Project Buildout;
- Near-term With Project (Cinema in Phase 1);
- Near-term With Project (Cinema in Phase 2);
- Long-term Cumulative (Year 2030) Without Project; and
- Long-term Cumulative (Year 2030) With Project.

### Trip Generation

Table 5.2-7, *Project Trip Generation of Proposed Project – Phase 1*, shows the traffic volumes generated by the project associated with Phase 1. As shown in this table, Phase 1 of the proposed project would generate 9,888 ADT with 894 trips in the AM peak hour and 1,188 trips in the PM peak hour (accounting for mixed-use reductions).

Table 5.2-8, *Project Trip Generation of Proposed Project – Phases 1 and 2*, shows the traffic volumes generated by the project for Phases 1 and 2. As shown in this table, Phases 1 and 2 of the proposed project would generate 17,812 ADT with 1,182 trips in the AM peak hour and 2,021 trips in the PM peak hour (accounting for mixed-use reductions).

Table 5.2-9, *Trip Generation Of Proposed Project At Buildout*, shows the traffic volumes generated by project buildout. As shown in this table, the proposed project would generate a total of 26,961 ADT with 1,538 trips in the AM peak hour and 2,932 trips in the PM peak hour (accounting for mixed-use reductions). Mixed-use reductions are applied because, according to the City of San Diego Traffic Impact Study Manual (dated July 1998), most of the trip generation rate data available have been developed from measurements at isolated single-use developments. When uses are combined, simply adding the single-use estimates together can result in a total trip generation estimate that is too great for the site. The credit accounts for the reduction in trips from the combined uses.

Table 5.2-7   PROJECT TRIP GENERATION OF PROPOSED PROJECT - PHASE 1									
Use	ADT	A	M Peak H	Iour		PM Peak Hour			
	ADI	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total		
Corporate office	2,450	331	37	368	37	331	368		
Multi-tenant office	3,786	443	49	492	106	424	530		
Retail	4,026	72	48	120	181	181	362		
Mixed-use reductions	-374	-78	-8	-86	-12	-60	-72		
TOTAL	9,888	768	126	894	312	876	1,188		

Source: USAI 2012

Table 5.2-8   PROJECT TRIP GENERATION OF PROPOSED PROJECT - PHASES 1 AND 2									
Use	ADT	AN	M Peak H	lour		PM Pea	ak Hour		
	ADI	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total		
Corporate office	2,450	331	37	368	37	331	368		
Multi-tenant office	3,786	443	49	492	106	424	530		
Community shopping center	11,019	198	132	330	551	551	1,102		
Multi-family residential	1,164	19	74	93	81	35	116		
Mixed-use reductions	-607	-80	-21	-101	-28	-67	-95		
TOTAL	17,812	911	271	1,182	747	1,274	2,021		

Table 5.2-9   TRIP GENERATION OF PROPOSED PROJECT AT BUILDOUT									
Use	ADT -	AM	Peak I	Iour	PM Peak Hour				
Use		In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total		
Corporate office	2,450	331	37	368	37	331	368		
Multi-tenant office	3,786	443	49	492	106	424	530		
Hotel	1,500	54	36	90	72	48	120		
Retail	14,781	266	177	443	739	739	1,478		
Cinema	2,200	0	0	0	98	142	240		
Multi-family residential	3,648	58	233	391	255	109	365		
Mixed-use reductions	-1,404	-95	-52	-147	-77	-92	-169		
TOTAL	26,961	1,057	481	1,538	1,231	1,701	2,932		

Source: USAI 2012

### Existing Plus Project Conditions

Existing Plus Project conditions compares existing conditions without the project to existing conditions with all three phases of the project (Phase 1, Phases 1 and 2, and project buildout). Existing Plus Project traffic volumes were derived by adding project traffic trips (see Tables 5.2-7, 5.2-8, and 5.2-9) to existing volumes.

#### Existing Plus Project (Phase 1)

The Existing Plus Project (Phase 1) scenario represents only traffic generated by Phase 1 of the proposed project.

<u>Roadway Segments</u>. Table 5.2-10, *Existing Plus Project (Phase 1) Conditions – Roadway Segments*, shows the ADT, LOS, and V/C for analyzed roadway segments under Existing Plus Project (Phase 1) conditions. Under this scenario, all analyzed segments would operate at LOS D or better, with the exception of the following three segments:

- Del Mar Heights Road between the I-5 NB ramps and High Bluff Drive (LOS E);
- El Camino Real between Via de la Valle and San Dieguito Road (LOS F); and
- Via de la Valle from San Andres Drive to El Camino Real (West) (LOS F).

The roadway segments of El Camino Real and Via de la Valle would operate at LOS F with or without the project, but the increase in V/C would be greater than 0.01, which exceeds the City's significance thresholds. With the addition of project traffic, the LOS along the Del Mar Heights Road segment would decrease from D to E. Impacts to these roadway segments would be potentially significant under Existing Plus Project (Phase 1) conditions.

<u>Intersections</u>. Table 5.2-11, *Existing Plus Project (Phase 1) Conditions – Intersections,* shows the average vehicle delay and LOS at each of the analyzed intersections under Existing Plus Project (Phase 1) conditions. As shown in the table, all analyzed intersections would operate at LOS D or better during AM and PM peak hours except for the following intersection:

• Carmel Creek Road/Del Mar Trail (LOS E during the AM peak hour)

This intersection would operate at LOS E with or without the project, and the increase in deay would be 2.0 seconds with Phase 1 of the project, which does not exceed the City's significance thresholds (greater than 2.0 for intersections operating at LOS E). Therefore, direct project impacts to this intersection would be less than significant.

<u>Freeway Segments</u>. Table 5.2-12, *Existing Plus Project (Phase 1) Conditions – Freeway Segments*, shows the ADT, peak hour volume, V/C, and LOS for analyzed freeway segments under Existing Plus Project (Phase 1) conditions. As shown in the table, all analyzed segments would operate at LOS D or better. Impacts to freeway segments therefore would be less than significant under Existing Plus Project (Phase 1) conditions.

<u>Freeway Ramp Meters</u>. Table 5.2-13, *Existing Plus Project (Phase 1) Conditions – Freeway Ramp Meters*, shows the delay and queue length for analyzed ramp meters under Existing Plus Project (Phase 1) conditions. As shown in the table, no delays would occur, except at Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 SB on-ramp (WB), where a delay of 8.07 minutes is expected. Because the delay would be less than 15 minutes, impacts would be less than significant.

Table 5.2-10								
EXISTING PL	US PROJEC	T (PHASE	1) CONDI	TIONS – ROA	ADWAY SE	GMENTS		
		<b>`</b>	,					
	Existing Conditions			Existing Plus Project (Phase 1)				~
Roadway Segment	ADT	V/C	LOS	ADT	V/C	LOS	$\Delta V/C$	Significant?
Del Mar Heights Road								
Mango Drive to Portofino Drive	21,314	0.47	В	22,204	0.49	В	0.02	No
Portofino Drive to I-5 SB ramps	36,086	0.72	С	37,273	0.75	С	0.03	No
I-5 SB ramps to I-5 NB ramps	40,090	0.80	D	42,166	0.84	D	0.04	No
I-5 NB ramps to High Bluff Drive	51,625	0.86	D	55,481	0.92	Е	0.06	Yes
High Bluff Drive to Third Avenue	ĺ.	DNE		42,360	0.71	С		No
Third Avenue to First Avenue		DNE		41,371	0.69	С		No
First Avenue to El Camino Real		DNE		40,382	0.67	С		No
El Camino Real to Carmel Country Road	32,674	0.55	В	35,344	0.59	В	0.04	No
Carmel Country Road to Torrey Ridge Road	21,658	0.36	А	22,943	0.38	Α	0.02	No
Torrey Ridge Road to Lansdale Drive	19,071	0.32	А	19,961	0.33	А	0.01	No
Lansdale Drive to Carmel Canyon Road	15,188	0.25	А	15,682	0.26	А	0.01	No
El Camino Real		•						•
Via de la Valle to San Dieguito Road	15,579	1.04	F	15,876	1.06	F	0.02	Yes
San Dieguito Road to Derby Downs Road	13,915	0.35	А	14,311	0.36	А	0.01	No
Derby Downs Road to Half Mile Drive	15,333	0.38	В	15,729	0.39	В	0.01	No
Half Mile Drive to Quarter Mile Drive	13,516	0.34	А	14,010	0.35	А	0.01	No
Quarter Mile Drive to Del Mar Heights Road	14,925	0.37	А	15,518	0.39	В	0.02	No
Del Mar Heights Road to Townsgate Drive	14,731	0.30	А	16,214	0.32	Α	0.02	No
Townsgate Drive to High Bluff Drive	15,425	0.31	А	16,710	0.33	А	0.03	No
High Bluff Drive to Valley Centre Drive	19,364	0.39	А	20,254	0.41	В	0.02	No
Valley Centre Drive to Carmel Valley Road	27,589	0.61	С	28,182	0.63	С	0.02	No
Carmel Country Road		•		•				•
Del Mar Heights Road to Townsgate Drive	15,932	0.40	В	16,921	0.42	В	0.02	No
Townsgate Drive to Carmel Creek Road	13,878	0.35	А	14,669	0.37	Α	0.02	No
Carmel Creek Road to Carmel Canyon Road	13,137	0.33	А	13,631	0.34	А	0.01	No
Carmel Canyon Road to SR 56 WB ramps	20,553	0.51	В	20,949	0.52	В	0.01	No
Carmel Canyon Road		-						
Del Mar Heights Road to Carmel County Road	12,224	0.31	А	12,422	0.31	А	0	No
Carmel Creek Road								
Carmel Country Road to Carmel Grove Road	11,206	0.28	А	11,503	0.29	Α	0.01	No
Carmel Grove Road to SR 56 WB ramps	14,862	0.37	В	15,159	0.38	В	0.01	No
Valley Centre Drive								
Carmel View Road to Carmel Creek Road	10,875	0.36	В	10,974	0.37	В	0.01	No
Carmel Valley Road								
I-5 NB ramps to El Camino Real	43,375	0.72	С	43,573	0.73	С	0.01	No
High Bluff Drive				•				
Del Mar Heights Road to El Camino Real	9,842	0.66	С	10,139	0.67	D	0.01	No
Via de la Valle	· · ·							
San Andres Drive to El Camino Real (West)	24,400	2.44	F	24,598	2.46	F	0.02	Yes
Source: USAI 2012		•			•			

 $\Delta$  V/C = difference in V/C between With Project conditions and Without Project conditions

DNE = does not exist Shaded cells indicate roadway segments that would exceed the City's significance thresholds.

	Table 5.2-11   EXISTING PLUS PROJECT (PHASE 1) CONDITIONS – INTERSECTIONS												
AM Peak Hour   PM Peak Hour													
No. <sup>1</sup>	Intersection	Exis Condi	ting itions	Existin Proj (Phas	g Plus ject se 1)	A Delay	Signif-	Exist Condi	ing tions	Existing Plus Project (Phase 1)		Δ Delay	Signif-
		Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	(sec)	icant.	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	(sec)	Kant:
1	El Camino Real/Via de la Valle	27.7	С	28.2	С	0.5	No	30.0	С	30.9	С	0.9	No
2	El Camino Real/San Dieguito Road	16.6	В	16.8	В	0.2	No	23.8	С	25.0	С	1.2	No
3	El Camino Real/Derby Downs Road	4.3	Α	4.3	Α	0.0	No	3.3	Α	4.5	Α	1.2	No
4	El Camino Real/Half Mile Drive	19.6	В	20.5	С	0.9	No	16.8	В	17.5	В	0.7	No
5	El Camino Real/Quarter Mile Drive	20.0	В	20.1	С	0.1	No	14.0	В	15.0	В	1.0	No
6	Del Mar Heights Road/Mango Drive	31.7	С	32.3	С	0.6	No	29.7	С	31.6	С	1.9	No
7	Del Mar Heights Road/Portofino Drive	9.3	Α	9.5	Α	0.2	No	9.1	Α	9.2	Α	0.1	No
8	Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 SB ramps	22.5	С	24.2	С	1.7	No	20.3	С	22.2	С	1.9	No
9	Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 NB ramps	35.1	D	36.2	D	1.1	No	37.5	D	38.0	D	0.5	No
10	Del Mar Heights Road/High Bluff Drive	26.1	С	26.6	С	0.5	No	28.9	С	34.2	С	5.3	No
11	Del Mar Heights Road/Third Avenue	DN	νE	5.4	Α		No	DN	E	10.5	В		No
12	Del Mar Heights Road/First Avenue	DN	ΙE	4.0	А		No	DN	E	11.3	В		No
13	Del Mar Heights Road/El Camino Real	27.2	С	30.6	С	3.4	No	26.9	С	30.3	С	3.4	No
14	Del Mar Heights Road/Carmel Country Road	22.1	С	24.9	С	2.8	No	24.3	С	24.9	С	0.6	No
15	Del Mar Heights Road/Torrey Ridge Road	22.7	С	24.0	С	1.3	No	14.9	В	16.6	В	1.7	No
16	Del Mar Heights Road/Lansdale Drive	20.4	С	21.7	С	1.3	No	19.8	В	19.9	В	0.1	No
17	Del Mar Heights Road/Carmel Canyon Road	13.4	В	13.6	В	0.2	No	9.8	Α	9.8	Α	0.0	No
18	El Camino Real/Del Mar Highland Town Center	7.2	Α	15.9	В	8.7	No	12.4	В	22.7	С	10.3	No
19	Carmel County Road/Townsgate Drive	25.8	С	26.4	С	0.6	No	20.2	С	21.7	С	1.5	No
20	El Camino Real/Townsgate Drive	18.2	В	18.5	В	0.3	No	13.0	В	13.8	В	0.8	No
21	Carmel Country Road/Carmel Creek Road	45.3	D	46.7	D	1.4	No	23.2	С	25.3	С	2.1	No
22	El Camino Real/High Bluff Drive	25.2	С	25.5	С	0.3	No	27.9	С	28.8	С	0.9	No
23	Carmel View Road/High Bluff Drive	8.3	Α	8.6	Α	0.3	No	9.0	Α	9.3	Α	0.3	No
24	Carmel Creek Road/Carmel Grove Road	26.8	С	26.8	С	0.0	No	17.2	В	17.2	В	0.0	No
25	Carmel Valley Road/I-5 SB ramps	19.6	В	20.0	В	0.4	No	27.0	С	27.7	С	0.7	No
26	Carmel Valley Road/I-5 NB ramps	12.6	В	12.6	В	0.0	No	18.2	В	18.3	В	0.1	No
27	El Camino Real/Valley Centre Drive	20.9	С	20.9	С	0.0	No	19.7	В	20.1	С	0.4	No
28	El Camino Real/Carmel Valley Road	14.0	В	14.9	В	0.9	No	16.8	В	20.5	С	3.7	No
29	El Camino Real/SR 56 EB on-ramp	15.4	В	15.6	В	0.2	No	24.4	С	25.3	С	0.9	No
30	Carmel View Road/Valley Centre Drive	6.7	Α	6.7	А	0.0	No	7.8	Α	7.8	Α	0.0	No
31	Carmel Creek Road/SR 56 WB ramps	37.0	D	38.8	D	1.8	No	20.7	С	20.8	С	0.1	No
32	Carmel Creek Road/SR 56 EB ramps	11.6	В	11.7	В	0.1	No	19.5	В	25.0	С	5.5	No

	Table 5.2-11 (cont.) EXISTING PLUS PROJECT (PHASE 1) CONDITIONS – INTERSECTIONS												
	AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour												
No. <sup>1</sup>	Intersection	Exist Condi	Existing Conditions Existing Plus Project (Phase 1)			Δ Delay	Signif-	Exist Condit	ing tions	Existin Proj (Phas	g Plus ect se 1)	Δ Delay	Signif-
		Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	(sec)	icant?	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	(sec)	icant?
33	Carmel Country Road/Carmel Canyon Road	31.9	С	32.0	С	0.1	No	23.2	С	25.0	С	1.8	No
34	Carmel Country Road/SR 56 WB ramps	15.7	В	15.8	В	0.1	No	10.9	В	11.3	В	0.4	No
35	35   Carmel Country Road/SR 56 EB ramps   13.4   B   13.4   B   0.0   No   11.5   B   11.8   B   0.3   No												
36	36   Carmel Creek Road/Del Mar Trail   41.6   E   43.6   E   2.0   No   20.1   C   20.9   C   0.8   No												

DNE = does not exist

<sup>1</sup> Number corresponds with intersection location on Figure 5.2-1. Shaded cells indicate intersections that would exceed the City's significance thresholds.

Table 5.2-12 EXISTING PLUS PROJECT (PHASE 1) CONDITIONS – FREEWAY SEGMENTS													
SegmentDirectionExisting ConditionsExisting Plus Project (Phase 1)Δ V/CSignif- icant?													
		V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS		icant?						
1-5													
Lamas Santa Ea Driva ta Via da la Valla NB 0.632 C 0.634 C 0.002 No													
Lonias Santa Fe Drive to via de la valle	SB	0.652	С	0.654	С	0.002	No						
Via de la Valla to Del Mar Heighta Read	NB	0.645	С	0.647	С	0.002	No						
Via de la Valle to Del Mai Heights Road	SB	0.666	С	0.668	С	0.002	No						
Dal Mar Unighta Dood to SD 56	NB	0.557	В	0.561	В	0.004	No						
Del Mai Heighis Koad to SK 50	SB	0.574	В	0.579	В	0.005	No						
SD 56 to Cormel Mountain Dood	NB	0.575	В	0.577	В	0.002	No						
SK 50 to Carmer Mountain Road	SB	0.629	С	0.631	С	0.002	No						
Cormal Mountain Road to L 805 marga	NB	0.558	В	0.560	В	0.002	No						
Carmer wouldain Road to 1-805 merge	SB	0.548	В	0.550	В	0.002	No						

Table 5.2-12 (cont.) EXISTING PLUS PROJECT (PHASE 1) CONDITIONS – FREEWAY SEGMENTS													
SegmentDirectionExisting ConditionsExisting Plus Project (Phase 1)Signif- icent?													
		V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS		icant:						
SR 56													
El Camino Roal to Carmol Croak Road	EB	0.814	D	0.816	D	0.002	No						
El Camino Real lo Camiel Cleek Road	WB	0.835	D	0.837	D	0.002	No						
EB 0.764 C 0.766 C 0.002 No													
Carmer Creek Road to Carmer Country Road	WB	0.784	С	0.786	C	0.002	No						
	WB	0.784	C	0.786	C	0.002	INO						

Table 5.2-13 EXISTING PLUS PROJECT (PHASE 1) CONDITIONS – FREEWAY RAMP METERS													
Location Peak Hour Existing Conditions Existing Plus Project (Phase 1) A Delay Significant?													
Location	Peak Hour	Delay (minutes)	Queue (feet)	Delay (minutes)	Queue (feet)	(minutes)	Significant?						
Del Mar Heights Road/ I-5	AM	6.20	1,102	8.07	1,436	1.87	No						
SB on-ramp (WB)	PM	0	0	0	0	0	No						
Del Mar Heights Road/ I-5	AM	0	0	0	0	0	No						
SB on-ramp (EB)	PM	0	0	0	0	0	No						
Del Mar Heights Road/ I-5	AM		Meter not tu	irned on		0	No						
NB on-ramp	PM	0	0	0	0	0	No						

Source: USAI 2012

# Existing Plus Project (Phases 1 and 2)

The Existing Plus Project (Phases 1 and 2) scenario represents only traffic generated by Phases 1 and 2 of the proposed project.

<u>Roadway Segments</u>. Table 5.2-14, *Existing Plus Project (Phases 1 And 2) Conditions – Roadway Segments*, shows the ADT, LOS, and V/C for analyzed roadway segments under Existing Plus Project (Phases 1 and 2) conditions. Under this scenario, all analyzed segments would operate at LOS D or better, with the exception of three segments:

- Del Mar Heights Road between the I-5 NB ramps and High Bluff Drive (LOS E);
- El Camino Real between Via de la Valle and San Dieguito Road (LOS F); and
- Via de la Valle from San Andres Drive to El Camino Real (West) (LOS F).

The roadway segments of El Camino Real and Via de la Valle would operate at LOS F with or without the project, but the increase in V/C would be greater than 0.01, which exceeds the City's significance thresholds. With the addition of Phases 1 and 2 project traffic, the LOS along the Del Mar Heights Road segment would decrease from D to E. Impacts to these roadway segments would be potentially significant under Existing Plus Project (Phases 1 and 2) conditions.

<u>Intersections</u>. Table 5.2-15, *Existing Plus Project (Phases 1 And 2) Conditions – Intersections,* shows the average vehicle delay and LOS at each of the analyzed intersections under Existing Plus Project (Phases 1 and 2) conditions. As shown in the table, all analyzed intersections would operate at LOS D or better during AM and PM peak hours, with the exception of the following intersection:

• Carmel Creek Road/Del Mar Trail (LOS E during the AM peak hour)

Although this intersection would operate at LOS E with or without the project, the delay would increase by 2.9 seconds, which would exceed the City's significance thresholds. Impacts to this intersection therefore would be potentially significant under Existing Plus Project (Phases 1 and 2) conditions.

<u>Freeway Segments</u>. Table 5.2-16, *Existing Plus Project (Phases 1 And 2) Conditions – Freeway Segments*, shows the ADT, peak hour volume, V/C, and LOS for analyzed freeway segments under Existing Plus Project (Phases 1 and 2) conditions. As shown in the table, all analyzed segments would operate at LOS C or better. Impacts to freeway segments therefore would be less than significant under Existing Plus Project (Phases 1 and 2) conditions.

<u>Freeway Ramp Meters</u>. Table 5.2-17, *Existing Plus Project (Phases 1 And 2) Conditions – Freeway Ramp Meters*, shows the delay and queue length for analyzed ramp meters under Existing Plus Project (Phases 1 and 2) conditions. As shown in the table, no delays would occur, except at Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 SB on-ramp (WB), where a delay of 10.76 minutes is expected. Because the delay would be less than 15 minutes, project impacts to this ramps meter would be less than significant.

