SAN YSIDRO COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

NOTICE OF <u>SUBCOMMITTEE</u> MEETING

MOBILITY (TRAFFIC) SUBCOMMITTEE

Location:

**San Ysidro Community Services Center
663 East San Ysidro Blvd
San Ysidro, CA 92173**

Monday, February 23, 2015 at 12:30 p.m.

Contact: David Flores (619) 428-1115

1. **Call to Order and Introductions**

2. **Public Comment on Matters Not on the Agenda**
Comments and inquiries from any person regarding matters which are not on this Agenda. Comments and inquiries must be related to the Group's purposes, described in City Council Policy 600-24. If a large number of people wish to speak on the same item, comment may be limited to a set period of time per item. The Brown Act does not allow any action or vote to be taken on items not properly noticed. Public comment on any item appearing on this agenda is taken at the time the item is heard.

3. **Docket Items**

    a.   Summary of subcommittee meeting on February 19, 2015

    b.   Review of traffic analysis methodology. Leo Espelet (Transportation Engineer, Kimley-Horn & Associates) to discuss methodology.
Mr. Jeff Brazel (Principal, JVB Real Estate Advisors) to present analysis concerns.

    c.   Continue review of the technical analysis and 83 mobility recommendations for the San Ysidro Community Plan Update. The analysis includes an evaluation of the existing roadway network with the increase of traffic volumes anticipated with the build-out of the community. The document is *San Ysidro Community Plan Update -- Traffic Analysis Memo for the Preferred Land Use Alternative*, dated November 7, 2014, prepared by consulting firm of Kimley-Horn.

    Adjournment

<u>Subcommittee members:</u>
Jennifer Goudeau (business), Miguel Aguirre (business),
Ben Meza (resident),Steve Otto (resident), Jason Wells (resident), David Flores (not-for-profit)

Traffic Analysis Memo for the Preferred Land Use Alternative – San Ysidro Community Plan Update

---

General Comments:

The following are generalized comments pertaining to fundamental questions/concerns about the Traffic Analysis Memo, more specific comments that can be tracked by page/paragraph will follow.

This Community Plan Update is well planned and seeks to reduce vehicle trips and miles traveled and support walking and biking as a transportation choice while improving mobility within the community. The smart growth land uses proposed are expected to promote interaction within the land uses on-site and encourage multi-modal forms of transportation. Such developments generate fewer vehicle trips and less demand for parking as compared to conventional suburban developments due to the synergy of land uses and increased activity of transit, walking and bicycle trips. In short, the context of the proposed development types and the proposed improvements to multi-modal forms of transportation together reduce the generation of auto-related trips. However, this traffic analysis memo appears to assume the opposite.

It is important to be conservative, yet realistic in making future projections for trip generation for a long-range community plan as significant infrastructure improvements are planned/programed and funded based on the results of the transportation analysis. However, it is unfair and unnecessary to over-estimate auto traffic generation thereby over burdening development and redevelopment.

Transportation analysis (future trip generation projections) should be based on the specific context in which new development/redevelopment is proposed. This does not appear to be the case with this traffic analysis memo.

Page 79, Paragraph 3 of the memo reads as follows: "*The expected growth for the San Ysidro Community would be located along Transit Oriented Development areas like the order Village Area and the Beyer Station area. Having an increased density around established transit areas would allow for a sustainable growth of the community without relying on the automobile as a mode of transportation.*"

- This statement is likely true and is consistent with the goals of the community plan update, yet this memo describes trip generation projections (auto, transit,

walking and bicycle) based on assumptions that <u>96%</u> of all trips will <u>rely on the automobile as a mode of transportation.</u>   This is counter intuitive to the rational for all of the planned Multi-modal improvements recommended in this memo and the community plan update.

- In addition, this is not supported by evidence that would lead the reader of this report to believe these projections, no evidence of existing rates of multi-modal transportation are presented and no rational is presented to explain these auto-centric projections. In short the assumptions of a 96% reliance on the auto eliminate all credibility of the resulting calculations.
- This appears <u>unreasonable</u> considering 1) the access to multi-modal forms of transportation such as commuter rail/light rail/BRT/bus options already existing within the San Ysidro community; 2) the growing acceptance and dependence on those forms of transportation that can be anticipated in the future.

Specific Comments:

<u>Page 1, Par 3:</u> In this section, "Land use is converted to trips (auto, transit, walk and bicycle) using trip generation rates calibrated for this community".

