3.15 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC/CIRCULATION/PARKING

3.15.1 Existing Conditions

Transportation System

San Diego's transportation system provides for the movement of people and goods through a network of highways and roads, public transit, freight railroads, airports, seaports, and intermodal facilities. Local streets, paths and trails serve to provide local access and connections to the regional network. The transportation system provides travel for residents, employees, visitors, and goods movement and creates a system that supports City and regional economic needs. To accommodate the various travel needs, the City's transportation network includes numerous modes of transportation.

Roadways
Roadways are categorized into the following street classifications and functions:

Freeway: A street that is designed to carry through traffic, and is fully access controlled by grade separations, interchanges, and ramp connections. It normally is maintained by the California State Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and is constructed to state criteria, and varies in width from four to eight or more lanes.

Prime Arterial: A street that primarily provides a network connecting vehicles and transit to other primary arterials and to the freeway system. It carries heavy vehicular movement while providing low pedestrian movement and moderate bicycle and transit movements. It has a raised center median, bicycle lanes, street trees, traffic safety street lighting, sidewalks, and no access from abutting property. It may include underground utilities.

Major Arterial: A street that primarily provides a network connecting vehicles and transit to other major arterials and primary arterials, and to the freeway system and secondarily providing access to abutting commercial and industrial property. It carries moderate-to-heavy vehicular movement, low-to-high pedestrian and bicycle movements, and moderate-to-high transit movement. It has a raised center median, street trees, traffic safety, street lighting, and sidewalks, and may include landscaping, pedestrian-scale lighting, underground utilities, on-street parking, and/or bike lanes.

Collector Street: A street that primarily provides movement between local/collector streets and streets of higher classification and, secondarily, provides access to abutting property. It carries low- to moderate-vehicular movement, low- to heavy-pedestrian movement, moderate- to heavy-bicycle movement, and low- to moderate-transit movement. It has on-street parking, street trees, traffic safety street lighting, and sidewalks. It may also include landscaping, pedestrian-scale lighting, and underground utilities.

Local Street: A street that provides, primarily, direct access to abutting property. It carries low vehicular movement, low- to heavy-pedestrian movement, and low- to moderate-bicycle

movement. It has on-street parking, street trees, traffic safety street lighting, and sidewalks. It may include landscaping, pedestrian-scale lighting, and underground utilities.

Bikeways

Bikeways can be classified into four types in accordance with the Caltrans Highway Design Manual:

- Class I Bike Path – Typically called a bike path, this provides for bicycle travel on a paved right-of way completely separated from any street or highway.
- Class II Bike Lane – These facilities are often referred to as bike lanes. Bike lanes provide a striped and stenciled lane for one-way travel on a street or highway. When properly designed, bike lanes help improve the visibility of bicyclists.
- Class III Bike Route – Generally referred to as a bike route, it provides for shared use with pedestrian or motor vehicle traffic and is identified only by signing. This is recommended when there is enough right-of-way for bicyclists and motorists to safely pass.
- Shared Roadway (No Bikeway Designation). Most bicycle travel in the state now occurs on streets and highways without bikeway designations. This probably will be true in the future as well. In some instances, entire street systems may be fully adequate for safe and efficient bicycle travel and signing and striping for bicycle use may be unnecessary.

The City of San Diego has a developed network of designated Class I, II, and III bikeways. **Figure 3.15-1** shows the existing network of designated bikeways within the City. Many Class I paths are located in Mission Valley, Mission Bay Park, and along the beachfronts in Pacific Beach and Mission Beach. Other Class I facilities of significant length can be found in Carmel Valley, Rancho Peñasquitos, Mira Mesa, Rose Canyon, near the San Diego Airport, and in the Mission Trails Park. In San Diego, many Class I bikeways provide critical links between communities that would otherwise be totally separated for bicyclists. Two examples of these critical links are the Rose Canyon and Murphy Canyon paths, which provide for convenient bicycle travel in areas with no other alternative route adjacent to busy freeways.

Most of the Class II bike lane facilities are located in areas of the City developed within the last 30 years and include Rancho Bernardo, Rancho Peñasquitos, Sabre Springs, Mira Mesa, University City, Carmel Valley, and Tierrasanta. Some important Class II bikeways of significant length include Genesee Avenue, Linda Vista, Kearny Villa, and Black Mountain Roads, Aero and Harbor Drives, Friars and Mission Gorge Roads, Nimitz and Beyer Boulevards, and Carmel Mountain, Torrey Pines, and Otay Mesa Roads.