Table 5.2-14											
EXISTING PLUS PROJECT (PHASES 1 AND 2) CONDITIONS – ROADWAY SEGMENTS											
	Fvie	ting Conditi	ons	Evisting Plus	Project (Pha	sos 1 & 2)					
Roadway Segment		V/C		ADT			$\Delta V/C$	Significant?			
Del Mar Heights Road	ADI	110	105	ADI	110	105					
Mango Drive to Portofino Drive	21 314	0.47	В	22.917	0.51	В	0.04	No			
Portofino Drive to I-5 SB ramps	36.086	0.72	C	38 223	0.76	C	0.04	No			
I-5 SB ramps to I-5 NB ramps	40,090	0.80	D	43 831	0.88	D	0.08	No			
I-5 NB ramps to High Bluff Drive	51 625	0.86	D	58 572	0.98	E	0.12	Yes			
High Bluff Drive to Third Avenue	01,020	DNE	2	45 925	0.77	C		No			
Third Avenue to First Avenue		DNE		45 213	0.75	Č		No			
First Avenue to El Camino Real		DNE		45.213	0.75	C		No			
El Camino Real to Carmel Country Road	32,674	0.55	В	37 483	0.63	Č	0.08	No			
Carmel Country Road to Torrey Ridge Road	21.658	0.36	Ā	23.974	0.40	Ă	0.04	No			
Torrey Ridge Road to Lansdale Drive	19.071	0.32	A	20.674	0.35	A	0.03	No			
Lansdale Drive to Carmel Canvon Road	15,188	0.25	A	16.079	0.27	A	0.02	No			
El Camino Real				- •,•,•							
Via de la Valle to San Dieguito Road	15.579	1.04	F	16.113	1.07	F	0.03	Yes			
San Dieguito Road to Derby Downs Road	13.915	0.35	А	14.627	0.37	А	0.02	No			
Derby Downs Road to Half Mile Drive	15.333	0.38	В	16.045	0.40	B	0.02	No			
Half Mile Drive to Quarter Mile Drive	13.516	0.34	А	14.407	0.36	А	0.02	No			
Ouarter Mile Drive to Del Mar Heights Road	14.925	0.37	А	15,994	0.40	В	0.03	No			
Del Mar Heights Road to Townsgate Drive	14.731	0.30	А	17.403	0.35	А	0.05	No			
Townsgate Drive to High Bluff Drive	15,425	0.31	А	17,741	0.36	А	0.05	No			
High Bluff Drive to Valley Centre Drive	19.364	0.39	А	20,967	0.42	В	0.03	No			
Valley Centre Drive to Carmel Valley Road	27,589	0.61	С	28,658	0.64	С	0.03	No			
Carmel Country Road				. ,							
Del Mar Heights Road to Townsgate Drive	15,932	0.40	В	17,713	0.44	В	0.04	No			
Townsgate Drive to Carmel Creek Road	13,878	0.35	А	15,303	0.38	В	0.03	No			
Carmel Creek Road to Carmel Canyon Road	13,137	0.33	А	14,028	0.35	А	0.02	No			
Carmel Canvon Road to SR 56 WB ramps	20,553	0.51	В	21.265	0.53	С	0.02	No			
Carmel Canvon Road		•	•		•						
Del Mar Heights Road to Carmel County Road	12,224	0.31	А	12,580	0.32	А	0.01	No			
Carmel Creek Road		•	•		•						
Carmel Country Road to Carmel Grove Road	11,206	0.28	А	11,740	0.29	А	0.01	No			
Carmel Grove Road to SR 56 WB ramps	14,862	0.37	Α	15,396	0.39	В	0.02	No			
Valley Centre Drive		•	•		•						
Carmel View Road to Carmel Creek Road	10,875	0.36	В	11,053	0.37	В	0.01	No			
Carmel Valley Road		•	•		•						
I-5 NB ramps to El Camino Real	43,375	0.72	С	43,731	0.73	С	0.01	No			
High Bluff Drive				•							
Del Mar Heights Road to El Camino Real	9,842	0.66	С	10,376	0.69	D	0.03	No			
Via de la Valle	· ·	•		· ·							
San Andres Drive to El Camino Real (West)	24,400	2.44	F	24,756	2.48	F	0.04	Yes			
Source: USAL2012											

Source: USAI 2012  $\Delta V/C =$  difference in V/C between With Project conditions and Without Project conditions

DNE = does not exist Shaded cells indicate roadway segments that would exceed the City's significance thresholds.

	Table 5.2-15 EXISTING PLUS PROJECT (PHASES 1 AND 2) CONDITIONS – INTERSECTIONS													
			1 1 9 2 0	IIII0E0	1 11110 2									
				AM Pe	ak Hour					PM Pea	k Hour			
No. <sup>1</sup>	Intersection	Exis Cond	ting itions	Existin Pro (Phase	ng Plus ject 1 & 2)	Δ Delay	Signif-	Exis Condi	ting tions	Existing Proj (Phase	g Plus ect 1 & 2)	∆ Delay	Signif- icant?	
		Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	(sec)	icant.	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	(sec)	icant.	
1	El Camino Real/Via de la Valle	27.7	С	28.4	С	0.7	No	30.0	С	32.6	С	2.6	No	
2	El Camino Real/San Dieguito Road	16.6	В	16.8	В	0.2	No	23.8	С	25.8	С	2.0	No	
3	El Camino Real/Derby Downs Road	4.3	Α	4.3	Α	0.0	No	3.3	Α	4.6	Α	1.3	No	
4	El Camino Real/Half Mile Drive	19.6	В	20.6	С	1.0	No	16.8	В	17.8	В	1.0	No	
5	El Camino Real/Quarter Mile Drive	20.0	В	20.1	С	0.1	No	14.0	В	15.1	В	1.1	No	
6	Del Mar Heights Road/Mango Drive	31.7	C	32.5	С	0.8	No	29.7	С	32.3	С	2.6	No	
7	Del Mar Heights Road/Portofino Drive	9.3	Α	9.5	Α	0.2	No	9.1	Α	9.3	Α	0.2	No	
8	Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 SB ramps	22.5	C	24.8	С	2.3	No	20.3	С	24.0	С	3.7	No	
9	Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 NB ramps	35.1	D	37.5	D	2.4	No	37.5	D	41.2	D	3.7	No	
10	Del Mar Heights Road/High Bluff Drive	26.1	С	27.4	С	1.3	No	28.9	С	40.4	D	11.5	No	
11	Del Mar Heights Road/Third Avenue	DN	νЕ	6.8	Α		No	DN	ΙE	14.1	В		No	
12	Del Mar Heights Road/First Avenue	DN	νE	6.0	Α		No	DN	ΙE	15.8	В		No	
13	Del Mar Heights Road/El Camino Real	27.2	C	32.2	С	5.0	No	26.9	С	37.3	D	10.4	No	
14	Del Mar Heights Road/Carmel Country Road	22.1	С	25.5	С	3.4	No	24.3	С	28.6	С	4.3	No	
15	Del Mar Heights Road/Torrey Ridge Road	22.7	С	25.1	С	2.4	No	14.9	В	16.2	В	1.3	No	
16	Del Mar Heights Road/Lansdale Drive	20.4	С	22.1	С	1.7	No	19.8	В	23.8	С	4.0	No	
17	Del Mar Heights Road/Carmel Canyon Road	13.4	В	13.6	В	0.2	No	9.8	А	9.9	Α	0.1	No	
18	El Camino Real/Del Mar Highland Town Center	7.2	A	17.9	В	10.7	No	12.4	В	26.1	С	13.7	No	
19	Carmel County Road/Townsgate Drive	25.8	С	26.6	С	0.8	No	20.2	С	22.1	С	1.9	No	
20	El Camino Real/Townsgate Drive	18.2	В	18.6	В	0.4	No	13.0	В	13.7	В	0.7	No	
21	Carmel Country Road/Carmel Creek Road	45.3	D	47.7	D	2.4	No	23.2	С	25.7	С	2.5	No	
22	El Camino Real/High Bluff Drive	25.2	C	25.8	С	0.6	No	27.9	С	30.1	С	2.2	No	
23	Carmel View Road/High Bluff Drive	8.3	A	8.6	A	0.3	No	9.0	A	9.5	Α	0.5	No	
24	Carmel Creek Road/Carmel Grove Road	26.8	С	26.8	С	0.0	No	17.2	В	17.3	В	0.1	No	
25	Carmel Valley Road/I-5 SB ramps	19.6	В	20.1	С	0.5	No	27.0	С	27.9	С	0.9	No	
26	Carmel Valley Road/I-5 NB ramps	12.6	В	12.6	В	0.0	No	18.2	В	18.4	В	0.2	No	
27	El Camino Real/Valley Centre Drive	20.9	С	21.0	С	0.1	No	19.7	В	20.2	С	0.5	No	
28	El Camino Real/Carmel Valley Road	14.0	В	14.9	В	0.9	No	16.8	В	20.6	С	3.8	No	
29	El Camino Real/SR 56 EB on-ramp	15.4	В	15.7	В	0.3	No	24.4	С	26.0	С	1.6	No	
30	Carmel View Road/Valley Centre Drive	6.7	Α	6.7	Α	0.0	No	7.8	Α	7.8	Α	0.0	No	
31	Carmel Creek Road/SR 56 WB ramps	37.0	D	39.0	D	2.0	No	20.7	С	21.5	С	0.8	No	
32	Carmel Creek Road/SR 56 EB ramps	11.6	В	11.8	В	0.2	No	19.5	В	25.6	C	6.1	No	

	Table 5.2-15 (cont.) EXISTING PLUS PROJECT (PHASES 1 AND 2) CONDITIONS – INTERSECTIONS												
	AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour												
No. <sup>1</sup>	Intersection	Exist Condi	ting tions	Existin Proj (Phase	g Plus ect 1 & 2)	Δ Delay	Signif-	Exist Condit	ing tions	Existing Plus Project (Phase 1 & 2)		Δ Delay	Signif-
		Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	(sec)	icant:	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	(sec)	icant:
33	Carmel Country Road/Carmel Canyon Road	31.9	С	32.2	С	0.3	No	23.2	С	25.2	С	2.0	No
34	Carmel Country Road/SR 56 WB ramps	15.7	В	15.8	В	0.1	No	10.9	В	11.3	В	0.4	No
35	Carmel Country Road/SR 56 EB ramps	13.4	В	13.4	В	0.0	No	11.5	В	11.9	В	0.4	No
36	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$												

DNE = does not exist

<sup>1</sup> Number corresponds with intersection location on Figure 5.2-1. Shaded cells indicate intersections that would exceed the City's significance thresholds.

EXISTING PLUS	PROJECT (PHAS	Table 5.2-16 ES 1 AND 2) CON	DITIONS	– FREEWA	Y SEGMEN	TS	
Segment	Direction	Existing Cond	litions	Existing P (Phases	lus Project 1 and 2)	ΔV/C	Significant?
		V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS		
I-5							
Lomas Santa Fa Driva ta Via da la Valla	NB	0.632	С	0.636	С	0.004	No
Lonias Santa Fe Drive to Via de la Vane	SB	0.652	С	0.656	С	0.004	No
Via de la Valle te Del Mar Heighte Dead	NB	0.645	С	0.649	С	0.004	No
via de la valle lo Del Mai Heights Road	SB	0.666	С	0.670	С	0.003	No
Del Mar Heighte Decidite SD 56	NB	0.557	В	0.564	В	0.007	No
Del Mai Heights Road to SR 56	SB	0.574	В	0.582	В	0.008	No
CD 5( to Commol Mountain Day 1	NB	0.575	В	0.578	В	0.003	No
SK 56 to Carmer Mountain Road	SB	0.629	С	0.633	С	0.004	No
Complete Desite Desite L 205	NB	0.558	В	0.561	В	0.003	No
Carmel Mountain Road to 1-805 merge	SB	0.548	В	0.551	В	0.003	No
SR 56	· ·			•	•		
Fl Coming Dealth Committee I Deal	EB	0.814	D	0.818	D	0.004	No
EI Camino Keai to Carmel Creek Road	WB	0.835	D	0.839	D	0.004	No
Correct Croads Dead to Correct Country Dead	EB	0.764	С	0.768	С	0.004	No
Carmer Creek Koad to Carmer Country Koad	WB	0.784	С	0.787	С	0.003	No

Source: USAI 2012

Table 5.2-17   EXISTING PLUS PROJECT (PHASES 1 AND 2) CONDITIONS – FREEWAY RAMP METERS													
Location Peak Hour Existing Conditions Existing Plus Project (Phases 1 and 2) A Delay Significant?													
Location	Peak Hour	Delay (minutes)	Queue (feet)	Delay (minutes)	Queue (feet)	(minutes)	Significant?						
Del Mar Heights Road/ I-5	AM	6.20	1,102	10.76	1,914	4.56	No						
SB on-ramp (WB)	PM	0	0	0	0	0	No						
Del Mar Heights Road/ I-5	AM	0	0	0	0	0	No						
SB on-ramp (EB)	PM	0	0	0	0	0	No						
Del Mar Heights Road/ I-5	AM		Meter not tu	irned on		0	No						
NB on-ramp	PM	0	0	0	0	0	No						

# Existing Plus Project Buildout

The Existing Plus Project Buildout scenario represents only traffic generated by buildout of the proposed project.

<u>Roadway Segments</u>. Table 5.2-18, *Existing Plus Project Buildout Conditions – Roadway Segments*, shows the ADT, LOS, and V/C for analyzed roadway segments under Existing Plus Project Buildout conditions. Under this scenario, all analyzed segments would operate at LOS D or better, with the exception of the same three segments as those identified in the Existing Plus Project (Phase 1) and Existing Plus Project (Phases 1 and 2) conditions, as well one additional segment of Del Mar Heights Road:

- Del Mar Heights Road between the I-5 SB ramps and I-5 NB ramps (LOS E);
- Del Mar Heights Road between the I-5 NB ramps and High Bluff Drive (LOS F);
- El Camino Real between Via de la Valle and San Dieguito Road (LOS F); and
- Via de la Valle from San Andres Drive to El Camino Real (West) (LOS F).

The roadway segments of El Camino Real and Via de la Valle would operate at LOS F with or without the project, but the increase in V/C would be greater than 0.01, which exceeds the City's significance thresholds. With the addition of project buildout traffic, the LOS along the two Del Mar Heights Road segments would decrease from D to E and F. Impacts to these four roadway segments would be potentially significant under Existing Plus Project Buildout conditions.

<u>Intersections</u>. Table 5.2-19, *Existing Plus Project Buildout Conditions – Intersections*, shows the average vehicle delay and LOS at each of the analyzed intersections under Existing Plus Project Buildout conditions. As shown in the table, all analyzed intersections would operate at LOS D or better during AM and PM peak hours, with the exception of the following intersection:

• Carmel Creek Road/Del Mar Trail (LOS E during the AM peak hour)

Although this intersection would operate at LOS E with or without the project, the increase in delay resulting from project traffic would be greater than 0.02 (4.6 seconds), which exceeds the City's significance thresholds. Impacts to this intersection therefore would be potentially significant under Existing Plus Project (Buildout) conditions.

<u>Freeway Segments</u>. Table 5.2-20, *Existing Plus Project Buildout Conditions – Freeway Segments* shows the ADT, peak hour volume, V/C, and LOS for analyzed freeway segments under Existing Plus Project Buildout conditions. As shown in the table, all analyzed segments would operate at LOS C or better. Therefore, impacts to freeway segments would be less than significant under Existing Plus Project Buildout conditions.

<u>Freeway Ramp Meters</u>. Table 5.2-21, *Existing Plus Project Buildout Conditions – Freeway Ramp Meters*, shows the delay and queue length for analyzed ramp meters under Existing Plus Project Buildout conditions. As shown in the table, no delays would occur, except at Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 SB on-ramp (WB), where a delay of 13.53 minutes is expected in the AM peak hour and 3.99 minutes in the PM peak hour. Because delays would be less than 15 minutes, project impacts to this ramp meter would be less than significant.

EXISTING P	LUS PROJECT	T BUILDO	able 5.2-18 OUT CONDI	TIONS – ROA	DWAY SEC	GMENTS		
Deed-wee Comment	Exist	ting Condi	tions	Existing P	lus Project B	uildout		C:
Roadway Segment	ADT	V/C	LOS	ADT	V/C	LOS	$\Delta V/C$	Significant?
Del Mar Heights Road				•				
Mango Drive to Portofino Drive	21,314	0.47	В	23,740	0.53	В	0.06	No
Portofino Drive to I-5 SB ramps	36,086	0.72	С	39,321	0.79	С	0.07	No
I-5 SB ramps to I-5 NB ramps	40,090	0.80	D	45,752	0.92	E	0.12	Yes
I-5 NB ramps to High Bluff Drive	51,625	0.86	D	62,140	1.04	F	0.18	Yes
High Bluff Drive to Third Avenue		DNE		50,042	0.83	D		No
Third Avenue to First Avenue		DNE		48,964	0.82	С		No
First Avenue to El Camino Real		DNE		48,964	0.82	С		No
El Camino Real to Carmel Country Road	32,674	0.55	В	39,953	0.67	С	0.12	No
Carmel Country Road to Torrey Ridge Road	21,658	0.36	А	25,163	0.42	В	0.06	No
Torrey Ridge Road to Lansdale Drive	19,071	0.32	А	21,497	0.36	Α	0.04	No
Lansdale Drive to Carmel Canyon Road	15,188	0.25	А	16,536	0.28	А	0.03	No
El Camino Real				•			•	
Via de la Valle to San Dieguito Road	15,579	1.04	F	16,388	1.09	F	0.05	Yes
San Dieguito Road to Derby Downs Road	13,915	0.35	А	14,993	0.38	А	0.03	No
Derby Downs Road to Half Mile Drive	15,333	0.38	В	16,411	0.41	В	0.03	No
Half Mile Drive to Quarter Mile Drive	13,516	0.34	А	14,864	0.37	Α	0.03	No
Quarter Mile Drive to Del Mar Heights Road	14,925	0.37	А	16,543	0.41	В	0.04	No
Del Mar Heights Road to Townsgate Drive	14,731	0.30	А	20,123	0.40	В	0.10	No
Townsgate Drive to High Bluff Drive	15,425	0.31	А	18,930	0.38	Α	0.07	No
High Bluff Drive to Valley Centre Drive	19,364	0.39	А	21,790	0.44	В	0.05	No
Valley Centre Drive to Carmel Valley Road	27,589	0.61	С	29,207	0.65	С	0.04	No
Carmel Country Road				•			•	
Del Mar Heights Road to Townsgate Drive	15,932	0.40	В	18,628	0.47	В	0.07	No
Townsgate Drive to Carmel Creek Road	13,878	0.35	А	16,035	0.40	В	0.05	No
Carmel Creek Road to Carmel Canyon Road	13,137	0.33	А	14,485	0.36	А	0.03	No
Carmel Canyon Road to SR 56 WB ramps	20,553	0.51	В	21,631	0.54	С	0.03	No
Carmel Canyon Road					•	•	•	
Del Mar Heights Road to Carmel County Road	12,224	0.31	А	12,763	0.32	А	0.01	No
Carmel Creek Road	• •				•	•	•	
Carmel Country Road to Carmel Grove Road	11,206	0.28	А	12,015	0.30	А	0.02	No
Carmel Grove Road to SR 56 WB ramps	14,862	0.37	А	15,671	0.39	В	0.02	No
Valley Centre Drive	,							
Carmel View Road to Carmel Creek Road	10,875	0.36	В	11,145	0.37	В	0.01	No
Carmel Valley Road	,			,				
I-5 NB ramps to El Camino Real	43,375	0.72	С	43,914	0.73	С	0.01	No
High Bluff Drive	,			,				
Del Mar Heights Road to El Camino Real	9,842	0.66	С	10,651	0.71	D	0.05	No
Via de la Valle		•			•	•	•	•
San Andres Drive to El Camino Real (West)	24,400	2.44	F	24,939	2.49	F	0.05	Yes

Source: USAI 2012  $\Delta$  V/C = difference in V/C between With Project conditions and Without Project conditions

DNE = does not exist Shaded cells indicate roadway segments that would exceed the City's significance thresholds.

	Table 5.2-19 EXISTING PLUS PROJECT BUILDOUT CONDITIONS – INTERSECTIONS													
				AM Pea	ak Hour					PM Pea	k Hour			
No. <sup>1</sup>	Intersection	Existing Conditions		Existin Pro Build	g Plus ject lout	۸ Delay	Signif-	Exist Condi	ing tions	Existing Plus Project Buildout		Δ Delay	Signif-	
		Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	(sec)	icant.	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	(sec)	icant.	
1	El Camino Real/Via de la Valle	27.7	С	28.7	С	1.0	No	30.0	С	33.5	С	3.5	No	
2	El Camino Real/San Dieguito Road	16.6	В	17.0	В	0.4	No	23.8	С	26.4	С	2.6	No	
3	El Camino Real/Derby Downs Road	4.3	Α	4.3	А	0.0	No	3.3	Α	5.0	Α	1.7	No	
4	El Camino Real/Half Mile Drive	19.6	В	20.9	С	1.3	No	16.8	В	18.9	В	2.1	No	
5	El Camino Real/Quarter Mile Drive	20.0	В	20.4	С	0.4	No	14.0	В	14.4	В	0.4	No	
6	Del Mar Heights Road/Mango Drive	31.7	С	32.9	С	1.2	No	29.7	С	33.4	С	3.7	No	
7	Del Mar Heights Road/Portofino Drive	9.3	Α	9.6	А	0.3	No	9.1	Α	9.4	Α	0.3	No	
8	Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 SB ramps	22.5	С	25.1	С	2.6	No	20.3	С	25.9	С	5.6	No	
9	Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 NB ramps	35.1	D	40.4	D	5.3	No	37.5	D	51.3	D	13.8	No	
10	Del Mar Heights Road/High Bluff Drive	26.1	С	29.1	С	3.0	No	28.9	С	47.2	D	18.3	No	
11	Del Mar Heights Road/Third Avenue	DN	ΙE	8.7	А		No	DN	E	21.2	С		No	
12	Del Mar Heights Road/First Avenue	DN	ΙE	7.7	А		No	DN	E	22.0	С		No	
13	Del Mar Heights Road/El Camino Real	27.2	С	33.6	С	6.4	No	26.9	С	45.5	D	18.6	No	
14	Del Mar Heights Road/Carmel Country Road	22.1	С	26.5	С	4.4	No	24.3	С	36.5	D	12.2	No	
15	Del Mar Heights Road/Torrey Ridge Road	22.7	С	25.3	С	2.6	No	14.9	В	15.4	В	0.5	No	
16	Del Mar Heights Road/Lansdale Drive	20.4	С	22.9	С	2.5	No	19.8	В	27.6	С	7.8	No	
17	Del Mar Heights Road/Carmel Canyon Road	13.4	В	13.6	В	0.2	No	9.8	Α	10.0	Α	0.2	No	
18	El Camino Real/Del Mar Highland Town Center	7.2	Α	19.1	В	11.9	No	12.4	В	28.7	С	16.3	No	
19	Carmel County Road/Townsgate Drive	25.8	С	26.9	С	1.1	No	20.2	С	22.7	С	2.5	No	
20	El Camino Real/Townsgate Drive	18.2	В	18.8	В	0.6	No	13.0	В	14.1	В	1.1	No	
21	Carmel Country Road/Carmel Creek Road	45.3	D	49.2	D	3.9	No	23.2	С	27.7	С	4.5	No	
22	El Camino Real/High Bluff Drive	25.2	С	25.8	С	0.6	No	27.9	С	31.8	С	3.9	No	
23	Carmel View Road/High Bluff Drive	8.3	Α	8.7	А	0.4	No	9.0	Α	9.8	Α	0.8	No	
24	Carmel Creek Road/Carmel Grove Road	26.8	С	26.8	С	0.0	No	17.2	В	17.4	В	0.2	No	
25	Carmel Valley Road/I-5 SB ramps	19.6	В	20.1	С	0.5	No	27.0	С	27.6	С	0.6	No	
26	Carmel Valley Road/I-5 NB ramps	12.6	В	12.6	В	0.0	No	18.2	В	18.2	В	0.0	No	
27	El Camino Real/Valley Centre Drive	20.9	С	21.1	С	0.2	No	19.7	В	20.2	С	0.5	No	
28	El Camino Real/Carmel Valley Road	14.0	В	14.9	В	0.9	No	16.8	В	20.9	С	4.1	No	
29	El Camino Real/SR 56 EB on-ramp	15.4	В	16.1	В	0.7	No	24.4	С	26.5	C	2.1	No	

	Table 5.2-19 (cont.) EXISTING PLUS PROJECT BUILDOUT CONDITIONS – INTERSECTIONS												
				AM Pe	ak Hour		PM Peak Hour						
No. <sup>1</sup>	Intersection	Exis Condi	ting tions	Existin Proj Builo	g Plus ject lout	∆ Delay	Signif-	Exist Condi	ing tions	Existin Proj Builo	g Plus ect lout	A   Significant?     Delay (sec)   Significant?     0.0   No     0.9   No     6.5   No     2.3   No     0.5   No     0.6   No     2.8   No	
		Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	(sec)	icant:	Delay (sec) LOS Delay (sec)	LOS	(sec)	icalit:		
30	Carmel View Road/Valley Centre Drive	6.7	Α	6.7	Α	0.0	No	7.8	Α	7.8	Α	0.0	No
31	Carmel Creek Road/SR 56 WB ramps	37.0	D	39.4	D	2.4	No	20.7	С	21.6	С	0.9	No
32	Carmel Creek Road/SR 56 EB ramps	11.6	В	11.7	В	0.1	No	19.5	В	26.0	С	6.5	No
33	Carmel Country Road/Carmel Canyon Road	31.9	С	32.3	С	0.4	No	23.2	С	25.5	С	2.3	No
34	Carmel Country Road/SR 56 WB ramps	15.7	В	15.8	В	0.1	No	10.9	В	11.4	В	0.5	No
35	Carmel Country Road/SR 56 EB ramps	13.4	В	13.4	В	0.0	No	11.5	В	12.1	В	0.6	No
36	Carmel Creek Road/Del Mar Trail	41.6	Е	46.2	E	4.6	Yes	20.1	C	22.9	C	2.8	No

DNE = does not exist

<sup>1</sup> Number corresponds with intersection location on Figure 5.2-1. Shaded cells indicate intersections that would exceed the City's significance thresholds.