- These trip generation rates are reportedly shown in Appendix A, but Appendix A only shows trip generation rates per land use summarized in two categories: Person and Vehicle, and neither these categories nor their use in this analysis is explained in the memo.
- If these trip generation rates were calibrated for this community, what is the basis for that calibration? See also my question regarding Page 3, Table 1?
- "…a total of 547,066 person trips would be generated by the community under the 2035 Proposed Land Use scenario."   What does that mean, are these annual person trips?, average daily trips? Peak am or pm trips? How does this relate to the rest of the analysis which discusses ADT's, and peak am and pm trips? A table summarizing Trip Generation by land uses showing ADT's existing and proposed, and showing a split of the AM and PM peak hour splits would be more useful to the reader.
- There is no discussion of the baseline traffic vs new traffic generated from the community plan update.   This will be important in understanding new developments fair share of future infrastructure requirements etc.

<u>Page 2, Par 4 – Page 3 Table 1:</u> The text and table depict/discuss "Mode Choice Splits" between auto, transit, walk and bicycle.

- Auto is assumed to represent 96% of total trips, with all others representing only 4% of total trips.   This appears <u>grossly unreasonable</u>, and is presented without evidence to support the assumptions or an explanation as to the rational used.
- Was there any analysis done considering the current ridership of these forms or transit? Future anticipation of greater ridership of these forms of transit, this would certainly be reasonable?
- Similar question about the assumption that only 1.9% of total trips would be via walking, seems grossly underestimated considering the number of people walking in the San Ysidro community today. In addition, the high intensity/density commercial/residential mixed-use areas (Border Village and Beyer Station for example) can be expected to generate more walking due to the proximity of residences to services/shopping/employment.
- The community plan update includes goals to plan for improved access to transit, improve bike access and safety, and make the community more walkable, and the plan update specifies various improvements to accomplish those goals. The San Ysidro Mobility Strategy is referred to in the plan update and in this memo. This memo also discusses recommended Multi-Modal improvements (pages 67-79) with suggestions to improve bicycle routs etc. However, none of these goals, strategies, and planned improvements appears to be reflected in this traffic analysis depicting only 4% of trip generation to transit, walking and biking.
- A 4% rate for transit, walking and biking might appear reasonable in some distant suburban community with primarily low density single family detached housing stock, but San Ysidro is, and is planned for, high density close-in mixed use development in very close proximity to various forms of multi-modal transportation opportunities. It is likely that San Ysidro has a greater proportion of residents living within reasonable walking distance to non-auto related forms of transit than any other community in San Diego.

Final Thoughts:

I understand the importance of comparing the existing capacity of the circulation system to the potential impact of increases in traffic generated by new development/redevelopment with the implementation of the community plan update. However, there appears to be two methodologies for approaching transportation analysis and recommendations employed in similar context in San Diego.

1. One approach is to analyze the traffic generation assuming auto-centric trip generation rates, identify circulation system deficiencies (roadway and intersection) that would result, then arbitrarily choose not to recommend some

infrastructure improvements taking into consideration the urban mixed-use design and recognizing the multi-modal improvements planned for the project. This is the approach recently employed in the Otay Mesa community plan update for example. This approach attempts to quantity circulation system deficiencies based on overly auto-centric assumptions and arbitrarily reduce roadway and intersection improvement recommendations based on a wholly unquantifiable rational.

2. Another, more reasonable approach is to either select trip generation rates that make sense considering the context of the planned development, coupled with transportation mode choice assumptions that take into consideration the ease of access and availability of alternative multi-modal forms of transportation (existing and planned) to estimate the future demand (and potential deficiencies) on the circulation system. Then make quantifiable recommendations about future circulation system/infrastructure improvements that are not arbitrary. The Grantville plan amendment, for example is employing this methodology.

In CEQA analysis for many projects a mixed-use credit methodology is used to take into consideration the mixed-use nature and proximity to transit of those types of projects. That "credit" approach is based on SANDAG's "MXD model" which estimates the amount of traffic which is reduced by walkable features, mixed-use development, and transit integration. An analysis that shows total trips, a reduction based on the mixed-use components of the plan update land uses, and a reduction based on transit would be more useful and appropriate.

I do not know if this credit approach to trip generation is best suited to this community plan update, but it is based on real studies of mixed-use projects. The findings from SANDAG's studies indicate that trip generation will generally be overestimated at smart growth developments if appropriate trip reductions are not included in the calculations. This method also provides a reasonable and supportable rational for the trip generation assumptions.