Class III bikeways are located both along major arterials and along quiet neighborhood streets. Arterial Class III facilities are located along such streets as Miramar Road, Rancho Peñasquitos Boulevard, Pacific Highway, 4th, 5th, and 6th Avenues, Camino Ruiz, and Saturn and Del Sol Boulevards. Neighborhood Class III routes are located along streets such as Orange Avenue in City Heights, Gold Coast Drive in Mira Mesa, Fort Stockton Drive in Mission Hills, Hornblend Avenue in Pacific Beach, L Street near Golden Hill, and Iris Avenue in Otay Mesa-Nestor.

The City of San Diego is committed to supporting bicycling as a form of mobility and recreation. As part of the City's long-term vision contained in the General Plan, the City supports the

planning and development of bicycle-friendly development projects, streets, and neighborhoods for both commuter and recreational riders. To this end, the City has adopted a citywide Bicycle Master Plan (BMP).

Development, maintenance, and support of the bicycle network are guided by the City's BMP (San Diego 2002). It identifies existing and future needs, and provides specific recommendations for facilities and programs over the next 20 years. The BMP contains detailed policies, action items, and network maps, and addresses issues such as bikeway planning, community involvement, facility design, bikeway classifications, multimodal integration, safety and education, and support facilities. The BMP is intended to provide a citywide perspective that is enhanced with more detailed community plan level recommendations and refinements. The BMP also identifies specific bicycling programs and addresses network implementation, maintenance and funding strategies.

Transit

Transit services are provided both for trips within the City and region and for trips between San Diego and adjacent areas. The current transit network includes local and express bus, light rail (trolley), and Coaster commuter rail services.

Within the San Diego region, transit services are provided by the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) in the southern metropolitan area (including the City of San Diego) and the North County Transit District (NCTD) in the northern part of the county (with Coaster and bus services that tie into the City of San Diego). Ferry service (privately operated) also is available between San Diego and Coronado. In addition, there are demand-responsive transit services that provide transit service in sparsely traveled areas and for travelers with special needs that cannot be well served by fixed-route service.

Figure 3.15-2 shows existing transit service with connections in the City of San Diego, including the adopted MTS 2006 Comprehensive Operational Analysis transit network of higher frequency transit lines and the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) network. Higher frequency bus and trolley service represents the urban network of single routes traveling on key corridors every 15 minutes or better. The RTP identifies light rail, local and express bus, and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) projects that would improve operations of existing services.

Passenger Rail

The Coaster and Amtrak trains provide passenger rail service to the City of San Diego along the coastal rail corridor. Passenger and freight trains also share the predominately single-track corridor. The Coaster provides commuter rail service between Oceanside and Downtown San Diego with stations in the City at Sorrento Valley, Old Town, and the Santa Fe Depot. Amtrak provides intercity passenger rail service from Downtown San Diego to Los Angeles, and north to San Luis Obispo, which is the second most heavily traveled intercity passenger rail corridor in the nation.

The Regional Transportation Plan identifies projects that would provide improved rail service and performance, and would enable service frequency improvements for commuter and intercity passenger rail services. Specific projects include: double tracking of the coastal rail corridor and a tunnel under University City (including a new station), and service frequency improvements.

Goods Movement

Goods movement in the San Diego region is provided via truck travel on the region's roadway systems as well as by air, rail, and seaport. Lindbergh Field serves as the primary airport for the movement of the goods transported by air. Freight rail service within the San Diego region is provided via the BNSF and SDIV railroads with Carrizo Gorge Railway operating between Tijuana and Tecate, Baja California. The region's seaport at Tenth Avenue in San Diego and National City is located on San Diego Bay and is operated by the San Diego Unified Port District.

Approximately 2.5 million tons of maritime cargo is handled annually. Inbound cargoes include refrigerated commodities, fertilizer, cement, break bulk commodities, and forest products such as newsprint. Main export cargoes include refrigerated cargo; break bulk; and bulk commodities such as soda ash, sodium sulfate, and borax. In the past four years, bulk tonnage has steadily increased from 157,000 to 744,000 metric tons annually (SANDAG 2004**).**

The San Diego & Arizona Eastern (SD&AE) Railway connects San Diego to Tijuana and Tecate in Baja California. The SDIV Railroad provides freight service between San Diego and San Ysidro. In 2001, Carrizo Gorge Railway took over operations between Tijuana and Tecate. Main commodities moved include liquefied petroleum gas, lumber, beverages, paper, grain, and sand. The extension of existing freight service between San Diego and Tecate to the Imperial Valley is being considered by rehabilitating the 70-mile Desert Line portion of the SD&AE, which has been out of service since 1983. In May 2002, MTDB granted a contract to Carrizo Gorge Railway to repair, operate, and maintain the Desert Line. The connection with the Union Pacific Railroad in Imperial Valley would link San Diego and its port to the rest of the United States and Mexico, and vastly improve the region's market opportunities.