Table 5.2-20   EXISTING PLUS PROJECT BUILDOUT CONDITIONS – FREEWAY SEGMENTS											
Segment	Direction	Existing Condit	tion	Existing P Buil	lus Project dout	Δ V/C	Significant?				
		V/C	LOS	V/C	LOS						
1-5											
Lomas Santa Fa Driva ta Via da la Valla	NB	0.632	С	0.637	С	0.005	No				
Lonias Santa Fe Drive to via de la valle	SB	0.652	С	0.658	С	0.006	No				
Via da la Valla ta Dal Mar Haighta Paad	NB	0.645	С	0.651	С	0.006	No				
via de la valle lo Del Mai Heights Road	SB	0.666	С	0.672	С	0.006	No				
Del Mar Heights Boad to SP 56	NB	0.557	В	0.568	В	0.011	No				
Del Mai Heights Road to SR 50	SB	0.574	В	0.586	В	0.012	No				
SP 56 to Cormal Mountain Poad	NB	0.575	В	0.580	В	0.005	No				
SK 50 to Carmer Wouldani Koad	SB	0.629	С	0.635	С	0.006	No				
Carmal Mountain Road to I 805 marga	NB	0.558	В	0.562	В	0.004	No				
Carmer wouldain Road to 1-803 merge	SB	0.548	В	0.552	В	0.004	No				

# ONE PASEO DRAFT EIR

Table 5.2-20 (cont.) EXISTING PLUS PROJECT BUILDOUT CONDITIONS – FREEWAY SEGMENTS											
Segment	Direction	Existing Condit	ion	Existing P Buil	Existing Plus Project Buildout		Significant?				
		V/C	LOS	V/C	V/C LOS						
SR 56											
El Camino Peol to Carmel Creek Pood	EB	0.814	D	0.820	D	0.006	No				
El Califillo Real lo Califiel Cleek Road	WB	0.835	D	0.841	D	0.006	No				
Carmal Craak Boad to Carmal Country Boad	EB	0.764	С	0.770	С	0.006	No				
Cannel Creek Road to Cannel Country Road	WB	0.784	С	0.789	С	0.005	No				

Table 5.2-21 EXISTING PLUS PROJECT BUILDOUT CONDITIONS – FREEWAY RAMP METERS											
T	Deck Harris	Existing Conditions Ex		Existing P Buil	sting Plus Project Buildout Δ Delay		6'				
Location	Peak Hour	Tr Delay (minutes) Queue (feet)		Delay (minutes)	Queue (feet)	(minutes)	Significant?				
Del Mar Heights Road/ I-5	AM	6.20	1,102	13.53	2,407	7.33	No				
SB on-ramp (WB)	PM	0	0	3.99	711	3.99	No				
Del Mar Heights Road/ I-5	AM	0	0	0	0	0	No				
SB on-ramp (EB)	PM	0	0	0	0	0	No				
Del Mar Heights Road/ I-5	AM		Meter not tu	irned on		0	No				
NB on-ramp	PM	0	0	0	0	0	No				

Source: USAI 2012

### Near-term Conditions

Near-term conditions are representative of traffic conditions anticipated to exist at the time of certification of the EIR for this project where traffic from other known development projects in the project area are added to existing traffic levels. The Near-term analysis reflects changes anticipated to occur prior to the anticipated date of certification of the EIR, and includes previously proposed and/or approved projects in the project vicinity (as identified in Section 7.0 of Draft EIR Appendix C). Within that period, other developers could implement previously proposed and/or approved projects in the project vicinity, resulting in relatively rapid changes to traffic patterns that existed at the time of circulation of the NOP. Near-term analyses were conducted to evaluate Phase 1, Phases 1 and 2, and buildout (Phases 1, 2, and 3) of the proposed project plus other approved, pending, or planned projects within the project vicinity. Additionally, a Near-term analysis was completed to determine impacts resulting from constructing the proposed cinema in Phase 1 or 2 instead of Phase 3 of the project.

### Near-term Without Project

Near-term traffic volumes were derived by (1) adding volumes from other approved, pending, or planned projects in the project vicinity to existing volumes, and (2) adding a three-percent increase in traffic volumes to existing volumes to account for future unforeseen projects in the vicinity. The other projects were identified through consultation with the City and are identified in the TIA (Section 7.0 of Draft EIR Appendix C).

<u>Roadway Segments</u>. Table 5.2-22, *Near-term Without Project And With Project (Phase 1) Conditions – Roadway Segments*, shows the ADT, LOS, and V/C for analyzed roadway segments under Near-term Without Project conditions, and Figure 5.2-3, *Near-term Without Project ADT Volumes*, depicts the ADT of each analyzed roadway segment. Under Near-term Without the Project, all analyzed segments would operate at LOS D or better, with the exception of the following two segments:

- El Camino Real between Via de la Valle and San Dieguito Road (LOS F); and
- Via de la Valle from San Andres Drive to El Camino Real (West) (LOS F).

<u>Intersections</u>. Table 5.2-23, *Near-term Without Project And With Project (Phase 1) Conditions – Intersections*, shows the average vehicle delay and LOS at each of the analyzed intersections under Near-term Without Project conditions. As shown in the table, all analyzed intersections would operate at LOS D or better during AM and PM peak hours under Near-term Without Project conditions, with the exception of the following intersections:

- Carmel Country Road/Carmel Creek Road (LOS E during the AM peak hour); and
- Carmel Creek Road/Del Mar Trail (LOS E during the AM peak hour).

<u>Freeway Segments</u>. Table 5.2-24, *Near-term Without Project And With Project (Phase 1) Conditions – Freeway Segments*, shows the ADT, peak hour volume, V/C, and LOS for analyzed freeway segments under Near-term Without Project conditions. As shown in the table, all analyzed segments would operate at LOS D or better under Near-term Without Project conditions.



Near-term Without Project ADT Volumes

ONE PASEO

Figure 5.2-3

<u>Freeway Ramp Meters</u>. Table 5.2-25 *Near-term Without Project And With Project (Phase 1) Conditions – Freeway Ramp Meters*, shows the demand, excess demand, delay, and queue length for analyzed ramp meters under Near-term Without Project conditions. As shown in the table, no delays would occur, except at Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 SB on-ramp (WB), where a delay of 9.29 minutes is expected.

# Near-term With Project (Phase 1)

Near-term With Project (Phase 1) traffic volumes were derived by adding Phase 1 project volumes (refer to Table 5.2-7) to Near-term Without Project volumes. Near-term With Project (Phase 1) volumes are illustrated in Figure 5.2-4, *Near-term With Project (Phase 1) ADT Volumes*.

<u>Roadway Segments</u>. Table 5.2-22 shows the ADT, LOS, and V/C for analyzed roadway segments under Near-term With Project (Phase 1) conditions. Upon development of Phase 1, all but the following three analyzed roadway segments would operate at LOS D or better:

- Del Mar Heights Road from the I-5 NB ramps to High Bluff Drive (LOS E);
- El Camino Real from Via de la Valle to San Dieguito Road (LOS F): and
- Via de la Valle from San Andres Drive to El Camino Real (West) (LOS F).

With the addition of Phase 1 project traffic, the LOS at Del Mar Heights Road from the I-5 NB ramps to High Bluff Drive would decrease from D to E. Therefore, the project would result in a potentially significant direct impact to this segment of Del Mar Heights Road.

The segment of El Camino Real from Via de la Valle to San Dieguito Road would continue to operate at LOS F with Phase 1. The addition of Phase 1 project traffic would result in an increase in V/C of 0.02, which would exceed the City's threshold of greater than 0.01. Thus, the project would result a potentially significant direct impact to this segment of El Camino Real.

Similarly, Via de la Valle from San Andres Drive to El Camino Real (West) would continue to operate at LOS F with Phase 1. The addition of Phase 1 project traffic would result in a change in V/C would of 0.02, which is above the City's threshold of greater than 0.01. Thus, the project would result a potentially significant direct impact to this segment of Via de la Valle.

Table 5.2-22 NEAR-TERM WITHOUT PROJECT AND WITH PROJECT (PHASE 1) CONDITIONS – ROADWAY SEGMENTS											
	Noor to	m Withou	t Droigat	Noor torm V	Vith Project	(Dhase 1)					
Roadway Segment					VIII Project (	LOS	$\Delta V/C$	Significant?			
Del Mar Heights Road	ADI	v/c	LOS	ADI	110	105					
Mango Drive to Portofino Drive	21,953	0.49	В	22.843	0.51	В	0.02	No			
Portofino Drive to I-5 SB ramps	37,169	0.74	С	38,355	0.77	С	0.03	No			
I-5 SB ramps to I-5 NB ramps	41.213	0.82	D	43,289	0.87	D	0.05	No			
I-5 NB ramps to High Bluff Drive	54,775	0.91	D	58,631	0.98	Е	0.07	Yes			
High Bluff Drive to Third Avenue	40,648	0.68	С	45,098	0.75	С	0.07	No			
Third Avenue to First Avenue	40,648	0.68	С	44,109	0.74	С	0.06	No			
First Avenue to El Camino Real	40,648	0.68	С	43,120	0.72	С	0.04	No			
El Camino Real to Carmel Country Road	33,654	0.56	В	36,324	0.61	С	0.05	No			
Carmel Country Road to Torrey Ridge Road	22,308	0.37	А	23,593	0.39	Α	0.02	No			
Torrey Ridge Road to Lansdale Drive	19,643	0.33	А	20,533	0.34	А	0.01	No			
Lansdale Drive to Carmel Canyon Road	15,644	0.26	А	16,138	0.27	Α	0.01	No			
El Camino Real		-						·			
Via de la Valle to San Dieguito Road	16,235	1.08	F	16,532	1.10	F	0.02	Yes			
San Dieguito Road to Derby Downs Road	14,332	0.36	А	14,728	0.37	Α	0.01	No			
Derby Downs Road to Half Mile Drive	15,793	0.39	В	16,189	0.40	В	0.01	No			
Half Mile Drive to Quarter Mile Drive	13,921	0.35	А	14,416	0.36	A	0.02	No			
Quarter Mile Drive to Del Mar Heights Road	15,373	0.38	В	15,966	0.40	В	0.02	No			
Del Mar Heights Road to Townsgate Drive	17,014	0.34	А	18,497	0.37	A	0.03	No			
Townsgate Drive to High Bluff Drive	16,662	0.33	А	17,947	0.36	A	0.03	No			
High Bluff Drive to Valley Centre Drive	21,035	0.42	В	21,925	0.44	В	0.02	No			
Valley Centre Drive to Carmel Valley Road	30,131	0.67	С	30,724	0.68	C	0.01	No			
Carmel Country Road											
Del Mar Heights Road to Townsgate Drive	16,410	0.41	В	17,399	0.43	В	0.02	No			
Townsgate Drive to Carmel Creek Road	14,294	0.36	А	15,085	0.38	В	0.02	No			
Carmel Creek Road to Carmel Canyon Road	13,531	0.34	А	14,026	0.35	A	0.01	No			
Carmel Canyon Road to SR 56 WB ramps	21,170	0.53	С	21,565	0.54	С	0.01	No			
Carmel Canyon Road											
Del Mar Heights Road to Carmel County Road	12,591	0.31	А	12,788	0.32	А	0.01	No			
Carmel Creek Road											
Carmel Country Road to Carmel Grove Road	11,542	0.29	А	11,839	0.30	А	0.01	No			
Carmel Grove Road to SR 56 WB ramps	15,933	0.40	В	16,230	0.41	В	0.01	No			
Valley Centre Drive											
Carmel View Road to Carmel Creek Road	11,826	0.39	В	11,925	0.40	В	0.01	No			
Carmel Valley Road											
I-5 NB ramps to El Camino Real	45,968	0.77	C	46,166	0.77	C	0	No			
High Bluff Drive								-			
Del Mar Heights Road to El Camino Real	10,137	0.68	D	10,434	0.70	D	0.02	No			
Via de la Valle		<b>-</b>									
San Andres Drive to El Camino Real (West)	26,732	2.67	F	26,930	2.69	F	0.02	Yes			

Source: USAI 2012  $\Delta$  V/C = difference in V/C between With Project conditions and Without Project conditions Shaded cells indicate roadway segments that would exceed the City's significance thresholds.



Near-term With Project (Phase 1) ADT Volumes ONE PASEO Figure 5.2-4

	NEAR-TERM WITHOUT PROJECT AND WITH PROJECT (PHASE 1) CONDITIONS – INTERSECTIONS														
			AM Pe		PM Peak Hour										
No. <sup>1</sup>	Intersection	Near-term Without Project		Near-term With Project (Phase 1)		Δ Delay	Signif-	Near-term Without Project		Near-term With Project (Phase 1)		Δ Delay	Signif-		
		Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	(sec)	icant:	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	(sec)	icant?		
1	El Camino Real/Via de la Valle	31.4	С	31.9	С	0.5	No	38.8	D	40.6	D	1.8	No		
2	El Camino Real/San Dieguito Road	16.9	В	17.1	В	0.2	No	25.2	С	27.3	С	2.1	No		
3	El Camino Real/Derby Downs Road	4.3	Α	4.3	Α	0	No	4.5	Α	5.0	Α	0.5	No		
4	El Camino Real/Half Mile Drive	20.6	В	21.7	С	1.1	No	14.0	В	14.1	В	0.1	No		
5	El Camino Real/Quarter Mile Drive	20.6	С	21.8	С	1.2	No	15.1	В	15.5	В	0.4	No		
6	Del Mar Heights Road/Mango Drive	33.3	С	34.2	С	0.9	No	31.4	С	33.5	D	2.1	No		
7	Del Mar Heights Road/Portofino Drive	9.4	Α	9.6	Α	0.2	No	9.2	Α	9.3	Α	0.1	No		
8	Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 SB ramps	24.8	С	29.6	С	4.8	No	23.0	С	24.6	С	1.6	No		
9	Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 NB ramps	39.6	D	50.5	D	10.9	No	38.3	D	43.5	D	5.2	No		
10	Del Mar Heights Road/High Bluff Drive	28.5	С	28.9	С	0.4	No	32.1	С	41.3	D	9.2	No		
11	Del Mar Heights Road/Third Avenue	DNE		5.9	Α		No	DNI	E	10.0	Α		No		
12	Del Mar Heights Road/First Avenue	DN	ЛЕ	4.2	Α		No	DNI	E	10.7	В		No		
13	Del Mar Heights Road/El Camino Real	29.9	С	32.1	С	2.2	No	29.5	С	37.0	D	7.5	No		
14	Del Mar Heights Road/Carmel Country Road	22.9	С	25.7	С	2.8	No	21.1	С	23.5	С	2.4	No		
15	Del Mar Heights Road/Torrey Ridge Road	23.6	С	24.8	С	1.2	No	11.9	В	16.4	В	4.5	No		
16	Del Mar Heights Road/Lansdale Drive	19.0	В	20.4	С	1.4	No	17.6	В	18.3	В	0.7	No		
17	Del Mar Heights Road/Carmel Canyon Road	13.8	В	13.9	В	0.1	No	10.2	В	10.3	В	0.1	No		
18	El Camino Real/Del Mar Highland Town Center	6.8	Α	14.0	В	7.2	No	13.5	В	22.6	Α	9.1	No		
19	Carmel County Road/Townsgate Drive	26.5	С	27.2	С	0.7	No	21.8	С	27.2	С	5.4	No		
20	El Camino Real/Townsgate Drive	21.3	С	21.3	С	0	No	20.7	С	20.7	С	0	No		
21	Carmel Country Road/Carmel Creek Road	58.6	E	60.4	E	1.8	No	24.1	С	26.1	С	2.0	No		
22	El Camino Real/High Bluff Drive	21.1	С	23.3	С	2.2	No	26.2	С	27.7	С	1.5	No		
23	Carmel View Road/High Bluff Drive	8.4	Α	8.6	Α	0.2	No	9.1	Α	9.5	А	0.4	No		
24	Carmel Creek Road/Carmel Grove Road	27.8	С	27.8	С	0	No	17.5	В	17.6	В	0.1	No		
25	Carmel Valley Road/I-5 SB ramps	22.6	С	23.1	С	0.5	No	32.1	С	32.2	С	0.1	No		
26	Carmel Valley Road/I-5 NB ramps	13.6	В	13.7	В	0.1	No	20.4	С	20.5	С	0.1	No		
27	El Camino Real/Valley Centre Drive	24.6	С	25.0	С	0.4	No	23.2	С	29.7	С	6.5	No		
28	El Camino Real/Carmel Valley Road	14.8	В	16.4	В	1.6	No	19.2	В	19.6	В	0.4	No		
29	El Camino Real/SR 56 EB on-ramp	18.0	В	18.2	В	0.2	No	32.3	С	34.0	С	1.7	No		
	Table 5.2-23 (cont.)														
------------------	---	------------------	-----------------	--------------------	------------	---------	----------------	------	----------------	------	-------	--------	----	--	--
	NEAR-TERM WITHOUT PROJECT AND WITH PROJECT (PHASE 1) CONDITIONS – INTERSECTIONS														
	AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour														
No. <sup>1</sup>	Intersection	Near- Without	term Project	n With Phase 1)	A Delay	Signif-									
		Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	(sec)	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	(sec)	icant?			
30	Carmel View Road/Valley Centre Drive	7.4	Α	7.4	Α	0	No	8.3	Α	8.3	Α	0	No		
31	Carmel Creek Road/SR 56 WB ramps	45.7	D	46.3	D	0.6	No	27.0	С	27.1	С	0.1	No		
32	Carmel Creek Road/SR 56 EB ramps	12.5	В	12.6	В	0.1	No	27.4	С	27.5	С	0.1	No		
33	Carmel Country Road/Carmel Canyon Road	33.1	С	35.7	D	2.6	No	25.6	С	25.9	С	0.3	No		
34	Carmel Country Road/SR 56 WB ramps	16.2	В	16.3	В	0.1	No	10.9	В	11.4	В	0.5	No		
35	Carmel Country Road/SR 56 EB ramps	14.1	В	14.1	В	0	No	11.7	В	11.9	В	0.2	No		
36	Carmel Creek Road/Del Mar Trail	47.9	Е	50.8	F	2.9	Yes	21.7	C	22.6	С	0.9	No		

DNE = does not exist

<sup>1</sup> Number corresponds with intersection location on Figure 5.2-1. Shaded cells indicate intersections that would exceed the City's significance thresholds.

Table 5.2-24 NEAR-TERM WITHOUT PROJECT AND WITH PROJECT (PHASE 1) CONDITIONS –														
FREEWAY SEGMENTS														
Near-term Without Project         Near-term With Project (Phase 1)														
Segment	Direction	ADT	Peak Hour Volume	V/C	LOS	ADT	Peak Hour Volume	V/C	LOS	Δ V/C	Signif- icant?			
I-5	•													
Lomas Santa Fe Drive to Via de la Valle NB 223,226 8,134 0.635 C 223,918 8,159 0.637 C 0.002 No														
	Lomas Santa Fe Drive to Via de la Valle $RD$ $223,220$ $6,154$ $0.055$ $C$ $223,170$ $8,155$ $0.057$ $C$ $0.002$ $100$ SB $223,179$ $8,394$ $0.656$ C $223,871$ $8,420$ $0.657$ C $0.002$ $100$													
Via de la Valle to Del Mar Heights Poad	NB	239,226	8,716	0.648	С	240,116	8,749	0.650	С	0.002	No			
Via de la Valle to Del Mai Heights Road	SB	239,179	8,996	0.669	С	240,069	9,029	0.671	С	0.002	No			
Dal Mar Haights Poad to SP 56	NB	242,333	8,830	0.560	В	244,113	8,895	0.564	В	0.004	No			
Der Mai Heights Koad to SK 50	SB	242,275	9,112	0.577	В	244,055	9,179	0.582	В	0.005	No			
SP 56 to Cormel Mountain Road	NB	289,605	13,191	0.578	В	290,594	13,236	0.580	В	0.002	No			
SK 50 to Carmer Mountain Road	SB	289,605	12,954	0.633	С	290,594	12,999	0.635	С	0.002	No			
Cormol Mountain Road to I 805 morga	NB	289,605	13,191	0.561	В	290,396	13,227	0.563	В	0.002	No			
Carmer Wouldani Koad to 1-805 merge	SB	289,605	12,954	0.551	В	290,396	12,990	0.553	В	0.002	No			
SR 56														
El Camino Pool to Carmol Crook Pood	EB	84,148	5,499	0.846	D	84,346	5,512	0.848	D	0.002	No			
El Camino Real to Camiel Cleek Road	WB	84,148	5,640	0.868	D	84,346	5,653	0.870	D	0.002	No			
Cormol Crook Road to Cormol Country Road	EB	78,381	5,123	0.788	С	78,579	5,135	0.790	D	0.002	No			
	WB	78,381	5,253	0.808	D	78,579	5,266	0.810	D	0.002	No			

Table 5.2-25         NEAR-TERM WITHOUT PROJECT AND WITH PROJECT (PHASE 1) CONDITIONS – FREEWAY RAMP METERS														
Location Peak Hour Near-term Without Project (Phase 1) A Delay Significant?														
Location	r eak nour	Delay (minutes)	Queue (feet)	Delay (minutes)	Queue (feet)	(minutes)	Significant:							
Del Mar Heights Road/ I-5	AM	9.29	1,653	11.17	1,987	1.88	No							
SB on-ramp (WB)	PM	0	0	3.42	609	3.42	No							
Del Mar Heights Road/ I-5	AM	0	0	0	0	0	No							
SB on-ramp (EB)	PM	0	0	0	0	0	No							
Del Mar Heights Road/ I-5	I-5 AM Meter not turned on 0 No													
NB on-ramp	PM	0	0	1.26	363	1.26	No							

<u>Intersections</u>. As shown in Table 5.2-23, all analyzed intersections would operate at LOS D or better under Near-term With Project (Phase 1) conditions, with the exception of the following intersection:

• Carmel Creek Road/Del Mar Trail (LOS F in the AM peak hour)

Delays at this intersection would increase by 2.9 seconds with the project, which would exceed the City's threshold of greater than 2.0 seconds. Thus, the project would result in a potentially significant direct impact to the intersection of Carmel Creek Road/Del Mar Trail.

<u>Freeway Segments</u>. As shown in Table 5.2-24, all analyzed freeway segments would operate at LOS D or better under Near-term With Project (Phase 1) conditions. Since all analyzed freeway segments would operate at acceptable levels, impacts to freeway segments resulting from the project would be less than significant.

<u>Freeway Ramp Meters</u>. As shown in Table 5.2-25, ramp meters at Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 SB on-ramp (eastbound; EB) would not experience delays under Near-term With Project (Phase 1) conditions. The ramp meter at the Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 SB on-ramp (WB) would experience a delay of 11.17 minutes during the AM peak hour and 3.42 minutes during the PM peak hour under the Near-term With Project (Phase 1) conditions. The Del Mar Height Road/I-5 NB on-ramps would experience a delay of 1.26 minutes during the PM peak hour. Because the ramp delays would be less than 15 minutes, project impacts to freeway ramps would be less than significant.

## *Near-term With Project (Phases 1 and 2)*

Near-term With Project (Phases 1 and 2) traffic volumes were derived by adding Phases 1 and 2 project volumes (refer to Table 5.2-8) to Near-term Without Project volumes. Near-term With Project (Phases 1 and 2) volumes are illustrated in Figure 5.2-5, *Near-term With Project (Phases 1 and 2) ADT Volumes*.

<u>Roadway Segments</u>. Table 5.2-26, *Near-term Without Project And With Project (Phases 1 And 2) Conditions – Roadway Segments,* shows the ADT, LOS, and V/C for analyzed roadway segments under Near-term With Project (Phases 1 and 2) conditions. All but the following three analyzed roadway segments would operate at LOS D or better upon development of Phases 1 and 2:

- Del Mar Heights Road from the I-5 NB ramps to High Bluff Drive (LOS F);
- Via de la Valle from San Andres Drive to El Camino Real (West) (LOS F); and
- El Camino Real from Via de la Valle to San Dieguito Road (LOS F).

With the addition of Phases 1 and 2 project traffic, the LOS along the segment of Del Mar Heights Road from the I-5 NB ramps to High Bluff Drive would decrease from D to F. Therefore, the project would result in a potentially significant direct impact to this segment of Del Mar Heights Road. The segment of El Camino Real from Via de la Valle to San Dieguito Road would continue to operate at LOS F with development of Phases 1 and 2. The addition of Phases 1 and 2 project traffic would result in an increase in V/C of 0.04, which would exceed the City's threshold of greater than 0.01. Thus, the project would result a potentially significant direct impact to this segment of El Camino Real.

Similarly, Via de la Valle from San Andres Drive to El Camino Real (West) would continue to operate at LOS F with Phases 1 and 2. The addition of Phases 1 and 2 project traffic would result in a change in V/C would of 0.04, which is above the City's threshold of greater than 0.01. Thus, the project would result a potentially significant direct impact to this segment of Via de la Valle.

<u>Intersections</u>. As shown in Table 5.2-27, *Near-term Without Project And With Project (Phases 1 And 2) Conditions – Intersections,* all analyzed intersections would operate at LOS D or better under Near-term With Project (Phases 1 and 2) conditions, with the exception the following:

- Del Mar Heights Road/High Bluff Drive (LOS E in PM peak hour);
- Del Mar Heights Road/El Camino Real (LOS E in PM peak hour);
- Carmel Country Road/Carmel Creek Road (LOS E in AM peak hour); and
- Carmel Creek Road/Del Mar Trail (LOS F in AM peak hour).

The LOS at the Del Mar Heights Road/High Bluff Drive intersection would degrade from C to E during the PM peak hour with the addition of Phases 1 and 2 project traffic. The change in LOS along with the associated increase in delay (24.1 seconds) would exceed the City's significance threshold for intersection impacts. Therefore, the project would result in a potentially significant direct impact to this intersection.

Similarly, the LOS at the intersection of Del Mar Heights Road/El Camino Real would degrade from C to E during the PM peak hour with the addition of Phases 1 and 2 project traffic. The change in LOS along with the associated increase in delay (29.6 seconds) would exceed the City's significance threshold for intersection impacts. Therefore, the project would result in a potentially significant direct impact to this intersection.

The intersection of Carmel Country Road/Carmel Creek Road would operate at LOS E with and without the project. With the addition of Phases 1 and 2 project traffic, the delay at this intersection would only increase by 1.8 seconds, which would not exceed the City's significance threshold of greater than 2.0 seconds (for intersections at LOS E). Therefore, project impacts to the Carmel Country Road/Carmel Creek Road intersection would be less than significant.

The LOS at the intersection of Carmel Creek Road/Del Mar Trail would degrade from E to F in the AM peak hour with Phases 1 and 2 project traffic, and delays would increase by 4.1 seconds, which would exceed the City's significance threshold of greater than 1.0 second (for intersections at LOS F). Thus, the project would result in a potentially significant direct impact to the intersection of Carmel Creek Road/Del Mar Trail.



Near-term With Project (Phases 1 and 2) ADT Volumes ONE PASEO Figure 5.2-5

<u>Freeway Segments</u>. As shown in Table 5.2-28, *Near-term Without Project And With Project* (*Phases 1 And 2*) *Conditions – Freeway Segments*, all analyzed freeway segments would operate at LOS D or better under Near-term With Project (Phases 1 and 2) conditions. Since all analyzed freeway segments would operate at acceptable levels, impacts to freeway segments resulting from the project would be less than significant.

<u>Freeway Ramp Meters</u>. As shown in Table 5.2-29, *Near-term Without Project And With Project (Phases 1 And 2) Conditions – Freeway Ramp Meters*, ramp meters at Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 SB on-ramp (eastbound; EB) would not experience delays under Near-term With Project (Phases 1 and 2) conditions. The ramp meter at the Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 SB on-ramp (WB) would experience a delay of 13.86 minutes during the AM peak hour and 10.52 minutes during the PM peak hour under the Near-term With Project (Phases 1 and 2) conditions. The Del Mar Height Road/I-5 NB on-ramps would experience a delay of 3.14 minutes during the PM peak hour. Because the ramp delays would be less than 15 minutes, project impacts to freeway ramps would be less than significant.

I able 5.2-26         NEAR-TERM WITHOUT PROJECT AND WITH PROJECT (PHASES 1 AND 2) CONDITIONS –         ROADWAY SEGMENTS													
Roadway Segment	Near-ter	rm Withou	t Project	Near-term V	With Project ( and 2)	Phases 1	Δ V/C	Significant?					
	ADT	V/C	LOS	ADT	V/C	LOS		-					
Del Mar Heights Road													
Mango Drive to Portofino Drive	21,953	0.49	В	23,557	0.52	В	0.03	No					
Portofino Drive to I-5 SB ramps	37,169	0.74	С	39,306	0.79	С	0.05	No					
I-5 SB ramps to I-5 NB ramps	41,213	0.82	D	44,953	0.90	D	0.08	No					
I-5 NB ramps to High Bluff Drive	54,775	0.91	D	61,721	1.03	F	0.12	Yes					
High Bluff Drive to Third Avenue	40,648	0.68	С	48,664	0.81	С	0.13	No					
Third Avenue to First Avenue	40,648	0.68	С	47,951	0.80	С	0.12	No					
First Avenue to El Camino Real	40,648	0.68	С	47,951	0.80	С	0.12	No					
El Camino Real to Carmel Country Road	33,654	0.56	В	38,463	0.64	С	0.06	No					
Carmel Country Road to Torrey Ridge Road	22,308	0.37	Α	24,623	0.41	Α	0.04	No					
Torrey Ridge Road to Lansdale Drive	19,643	0.33	Α	21,246	0.35	Α	0.02	No					
Lansdale Drive to Carmel Canyon Road	15,644	0.26	Α	16,534	0.28	А	0.02	No					
El Camino Real													
Via de la Valle to San Dieguito Road	16,235	1.08	F	16,770	1.12	F	0.04	Yes					
San Dieguito Road to Derby Downs Road	14,332	0.36	Α	15,045	0.38	В	0.02	No					
Derby Downs Road to Half Mile Drive	15,793	0.39	В	16,505	0.41	В	0.02	No					
Half Mile Drive to Quarter Mile Drive	13,921	0.35	Α	14,812	0.37	Α	0.02	No					
Quarter Mile Drive to Del Mar Heights Road	15,373	0.38	В	16,441	0.41	В	0.03	No					
Del Mar Heights Road to Townsgate Drive	17,014	0.34	Α	19,686	0.39	А	0.05	No					
Townsgate Drive to High Bluff Drive	16,662	0.33	А	18,977	0.38	Α	0.05	No					
High Bluff Drive to Valley Centre Drive	21,035	0.42	В	22,638	0.45	В	0.03	No					
Valley Centre Drive to Carmel Valley Road	30,131	0.67	С	31,199	0.69	С	0.02	No					
Carmel Country Road													
Del Mar Heights Road to Townsgate Drive	16,410	0.41	В	18,191	0.45	В	0.04	No					
Townsgate Drive to Carmel Creek Road	14,294	0.36	Α	15,719	0.39	В	0.03	No					
Carmel Creek Road to Carmel Canyon Road	13,531	0.34	Α	14,422	0.36	А	0.02	No					
Carmel Canyon Road to SR 56 WB ramps	21,170	0.53	С	21,882	0.55	С	0.02	No					
Carmel Canyon Road													
Del Mar Heights Road to Carmel County Road	12,591	0.31	A	12,947	0.32	A	0.01	No					
Carmel Creek Road													
Carmel Country Road to Carmel Grove Road	11,542	0.29	A	12,077	0.30	A	0.01	No					
Carmel Grove Road to SR 56 WB ramps	15,933	0.40	В	16,467	0.41	В	0.01	No					
Valley Centre Drive													
Carmel View Road to Carmel Creek Road	11,826	0.39	В	12,004	0.40	В	0.01	No					

Table 5.2-26 (cont.) NEAR-TERM WITHOUT PROJECT AND WITH PROJECT (PHASES 1 AND 2) CONDITIONS – ROADWAY SEGMENTS													
Roadway Segment     Near-term Without Project     Near-term With Project (Phases 1 and 2)     Δ V/C     Significant?													
$\frac{1}{\text{ADT}} \frac{1}{\text{V/C}} \frac{1}{\text{LOS}} \frac{1}{\text{V/C}} \frac{1}{\text{LOS}} \frac{1}{\text{V/C}} \frac{1}{\text{Significant}}$													
Carmel Valley Road													
I-5 NB ramps to El Camino Real	45,968	0.77	С	46,324	0.77	С	0	No					
High Bluff Drive													
Del Mar Heights Road to El Camino Real	10,137	0.68	D	10,672	0.71	D	0.03	No					
Via de la Valle													
San Andres Drive to El Camino Real (West)	26,732	2.67	F	27,088	2.71	F	0.04	Yes					

 $\Delta$  V/C = difference in V/C between With Project conditions and Without Project conditions Shaded cells indicate roadway segments that would exceed the City's significance thresholds.

# Table 5.2-27 NEAR-TERM WITHOUT PROJECT AND WITH PROJECT (PHASES 1 AND 2) CONDITIONS – INTERSECTIONS

				AM Pea	ak Hour					PM Peak	Hour		
No. <sup>1</sup>	Intersection	Near- Without	term Project	Near- With P (Phases	term Project 1 & 2)	Δ Delay	Signif-	Near-t Without	ærm Project	Near-t With Pr (Phases	erm ·oject 1 & 2)	∆ Delay	Signif- icant?
		Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	(sec)	icant:	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	(sec)	icant:
1	El Camino Real/Via de la Valle	31.4	С	32.2	С	0.8	No	38.8	D	42.5	D	3.7	No
2	El Camino Real/San Dieguito Road	16.9	В	17.3	В	0.4	No	25.2	С	26.9	С	1.7	No
3	El Camino Real/Derby Downs Road	4.3	Α	4.3	А	0	No	4.5	A	5.0	Α	0.5	No
4	El Camino Real/Half Mile Drive	20.6	В	21.8	С	1.2	No	14.0	В	14.2	В	0.2	No
5	El Camino Real/Quarter Mile Drive	20.6	С	20.6	С	0	No	15.1	В	16.4	В	1.3	No
6	Del Mar Heights Road/Mango Drive	33.3	С	34.5	С	1.2	No	31.4	С	34.3	С	2.9	No
7	Del Mar Heights Road/Portofino Drive	9.4	Α	9.6	Α	0.2	No	9.2	Α	9.4	Α	0.2	No
8	Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 SB ramps	24.8	С	28.7	С	3.9	No	23.0	С	27.8	С	4.8	No
9	Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 NB ramps	39.6	D	49.8	D	10.2	No	38.3	D	50.5	D	12.2	No
10	Del Mar Heights Road/High Bluff Drive	28.5	С	31.3	С	2.8	No	32.1	С	56.2	Е	24.1	Yes
11	Del Mar Heights Road/Third Avenue	DN	ΙE	6.5	Α		No	DN	E	13.5	В		No
12	Del Mar Heights Road/First Avenue	DN	ΙE	6.0	A		No	DN	E	15.6	В		No
13	Del Mar Heights Road/El Camino Real	29.9	С	34.5	С	4.6	No	29.5	С	59.1	E	29.6	Yes

	NEAR-TERM WITHOUT PROJECT AND WITH PROJECT (PHASES 1 AND 2) CONDITIONS – INTERSECTIONS         AM Peak Hour														
				AM Pea	ak Hour					PM Peak	Hour				
No. <sup>1</sup>	Intersection	Near- Without	term Project	Near- With P (Phases	term Project 1 & 2)	Δ Delay	Signif-	Near-1 Without	term Project	Near-t With Pr (Phases	term roject 1 & 2)	Δ Delay	Signif-		
		Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	(sec)	icant:	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	(sec)	icant:		
14	Del Mar Heights Road/Carmel Country Road	22.9	С	26.4	С	3.5	No	21.1	С	25.6	С	4.5	No		
15	Del Mar Heights Road/Torrey Ridge Road	23.6	C	26.0	С	2.4	No	11.9	В	11.9	В	0	No		
16	Del Mar Heights Road/Lansdale Drive	19.0	В	20.4	С	1.4	No	17.6	В	18.4	В	0.8	No		
17	Del Mar Heights Road/Carmel Canyon Road	13.8	В	14.0	В	0.2	No	10.2	В	10.2	В	0	No		
18	El Camino Real/Del Mar Highland Town Center	6.8	Α	14.3	В	7.5	No	13.5	В	27.5	С	14.0	No		
19	Carmel County Road/Townsgate Drive	26.5	C	27.4	С	0.9	No	21.8	С	22.6	С	0.8	No		
20	El Camino Real/Townsgate Drive	21.3	C	21.3	С	0	No	20.7	С	20.9	С	0.2	No		
21	Carmel Country Road/Carmel Creek Road	58.6	Е	60.4	E	1.8	No	24.1	С	27.4	С	3.3	No		
22	El Camino Real/High Bluff Drive	21.1	С	21.6	С	0.5	No	26.2	C	29.0	С	2.8	No		
23	Carmel View Road/High Bluff Drive	8.4	A	8.7	A	0.3	No	9.1	A	9.7	A	0.6	No		
24	Carmel Creek Road/Carmel Grove Road	27.8	С	27.8	С	0	No	17.5	В	17.7	В	0.2	No		
25	Carmel Valley Road/I-5 SB ramps	22.6	С	22.8	С	0.2	No	32.1	С	32.6	С	0.5	No		
26	Carmel Valley Road/I-5 NB ramps	13.6	В	14.1	В	0.5	No	20.4	C	20.6	C	0.2	No		
27	El Camino Real/Valley Centre Drive	24.6	С	32.7	С	8.1	No	23.2	С	29.8	C	6.6	No		
28	El Camino Real/Carmel Valley Road	14.8	В	15.0	В	0.2	No	19.2	В	19.8	В	0.7	No		
29	El Camino Real/SR 56 EB on-ramp	18.0	В	18.6	В	0.6	No	32.3	C	35.1	D	2.8	No		
30	Carmel View Road/Valley Centre Drive	7.4	A	7.4	A	0	No	8.3	A	8.3	A	0	No		
31	Carmel Creek Road/SR 56 WB ramps	45.7	D	46.6	D	0.9	No	27.0	C	30.6	С	3.6	No		
32	Carmel Creek Road/SR 56 EB ramps	12.5	В	12.6	В	0.1	No	27.4	С	27.6	С	0.2	No		
33	Carmel Country Road/Carmel Canyon Road	33.1	С	35.9	D	2.8	No	25.6	C	25.6	С	0	No		
34	Carmel Country Road/SR 56 WB ramps	16.2	В	16.2	В	0	No	10.9	В	12.3	В	1.4	No		
35	Carmel Country Road/SR 56 EB ramps	14.1	В	14.3	В	0.2	No	11.7	В	12.1	В	0.4	No		
36	Carmel Creek Road/Del Mar Trail	47.9	Е	52.0	F	4.1	Yes	21.7	С	23.8	С	2.1	No		

T 11 50 05

### Source: USAI 2012

DNE = does not exist

<sup>1</sup> Number corresponds with intersection location on Figure 5.2-1. Shaded cells indicate intersections that would exceed the City's significance thresholds.

Table 5.2-28 NEAR TERM WITHOUT PROJECT AND WITH PROJECT (PHASES 1 AND 2) CONDITIONS													
NEAR-TERM WITHOUT PROJECT AND WITH PROJECT (PHASES 1 AND 2) CONDITIONS – FREEWAY SEGMENTS													
Near-term Without Project     Near-term With Project (Phases 1 and 2)													
Segment	Direction	Direction ADT Peak Hour V/C LOS ADT Peak Hour V/C LOS Volume V/C LOS											
I-5													
Lomas Santa Fe Drive to Via de la Valle	NB	223,226	8,134	0.635	С	224,473	8,179	0.639	С	0.004	No		
Lonias Santa i e Drive to via de la vane	SB	223,179	8,394	0.656	С	224,426	8,441	0.659	С	0.003	No		
Via de la Valle to Del Mar Heights Road	NB	239,226	8,716	0.648	С	240,829	8,775	0.652	С	0.004	No		
via de la vane to Del Mai fielgits Road	SB	239,179	8,996	0.669	С	240,782	9,056	0.673	С	0.004	No		
Del Mar Heights Road to SR 56	NB	242,333	8,830	0.560	В	245,539	8,947	0.567	В	0.007	No		
Der War Heights Koau to SK 50	SB	242,275	9,112	0.577	В	245,481	9,233	0.585	В	0.08	No		
SR 56 to Carmel Mountain Road	NB	289,605	13,191	0.578	В	291,386	13,272	0.581	В	0.03	No		
SK 50 to Carmer Wountain Koau	SB	289,605	12,954	0.633	С	291,386	13,034	0.636	С	0.003	No		
Carmel Mountain Road to L-805 merge	NB	289,605	13,191	0.561	В	291,030	13,256	0.564	В	0.003	No		
Carnier Wouldani Road to 1-005 merge	SB	289,605	12,954	0.551	В	291,030	13,018	0.554	В	0.003	No		
SR 56													
El Camino Real to Carmel Creek Road	EB	84,148	5,499	0.846	D	84,504	5,523	0.850	D	0.004	No		
	WB	84,148	5,640	0.868	D	84,504	5,663	0.871	D	0.003	No		
Carmel Creek Road to Carmel Country Road	EB	78,381	5,123	0.788	С	78,737	5,146	0.792	D	0.004	No		
	WB	78,381	5,253	0.808	D	78,737	5,277	0.812	D	0.004	No		

Table 5.2-29 NEAR-TERM WITHOUT PROJECT AND WITH PROJECT (PHASES 1 AND 2) CONDITIONS – FREEWAY RAMP METERS														
Legetion Peak Hour Near-term Without Project (Phases 1 and 2) A Delay Significant?														
Location	Decation     Peak Hour     Delay (minutes)     Queue (feet)     Delay (minutes)     Queue (feet)     Significant?													
Del Mar Heights Road/ I-5 SB	AM	9.29	1,653	13.86	2,465	4.57	No							
on-ramp (WB)	PM	0	0	10.52	1,871	10.52	No							
Del Mar Heights Road/ I-5 SB	AM	0	0	0	0	0	No							
on-ramp (EB)	PM	0	0	0	0	0	No							
Del Mar Heights Road/ I-5 NB	AM		Meter not tu	irned on		0	No							
on-ramp	PM	0	0	3.14	899	3.14	No							

## Near-term With Project Buildout

Near-term With Project Buildout traffic volumes were derived by adding Phases 1, 2, and 3 project volumes (refer to Table 5.2-9) to Near-term Without Project volumes. Near-term With Project Buildout volumes are illustrated in Figure 5.2-6, *Near-term With Project Buildout ADT Volumes*.

<u>Roadway Segments</u>. Table 5.2-30, *Near-term Without Project And With Project Buildout Conditions – Roadway Segments*, shows the ADT, LOS, and V/C for analyzed roadway segments under Near-term With Project Buildout conditions. All but the following four analyzed roadway segments would operate at LOS D or better upon project buildout:

- Del Mar Heights Road from the I-5 SB ramps to the I-5 NB ramps (LOS E);
- Del Mar Heights Road from the I-5 NB ramps to High Bluff Drive (LOS F);
- El Camino Real from Via de la Valle to San Dieguito Road (LOS F); and
- Via de la Valle from San Andres Drive to El Camino Real (West) (LOS F).

With the addition of project buildout traffic, the LOS along the two segments of Del Mar Heights Road would decrease from D to E or F. Therefore, the project would result in potentially significant direct impacts to these two segments of Del Mar Heights Road.

The segment of El Camino Real from Via de la Valle to San Dieguito Road would continue to operate at LOS F at project buildout. The addition of project buildout traffic would result in an increase in V/C of 0.06, which would exceed the City's threshold of greater than 0.01. Thus, the project would result a potentially significant direct impact to this segment of El Camino Real.

Similarly, Via de la Valle from San Andres Drive to El Camino Real (West) would continue to operate at LOS F at project buildout. The addition of project buildout traffic would result in a change in V/C would of 0.06, which is above the City's threshold of greater than 0.01. Thus, the project would result a potentially significant direct impact to this segment of Via de la Valle.

<u>Intersections</u>. As shown in Table 5.2-31, *Near-term Without Project And With Project Buildout Conditions – Intersections*, all analyzed intersections would operate at LOS D or better under Near-term With Project Buildout conditions, with the exception the following:

- Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 NB ramps (LOS E in PM peak hour);
- Del Mar Heights Road/High Bluff Drive (LOS E in PM peak hour);
- Del Mar Heights Road/El Camino Real (LOS E in PM peak hour);
- Carmel Country Road/Carmel Creek Road (LOS E in AM peak hour); and
- Carmel Creek Road/Del Mar Trail (LOS F in AM peak hour).