Figure 3.15-3 represents a compilation of the RTP network and the circulation systems identified in the City's adopted community plans. Community plans provide finer level of street system details.

Regional Transportation Model

The SANDAG Series 10 Transportation Regional Model is the tool that all cities within the San Diego region use to forecast future traffic volumes and estimate the traffic effects of changes in land use and roadway facilities. The traffic model produces separate assignments of travel throughout the day and during peak hours. The model is also used to compare existing transportation conditions (Year 2005) to future conditions (Year 2030). Different modes of travel can also be extracted from the model such as the number of trips traveling in carpool lanes, driving alone, taking transit trips, riding a bike or walking.

SANDAG's Transportation Model was used to obtain information to determine potential impacts to the transportation system due to implementation of the Draft General Plan (SANDAG 2030). The Model projected future roadway miles Level of Service, vehicle miles traveled, and trips taken by different modes of transportation for Year 2030.

The Transportation Model is based on the long-range population, housing, and employment projections of the preliminary 2030 Cities/County Forecast. This forecast assumes that the region will encourage more and smarter growth development over time. Within the City limits, the City of Villages Opportunity Areas Map (adopted as Appendix A to the Strategic Framework Action Plan 2002) was incorporated into the methodology used in determining locations for potential additional residential development, but only in locations where adopted community plans allow for mixed-use and multifamily development.

The model optimizes the performance of the roadway and public transit system through smart land use planning, increased transit options, increased system and demand management, and additional infrastructure to accommodate the future growth. The infrastructure improvements include freeway, interchange, transit, bicycle and other projects funded through a 42 billion dollar "Reasonably Expected Revenue Scenario." The model reflects a land use and transportation system that:

- Provides connectivity within the network to accommodate all modes of travel.
- Connects transit to frequented destinations.
- Improves accessibility.
- Places higher density land uses along transit corridors.
- Increases opportunities for alternative modes of transportation (i.e., carpool lanes, transit connections).
- Enhances the roadway network.

Existing (Year 2005) Performance Measures

Level of Service

Level of Service (LOS) is a measure of operational conditions within a traffic stream. It relates to delay in traffic flow, generally measured in terms of speed and travel time, freedom to maneuver, traffic interruption, driver comfort, and convenience.

The LOS for the roadway segment is measured using a volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratio. The volume to capacity ratio is a conventional level of service measure, which equates roadway demand to supply. Demand is expressed by roadway volume, and supply is expressed as the carrying capacity of a roadway. The LOS is categorized into six levels, A through F, with LOS A representing the best possible condition and LOS F representing the worst. **Table 3.15-1** provides the general description of each level of service as it relates to the flow of traffic. **Figure 3.15-1** shows existing LOS for regional serving roadways within the City.

Table 3.15-1
Roadway Level of Service

Level of Service	General Description
A	Primarily free-flow operations. Vehicles are completely unimpeded in their ability to maneuver within the traffic stream. Control delay at signalized intersections is minimal.
B	Reasonably unimpeded operations. The ability to maneuver within the traffic stream is only slightly restricted, and control delays at signalized intersections are not significant.
C	Stable operations; however, ability to maneuver and change lanes in midblock locations may be more restricted than at LOS B, and longer queues, adverse signal coordination, or both may contribute to lower average travel speeds.
D	Borders on a range in which small increases in flow may cause substantial increases in delay. LOS D may be due to adverse signal progression, inappropriate signal timing, high volumes, or a combination of these factors.
E	Characterized by significant delays. Such operations are caused by a combination of adverse progression, high signal density, high volumes, extensive delays at critical intersections, and inappropriate signal timing.
F	Characterized by urban street flow at extremely low speeds. Intersection congestion is likely at critical signalized locations, with high delays, high volumes and extensive queuing,

Source: 2000 Highway Capacity Manual

Existing Roadway Miles LOS

The standard for acceptable LOS on existing roadways within the City of San Diego is LOS D with the exception of the Downtown community with an acceptable LOS E. **Table 3.15-2** summarizes the performance measure results of the existing freeways and classified roadways within the City of San Diego. As shown on **Table 3.15-2**, approximately 26 percent of the roadways within the City of San Diego are currently operating at LOS E or F.