The LOS at the three Del Mar Heights Road intersections would degrade from C or D to E during the PM peak hour with the addition of project buildout traffic. The change in LOS along with the associated increase in delay (17.8, 24.1, and 33.9 seconds, respectively) would exceed the City's significance threshold for intersection impacts. Therefore, the project would result in potentially significant direct impacts to these three intersections at Del Mar Heights Road.

The intersection of Carmel Country Road/Carmel Creek Road would operate at LOS E with and without the project. With the addition of project buildout traffic, the delay at this intersection would only increase by 1.8 seconds, which would not exceed the City's significance threshold of greater than 2.0 seconds (for intersections at LOS E). Therefore, project impacts to the Carmel Country Road/Carmel Creek Road intersection would be less than significant.

The LOS at the intersection of Carmel Creek Road/Del Mar Trail would degrade from E to F in the AM peak hour with project buildout traffic, and delays would increase by 5.4 seconds, which would exceed the City's significance threshold of greater than 1.0 second (for intersections at LOS F). Thus, the project would result in a potentially significant direct impact to the intersection of Carmel Creek Road/Del Mar Trail.

<u>Freeway Segments</u>. As shown in Table 5.2-32, *Near-term Without Project And With Project Buildout Conditions – Freeway Segments*, all analyzed freeway segments would operate at LOS D or better under Near-term With Project Buildout conditions. Since all analyzed freeway segments would operate at acceptable levels, impacts to freeway segments resulting from the project would be less than significant.

<u>Freeway Ramp Meters</u>. As shown in Table 5.2-33, *Near-term Without Project And With Project Buildout Conditions – Freeway Ramp Meters*, ramp meters at Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 SB on-ramp (eastbound; EB) would not experience delays under Near-term With Project Buildout conditions. The ramp meter at the Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 SB on-ramp (WB) would experience a delay of 16.63 minutes during the AM peak hour and 15.16 minutes during the PM peak hour under the Near-term With Project Buildout conditions. The Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 NB on-ramps would experience a delay of 5.01 minutes during the PM peak hour. Although the ramp delays at the Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 SB on-ramp (WB) would exceed 15 minutes under Near-term With Project Buildout conditions, the corresponding freeway segment operates at an acceptable LOS D, and therefore, project impacts at this ramp meter would be less than significant. The ramp delays would be less than 15 minutes at the other ramp meters. Project impacts to freeway ramps would be less than significant.



E\ArcGIS\K\KIL-03 SDCorporateCenter\Map\ENV\EIR\Fig5\_2-6\_Existing\_Cum\_ADT.indd -KF

## Near-term With Project Buildout ADT Volumes ONE PASEO Figure 5.2-6

NEAR-TERM WITHOUT PROJECT AND WITH PROJECT BUILDOUT CONDITIONS – ROADWAY SEGMENTS														
	Near-ter	rm Withou	t Project	Near-term	With Project	Buildout		G: 1 <b>7</b> (9						
Roadway Segment	ADT	V/C	LOS	ADT	V/C	LOS	$\Delta V/C$	Significant?						
Del Mar Heights Road														
Mango Drive to Portofino Drive	21,953	0.49	В	24,013	0.53	В	0.04	No						
Portofino Drive to I-5 SB ramps	37,169	0.74	С	40,404	0.81	D	0.07	No						
I-5 SB ramps to I-5 NB ramps	41,213	0.82	D	46,874	0.94	E	0.12	Yes						
I-5 NB ramps to High Bluff Drive	54,775	0.91	D	65,290	1.09	F	0.18	Yes						
High Bluff Drive to Third Avenue	40,648	0.68	С	52,781	0.88	D	0.20	No						
Third Avenue to First Avenue	40,648	0.68	С	51,702	0.86	D	0.18	No						
First Avenue to El Camino Real	40,648	0.68	С	51,702	0.86	D	0.18	No						
El Camino Real to Carmel Country Road         33,654         0.56         B         41,473         0.69         C         0.13         No														
En campio Rear to Carmer Country Road         53,034         0.30         B         41,473         0.09         C         0.13         No           Carmel Country Road to Torrey Ridge Road         22,308         0.37         A         25,813         0.43         B         0.07         No														
Carmel Country Road to Torrey Ridge Road         22,308         0.37         A         25,813         0.43         B         0.07         No           Torrey Ridge Road to Lansdale Drive         19,643         0.33         A         22,070         0.37         A         0.04         No														
I orrey Ridge Road to Lansdale Drive         19,643         0.33         A         22,070         0.37         A         0.04         No           Lansdale Drive to Carmel Canyon Road         15,644         0.26         A         16,992         0.28         A         0.02         No														
El Camino Real														
Via de la Valle to San Dieguito Road	16,235	1.08	F	17.044	1.14	F	0.06	Yes						
San Dieguito Road to Derby Downs Road	14,332	0.36	Α	15,411	0.39	В	0.03	No						
Derby Downs Road to Half Mile Drive	15,793	0.39	В	16.871	0.42	В	0.03	No						
Half Mile Drive to Quarter Mile Drive	13,921	0.35	Α	15,270	0.38	В	0.03	No						
Quarter Mile Drive to Del Mar Heights Road	15,373	0.38	В	16,990	0.42	В	0.04	No						
Del Mar Heights Road to Townsgate Drive	17,014	0.34	Α	22,406	0.45	В	0.11	No						
Townsgate Drive to High Bluff Drive	16,662	0.33	Α	20,167	0.40	В	0.07	No						
High Bluff Drive to Valley Centre Drive	21,035	0.42	В	23,461	0.47	В	0.05	No						
Valley Centre Drive to Carmel Valley Road	30,131	0.67	С	31,748	0.71	С	0.04	No						
Carmel Country Road														
Del Mar Heights Road to Townsgate Drive	16,410	0.41	В	19,106	0.48	В	0.07	No						
Townsgate Drive to Carmel Creek Road	14,294	0.36	Α	16,451	0.41	В	0.05	No						
Carmel Creek Road to Carmel Canyon Road	13,531	0.34	Α	14,879	0.37	Α	0.03	No						
Carmel Canyon Road to SR 56 WB ramps	21,170	0.53	С	22,248	0.56	С	0.03	No						
Carmel Canyon Road														
Del Mar Heights Road to Carmel County Road	12,591	0.31	Α	13,130	0.33	Α	0.02	No						
Carmel Creek Road														
Carmel Country Road to Carmel Grove Road	11,542	0.29	А	12,351	0.31	Α	0.02	No						
Carmel Grove Road to SR 56 WB ramps	15,933	0.40	В	16,742	0.42	В	0.02	No						
Valley Centre Drive														
Carmel View Road to Carmel Creek Road	11,826	0.39	В	12,096	0.40	В	0.01	No						

T 11 50 30

Table 5.2-30 (cont.) NEAR-TERM WITHOUT PROJECT AND WITH PROJECT BUILDOUT CONDITIONS – ROADWAY SEGMENTS														
Readway Segment         Near-term Without Project         Near-term With Project Buildout         A V/C         Significant?														
Roadway SegmentNear term with respectNear term with respect buildout $\Delta$ V/CSignificant?														
Carmel Valley Road														
I-5 NB ramps to El Camino Real	45,968	0.77	С	46,507	0.78	С	0.01	No						
High Bluff Drive														
Del Mar Heights Road to El Camino Real	10,137	0.68	D	10,946	0.73	D	0.05	No						
Via de la Valle														
San Andres Drive to El Camino Real (West)	26,732	2.67	F	27,271	2.73	F	0.06	Yes						

 $\Delta$  V/C = difference in V/C between With Project conditions and Without Project conditions Shaded cells indicate roadway segments that would exceed the City's significance thresholds.

## Table 5.2-31 NEAR-TERM WITHOUT PROJECT AND WITH PROJECT BUILDOUT CONDITIONS – INTERSECTIONS

				AM Pe	ak Hour					PM Pea	k Hour		
No. <sup>1</sup>	o. <sup>1</sup> Intersection		Near-term Without Project		term Project dout	Δ Delay	Signif-	Near-t Without I	erm Project	Near-ter Proj Builo	m With ject lout	∆ Delay	Signif-
		Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	(sec)	icant:	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	(sec)	icant:
1	El Camino Real/Via de la Valle	31.4	С	32.5	С	1.1	No	38.8	D	45.3	D	6.5	No
2	El Camino Real/San Dieguito Road	16.9	В	17.4	В	0.5	No	25.2	С	27.6	С	2.4	No
3	El Camino Real/Derby Downs Road	4.3	Α	4.3	Α	0	No	4.5	Α	5.0	Α	0.5	No
4	El Camino Real/Half Mile Drive	20.6	В	22.4	С	1.8	No	14.0	В	14.2	В	0.2	No
5	El Camino Real/Quarter Mile Drive	20.6	С	20.6	С	0	No	15.1	В	17.9	В	2.8	No
6	Del Mar Heights Road/Mango Drive	33.3	С	35.1	D	1.8	No	31.4	С	35.9	D	4.5	No
7	Del Mar Heights Road/Portofino Drive	9.4	Α	9.6	Α	0.2	No	9.2	Α	9.4	А	0.2	No
8	Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 SB ramps	24.8	С	29.9	С	5.1	No	23.0	С	28.5	С	5.5	No
9	Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 NB ramps	39.6	D	49.2	D	9.6	No	38.3	D	56.1	Е	17.8	Yes
10	Del Mar Heights Road/High Bluff Drive	28.5	С	34.2	С	5.7	No	32.1	С	57.0	Е	24.9	Yes
11	Del Mar Heights Road/Third Avenue	DN	ΙE	8.5	Α		No	DNI	Ξ	21.4	С		No
12	Del Mar Heights Road/First Avenue	DN	ΙE	7.9	A		No	DNI	Ξ	25.3	С		No
13	Del Mar Heights Road/El Camino Real	29.9	С	37.4	D		No	29.5	С	62.9	E	33.4	Yes

	1 able 5.2-31 (cont.) NEAR-TERM WITHOUT PROJECT AND WITH PROJECT BUILDOUT CONDITIONS – INTERSECTIONS												
				AM Pe	ak Hour					PM Pea	k Hour		
No. <sup>1</sup>	Intersection	Near- Without	term Project	Near- With P Build	term Project dout	Δ Delay	Signif-	Near-te Without I	erm Project	Near-ter Proj Builo	m With ect lout	Δ Delay	Signif-
		Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	(sec)	icant:	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	(sec)	icant:
14	Del Mar Heights Road/Carmel Country Road	22.9	C	27.3	С	4.4	No	21.1	С	28.2	С	7.1	No
15	Del Mar Heights Road/Torrey Ridge Road	23.6	С	26.3	С	2.7	No	11.9	В	12.0	В	0.1	No
16	Del Mar Heights Road/Lansdale Drive	19.0	В	20.8	С	1.8	No	17.6	В	19.7	В	2.1	No
17	Del Mar Heights Road/Carmel Canyon Road	13.8	В	14.0	В	0.2	No	10.2	В	10.7	В	0.5	No
18	El Camino Real/Del Mar Highland Town Center	6.8	A	15.6	В	8.8	No	13.5	В	30.8	С	17.3	No
19	Carmel County Road/Townsgate Drive	26.5	С	27.7	С	1.2	No	21.8 C 23.2 C 1.4				No	
20	El Camino Real/Townsgate Drive	21.3	C	21.6	С	0.3	No	20.7	C	22.3	С	1.6	No
21	Carmel Country Road/Carmel Creek Road	58.6	E	60.4	E	1.8	No	24.1	C	28.6	C	4.5	No
22	El Camino Real/High Bluff Drive	21.1	C	22.2	C	1.1	No	26.2	C	30.6	C	4.4	No
23	Carmel View Road/High Bluff Drive	8.4	A	8.8	A	0.4	No	9.1	A	10.0	A	0.9	No
24	Carmel Creek Road/Carmel Grove Road	27.8	C	27.9	C	0.1	No	17.5	B	17.9	B	0.4	No
25	Carmel Valley Road/I-5 SB ramps	22.6	C	23.0	C	0.4	No	32.1	C	33.1	C	1.0	No
26	Carmel Valley Road/I-5 NB ramps	13.6	B	14.1	B	0.5	No	20.4	C	20.8	C	0.4	No
27	El Camino Real/Valley Centre Drive	24.6	C	32.9	C	8.3	No	23.2	C	30.5	C	7.3	No
28	El Camino Real/Carmel Valley Road	14.8	В	15.1	B	0.3	No	19.2	B	20.0	B	0.8	NO
29	El Camino Real/SR 56 EB on-ramp	18.0	В	18.8	В	0.8	No	32.3	C	35.8	D	3.5	NO
30	Carmel View Road/Valley Centre Drive	7.4	A	7.4	A	0	No	8.3	A	8.3	A	0	No
31	Carmel Creek Road/SR 56 WB ramps	45.7	D	46.8	D	1.1	No	27.0	C	30.8	C	3.8	No
32	Carmel Creek Road/SR 56 EB ramps	12.5	В	12.6	В	0.1	No	27.4	C	27.8	C	0.4	No
33	Carmel Country Road/Carmel Canyon Road	33.1	C	35.9	D	2.8	No	25.6	С	25.8	C	0.2	No
34	Carmel Country Road/SR 56 WB ramps	16.2	В	16.2	В	0	No	10.9	В	12.4	В	1.5	No
35	Carmel Country Road/SR 56 EB ramps	14.1	В	14.3	В	0.2	No	11.7	В	12.2	В	0.5	No
36	Carmel Creek Road/Del Mar Trail	47.9	E	53.5	F	5.4	Yes	21.7	С	25.1	D	3.4	No

Source: USAI 2012 DNE = does not exist

<sup>1</sup> Number corresponds with intersection location on Figure 5.2-1. Shaded cells indicate intersections that would exceed the City's significance thresholds.

	Table 5.2-32										
NEAR-TERM	WITHOUT P	<b>ROJECT</b> A	AND WITH	I PROJE	CT BUI	LDOUT C	ONDITIO	NS –			
		FREE	WAY SEG	MENTS							
Noon town Without Duriest Noon town With Duriest Duildout											
		Iveal-	Dool	out i roje		Iveal-tel	III WILIIII Doolz	ojeci bu	Indout	٨	Signif
Segment	Direction	ADT	Hour	V/C	1.05	ADT	Hour	V/C	1.05		icont?
		ADI	Volumo	VIC	LUS	ADI	Volumo	vic	LUS	vic	icant.
1.5			volume				volume				
	NB	223 226	8 1 3 4	0.635	С	225 113	8 202	0 641	С	0.006	No
Lomas Santa Fe Drive to Via de la Valle	SB	223,179	8.394	0.656	C	225.066	8.465	0.661	C	0.005	No
	NB	239,226	8,716	0.648	C	241,652	8,805	0.655	C	0.007	No
Via de la Valle to Del Mar Heights Road	SB	239,179	8,996	0.669	С	241,605	9,087	0.676	С	0.007	No
Del Mar Haishta Des d ta SD 5/	NB	242,333	8,830	0.560	В	247,186	9,007	0.571	В	0.010	No
Del Mar Heights Road to SR 56	SB	242,275	9,112	0.577	В	247,128	9,295	0.589	В	0.012	No
SP 56 to Carmel Mountain Road	NB	289,605	13,191	0.578	В	292,301	13,314	0.583	В	0.005	No
SK 50 to Carmer Mountain Road	SB	289,605	12,954	0.633	С	292,301	13,075	0.638	С	0.005	No
Carmel Mountain Road to L-805 merge	NB	289,605	13,191	0.561	В	291,762	13,289	0.565	В	0.004	No
Carmer Wountain Road to 1-805 merge	SB	289,605	12,954	0.551	В	291,762	13,051	0.555	В	0.004	No
SR 56											
Fl Camino Real to Carmel Creek Road	EB	84,148	5,499	0.846	D	84,606	5,529	0.851	D	0.005	No
	WB	84,148	5,640	0.868	D	84,606	5,670	0.872	D	0.004	No
Carmel Creek Road to Carmel Country Road	EB	78,381	5,123	0.788	С	78,839	5,152	0.793	D	0.005	No
Currier Crock Rold to Currier County Rold	WB	78,381	5,253	0.808	D	78,839	5,284	0.813	D	0.005	No

Table 5.2-33 NEAR-TERM WITHOUT PROJECT AND WITH PROJECT BUILDOUT CONDITIONS – FREEWAY RAMP METERS											
Location	Peak	eak Near-term Without Project Near-term With Project Buildout A Delay Significa									
Location	Hour	Delay (minutes) Queue (feet)			Delay (min	(minutes) Queue (feet)		(minutes)	Significant:		
Dol Mar Heights Bood/ L5 SP on romn (WP)	AM	9.29		1,653	16.63		2,958	7.34	No		
Del Mai Heights Road/ 1-3 SB oll-Tamp (WB)	PM	0		0	15.16		2,697	15.16	No		
Dol Mar Heights Dood/ L5 SD on romn (ED)	AM	0		0	0		0	0	No		
Del Mai Heights Koad/ 1-3 SB on-Tamp (EB)	PM	0	0 0 0 0 0								
Dol Mar Haights Bood/ L 5 NP on ramp	AM	AM Meter not turned on 0						No			
Dei Mai Tieigius Road/ 1-3 NB oll-fallip	PM	PM 0 0 5.01 1,436 5.01						No			

## Near-term With Cinema

As described in Section 3.0, *Project Description*, of this EIR, construction of the proposed cinema is anticipated to occur during Phase 3 of the project. However, because the timing of the cinema would be driven by market conditions, it is possible that the cinema could be constructed in earlier phases of the project (Phase 1 or 2). The analysis below evaluates potential Near-term traffic impacts that would occur if the proposed cinema would be constructed in Phase 1 or Phase 2 of the project.

<u>Cinema in Phase 1</u>. If the cinema were constructed in Phase 1, an additional 2,200 ADT would be generated in Phase 1, resulting in a total Phase 1 trip generation of 12,088 ADT (compared to 9,888 ADT without the cinema in Phase 1 – see Table 5.2-7).

Impacts to roadway segments would be the same as those previously identified under Near-term With Project (Phase 1) conditions. Potentially significant direct impacts would occur to the same three roadway segments, including Del Mar Heights Road between the I-5 NB ramps to High Bluff Drive, El Camino Real between Via de la Valle and San Dieguito Road, and Via de la Valle between San Andres Drive and El Camino Real (West), and no additional roadway segments would be significantly impacted as a result of the cinema in Phase 1.

With the cinema in Phase 1, potentially significant direct impacts would occur to the same intersection previously identified under Near-term With Project (Phase 1) conditions (Carmel Creek Road/Del Mar Trail), as well as one additional intersection. The LOS at the intersection of Del Mar Heights Road/High Bluff Drive would degrade from C to E and the delay would increase by 24.7 seconds during the PM peak hour, which would exceed the City's significance threshold.

Additionally, no new potentially significant impacts to freeway segments or ramp meters would occur as a result of the cinema in Phase 1.

<u>Cinema in Phase 2</u>. If the cinema were constructed in Phase 2, an additional 2,200 ADT would be generated in Phase 2, resulting in a total Phase 2 trip generation of 20,012 ADT (compared to 17,812 ADT without the cinema in Phase 2– see Table 5.2-8).

Impacts to roadway segments would be the same as those previously identified under Near-term With Project (Phases 1 and 2) conditions. Potentially significant direct impacts would occur to the same three roadway segments, including Del Mar Heights Road between the I-5 NB ramps to High Bluff Drive, El Camino Real between Via de la Valle and San Dieguito Road, and Via de la Valle between San Andres Drive and El Camino Real (West), and no additional roadway segments would be significantly impacted as a result of the cinema in Phase 2.

With the cinema in Phase 2, potentially significant direct impacts would occur to the same intersections previously identified under Near-term With Project (Phases 1 and 2) conditions (Del Mar Heights Road/High Bluff Drive, Del Mar Heights Road/El Camino Real, and Carmel Creek Road/Del Mar Trail). No additional intersections would be significantly impacted as a result of the cinema in Phase 2.

Additionally, no new potentially significant impacts to freeway segments or ramp meters would occur as a result of the cinema in Phase 2.

## Long-term Cumulative (Year 2030) Conditions

Long-term Cumulative (Year 2030) conditions represent traffic conditions in the year 2030 with buildout of the proposed project and the community. The Long-term Cumulative (Year 2030) analysis assumes SR 56 has been widened to six lanes with auxiliary lanes as appropriate, and assumes the I-5/SR 56 NB connector has been constructed.

## Long-term Cumulative (Year 2030) Without Project

Long-term Cumulative (Year 2030) traffic volumes were derived from a SANDAG Series 11 regional traffic forecast model and from the I-5/SR 56 NB Connector study traffic volumes in order to provide consistency with other traffic reports completed in the community. Figure 5.2-7, *Long-term Cumulative (Year 2030) Without Project ADT Volumes*, illustrates the Long-term Cumulative (Year 2030) traffic conditions without the project.

<u>Roadway Segments</u>. Table 5.2-34, *Long-term Cumulative (Year 2030) Without Project and With Project Conditions – Roadway Segments*, shows the ADT, LOS, and V/C for analyzed roadway segments under Long-term Cumulative (Year 2030) Without Project conditions. As shown, all roadway segments would operate at an acceptable LOS except the following:

- El Camino Real between Via de la Valle and San Dieguito Road (LOS F); and
- Via de la Valle between San Andres Drive and El Camino Real (West) (LOS F).

<u>Intersections</u>. As shown in Table 5.2-35, *Long-term Cumulative (Year 2030) Without Project and With Project Conditions – Intersections*, all analyzed intersections would operate at LOS D or better under Long-term Cumulative (Year 2030) Without Project conditions, with the exception of the following:

- Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 NB Ramps (LOS E in the AM and PM peak hour);
- El Camino Real/SR 56 EB Ramp (LOS F in the PM peak hour); and
- Carmel Creek Road/Del Mar Trail (LOS E in the AM peak hour).

<u>Freeway Segments</u>. As shown in Table 5.2-36, *Long-term Cumulative (Year 2030) Without Project and With Project Conditions – Freeway Segments*, all analyzed I-5 freeway segments would operate at acceptable levels and the following analyzed segments of SR 56 would operate at unacceptable levels under Long-term Cumulative (Year 2030) Without Project conditions:

- SR 56 between El Camino Real and Carmel Creek Road (LOS E in EB direction and LOS F in WB direction): and
- SR 56 between Carmel Creek Road and Carmel Country Road (LOS E in the WB direction.

<u>Freeway Ramp Meters</u>. As shown in Table 5.2-37, *Long-term Cumulative (Year 2030) Without Project and With Project Conditions – Freeway Ramp Meters*, ramp meters at Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 SB on-ramp (EB) would not experience delays in the Long-term Cumulative (Year 2030) conditions. However, the ramp meter at Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 SB on-ramp (WB) would experience a delay of 40.27 minutes during the AM peak hour and 5.22 minutes during the PM peak hour under Long-term Cumulative (Year 2030) Without Project conditions. Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 NB on-ramp would not experience delays in the AM peak hour, but a delay of 8.30 minutes in the PM peak hour. The two ramp meters at SR 56 (El Camino Real and Carmel Country EB on-ramps) would experience delays of less than 15 minutes during the AM and PM peak hours.

The ramp delay at Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 SB on-ramp (WB) is considered to be operating at unacceptable levels because the ramp delays would be more than 15 minutes. Thus, a 15-minute maximum meter rate analysis was completed. As shown in Table 5.2-38, *Long-term Cumulative (Year 2030) Without Project and With Project Conditions – 15-minute Delay at Freeway Ramp Meters*, to achieve a delay of 15 minutes or less at this ramp, the queue length would be required to be 3,567 feet instead of 7,163 feet.