Table 3.15-2
Citywide Existing Roadway Miles

Level of Service	% of Roadway Miles
A	28%
B	20%
C	16%
D	10%
E	9%
F	17%

Source: SANDAG Series 10, Year 2005 Regional Transportation Model

Existing Vehicle Mile Travel (VMT)

Vehicle Miles Traveled is a measure that identifies the number of miles motorists travel on the roadway network. Measuring the percent of daily vehicle miles traveled at a LOS E or F identifies the total number of miles motorists will travel under congested conditions throughout the day.

It is estimated that over 35 million daily vehicle miles are traveled everyday on streets and freeways within the City of San Diego (2005). Approximately 20 million of these vehicle miles (57 percent) currently occur at Level of Service E or F as shown on **Table 3.15-3**.

Table 3.15-3
Citywide Existing Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)

Level Of Service	VMT on Roadway Network
A	1,610,215 (4%)
B	3,358,636 (10%)
C	4,828,820 (14%)
D	5,320,205 (15%)
E	6,126,363 (18%)
F	13,770,030 (39%)
Total	**35,014,269 (100%)**

Source: SANDAG Series 10, Year 2005 Regional Transportation Model

Existing Alternative Modes of Travel

The amount of travel on each mode of transportation can be measured by taking the number of trips using that particular mode, and comparing it with the total trips in the transportation system. This will measure the trips traveled by mode for all trip purposes compared with all other trips traveled either by the peak periods of the day or throughout the day. **Table 3.15-4** indicates the percent of trips for each mode for all trip purposes during the peak hours and throughout the day.

Table 3.15-4
Citywide Existing Percent of Travel Mode for All Trip Purposes

Time Period	Mode	Total Percent By Mode
Peak *	**Total Auto:**	**86.7%**
	Drive Alone	59.5%
	Carpool	27.1%
	Total Transit	**2.6%**
	Bike & Walk	10.8%
Daily	**Total Auto:**	**87.6%**
	Drive Alone	56.3%
	Carpool	31.3%
	Total Transit	**1.7%**
	Bike & Walk	10.7%

Source: SANDAG Series 10, Year 2005 Regional Transportation Model
* 6:00 AM to 9:00 AM & 3:00 PM to 6:00 PM

As shown on **Table 3.15-4**, currently 86.7 percent of total peak hour trips are auto trips. The remaining of peak hour trips are 2.6 percent of transit and 10.8 percent of bike and walking trips. The auto trips can be broken down as: 59.5 percent drive alone, and 27.1 percent carpool.

Existing Home-to-Work Trips

Home-to-work trips are considered commuting trips and are typically made during the peak hours. A closer look at home-to-work trips is a good measure of travel most often taken by motorists on a daily basis during the week. **Table 3.15-5** summarizes the percentage of home-to-work trips by travel mode during the peak period. As shown on **Table 3.15-5**, approximately 78.8 percent of the trips are driving alone, 12.2 percent are carpooling, 5.6 percent are taking transit, and 3.4 percent are biking or walking to work.

Table 3.15-5
Citywide Existing Percent of Peak Hour*
Home-to-Work Travel Mode

Mode	Total Percent By Mode
Total Auto:	**91.0%**
Drive Alone	78.8%
Carpool	12.2%
Total Transit	**5.6%**
Bike & Walk	3.4%

Source: SANDAG Series 10, Year 2005 Regional Transportation Model
* 6:00AM to 9:00AM & 3:00 PM to 6:00 PM

Focused Transit Investment Areas

Citywide comparisons of transit and automobile use provide only partial understanding of the role of each mode in a comprehensive mobility system. The street and freeway system extends to all developed areas within the City and is available for use 24 hours a day, seven days a week. In contrast, transit investments are typically focused in specific areas. When transit investments are made in urban core areas with transit-supportive land uses and densities, higher frequency, all day local and express transit services can be more efficiently provided and transit mode shares can be expected to be significantly higher than the citywide figures shown on **Table 3.15-5.** For areas without transit-supportive land uses, transit investment is often limited to a few key travel corridors, along with limited peak commuter services, resulting in minimal transit mode shares. Thus, the citywide mode shares comparisons on **Table 3.15-5** dilute the significance of transit's contributions to the mobility system by spreading out transit trips over times and areas that transit was not designed to serve. In order to gain information on the role of transit in areas where significant transit investments have been made or are planned, data from three focused areas were analyzed in PEIR **Section 3.15.5**. The areas studied included the College Area, University, and Uptown communities.

Existing Parking Supply/Demand

Parking demand and parking needs vary from community to community depending on land use and geographic location. The City uses parking programs based on the parking needs of each individual community (or area). Such parking programs include residential permit programs, Community Parking Districts (CPD), time-limited parking regulations, angled parking, and others.

There are currently CPDs established in Downtown, Uptown, and Mid-City. Council Policy 100-18 (San Diego 2004 A) provides for a CPD to retain 45 percent of the parking meter revenues collected within its boundaries. These funds are to be used for improvements and activities that increase the availability, supply and effective use of parking to residents, visitors, and employees within the area in which the meters are located. Funds may be used for parking supply, signage, marketing, promoting alternative forms of transportation to reduce parking demand (e.g., community shuttles, public transit, bicycling, and walking), and other uses such as landscaping and security.

Most current community plans contain goals and policies that specifically provide for adequate parking. The existing parking provisions common to most community plans include:

1. Provide an adequate, accessible, and well-maintained supply of parking for residents, businesses, and tourists.
2. Provide adequate off-street parking for vehicles in all community projects.
3. Require new development to provide parking and address pedestrian activity in site design proposals.
4. Prohibit the elimination of existing parking.

The City's Land Development Code (LDC) contains citywide parking regulations designed to "work together to accommodate a multi modal transportation system." The intent of the regulations is to "provide for a safe and efficient transportation system . . ., to reduce traffic congestion and improve air quality; and to reasonably accommodate the peak parking needs of development, balanced by the needs of pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users and by the preservation of community character." The LDC parking regulations include parking ratios by land use, transit area parking reductions, shared parking provisions, tandem parking provisions, motorcycle parking requirements, and bicycle parking requirements. In Transit Areas, parking standards are reduced by about 15 percent for most multiple dwelling units and commercial uses located in transit areas. Transit Areas are identified in **Map No. C-921**. The Transit Area parking reductions were first implemented in 1987. In 2001, updates to the Transit Areas Map were adopted, and then later repealed by the City Council due to community dissatisfaction with parking reductions. In addition, the MTS adopted and began to implement comprehensive changes in transit services in 2006 which are not reflected on the Transit Areas Map.

The City has also adopted Planned District Ordinance regulations that address parking requirements in specific communities, and a Parking Impact Overlay Zone to increase off-street parking requirements for specified coastal, beach, and campus areas that have parking impacts.

Regulatory Framework

State and Federal Requirements

The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21), signed into law in 1998, provides the regulatory framework at the federal level for transportation planning in urban areas. This legislation requires that Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) prepare long-range transportation plans. In federally designated air quality nonattainment and maintenance areas, the long-range transportation plan is to be updated every three years. The state of California has additional regulations for the preparation of long-range transportation plans.

Regional Plans

SANDAG is the region's transportation and planning agency. The City of San Diego participates in the development and adoption of SANDAG documents and programs through the votes of our elected officials serving on the SANDAG Board of Directors, staff participation on SANDAG advisory committees, and direct citizen participation in the process. Key regional planning efforts include the:

Regional Transportation Plan (RTP**)** - SANDAG, the MPO for the San Diego region, adopted the MOBILITY 2030 RTP in 2003 in compliance with state and federal regulations. The MOBILITY 2030 plan was developed around four main components: land use, system development, system management, and demand management. The plan includes new and better connections to more efficiently move people on buses, trolleys, trains, and cars. It establishes the basis for state funding of local and regional transportation projects, and is a prerequisite for federal funding. SANDAG prioritizes and allocates the expenditure of regional, state, and federal transportation funds to implement RTP projects. In 2006, the 2030 Revenue Constrained RTP was updated, and in 2007, SANDAG began a comprehensive RTP update.

Regional Transit Vision (RTV**)** - The RTV is a component of the RTP. The goal of the RTV is to make public transit competitive with solo driving during peak periods. Local jurisdictions play a significant role in creating communities that support the RTV. Two key concepts of the RTV are: 1) Integrating transit into the more populated urban communities and 2) Surrounding public transit with supportive land uses. The RTV also promotes priority measures that will allow transit to bypass congested roadways and intersections. The 2007 update of the RTP will include a review of the region's transit strategy, using information gained from an Independent Transit Planning Review, and other sources.

Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP**)** - The SRTP strategy is to balance the short-term needs associated with managing existing transit services, while implementing the long-term regional transit vision identified in MOBILITY 2030. The SRTP provides a framework for transit system development over a five-year period. SANDAG is responsible for regional transit planning, programming, and construction. The MTS and NCTD are responsible for the detailed transit routing and operations.