## Long-term Cumulative (Year 2030) With Project

Long-term Cumulative (Year 2030) With Project traffic volumes were derived by adding project buildout volumes (refer to Table 5.2-9) to Long-term Cumulative (Year 2030) Without Project volumes. Long-term Cumulative (Year 2030) With Project traffic is illustrated in Figure 5.2-8, *Long-term Cumulative (Year2030) With Project ADT Volumes.* 

<u>Roadway Segments.</u> Table 5.2-34 shows the ADT, LOS, and V/C for analyzed roadway segments under Long-term Cumulative (Year 2030) With Project conditions. With the addition of project buildout traffic to Long-term Cumulative (Year 2030) Without Project conditions, the following three roadway segments would operate at unacceptable levels:

- Del Mar Heights Road from the I-5 NB ramps to High Bluff Drive (LOS F);
- El Camino Real from Via de la Valle to San Dieguito Road (LOS F); and
- Via de la Valle from San Andres Drive to El Camino Real (West) (LOS F).

The LOS along Del Mar Heights Road from the I-5 NB ramps to High Bluff Drive would decrease from D to F with the addition of project buildout traffic. Therefore, the project would result in a potentially significant cumulative impact to Del Mar Heights Road from I-5 NB ramps to High Bluff Drive.

The segment of El Camino Real from Via de la Valle to San Dieguito Road would continue to operate at LOS F under Long-term Cumulative (Year 2030) With Project conditions. The addition of project buildout traffic would result in an increase in V/C of 0.05, which would exceed the City's threshold of greater than 0.01. Thus, the project would result a potentially significant cumulative impact to this segment of El Camino Real.



Long-term Cumulative (Year 2030) Without Project ADT Volumes ONE PASEO Figure 5.2-7



Long-term Cumulative (Year 2030) With Project ADT Volumes ONE PASEO Figure 5.2-8 Via de la Valle from San Andres Drive to El Camino Real (West) would continue to operate at LOS F with the addition of the project buildout traffic to Long-term Cumulative (Year 2030) Without Project conditions. The addition of project buildout traffic would result in a change in V/C of 0.05, which would exceed the City's threshold of greater than 0.01. Thus, the project would result in a potentially significant cumulative impact to Via de la Valle from San Andres Drive to El Camino Real (West).

<u>Intersections</u>. As shown in Table 5.2-35 all analyzed intersections would operate at LOS D or better under Long-term Cumulative (Year 2030) With Project conditions, with the exception of the following five intersections:

- Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 NB ramps (LOS F in the AM/PM peak hours);
- Del Mar Heights Road/High Bluff Drive (LOS E in the AM peak hour and LOS F in the PM peak hour);
- Del Mar Heights Road/El Camino Real (LOS F in the PM peak hour);
- El Camino Real/SR 56 EB ramp (LOS F in the PM peak hour); and
- Carmel Creek Road/Del Mar Trail (LOS E in the AM peak hour).

The project would result in potentially significant cumulative impacts at these five intersections since project buildout traffic would increase delays by more than 2.0 seconds at intersections forecasted to operate at LOS E and 1.0 second at intersections forecasted to operate at LOS F:

<u>Freeway Segments</u>. As shown in Table 5.2-36 all analyzed I-5 freeway segments would operate at acceptable levels in the Long-term Cumulative (Year 2030) With Project conditions. The following analyzed segments of SR 56 would continue to operate at unacceptable LOS E or F:

- El Camino Real to Carmel Creek Road (LOS E in EB direction and LOS F in WB direction); and
- Carmel Creek Road to Carmel Country Road (LOS E in WB direction).

The resulting increase in V/C would not exceed 0.005 at the segment that would operate at LOS F or 0.010 at the segments that would operate at LOS E. Project cumulative impacts to these SR 56 freeway segments are therefore considered less than significant.

<u>Freeway Ramp Meters</u>. As shown in Table 5.2-37 ramp meter at Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 SB on-ramp (EB) would not experience delays in the Long-term Cumulative (Year 2030) With Project conditions. However, the ramp meter at Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 SB on-ramp (WB) would experience a delay of 47.61 minutes during the AM peak hour and 29.84 minutes during the PM peak hour under Long-term Cumulative (Year 2030) With Project conditions. Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 NB Ramp would experience a delay of 1.37 minutes in the AM peak hour and 16.04 minutes in the PM peak hour. Cumulative impacts to the Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 SB on-ramp (WB) and Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 NB on-ramp would be considered potentially significant because the ramp delays would be more than 15 minutes and the corresponding queue lengths would be substantial. The planned ramp meters at the SR 56 (El Camino Real and Carmel Country Road EB on-ramps) would experience delays of less than 15 minutes and therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

A 15-minute maximum meter rate analysis was completed, as shown in Table 5.2-38. This analysis assumes that drivers would seek alternative routes if the delay exceeds 15 minutes. Under this assumption, the Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 SB on-ramp (WB) queue length would be 4,872 and 6,699 feet in the AM/PM peak hours, respectively, and the Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 NB on-ramp would be 6,148 feet in the PM peak hour. Since the project is responsible for over two minutes of delays at these ramps with delays over 15 minutes under both of the analysis methods, the project would result in significant cumulative impacts to the Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 NB on-ramp (WB) and Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 NB on-ramp.

Table 5.2-34 LONG-TERM CUMULATIVE (YEAR 2030) WITHOUT PROJECT AND WITH PROJECT CONDITIONS – ROADWAY SEGMENTS								
	Long-term C	umulative (Y	(ear 2030)	Long-term (	Cumulative (	Year 2030)		C: : C: . (3
Roadway Segment		Nout Project			Vith Project	1.05	$\Delta V/C$	Significant?
Del Mar Heights Road		110	LOS		110	105		
Mango Drive to Portofino Drive	39,580	0.88	D	41.639	0.93	D	0.05	No
Portofino Drive to I-5 SB ramps	38,580	0.79	C	42.815	0.86	D	0.07	No
I-5 SB ramps to I-5 NB ramps	37.820	0.76	C	43,482	0.87	D	0.11	No
I-5 NB ramps to High Bluff Drive	51.800	0.86	D	62.315	1.25	F	0.21	Yes
High Bluff Drive to Third Avenue	42,770	0.71	С	54.902	0.92	D	0.21	No
Third Avenue to First Avenue	42,770	0.71	C	53.824	0.90	D	0.19	No
First Avenue to El Camino Real	42,770	0.71	С	53,824	0.90	D	0.19	No
El Camino Real to Carmel Country Road	38,370	0.64	С	46,189	0.77	С	0.13	No
Carmel Country Road to Torrey Ridge Road	34,400	0.57	В	37,905	0.63	С	0.09	No
Torrey Ridge Road to Lansdale Drive	34,400	0.57	В	36,826	0.61	С	0.04	No
Lansdale Drive to Carmel Canyon Road	34,400	0.57	В	35,748	0.60	С	0.03	No
El Camino Real	, i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i							
Via de la Valle to San Dieguito Road	31,320	2.09	F	32,129	2.14	F	0.05	Yes
San Dieguito Road to Derby Downs Road	29,000	0.73	С	30,078	0.75	D	0.02	No
Derby Downs Road to Half Mile Drive	29,000	0.73	С	30,078	0.75	D	0.02	No
Half Mile Drive to Quarter Mile Drive	29,000	0.73	С	30,348	0.76	D	0.03	No
Quarter Mile Drive to Del Mar Heights Rd.	29,000	0.73	С	30,618	0.77	D	0.04	No
Del Mar Heights Road to Townsgate Drive	23,000	0.46	В	28,392	0.57	С	0.11	No
Townsgate Drive to High Bluff Drive	26,000	0.52	В	29,505	0.59	С	0.07	No
High Bluff Drive to Valley Centre Drive	35,620	0.71	С	38,046	0.76	C	0.05	No
Valley Centre Drive to Carmel Valley Road	36,470	0.81	D	38,088	0.85	D	0.04	No
Carmel Country Road								
Del Mar Heights Road to Townsgate Drive	22,280	0.56	С	24,976	0.62	С	0.06	No
Townsgate Drive to Carmel Creek Road	18,800	0.47	В	20,957	0.52	В	0.05	No
Carmel Creek Road to Carmel Canyon Road	13,590	0.34	Α	14,938	0.37	Α	0.03	No
Carmel Canyon Road to SR 56 WB ramps	26,000	0.65	С	27,078	0.68	С	0.03	No
Carmel Canyon Road								
Del Mar Heights Road to Carmel County Road	13,000	0.33	Α	13,539	0.34	A	0.01	No
Carmel Creek Road								
Carmel Country Road to Carmel Grove Rd.	15,000	0.38	В	15,809	0.40	В	0.02	No
Carmel Grove Road to SR 56 WB ramps	17,000	043	В	17,809	0.45	В	0.02	No
Valley Centre Drive								
Carmel View Road to Carmel Creek Road	20,000	0.67	D	20,270	0.68	D	0.01	No

LONG-TERM CUMULATIVE (YI	EAR 2030) WIT	Ta HOUT PR	ble 5.2-34 (c OJECT ANI	ont.) D WITH PRO	JECT CON	DITIONS – R	OADWAY S	SEGMENTS
Roadway Segment	Long-term Cu Wit	ımulative ( hout Projec	Year 2030) t	Long-term	Cumulative With Project	(Year 2030)	Δ V/C	Significant?
v O	ADT	V/C	LOS	ADT	V/C	LOS		8
Carmel Valley Road								•
I-5 NB ramps to El Camino Real	43,020	0.72	С	43,559	0.73	С	0.01	No
High Bluff Drive								
Del Mar Heights Road to El Camino Real	11,700	0.78	D	12,509	0.83	D	0.05	No
Via de la Valle								
San Andres Drive to El Camino Real (West)	33,100	3.31	F	33,639	3.36	F	0.05	Yes

 $\Delta$  V/C = difference in V/C between With Project conditions and Without Project conditions Shaded cells indicate roadway segments that would exceed the City's significance thresholds.

	Table 5.2-35 LONG-TERM CUMULATIVE (YEAR 2030) WITHOUT PROJECT AND WITH PROJECT CONDITIONS – INTERSECTIONS												
No. <sup>1</sup>	Intersection	Long- Cumu (Year With Proj	term lative 2030) 10ut ject	AM Pe Long Cumu (Year With F	eak Hour -term lative 2030) Project	Δ Delay (sec)	Signif- icant?	Long-t Cumul (Year 2 With Proje	term ative 2030) out ect	PM Peak Hour Long-term Cumulative (Year 2030) With Project Delay LOS		Δ Delay (sec)	Signif- icant?
		Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS			Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	1.3	
1	El Camino Real/Via de la Valle	22.2	С	23.1	С	0.9	No	19.1	В	20.4	С	1.3	No
2	El Camino Real/San Dieguito Road	24.2	С	26.7	С	2.5	No	47.2	D	52.5	D	5.3	No
3	El Camino Real/Derby Downs Road	4.3	A	4.3	A	0	No	5.1	Α	5.1	Α	0	No
4	El Camino Real/Half Mile Drive	22.9	С	24.8	С	1.9	No	14.0	В	14.1	В	0.1	No
5	El Camino Real/Quarter Mile Drive	20.6	С	25.2	С	4.6	No	12.1	В	12.7	В	0.6	No
6	Del Mar Heights Road/Mango Drive	36.8	D	39.6	D	2.8	No	29.3	С	35.7	D	6.4	No
7	Del Mar Heights Road/Portofino Drive	9.8	A	10.1	В	0.3	No	9.6	Α	10.1	В	0.5	No
8	Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 SB ramps	26.1	C	29.0	С	2.9	No	22.4	C	25.7	C	3.3	No
9	Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 NB ramps	71.5	E	107.1	F	35.6	Yes	55.5	E	94.0	F	38.5	Yes
10	Del Mar Heights Road/High Bluff Drive	44.0	D	55.3	E	11.3	Yes	40.1	D	80.2	F	40.1	Yes
11	Del Mar Heights Road/Third Avenue	DNE	DNE	8.3	Α		No	DNE	DNE	20.7	C		No
12	Del Mar Heights Road/First Avenue	DNE	DNE	7.7	A		No	DNE	DNE	20.9	С		No
13	Del Mar Heights Road/El Camino Real	35.0	C	50.8	D	15.8	No	41.5	D	84.1	F	42.6	Yes
14	Del Mar Heights Road/Carmel Country Road	33.6	С	41.3	D	7.7	No	34.1	С	49.3	D	15.2	No
15	Del Mar Heights Road/Torrey Ridge Road	29.5	С	33.1	С	3.6	No	11.9	В	14.4	В	2.5	No

	Table 5.2-35 (cont.) LONG-TERM CUMULATIVE (YEAR 2030) WITHOUT PROJECT AND WITH PROJECT CONDITIONS – INTERSECTIONS												
				AM Pe	ak Hour					PM Pea	k Hour		
No. <sup>1</sup>	Intersection	Long- Cumu (Year With Proj	term lative 2030) out ect	Long- Cumu (Year With F	term lative 2030) Project	Δ Delay (sec)	Signif- icant?	Long-t Cumul (Year 2 With Proje	erm ative 2030) out ect	Long- Cumu (Year 2 With P	term lative 2030) roject	Δ Delay (sec)	Signif- icant?
		Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS			Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS		
16	Del Mar Heights Road/Lansdale Drive	32.7	С	41.1	D	8.4	No	18.7	В	20.9	С	2.2	No
17	Del Mar Heights Road/Carmel Canyon Road	29.4	С	29.8	С	0.4	No	16.0	В	17.2	В	1.2	No
18	El Camino Real/Del Mar Highland Town Center	6.2	Α	17.4	В	11.2	No	14.2	В	33.7	С	19.5	No
19	Carmel County Road/Townsgate Drive	32.0	С	32.9	С	0.9	No	29.8	С	34.6	С	4.8	No
20	El Camino Real/Townsgate Drive	22.5	С	22.7	С	0.2	No	24.3	С	35.4	D	11.1	No
21	Carmel Country Road/Carmel Creek Road	41.5	D	45.7	D	4.2	No	19.7	В	21.5	С	1.8	No
22	El Camino Real/High Bluff Drive	22.9	С	24.4	С	1.5	No	33.6	С	40.0	D	6.4	No
23	Carmel View Road/High Bluff Drive	8.9	A	9.3	A	0.4	No	9.8	A	10.9	В	1.1	No
24	Carmel Creek Road/Carmel Grove Road	15.3	В	15.3	В	0	No	11.4	В	17.3	В	5.9	No
25	Carmel Valley Road/I-5 SB ramps	25.3	C	26.3	C	1.0	No	30.9	C	35.3	D	4.4	No
26	Carmel Valley Road/I-5 NB ramps	26.8	С	27.3	C	0.5	No	19.6	В	20.0	В	0.4	No
27	El Camino Real/Valley Centre Drive	22.0	С	22.2	C	0.2	No	27.4	C	29.3	С	1.9	No
28	El Camino Real/Carmel Valley Road	22.0	С	22.2	С	0.2	No	17.6	В	19.2	В	1.6	No
29	El Camino Real/SR 56 EB on-ramp	23.1	C	23.6	C	0.5	No	89.0	F	97.6	F	8.6	Yes
30	Carmel View Road/Valley Centre Drive	7.7	Α	7.7	A	0	No	6.2	Α	6.2	Α	0	No
31	Carmel Creek Road/SR 56 WB ramps	47.0	D	54.2	D	7.2	No	42.6	D	53.3	D	10.7	No
32	Carmel Creek Road/SR 56 EB ramps	15.0	В	15.0	В	0	No	22.9	С	23.4	С	0.5	No
33	Carmel Country Road/Carmel Canyon Road	34.5	С	36.6	D	2.1	No	33.4	С	34.1	С	0.7	No
34	Carmel Country Road/SR 56 WB ramps	17.1	В	17.1	В	0	No	9.9	Α	12.7	В	2.8	No
35	Carmel Country Road/SR 56 EB ramps	20.1	C	22.0	С	1.9	No	18.2	В	18.7	В	0.5	No
36	Carmel Creek Road/Del Mar Trail	43.3	E	48.3	E	5.0	Yes	20.6	С	23.6	C	3.0	No

Source: USAI 2012 DNE = does not exist

<sup>1</sup> Number corresponds with intersection location on Figure 5.2-1. Shaded cells indicate intersections that would exceed the City's significance thresholds.

LONG-TERM CUMULATIVE (YI	EAR 2030) W	TTHOUT P	Table 5.2 ROJECT A	2-36 AND WIT	TH PROJ	IECT CON	DITIONS	– FREEV	VAY SE	GMENT	S
		Long-ter	Long-term Cumulative (Year 2030)Long-term Cumulative (Year 2030)Without ProjectWith Project							Δ	Signif-
Segment	Direction	ADT	Peak Hour Volume	V/C	LOS	ADT	Peak Hour V/C LOS V/C		V/C	icant?	
I-5											
Lomas Santa Fe Drive to Via de la Valle	NB	258,913	9,434	0.737	С	260,800	9,503	0.742	С	0.005	No
	SB	258,913	9,738	0.761	С	260,800	9,809	0.766	С	0.005	No
Via da la Valla ta Dal Mar Haighta Boad	NB	286,874	10,453	0.777	С	289,300	10,541	0.784	С	0.007	No
Via de la Valle to Del Mai Heights Road	SB	286,874	10,789	0.802	D	289,300	10,881	0.809	D	0.007	No
Dal Mar Haights Road to SP 56	NB	301,247	10,976	0.696	С	306,100	11,153	0.707	С	0.011	No
Del Mai neights Road to SR 50	SB	301,247	11,330	0.718	С	306,100	11,513	0.730	С	0.012	No
SP 56 to Correct Mountain Boad	NB	409,604	18,657	0.817	D	412,300	18,779	0.823	D	0.006	No
SK 50 to Carmer Mountain Road	SB	409,604	18,322	0.895	D	412,300	18,443	0.901	D	0.006	No
Cormel Mountain Read to L 905 marga	NB	389,443	17,738	0.755	С	391,600	17,837	0.759	С	0.004	No
Carmer Mountain Road to 1-805 merge	SB	389,443	17,420	0.741	С	391,600	17,517	0.745	С	0.004	No
SR 56											
El Camina Paul to Carmal Craak Paud	EB	133,342	8,714	0.985	Е	133,800	8,744	0.988	E	0.003	No
	WB	133,342	8,937	1.010	F	133,800	8,967	1.013	F	0.003	No
Cormal Craak Bood to Cormal Country Bood	EB	122,242	7,989	0.903	D	122,700	8,019	0.906	D	0.003	No
Carmer Creek Road to Carmer Country Road	WB	122,242	8,193	0.926	Е	122,700	8,223	0.929	Е	0.003	No

Table 5.2-37 LONG-TERM CUMULATIVE (YEAR 2030) WITHOUT PROJECT AND WITH PROJECT CONDITIONS – FREEWAY RAMP METERS									
Location	Pook Hour	Long-term (Year 2030) W		Long-term (Year 2030)	Cumulative With Project	Δ Delay	Significant?		
Location	Peak Hour Delay (minutes)		Queue (feet)	Delay (minutes)	Queue (feet)	(minutes)	Significant:		
Del Mar Heights Road/ I-5	AM	40.27	7,163	47.61	8,468	7.34	Yes		
SB on-ramp (WB)	PM	5.22	928	29.84	5,307	24.62	Yes		
Del Mar Heights Road/ I-5	AM	0	0	0	0	0	No		
SB on-ramp (EB)	PM	0	0	0	0	0	No		
Del Mar Heights Road/ I-5	AM	0	0	1.37	392	1.37	No		
NB on-ramp	PM	8.30	2,378	16.04	4,597	7.74	Yes		
El Camino Real / SR 56	AM	0	0	0	0	0	No		
EB on-ramp	PM	3.93	2,277	4.78	2,770	0.85	No		
Carmel Country Road /	AM	0	0	0	0	0	No		
SR 56 EB on-ramp	PM	0	0	0	0	0	No		

Shaded cells indicate significant impacts.

#### Table 5.2-38 LONG-TERM CUMULATIVE (YEAR 2030) WITHOUT PROJECT AND WITH PROJECT CONDITIONS – 15-MINUTE DELAY AT FREEWAY RAMP METERS

Location	Dool: Hour	Long-term (Year 2030) W	Cumulative /ithout Project	Long-term (Year 2030)	Cumulative With Project	Δ Delay	Significant?	
Location	reak nour	Delay (minutes)	Queue (feet)	Delay (minutes)	Queue (feet)	(minutes)	Significant:	
Del Mar Heights Road/ I-5	AM	15.0	3,567	20.5	4,872	5.5	Yes	
SB on-ramp (WB)	PM	15.0	2,320	43.3	6,699	28.3	Yes	
Del Mar Heights Road/ I-5	AM	15.0	2,291	15.0	2,291	0	No	
SB on-ramp (EB)	PM	15.0	1,740	15.0	1,740	0	No	
Del Mar Heights Road/ I-5	AM	15.0	3,393	17.8	4,031	2.8	No	
NB on-ramp	PM	15.0	3,915	23.6	6,148	8.6	Yes	
El Camino Real / SR 56	AM	15.0	4,060	15.5	4,205	0.5	No	
EB on-ramp	PM	15.0	7,415	16.0	7,903	1.0	No	
Carmel Country Road /	AM	15.0	1,914	16.1	2,059	1.1	No	
SR 56 EB on-ramp	PM	15.0	1,711	19.3	2,204	4.3	No	

Source: USAI 2012

Shaded cells indicate significant impacts.

## Construction Traffic

Appendix O of the TIA (USAI 2012; Appendix C of the Draft EIR) includes a detailed quantitative analysis of potential construction traffic impacts. Construction traffic trips during project construction would be generated by employees, materials deliveries, and trucks importing and exporting soil. A total of five construction traffic scenarios were evaluated, including:

- Phase 1 construction;
- Phase 2 construction;
- Phase 3 construction;
- Concurrent Phases 1 and 2 construction; and
- Concurrent Phases 1, 2, and 3 construction.

Two scenarios were evaluated for each construction phase, including the Existing With Construction Traffic and Near-term With Construction Traffic. The Existing With Construction Traffic scenario analyzes existing traffic conditions along with construction traffic by Phase. The Near-term With Construction Traffic scenario analyzes existing with near-term cumulative projects in the project area along with construction traffic by Phase. To determine Near-term traffic volumes, a percentage of cumulative projects were assumed based on the project's trip generation by Phase. Because Phase 1 project traffic (9,888 ADT; refer to Table 5.2-7) represents approximately 37 percent of the total project traffic volumes (26,961; refer to Table 5.2-9), 37 percent of cumulative projects traffic was added to existing volumes. Using the same methodology, approximately 66 percent of cumulative projects traffic was assumed for Phase 2 (refer to Table 5.2-8), and 100 percent for Phase 3.

The traffic study area for the construction traffic analysis was based on the assumed construction employee and truck routes accessing the site via Del Mar Heights Road from I-5 and El Camino Real. Construction staging and construction employee parking would be provided on site. Construction employee vehicles would enter the project site via a right turn into the site at Third Avenue from EB Del Mar Heights Road and exit at the signalized access at First Avenue. The traffic study area includes a total of seven roadway segments, five intersections, and two freeway segments, as identified in Table 5.2-39, *Construction Traffic Study Area*. Refer to Figure 5.2-1 for the location of these facilities.