Congestion Management Plan (CMP) - The CMP focuses on two main activities: 1) addressing existing congestion through regular roadway monitoring and determining ways to streamline

traffic flow, and 2) identifying and mitigating future congestion resulting from new development. SANDAG, Caltrans, and local jurisdictions implement the CMP through two means. The first is through the adoption of deficiency plans. The plans are developed through the cooperation of SANDAG, Caltrans, and the local jurisdictions. These plans identify the cause of congestion, potential solutions, and establish funding mechanisms for improvements that help manage congestion. The second way is through enhanced CEQA review. Local jurisdictions must conduct enhanced CEQA review for large development projects, a process which identified potential congestion problems on a regional level and finds ways to minimize these problems.

Community Plans

The City has over fifty planning areas. As part of community plan updates, land use and street network alternatives are analyzed using transportation models and software to estimate traffic generation, forecast traffic volumes and evaluate levels of service on the transportation system for each alternative. Adopted community plans specify the planned system of classified streets within the local community.

3.15.2 Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact could occur if implementation of the Draft General Plan:

- Increases the number of roadway miles at a Level of Service E or F on the planned transportation network;
- Increases the percent of daily vehicle miles traveled at a Level of Service E or F on the planned circulation system;
- Decreases the percent of multimodal trips in the City's transportation system; or
- Creates an average demand for parking that substantially exceeds the available supply.

3.15.3 Impact Analysis

SANDAG's Transportation Model was used to obtain information to determine potential impacts to the transportation system due to implementation of the Draft General Plan along with regional transportation plans. The Model projected roadway miles Level of Service (LOS), Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), and trips taken by different modes of transportation for Year 2005 and Year 2030. As seen in the following tables, vehicular travel is expected to increase, yet congestion is expected to decrease. This reduction in congestion is attributed to implementation of SANDAG's MOBILITY 2030 plan along with the land use recommendations in the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) (see EIR **Section 3.8**).

SANDAG's MOBILITY 2030 Plan estimates that approximately 42 billion dollars of improvements will be made to the regional transportation system through Year 2030. Regional improvements include transit, managed/HOV lanes, highway, local roads, transportation demand management, land use, bicycle/pedestrian, and other related efforts. Revenue sources for the planned improvements are "reasonably expected" to come from state, federal, TransNet and local revenue sources. "Reasonably expected" includes revenue sources that are available today and will continue as revenue along with additional revenues expected to become available through 2030.

Figures 3.15-5 and **3.15-6** show the Year 2006 and Year 2030 transportation systems respectively.

Could the implementation of the Draft General Plan increase the number of roadway miles at Level of Service E or F on the planned transportation network?

Future Roadway Miles LOS

Table 3.15-6 compares roadway miles for each level of service from Year 2005 (considered existing conditions) to Year 2030. As shown on the table, the percent of roadway miles that will experience LOS E and F conditions is projected to decrease, meaning that there will be fewer congested areas in the future than there are under existing conditions. More specifically, the miles of roadways projected to operate at LOS E and LOS F decrease from approximately 26 percent (Year 2005) to 18 percent (Year 2030). These improvements are attributed to the implementation of the MOBILITY 2030 plan and RCP as discussed above. **Figure 3.15-7** shows the forecasted 2030 LOS for regional serving roadways within the City.

Table 3.15-6
Comparison of Citywide Roadway Miles
Year 2005 vs. Year 2030

Level of Service	Year 2005 Roadway Miles	Year 2030 Roadway Miles
A	368 (28%)	419 (30%)
B	267 (20%)	288 (21%)
C	218 (16%)	255 (19%)
D	130 (10%)	167 (12%)
E	118 (9%)	139 (10%)
F	221 (17%)	115 (8%)

Source: SANDAG Series 10, Year 2030 Regional Transportation Model

The Draft General Plan has policies that call for the City to increase capacity and reduce congestion on the street and freeway system, and to work with SANDAG to implement the City's priorities for transportation improvements. While the SANDAG Transportation Model forecasts that roadway LOS conditions will improve by the Year 2030, there are many uncertainties associated with the multi-year implementation of the Draft General Plan and regional transportation plans that could result in traffic impacts at various points in time. Potential for traffic impact exists due to possible changes in the availability of funding sources, specific project approval or construction delays, transportation infrastructure design changes, and new development projects that require new or different facilities.

In addition, a major update to the MOBILITY 2030 RTP is underway which could result in adoption of different strategies and projects that are unknown at this time. As a result, it is infeasible at this Program EIR level to provide specific mitigation that would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. As such, there is potential for significant unavoidable impacts related to transportation. For these reasons, at the Program EIR level, impacts to traffic LOS are considered significant and unavoidable. Future environmental analysis would be required for any future projects (i.e., the RTP update, community plan updates, private development projects, and CIP projects); identification of project-specific mitigation measures would be determined at that time.

Could implementation of the Draft General Plan increase the percent of daily vehicle miles traveled at a Level of Service E or F on the planned circulation system?

As the region continues to grow, the population inevitably will increase along with an increase in vehicular travel. That is reflected on **Table 3.15-7** which shows approximately 35 million Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) daily in Year 2005 compared with approximately 43 million VMT in Year 2030.

However, the percent of vehicle miles traveled which will experience congestion will improve throughout the network. The percentage of vehicle miles traveled at a LOS E or F is expected to decrease from 57 percent to 39 percent between 2005 and 2030.

Table 3.15-7
Comparison of Citywide VMT
Year 2030 vs. Year 2005

Level of Service	Year 2005 VMT	Year 2030 VMT
A	1,601,215 (4%)	2,234,114 (5%)
B	3,358,636 (10%)	5,328,563 (12%)
C	4,828,820 (14%)	10,088,428 (24%)
D	5,320,205 (15%)	8,724,623 (20%)
E	6,126,363 (18%)	9,708,444 (23%)
F	13,770,030 (39%)	6,830,203 (16%)
Total	35,014,269 (100%)	42,914,375 (100%)

Source: SANDAG Series 10, Year 2030 Regional Transportation Model

This improvement can be contributed to a number of factors mentioned earlier. The robust roadway and transit network planned through 2030, the smart growth approach to land use, improved access, and increased opportunities for walking and cycling is expected to result in alternative modes becoming more heavily used.

The Draft General Plan has policies that call for the City to increase capacity and reduce congestion on the street and freeway system, and to work with SANDAG to implement the City's priorities for transportation improvements. The SANDAG Transportation Model forecasts that daily vehicle miles traveled at LOS E or F should decrease by the Year 2030. However, there are many uncertainties associated with the multi-year implementation of the Draft General Plan and regional transportation plans that could result in traffic impacts occurring at various points in time. Uncertainties include potential changes in the availability of funding sources, project approval or construction delays, transportation infrastructure design changes and new development projects that require new or different facilities.

In addition, a major update to the MOBILITY 2030 RTP is underway which could result in the adoption of different strategies and projects that are unknown at this time. As a result, it is infeasible at this Program EIR level to provide specific mitigation that would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. As such, there is potential for significant unavoidable impacts related to transportation. For these reasons, at the Program EIR level, impacts to traffic LOS are

considered significant and unavoidable. Environmental analysis would be required for any future projects (i.e., the RTP update, community plan updates, private development projects, and CIP projects); identification of project-specific mitigation measures would be determined at that time.

Could the implementation of the Draft General Plan decrease the percent of multimodal trips in the City's transportation system?

The Draft General Plan Mobility Element and SANDAG's MOBILITY 2030 plan all highlight the importance of integrating transportation and land use planning decisions, and using multimodal strategies to reduce congestion and increase travel choices. Giving people travel choices distributes trips throughout the transportation system and provides alternatives to driving alone, such as carpooling, transit, biking or walking.

The percent of trips taken by carpools and transit is expected to increase, though the percent of trips taken by biking and walking is expected to decrease as compared in relation to the other modes of travel in Year 2030. This decrease can be partially explained by limitations of the SANDAG Model. The Model does a good job of forecasting regional vehicular trips, but is not well suited to measuring local pedestrian and bicycle trips that are influenced by factors such as the quality of the urban environment, the connectivity of the bicycle and pedestrian path system, and the availability of local goods and services. However, the projected number of biking and walking trips, is expected to increase when compared to the existing level of biking and walking by 11 percent and 14 percent respectively in Year 2030 in both the peak periods and throughout the day per the SANDAG Model. **Tables 3.15-8** and **3.15-9** indicate the daily and peak period percent of trips for each mode. The tables also identify the actual number of trips for each mode for existing conditions and for future conditions.

In summary these tables show that:

- Transit trips are expected to increase from Year 2005 to Year 2030 in both the peak periods and throughout the day.
  - Existing citywide peak period transit trips is 2.6 percent of all peak period trips and is expected to increase to 4.9 percent in Year 2030. This is an increase of approximately 112,700 new transit trips in the City by Year 2030 compared with Year 2005, a net 130 percent increase as shown on **Table 3.15-8**.
  - Current daily transit trips are 1.7 percent of all trips citywide and are expected to increase to 3.2 percent in Year 2030. This is an increase of 202,000 (net 131 percent per **Table 3.15-9**) of new transit trips in the City by Year 2030 compared with Year 2005.
- Carpool trips are expected to increase from Year 2005 to Year 2030 in both the peak periods and throughout the day.
  - Currently approximately 27.1 percent of trips during the peak hours are taken in the carpool lane. This is expected to increase to 28.0 percent in Year 2030. This is a net increase in number of carpool trips, approximately 226,400 which is a 25 percent net increase in Year 2030 as shown on **Table 3.15-8**.
  - Currently approximately 31.3 percent of daily trips are taken in the carpool lane and is expected to increase to 31.9 percent. This is a net increase in number of carpool

trips, approximately 685,500 which is a 24 percent net increase in Year 2030 as shown on **Table 3.15-9**.