## Phase 1 Construction

Phase 1 construction would generate a total of 1,775 ADT with 130 AM peak hour trips and 118 PM peak hour trips.

Existing With Phase 1 Construction Traffic. Existing With Phase 1 Construction Traffic volumes were derived by adding Phase 1 construction trips to existing volumes. As shown in Attachments 7, 8, and 9 in Appendix O of the TIA (Draft EIR Appendix C), no significant impacts to the analyzed roadway segments, intersections, or freeway segments would occur.

Table 5.2-39
CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC STUDY AREA
Roadway Segments
Del Mar Heights Road
I-5 SB Ramps to I-5 NB Ramps
I-5 NB Ramps to High Bluff Drive
High Bluff Drive to First Avenue
First Avenue to El Camino Real
El Camino Real to Carmel Country Road
El Camino Real
Quarter Mile Drive to Del Mar Heights Road
Del Mar Heights Road to Townsgate Drive
Intersections
Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 SB Ramps
Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 NB Ramps
Del Mar Heights Road/High Bluff Drive
Del Mar Heights Road/First Avenue
Del Mar Heights/El Camino Real
Freeway Segments
I-5
Via de la Valle to Del Mar Heights Road
Del Mar Heights Road to SR 56

<u>Near-term With Phase 1 Construction Traffic</u>. Near-term With Phase 1 Construction Traffic volumes were derived by adding Phase 1 construction trips and approximately 37 percent of near-term cumulative projects traffic volumes to existing volumes. As shown in Attachments 10, 11, and 12 in Appendix O of the TIA (Draft EIR Appendix C), no significant impacts to the analyzed roadway segments, intersections, or freeway segments would occur. *Phase 2 Construction* 

Phase 2 construction would generate a total of 1,265 ADT with 84 AM peak hour trips and 77 PM peak hour trips.

Existing With Phase 2 Construction Traffic. Existing With Phase 2 Construction Traffic volumes were derived by adding Phase 2 construction trips to existing volumes. As shown in Attachments 14, 15, and 16 in Appendix O of the TIA (Draft EIR Appendix C), no significant impacts to the analyzed roadway segments, intersections, or freeway segments would occur.

<u>Near-term With Phase 2 Construction Traffic</u>. Near-term With Phase 2 Construction Traffic volumes were derived by adding Phase 2 construction trips and approximately 66 percent of near-term cumulative projects traffic volumes to existing volumes. As shown in Attachments 17, 18, and 19 in Appendix O of the TIA (Draft EIR Appendix C), no significant impacts to the analyzed roadway segments, intersections, or freeway segments would occur.

### Phase 3 Construction

Phase 3 construction would generate a total of 1,369 ADT with 93 AM peak hour trips and 86 PM peak hour trips.

Existing With Phase 3 Construction Traffic. Existing With Phase 3 Construction Traffic volumes were derived by adding Phase 3 construction trips to existing volumes. As shown in Attachments 21, 22, and 23 in Appendix O of the TIA (Draft EIR Appendix C), no significant impacts to the analyzed roadway segments, intersections, or freeway segments would occur.

<u>Near-term With Phase 3 Construction Traffic</u>. Near-term With Phase 3 Construction Traffic volumes were derived by adding Phase 3 construction trips and 100 percent of near-term cumulative projects traffic volumes to existing volumes. As shown in Attachments 24, 25, and 26 in Appendix O of the TIA (Draft EIR Appendix C), no significant impacts to the analyzed roadway segments, intersections, or freeway segments would occur.

## Concurrent Phases 1 and 2 Construction

Under the Concurrent Phases 1 and 2 construction traffic scenario, Phases 1 and 2 of the project would be constructed together. Construction traffic under this scenario would generate a total of 1,975 ADT with 138 AM peak hour trips and 126 PM peak hour trips.

Existing With Phases 1 and 2 Construction Traffic. Existing With Phases 1 and 2 Construction Traffic volumes were derived by adding Phases 1 and 2 construction trips to existing volumes. As shown in Attachments 28, 29, and 30 in Appendix O of the TIA (Draft EIR Appendix C), no significant impacts to the analyzed roadway segments, intersections, or freeway segments would occur.

<u>Near-term With Phases 1 and 2 Construction Traffic</u>. Near-term With Phases 1 and 2 Construction Traffic volumes were derived by adding Phases 1 and 2 construction trips and 66 percent of near-term cumulative projects traffic volumes to existing volumes. As shown in Attachments 31, 32, and 33 in Appendix O of the TIA (Draft EIR Appendix C), no significant impacts to the analyzed roadway segments, intersections, or freeway segments would occur.

## Concurrent Phases 1, 2, and 3 Construction

Under the Concurrent Phases 1, 2, and 3 construction traffic scenario, Phases 1, 2, and 3 of the project would be constructed together. Construction traffic under this scenario would generate a total of 2,175 ADT with 146 AM peak hour trips and 134 PM peak hour trips.

Existing With Phases 1, 2, and 3 Construction Traffic. Existing With Phases 1, 2, and 3 Construction Traffic volumes were derived by adding Phases 1, 2, and 3 construction trips to existing volumes. As shown in Attachments 35, 36, and 37 in Appendix O of the TIA (Draft EIR Appendix C), no significant impacts to the analyzed roadway segments, intersections, or freeway segments would occur. <u>Near-term With Phases 1, 2, and 3 Construction Traffic</u>. Near-term With <u>Phases 1, 2, and 3</u> Construction Traffic volumes were derived by adding Phases 1, 2, and 3 construction trips and 100 percent of near-term cumulative projects traffic volumes to existing volumes. As shown in Attachment 38 in Appendix O of the TIA (Draft EIR Appendix C), the LOS along the segment of Del Mar Heights Road between the 1-5 NB ramps and High Bluff Drive would decrease from D to E with construction traffic. Therefore, construction traffic during Concurrent Phases 1, 2, and 3 would result in a potentially significant impact to this roadway segment.

As shown in Attachments 39 and 40 in Appendix O of the TIA (Draft EIR Appendix C), no significant impacts to the analyzed intersections or freeway segments would occur.

## Impact Summary – Operational and Construction Traffic

Based on the evaluation of the various analyzed traffic scenarios above, the proposed project would result in potentially significant direct and/or cumulative traffic impacts to four roadway segments, five intersections, and two ramp meters, as identified below. Impacts to these facilities that would occur under each analyzed traffic scenario are identified in Table 5.2-40, *Traffic Impact Summary*.

## Roadway Segments

- Del Mar Heights Road from the I-5 SB ramps to the I-5 NB ramps (direct);
- Del Mar Heights Road from the I-5 NB ramps to High Bluff Drive (direct and cumulative);
- El Camino Real from Via de la Valle to San Dieguito Road (direct and cumulative); and
- Via de la Valle from San Andres Drive to El Camino Real (West) (direct and cumulative).

## Intersections

- Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 NB ramps in the AM/PM peak hours (direct and cumulative);
- Del Mar Heights Road/High Bluff Drive in the AM/PM peak hours (direct and cumulative);
- Del Mar Heights Road/El Camino Real in the PM peak hour (direct and cumulative);
- El Camino Real/SR 56 EB on-ramp in the PM peak hour (cumulative); and
- Carmel Creek Road/Del Mar Trail in the AM peak hour (direct and cumulative).

## Ramp Meters

- Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 SB on-ramp meter (WB) in the AM/PM peak hours (cumulative); and
- Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 NB on-ramp meter in the PM peak hour (cumulative).
# Construction Traffic

In addition, construction traffic during the Concurrent Phases 1, 2, and 3 scenario would result in a potentially significant impact to the roadway segment of Del Mar Heights Road between the 1-5 NB ramps and High Bluff Drive.

Table 5.2-40 TRAFFIC IMPACT SUMMARY									
Impact	Existing + Project (Phase 1)	Existing + Project (Phases 1 and 2)	Existing + Project Buildout	Near-term With Project (Phase 1)	Near-term With Project (Phases 1 and 2)	Near-term With Project Buildout	Near-term – Cinema in Phase 1	Near-term – Cinema in Phase 2	Long-term Cumulative (Year 2030) + Project
Roadway Segments									
Del Mar Heights Road I-5 SB ramps to I-5 NB ramps			D			D			
I-5 NB ramps to High Bluff Drive	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	С
El Camino Real Via de la Valle to San Dieguito Road	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	С
Via de la Valle San Andres Drive to El Camino Real (West)	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	С
Intersections									
Carmel Creek Road/Del Mar Trail		D	D	D	D	D	D	D	С
Del Mar Heights Road/High Bluff Drive					D	D	D	D	С
Del Mar Heights Road/El Camino Real					D	D		D	С
El Camino Real/SR 56 EB ramp									С
Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 NB ramps						D			С
Ramps Meters									
Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 SB (WB) ramp meter									С
Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 NB ramp meter									С

D = Direct impact C = Cumulative impact

Shaded cells indicate potentially significant impacts.

# **Significance of Impact**

Based on City significance criteria, significant direct and/or cumulative impacts would occur at the following study area locations under Existing Plus Project, Near-term With Project, and Long-term Cumulative (Year 2030) With Project conditions (refer to Table 2.5-40):

# Existing Plus Project (Phase 1) Direct Impacts

- Del Mar Heights Road from the I-5 NB ramps to High Bluff Drive;
- El Camino Real from Via de la Valle to San Dieguito Road; and
- Via de la Valle from San Andres Drive to El Camino Real (West).

# Existing Plus Project (Phases 1 and 2) Direct Impacts

- Del Mar Heights Road from the I-5 NB ramps to High Bluff Drive;
- El Camino Real from Via de la Valle to San Dieguito Road;
- Via de la Valle from San Andres Drive to El Camino Real (West); and
- Carmel Creek Road/Del Mar Trail in the AM peak hour.

### Existing Plus Project Buildout Direct Impacts

- Del Mar Heights Road from the I-5 SB ramps to the I-5 NB ramps;
- Del Mar Heights Road from the I-5 NB ramps to High Bluff Drive;
- El Camino Real from Via de la Valle to San Dieguito Road;
- Via de la Valle from San Andres Drive to El Camino Real (West); and
- Carmel Creek Road/Del Mar Trail in the AM peak hour.

### Near-term With Project (Phase 1) Direct Impacts

- Del Mar Heights Road from the I-5 NB ramps to High Bluff Drive;
- El Camino Real from Via de la Valle to San Dieguito Road;
- Via de la Valle from San Andres Drive to El Camino Real (West); and
- Carmel Creek Road/Del Mar Trail in the AM peak hour.

#### Near-term With Project (Phases 1 and 2) Direct Impacts

- Del Mar Heights Road from I-5 NB ramps to High Bluff Drive;
- El Camino Real from Via de la Valle to San Dieguito Road;
- Via de la Valle from San Andres Drive to El Camino Real (West);
- Del Mar Heights Road/High Bluff Drive in the PM peak hour;
- Del Mar Heights Road/El Camino Real in the PM peak hour; and
- Carmel Creek Road/Del Mar Trail in the AM peak hour.

#### Near-term With Project Buildout Direct Impacts

- Del Mar Heights Road from the I-5 SB ramps to the I-5 NB ramps;
- Del Mar Heights Road from the I-5 NB ramps to High Bluff Drive;
- El Camino Real from Via de la Valle to San Dieguito Road;
- Via de la Valle from San Andres Drive to El Camino Real (West);
- Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 NB ramps in the PM peak hour;
- Del Mar Heights Road/High Bluff Drive in the PM peak hour;
- Del Mar Heights Road/El Camino Real in the PM peak hour; and
- Carmel Creek Road/Del Mar Trail in the AM peak hour.

#### Near-term With Cinema in Phase 1 Direct Impacts

- Del Mar Heights Road from the I-5 NB ramps to High Bluff Drive;
- El Camino Real from Via de la Valle to San Dieguito Road;
- Via de la Valle from San Andres Drive to El Camino Real (West);
- Carmel Creek Road/Del Mar Trail in the AM peak hour; and
- Del Mar Heights Road/High Bluff Drive in the PM peak hour.

#### Near-term With Cinema in Phase 2 Direct Impacts

- Del Mar Heights Road from I-5 NB ramps to High Bluff Drive;
- El Camino Real from Via de la Valle to San Dieguito Road;
- Via de la Valle from San Andres Drive to El Camino Real (West);
- Del Mar Heights Road/High Bluff Drive in the PM peak hour;
- Del Mar Heights Road/El Camino Real in the PM peak hour; and
- Carmel Creek Road/Del Mar Trail in the AM peak hour.

#### Long-term Cumulative (Year 2030) With Project Impacts

- Del Mar Heights Road from the I-5 NB ramps to High Bluff Drive;
- El Camino Real from Via de la Valle to San Dieguito Road;
- Via de la Valle from San Andres Drive to El Camino Real (West);
- Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 NB ramps in the AM/PM peak hours;
- Del Mar Heights Road/High Bluff Drive in the AM/PM peak hours;
- Del Mar Heights Road/El Camino Real in the PM peak hour;
- El Camino Real/SR 56 EB on-ramp in the PM peak hour;
- Carmel Creek Road/Del Mar Trail in the AM peak hour;
- Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 SB on-ramp meter (WB)in the AM/PM peak hours; and
- Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 NB on-ramp meter in the PM peak hour.

#### Construction Traffic

Construction traffic during the Concurrent Phases 1, 2, and 3 scenario would result in a potentially significant direct impact to the roadway segment of Del Mar Heights Road between the 1-5 NB ramps and High Bluff Drive. No other significant construction traffic impacts would occur.

#### Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting

The following discussion and Table 5.2-41, *Traffic Mitigation Summary*, identifies proposed traffic mitigation for potentially significant direct and cumulative traffic impacts resulting from the project and whether or not the proposed mitigation would reduce impacts to below a level of significance. Some traffic impacts would remain significant even though in some cases, mitigation is identified that would fully mitigate direct and/or cumulative impacts resulting from the proposed project.

#### Roadway Segments

# Del Mar Heights Road

<u>I-5 SB Ramps to I-5 NB Ramps.</u> Mitigation is proposed for direct impacts to the segment of Del Mar Heights Road between the I-5 SB ramps and the I-5 NB ramps (Mitigation Measure 5.2-1). This segment of Del Mar Heights Road is located on the bridge that crosses over I-5. The proposed mitigation entails reconfiguring the median on the bridge to extend the EB to NB dual left-turn pocket. Direct impacts are considered significant because the roadway segment would continue to operate at LOS E even with implementation of this proposed improvement. Therefore, direct impacts would remain significant.

<u>I-5 NB Ramps to High Bluff Drive</u>. Mitigation is proposed for direct and cumulative impacts to the segment of Del Mar Heights Road between the I-5 NB ramps to High Bluff Drive, which would entail lengthening the WB right-turn pocket and modifying the raised median (Mitigation Measure 5.2-2). Direct and cumulative impacts would remain potentially significant following installation of the improvements, which are outside the control of the City.

The TIA identifies potential mitigation options for significant traffic impacts along Del Mar Heights Road near the I-5/Del Mar Heights Road interchange. Portions of the roadway and interchange are located within Caltrans right-of-way and not within the City's jurisdiction. Caltrans is currently in the process of the engineering and conducting environmental review of their I-5 North Coast Corridor Improvements project, which includes the I-5/Del Mar Heights Road interchange. In addition to the I-5 North Coast Corridor Improvements project, Caltrans is also analyzing alternatives for an I-5/SR 56 Connector project. Both of these Caltrans freeway projects involve freeway widening and could potentially require modifications or replacement of the Del Mar Heights Road bridge. The City and project applicant met on several occasions with Caltrans representatives to discuss project impacts to Caltrans facilities and possible mitigation of such impacts, including an alternative interchange configuration incorporating an I-5 NB loop on-ramp along EB Del Mar Height Road. However, this option would be inconsistent with the proposed Caltrans freeway widening project (refer to Section 19.10 of the TIA, Draft EIR Appendix C). Consequently, the configuration of the I-5/Del Mar Heights Road interchange is uncertain at this time (refer to Section 19.10 of the TIA [Appendix C of the Draft EIR] for details).

# El Camino Real

Mitigation for direct and cumulative project impacts to El Camino Real (between Via de la Valle and San Dieguito Road) would involve payment of fair-share fees by the project applicant that would contribute to the planned widening of this segment of El Camino Real (Mitigation Measure 5.2-3). The segment of El Camino Real (between Via de la Valle and San Dieguito Road) is planned to be widened (by others and not part of this project) to a four-lane Major as a City capital improvement project (CIP) and is programmed and funded in the City of San Diego Facilities Financing Program as project T-12.3. Although the fair-share contribution would provide full mitigation for cumulative impacts to El Camino Real (in accordance with Section 15130(a)(3) of the State CEQA Guidelines), direct impacts to this roadway segment would remain significant because there is no assurance of when the planned road widening improvements would occur. It is possible that one or more Phases of the proposed project could be constructed before the planned improvements to El Camino Real. In that case, the roadway segment would continue to operate at LOS F with the project, and project traffic would exceed the City's significance thresholds. Therefore, direct project impacts would remain significant until the roadway is widened. Cumulative impacts, however, would be reduced to below a level of significance with the fair-share contribution to the planned CIP improvement.

# Via de la Valle

Mitigation for direct and cumulative project impacts to Via de la Valle (between San Andres Drive and El Camino Real [West]) would involve payment of fair-share fees by the project applicant that would contribute to the unfunded portion of planned road widening improvements (Mitigation Measure 5.2-4). Improvements are identified in the Black Mountain Ranch Public Facilities Financing Plan (City 2006) as Project No. T-32.1 and would entail widening the segment of Via de la Valle between San Andres Drive and El Camino Real West to four-lane major street standards. Black Mountain Ranch is required to complete the roadway improvements and has posted a bond for the improvements. Advance funding for the roadway widening has been received from Black Mountain Ranch. Additional funding is expected to be borne by the fronting property owners or others with development contributing to traffic impacts to Via de la Valle. The developer of the Flower Hill Promenade project (located just east of the I-5/Via de la Valle interchange) is obligated to fund the remaining portion of the cost for the improvements and form a cost reimbursement district to collect funds necessary to complete Project No. T-32.1.

Although the fair-share contribution would provide full mitigation for cumulative impacts to Via de la Valle (in accordance with Section 15130(a)(3) of the State CEQA Guidelines), direct impacts to this roadway segment would remain significant because there is no assurance of when the planned road widening improvements would occur. It is possible that one or more Phases of the proposed project could be constructed before the planned improvements to Via de la Valle. In that case, the roadway segment would continue to operate at LOS F with the project, and the project traffic would exceed the City's significance thresholds. Therefore, direct project impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance with the fair-share contribution to the planned improvement.

# Intersections

# Carmel Creek Road/Del Mar Trail

Mitigation is proposed for direct and cumulative impacts to the intersection of Carmel Creek Road/Del Mar Trail (Mitigation Measure 5.2-5), which would involve installation of a traffic signal at this intersection. Installation of a traffic signal would reduce direct and cumulative impacts to below a level of significance because the LOS would improve from E or F to B and mitigate the project's impact.

# Del Mar Heights Road/High Bluff Drive

Mitigation is proposed for direct and cumulative impacts to the intersection of Del Mar Heights Road/High Bluff Drive (Mitigation Measures 5.2-6 and 7), which would involve intersection improvements including the addition of NB right-turn lane, widening Del Mar Heights Road on the north side receiving lanes and re-striping to provide NB triple left-turn lanes, modifying the EB and WB left-turn lanes to dual left-turn lanes and widening the EB approach by 2 feet on the south side to accommodate the EB and WB dual left-turn lanes. Implementation of these improvements would reduce direct and cumulative impacts to below a level of significance because the LOS would improve from E or F to D and mitigate the project's impact.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 5.2-7 would require minor road widening on both sides of Del Mar Heights Road to accommodate the proposed intersection improvements. Specifically, the north side of the roadway would be widened by 5 feet for approximately 165 feet west of the Del Mar Heights Road/High Bluff Drive intersection to accommodate the proposed triple left-turn lanes at the NB approach of the intersection. The south side of the roadway would be widened by approximately 2 feet to accommodate the proposed EB and WB dual left-turn lanes. The widening would occur within the existing road right-of-way, and a new 5-foot-wide sidewalk would be constructed along the widened portion on the north side that would connect to existing sidewalks.

# Del Mar Heights Road/El Camino Real

Mitigation is proposed for direct and cumulative impacts to the intersection of Del Mar Heights Road/El Camino Real (Mitigation Measure 5.2-8), which would involve construction of an EB right-turn lane. Implementation of this improvement would reduce direct and cumulative impacts to below a level of significance because the LOS would improve from E or F to D and mitigate the project's impact.

# El Camino Real/State Route 56 Eastbound On-Ramp

Mitigation is proposed for cumulative impacts to the intersection of El Camino Real/SR 56 EB on-ramp (Mitigation Measure 5.2-9), which would involve payment of a fair-share fee by the project applicant towards specific improvements at this intersection. Although the identified improvements would fully mitigate cumulative impacts because the LOS would improve from F to C and mitigate the project's impact, the project's cumulative impact to this intersection is considered potentially significant until the identified improvements are installed, which are outside the control of the City.

# Del Mar Heights Road/Interstate 5 Northbound Ramps

Mitigation is proposed for direct and cumulative impacts to the intersection of Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 NB ramps, which consists of specific intersection improvements (Mitigation Measure 5.2-10) that would reduce delays. Direct and cumulative impacts would remain potentially significant following installation of the improvements, which are outside the control of the City.

# Ramp Meters

### Del Mar Heights Road/Interstate 5 Southbound and Northbound Ramp Meters

Mitigation is proposed for cumulative impacts to the Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 SB and NB ramp meters (Mitigation Measures 5.2-11 and 5.2-12), which entails payment of a fair-share contribution (SB ramp meter) by the project applicant and specific improvements (NB ramp meter). While the fair-share contribution and identified improvements would fully mitigate cumulative impacts, the project's cumulative impacts to these ramp meters are considered potentially significant until the identified improvements are completed, which are outside the control of the City.

Table 5.2-41 TRAFFIC MITIGATION SUMMARY			
Impact	Impact Type	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation
Roadway Segments	1		
Del Mar Heights Road from I-5 SB ramps to I-5 NB ramps	Direct	<ul> <li>Mitigation Measure 5.2-1: Prior to issuance of the first building permit for Phase 1, the project applicant shall reconfigure the median on the bridge to extend the EB to NB dual left-turn pocket to 400 feet to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.</li> <li>Direct impacts are considered significant because the roadway segment would continue to operate at LOS E even with implementation of this proposed improvement. Therefore, direct impacts would remain significant.</li> </ul>	Significant
Del Mar Heights Road from I-5 NB ramps to High Bluff Drive	Direct and Cumulative	<ul> <li>Mitigation Measure 5.2-2: Prior to issuance of the first building permit for Phase 1, the project applicant shall widen the segment to extend the WB right-turn pocket at the I-5 NB ramps by 845 feet and modify the raised median to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and Caltrans.</li> <li>Direct and cumulative impacts would remain potentially significant following installation of the improvements, which are outside the control of the City.</li> </ul>	Significant (direct and cumulative)
El Camino Real from Via de la Valle to San Dieguito Road	Direct and Cumulative	<i>Mitigation Measure 5.2-3</i> : Prior to issuance of the first building permit for Phase 1, the project applicant shall make a fair-share contribution (4.9 percent) towards the widening of El Camino Real from Via de la Valle to San Dieguito Road to a four-lane Major.	Less than Significant (cumulative) Significant (direct)

Table 5.2-41 (cont.)         TRAFFIC MITIGATION SUMMARY				
Impact	Impact Type	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation	
Roadway Segments (cont.)				
El Camino Real from Via de la Valle to San Dieguito Road (cont.)		This roadway segment of El Camino Real is planned to be widened to a four-lane Major and is programmed and funded in the City of San Diego Facilities Financing Program as CIP T-12.3. Direct impacts to this segment of El Camino Real are considered significant because there is no assurance of when the planned road widening improvements would occur. Direct impacts therefore would remain significant until the roadway is widened.		
Via de la Valle from San Andres Drive to El Camino Real (West)	Direct and Cumulative	<ul> <li>Mitigation Measure 5.2-4: Prior to issuance of the first building permit for Phase 1, the project applicant shall make a fair-share contribution (19.4 percent) towards the widening of Via de la Valle from San Andres Drive to El Camino Real (West) to a four-lane Major.</li> <li>This roadway segment of Via de la Valle is planned to be widened to a four-lane Major and is programmed and funded in the Black Mountain Ranch Public Facilities Financing Plan as Project No. T-32.1. Direct impacts are considered significant because there is no assurance of when the planned road widening improvements would occur. Direct impacts therefore would remain significant until the roadway is widened.</li> </ul>	Less than significant (cumulative) Significant (direct)	
Intersections	1			
Carmel Creek Road/Del Mar Trail	Direct and Cumulative	<i>Mitigation Measure 5.2-5:</i> Prior to issuance of the first building permit for Phase 1, the project applicant shall install a traffic signal at the Carmel Creek Road/Del Mar Trail intersection, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.	Less than significant (direct and cumulative)	

Table 5.2-41 (cont.) TRAFFIC MITIGATION SUMMARY				
Impact	Impact Type	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation	
Intersections (cont.)	•			
Del Mar Heights Road/High Bluff Drive	Direct and Cumulative	<ul> <li><i>Mitigation Measure 5.2-6:</i> Prior to issuance of the first building permit for Phase 1, the project applicant shall construct a dedicated NB right-turn lane to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.</li> <li><i>Mitigation Measure 5.2-7:</i> Prior to issuance of the first building permit for Phase 2, the project applicant shall construct the following improvements at the Del Mar Heights Road/High Bluff Drive intersection to the satisfaction of the City Engineer: (1) widen Del Mar Heights Road on the north side receiving lanes and re-stripe the NB left and re-phase the signal to provide NB triple left-turn lanes; and (2) modify the EB and WB left-turn lanes and widen the EB approach by 2 feet on the south side to accommodate the EB and WB dual left-turn lanes</li> </ul>	Less than significant (direct and cumulative)	
Del Mar Heights Road/El Camino Real	Direct and Cumulative	<i>Mitigation Measure 5.2-8:</i> Prior to issuance of the first building permit for Phase 1, the project applicant shall construct a 365-foot long EB right-turn lane at the Del Mar Heights Road/El Camino Real intersection, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.	Less than significant (direct and cumulative)	
El Camino Real/SR 56 EB on-ramp	Cumulative	<i>Mitigation Measure 5.2-9:</i> Prior to issuance of the first building permit for Phase 3, the project applicant shall make a fair-share contribution (3.5 percent) towards the widening and re-striping of the EB approach to provide one left, one shared through/left-turn, one through, and two right-turn lanes at the El Camino Real/SR 56 EB on-ramp intersection.	Significant	

Table 5.2-41 (cont.) TRAFFIC MITIGATION SUMMARY					
Impact	Impact Type	Mitigation	Significance After Mitigation		
Intersections (cont.)	1				
El Camino Real/SR 56 EB on-ramp (cont.)		Cumulative impacts are considered potentially significant until the identified improvements are installed, which are outside the control of the City.			
Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 NB ramps	Direct and Cumulative	<i>Mitigation Measure 5.2-10:</i> Prior to issuance of the first building permit for Phase 1, the project applicant shall construct the following improvements at the Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 NB ramps to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and Caltrans: (1) widen/re-stripe the I-5 NB off-ramp to include dual left, one shared through/right, and one right-turn lanes; (2) extend the WB right-turn pocket by 845 feet and modify the raised median; and (3) reconfigure the median on the Del Mar Heights Road bridge to extend the EB dual left-turn pocket to 400 feet. Direct and cumulative impacts would remain potentially significant following installation of the improvements, which are outside the control of the City.	Significant (Direct and Cumulative)		
Ramp Meters					
Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 SB ramp meter (WB)	Cumulative	<i>Mitigation Measure 5.2-11:</i> Prior to issuance of the first building permit for Phase 3, the project applicant shall make a fair-share contribution (34.8 percent) towards adding an HOV lane to the I-5 SB loop on-ramp. Cumulative impacts are considered potentially significant until this identified improvement is completed, which is outside the control of the City.	Significant		

Table 5.2-41 (cont.) TRAFFIC MITIGATION SUMMARY						
Impact	Impact Type Mitigation		Significance After Mitigation			
Ramp Meters (cont.)						
Del Mar Heights Road/I-5 NB ramp meter       Cumulative       Mitigation Measure 5.2-12: Prior to building permit for Phase 1, the proje widen and re-stripe the I-5 NB on-ram lane to the satisfaction of the City Englished to the sati		<i>Mitigation Measure 5.2-12:</i> Prior to issuance of the first building permit for Phase 1, the project applicant shall widen and re-stripe the I-5 NB on-ramp to add an HOV lane to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and Caltrans. Cumulative impacts are considered potentially significant until this identified improvement is completed, which is outside the control of the City.	Significant			
Construction Impacts						
Del Mar Heights Road from I-5 NB ramps to High Bluff Drive Construction (Concurrent Phases 1, 2, and 3) Mitigation Measure 5.2-13: The VTM shall require that project construction be phased such that concurrent construction of Phases 1, 2, although phases may overlap.		Less than significant				

# 5.2.3 <u>Impact</u>

# Issue 3: Would the proposed project result in effects on existing parking?

### **Impact Thresholds**

In accordance with the City's Significance Determination Thresholds, parking impacts would be significant if the project would result in the following:

• The on-site parking supply is deficient by more than 10 percent of the required amount of parking (per the LDC) and the parking shortfall would substantially affect the availability of public parking in the vicinity of the project.

# **Impact Analysis**

Because the project proposes a mix of land uses, peak activity times for some uses, such as office and cinema, are essentially opposite one another as is their demand for parking. Therefore, shared parking among all of the proposed on-site uses except residential would be provided. Residents of the project would have reserved parking spaces, but all other uses would share parking spaces. On-site parking would primarily be provided in underground garages beneath the site, as well as a multi-level, above ground parking structure in Block D. Pursuant to Section 142.0545 of the LDC, shared parking is permitted in all zones except single unit residential with City approval of a shared parking agreement.

The development regulations of the proposed zone (CVPD-MC) stipulate that the minimum number of parking spaces would be established through an approved shared parking analysis. Accordingly, a Shared Parking Analysis has been prepared for the project (Walker 2011; Draft EIR Appendix D), which calculates the projected peak parking demand for the project and compares the peak demands to the proposed on-site parking supply to evaluate if adequate on-site parking would be provided. The shared parking demand projections are based on ratios and factors in the Urban Land Institute (ULI) Shared Parking Model (Shared Parking, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition; 2005), which is the industry-standard source for land use-based parking demand ratios and the most accurate methodology of determining parking demand generated under shared use conditions.

The Shared Parking Analysis determined that the peak parking demand for the project would occur during a weekday in December. The proposed land use with the highest weekday demand for parking would be office uses. For this reason, weekend parking demands would be much lower than weekday demands. Table 5.2-42, *Projected Peak Parking Demand and Supply*, summarizes the projected peak weekday and weekend parking demand and supply by development phase.

Table 5.2-42 PROJECTED PEAK PARKING DEMAND AND SUPPLY						
Phase Peak Weekday Demand Peak Weekend Demand Proposed Supply						
Phase 1	2,062	644	2,230			
Phases 1 and 2         2,656         645         2,889						
Project Buildout         3,881         2,642         4,089						

Source: Walker 2011.

As shown in Table 5.2-42, the projected peak weekday and weekend demands would not exceed the proposed supply for each development phase. In fact, a parking surplus would occur during each phase. The Shared Parking Analysis concludes that a minimum of 3,881 parking spaces would be required to adequately serve the project at buildout. Because the project proposes to provide a total of 4,089 spaces, the proposed on-site parking supply would meet peak demands and would not affect existing parking in the project vicinity.

The shared parking demand projections are based on the factors in the ULI Shared Parking Model as opposed the City's shared parking regulations contained in the LDC (Section 142.0545) because the ULI model is the latest industry-standard source for land use-based parking demand ratios and the most accurate methodology of determining parking demand generated under shared use conditions. The shared parking requirement for the project based on the City's shared parking model is 4,511. This number is higher than the ULI projections for several reasons, including higher base ratios than the ULI model and lack of a seasonal adjustment within the City's shared parking model is applied to the project (which it isn't in this case for the reasons discussed above about the applicability of utilizing the ULI model and the fact that the City has approved use of the ULI model for the proposed project in the Shared Parking Analysis), proposed parking would not be more than 10 percent less than the required amount per the LDC shared parking regulations. Therefore, no significant parking impacts would occur.

#### Significance of Impact

The project would provide a total of 4,089 parking spaces, which would exceed the calculated minimum of 3,881 spaces for project buildout utilizing the current ULI model. As a result, the on-site parking supply would not result in a parking shortfall and the availability of existing parking in the project vicinity would not be affected. No significant parking impacts would occur.

#### Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting

No mitigation measures would be required.

# 5.2.4 <u>Impact</u>

Issue 4: Would the project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

# Impact Analysis

No public or private airports are located in the project vicinity. The closest airport to the project site is MCAS Miramar, which is located approximately 10 miles to the southeast. The project site is not located within the airport influence area or any designated overflight, safety, or noise contour identified in the MCAS Miramar ALUCP.

The project site is located outside of the AIA for MCAS Miramar, but within the northwest boundary of the Federal Aviation Regulations Part 77 Outer Boundary contour on the ALUCP airspace protection map (refer to Section 5.1, *Land Use*). The project site is not, however, located within the contour boundaries for FAA height notification, Federal Aviation Regulations Part 77 obstruction surfaces, a High Terrain Zone, or the APCA in the ALUCP's airspace protection map. As such, the project would not result in airspace obstruction or affect air traffic patterns. No associated impacts would occur.

### **Significance of Impact**

The project would not affect air traffic patterns and therefore no associated significant impacts would occur resulting from project implementation.

#### Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting

No mitigation measures would be required.

# 5.2.5 <u>Impact</u>

# Issue 5: Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections)?

#### **Impact Thresholds**

In accordance with the City's Significance Determination Thresholds, traffic hazard impacts would be significant if the project would result in the following condition:

 Increase traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists, or pedestrians due to proposed non-standard design features (e.g., poor sight distance, proposed driveway onto an access-restricted roadway).

#### **Impact Analysis**

# Site Access and Internal Circulation

Vehicular access to the project site would be provided from Del Mar Heights Road and El Camino Real (refer to Figure 3-3). Two new signalized intersections are proposed along Del Mar Heights Road, including First Avenue and Third Avenue. Based on a peak hour signal warrant analysis (USAI 2012), traffic signals at these two intersections are warranted.

Market Street would be constructed as the fourth leg of the existing intersection of El Camino Real and Del Mar Highlands Town Center. This intersection is currently signalized, but signal modifications would be required in order to provide through access to the proposed Market Street. Additionally, three project access points would be provided along El Camino Real: one at Market Plaza and two at the southern portion of the project site adjacent to the proposed office buildings. Vehicular access to and from these new driveways would be provided by right-turn in/out movements only. Turn lanes into the site would be provided at these project access points.

Proposed internal roadways would include First, Second, and Third Avenues, Main Street, and Market Street. Internal intersections (i.e., First Avenue/Main Street/ Market Street, Second Avenue/Main Street, and Third Avenue/Main Street) would be stop-controlled. All internal streets would be considered private driveways.

### Traffic Hazards

No non-standard design features would be used as it relates to project access onto public streets. The project would include features to accommodate pedestrians and bicyclists, including internal sidewalks, pathways, plazas, paseos, and an internal bicycle route. These facilities would provide connections between proposed internal uses, as well as surrounding roadways. Internal intersections would be stop-controlled and would include crosswalks, and the signalized access points would include protected crosswalks. Most of the pedestrian facilities (i.e., except the sidewalks) would be separated from vehicular traffic. Therefore, the project has been designed to avoid potential vehicular/pedestrian and bicyclist conflicts. No associated traffic hazard impacts would occur.

#### Sight Visibility

A sight visibility analysis was prepared for the project to evaluate sight distance at proposed project access points (Leppert Engineering 2011e; Draft EIR Appendix E). Due to the curve of the El Camino Real roadway alignment along the project frontage, the analysis addressed sight distance requirements at three project access points along El Camino Real, including (1) Market Plaza; (2) Market Street; and (3) the northern driveway adjacent to the proposed office buildings. The other project access points (southern driveway on El Camino Real adjacent to the proposed office building, First Avenue/Del Mar Heights Road, and Third Avenue/Del Mar Heights Road) were not evaluated because the fronting roadway alignments do not create sight distance issues (i.e., the roadway is relatively straight along these driveways).

Required sight distance at the analyzed project driveways was calculated using the American Association of Highway and Transportation Officials guidelines and the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed<sup>2</sup> along El Camino Real. Based on City, the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed along this segment of El Camino Real is 48 mph, which results in a required minimum intersection sight distance of 459 feet.

Based on the analysis, sight distance easements would be required at each of the three analyzed driveways to provide the required minimum intersection sight distance. At the Market Plaza driveway, two small sight distance easements would be required within the project site frontage between Market Plaza and Del Mar Heights Road. One easement would be located just north of the driveway and would extend northward an approximate distance of 108 feet with a maximum width of approximately 1.7 feet. The other easement would be located in the northeast portion of the project site near the El Camino Real/Del Mar Heights Road intersection and would extend northward a distance of approximately 79 feet with a maximum width of approximately 2.4 feet. At the Market Street driveway, an easement would be located just north of the driveway and would extend northward an approximate distance of 148 feet with a maximum width of approximately 3 feet. At the northern driveway adjacent to the proposed office buildings, a sight distance easement would be located north of the driveway and would extend northward approximately 253 feet with a maximum width of approximately 14 feet. Within these four proposed sight distance easements, no structures would be constructed and landscape materials would be limited to a height of 30 inches, except for parkway trees. Accordingly, traffic hazard impacts associated with sight distance would be less than significant.

# Significance of Impact

Proposed access intersections would be adequate to handle proposed project traffic and would be in compliance with the City of San Diego Street Design Manual. The project would not create potential vehicular/pedestrian and bicyclist conflicts. In addition, adequate visibility from proposed driveways would be provided through provision of sight distance easements within the project site. Thus, the project would not result in significant traffic hazard impacts as a result of non-standard design features.

# Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting

As no significant traffic hazard impacts would occur, no mitigation is required.

# 5.2.6 <u>Impact</u>

# Issue 6: Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

# Impact Analysis

The project would provide adequate emergency access within the site. A fire access plan has been prepared for the project (Firesafe Planning Solutions 2011) and is illustrated in Figure 5.2-9, *Fire Access Plan*. As shown in the plan, primary access for emergency vehicles would be provided at the El Camino Real/Market Street intersection. Internal fire access routes

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The speed at which 85 percent of traffic along this roadway segment is travelling.



rcGIS\K\KIL-03 SDCorporateCenter\Map\ENV\EIR\Fig5\_2-9\_FireAccess.indd -KF

# **Fire Access Plan ONE PASEO** Figure 5.2-9

GENERAL FIRE NOTES:

A MILLIAND INTERFACE AREA A VEGETATION CLEARANC UNED PROVIDENT O A LUMBER DROP INSPECTION. USE 1 1 PLAN SONNCE REQUEST NUMBER TO SCHEDULE THE AME INSPECTION.

Lineage one electronic las the first end to the control of the con

whith sphere of 11/2". ADDRESS MARKING SPALE IELEMENTE & ADDRESS DATES SHALE (EVANDER) PORS TO INSULATIONAL OR OP-JUL IELEMENTE ADDRESS DATES ADDRESS DATES DATES DATES DATES INSULATIONES DATES DATES DATES DATES DATES DATES DATES PORTER DATES BARKENS SPALE IF PROVIDENT DATES DATES PORTER DATES BARKENS SPALE IF PROVIDENT DATES DATES

DEELE REVER, INFECTION, NO PERIODE DI INE CITTO SIN LODO DEPENDILI, OTRA PALI SILLI, NOE CONSTITUE DA SINOPONI, OF AN INFORMITION DI PRACET CONDITIONS OTRET TIMA TRACE TELES AN DEVORIBORISTI DOMITERE IN OTTO OTS AN DEGO TRE PLOVITA NO ERLAT PORTINOS OF THE OCC AND GEO. THIS PROJECT WAY BE SUBJECT TO ADDITIONAL EXEMPTIONERS INST STATISMO DERRU UNT BUSINARIANI OF ACTIVAL SIE AND PROJECT CONDITIONS OR DISLOSIBLE OF ADDITIONAL INFORMITION.

INFORMATION. Automatic fire sprincler systems shall be installed in accordance with applicable codes and local ordinances, amendments, and conference a separate plan signature is recurred.

GUIDEDINES. A SEPARATE PLAN SUBWITTAL IS REQUIRED. REQUIRED FIRE HYDRANT SPACING IS AT 600' MAXIMUM AND 300' FROM E OF ACCESS ROADS. THIS HYDRANT SPACING ON THIS PROJECT AVERAGES 250'

POST INDICATOR VALVES, FIRE DEPARTMENT CONNECTIONS AND ALARM BELL ARE TO LOCATED ON THE ADDRESS/ACCESS SIDE OF THE STRUCTURE, UPC 1001.4 FIRE LANES OF GRADE STRUCTURES WILL WITHSTAND CITY OF SAN DECO FIRE DEPARTMENT STANDARD WEIGHT LOAD OF 95,000 LBS.

COMBUSTIBLE CONSTRUCTION LETTE

PARKING ENFORCEMENT LETTER

SHEET INDEX

F-3 HOSE PULLS, STANDPIPES, GROUND LADDER ACCESS

SITE PLAN, FIRE NOTES, LETTERS DETAILS

F-2 FIRE TRUCK ACCESS, AERIAL LADDERIN FIRE LANE IDENTIFICATION, HYDRANTS, DETECTOR CHECKS, FIRE DEPARTMENT CONNECTIONS

MAY 26, SHEET

F-1

CITY OF SMILDISOC 1010 Decend Ansaus S San Dinas, CA (2110)

السلمين غمزقي

ر النبية محمد

.....

1010 Based Automatic Sen Class. CA 92101

ter Ban Diago Cor

F-1

OSS COMMERCI/

F. GROSS OFFICE

 $\geq$ 

Fire Lane Sign

END OI FIRE

END OF FIRE A

REFLECTIVE BACK

and fire lanes would be provided along the internal roadways, and fire lane signage would be posted along the roadways. Additional emergency requirements, such as fire hydrants, fire hydrant markers (i.e., blue reflectors installed in the roadway), knox box systems, adequate vertical clearances, adequate turning radii, and fire ladder clearances, would be provided in accordance with City and Fire Code requirements. In addition, the signalized access driveways (at Del Mar Heights Road/First Avenue, Del Mar Heights Road/Third Avenue, and El Camino Real/Market Street) would be equipped with signal pre-emption devices to assist emergency vehicles.

# Significance of Impact

Because the project would provide adequate emergency access features in compliance with City and Fire Code requirements, no significant traffic impacts associated with emergency access would occur.

# Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting

No mitigation measures would be required.

# 5.2.7 <u>Impact</u>

Issue 7: Would the project 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

# Alternative Transportation Modes

No existing bus routes or other mass transit services are provided in the project vicinity. A rapid bus route however is planned to serve the Carmel Valley community. This route (Route 473) is identified in the Revenue Constrained Plan of the 2050 RTP and would extend between Oceanside and the University Towne Center regional shopping mall via Carmel Valley. Specifically, Route 473 would occur along the Del Mar Heights Road and El Camino Real corridors. The project would provide a transit stop along the El Camino Real project frontage. Implementation of this planned transit route by SANDAG and MTS and provision of a transit stop along the project frontage would provide transit services along the project site frontage that would be accessible for future on-site residents, employees, and patrons, as well as transit users in the community.

The project would provide one or more shuttle stops along Main Street to provide additional transportation options to connect with activity centers in the surrounding community (refer to Figure 3-2).

High occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes occur on the segment of I-5 (one in each direction) near the project site. Project traffic could utilize these HOV lanes and may provide an incentive for residents, employees, and/or patrons to carpool.

Currently, bike lanes, sidewalks, marked crosswalks, and pedestrian traffic signals exist in the project vicinity that encourage pedestrian and bicycle travel. Bike lanes (lanes striped on the roadway and identified with signage and pavement markings) are provided along Del Mar Heights Road, El Camino Real, High Bluff Drive, and other surrounding roadways. The project would provide additional pedestrian and bicycle facilities that would connect to this existing pedestrian and bicycle network.

Pedestrian circulation would be provided throughout the site by a network of sidewalks, pathways, plazas, and paseos. These pedestrian facilities would provide convenient connections between the proposed uses within the project site, and also would connect to existing sidewalks along Del Mar Heights Road and El Camino Real.

An internal bicycle route would be provided along Third Avenue, Main Street, First Avenue, and Market Street. This bicycle route would connect to existing bicycle routes along Del Mar Heights Road and El Camino Real. The proposed bikeways would allow for connection to an existing paved trail that currently runs through the middle of the existing business park uses west of the project site. In addition, bicycle racks would be provided on site to support bicycle circulation.

# Consistency with Adopted Alternative Transportation Mode Plans and Policies

The proposed project would not negatively impact alternative transportation modes or safety. The provision of additional pedestrian and bicycle facilities, as well as a transit stop and shuttle stops, that would connect with existing and planned future facilities would be consistent with adopted plans supporting alternative transportation modes. Specifically, the project would be consistent with the 2050 RTP and the City of San Diego General Plan Mobility Element goal of supporting multi-modal transportation and the Urban Design Element goal to create mixed-use, walkable villages. This is also consistent with the RCP and the smart growth principles by developing a mixed-use village that would provide additional housing types and employment opportunities within close proximity to major roads, major freeways, and existing community amenities within the Carmel Valley community. SANDAG's Smart Growth Concept Map, updated January 27, 2012, provides a regional perspective on smart growth opportunity areas and identifies the proposed project site as a Town Center smart growth area (SANDAG 2012). The proposed mixed-use village concept is consistent with this designation. In addition, the opportunity to utilize the existing HOV lanes along I-5 would be consistent with General Plan policies supporting carpooling. Refer to Section 5.1, Land Use, and Table 5.1-1 for details on plan consistency.

# Significance of Impact

The proposed project would not impact alternative transportation modes and would support pedestrian and bicycle transportation, as well as carpooling and future planned transit operations in the Carmel Valley community. Thus, the project would be in consistent with the City's alternative transportation policies and no associated significant impacts would occur.

# Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting

No mitigation is required.