- Biking and walking trips percentage is expected to decrease as compared in relation to the other modes of travel in Year 2030 (see the discussion on Model limitations provided above). However, the projected number of biking and walking trips is expected to increase in Year 2030 when compared to the existing level of biking and walking in both the peak periods and throughout the day.
  - Existing citywide peak period biking and walking trips are 10.8 percent of all peak period trips and are expected to decrease to 9.9 percent by Year 2030, even though there is a net increase in number of biking and walking trips, approximately 40,200 which is an 11 percent net increase in Year 2030 as shown on **Table 3.15-8**.
  - Currently approximately 10.7 percent of daily trips are biking and walking trips and are expected to decrease to 9.9 percent, even though there is a net increase in number of biking and walking trips, approximately 133,000 which is a 14 percent net increase in Year 2030 as shown on **Table 3.15-9**.

***Table 3.15-8**
Comparison of Citywide Peak Period Travel Mode for All Trips Purposes
Year 2030 vs. Year 2005

Measure	Year 2005 % Of Total Person Trips	Year 2030 % Of Total Person Trips	Year 2005 Person Trips	Year 2030 Person Trips	Net % Person Trips Increase From Year 2005 To Year 2030
Drive Alone Auto	59.5%	57.2%	2,017,498	2,340,884	16%
Carpool	27.1%	28.0%	920,801	1,147,225	25%
Transit	2.6%	4.9%	86,801	199,498	130%
Bike & Walk	10.8%	9.9%	367,428	407,623	11%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	3,392,528	4,095,230	21%

Source: SANDAG Series 10, Year 2030 Regional Transportation Model
* 6:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Table 3.15-9
Comparison of Citywide Daily Travel Mode for All Trip Purposes
Year 2030 vs. Year 2005

Measure	Year 2005 % of total Person Trips	Year 2030 % of total Person Trips	Year 2005 Person Trips	Year 2030 Person Trips	Net % Person Trips Increase from Year 2005 to Year 2030
Drive Alone Auto	56.3%	55.0%	5,092,928	6,089,102	19%
Carpool	31.3%	31.9%	2,842,337	3,527,821	24%
Transit	1.7%	3.2%	153,880	355,460	131%
Bike & Walk	10.7%	9.9%	964,889	1,097,828	14%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	9,054,034	11,070,211	22%

Source: SANDAG Series 10, Year 2030 Regional Transportation Model

Citywide Home-to-Work Peak Hour Trips:

As mentioned earlier, home-to-work trips are considered commuting trips and are typically taken during the peak period. A closer look at home-to-work trips on **Table 3.15-10** indicates that the percent of trips taken by carpool and transit is expected to increase in Year 2030, Though the percent of trips taken by biking and walking is expected to decrease as compared in relation to the other modes of travel, the projected number of biking and walking trips is expected to increase when compared to the existing level of biking and walking by six percent in Year 2030 during the peak periods per the SANDAG Model:

- Transit trips are expected to increase from existing conditions to Year 2030 in the peak periods. Existing citywide peak period transit trips are 5.6 percent of all peak period trips and are expected to increase to 11.5 percent in Year 2030. This is an increase of approximately 66,300 (134 percent net increase as shown on **Table 3.15-10**) of new transit trips in the City by Year 2030 compared with Year 2005.
- Carpool trips are expected to increase from existing conditions to Year 2030 in the peak periods. Currently approximately 12.2 percent of trips during the peak hours are taken in

the carpool lane. This is expected to increase to 12.4 percent in Year 2030. This is an increase of approximately 18,200 trips using the carpool lanes.

- Biking and walking trips are expected to decrease as compared in relation to the other modes of travel in Year 2030. However, the projected number of biking and walking trips is expected to increase in Year 2030 when compared to the existing level of biking and walking in the peak periods. Existing citywide home-to-work peak period biking and walking trips are 3.4 percent and are expected to decrease to 3.1 percent in Year 2030, even though there is a net increase in number of biking and walking trips, approximately 1,750 which is a six percent net increase in Year 2030 as shown on **Table 3.15-10**.

***Table 3.15-10**
Comparison of Citywide Home-to-work Peak Period Travel Mode
Year 2030 vs. Year 2005

Measure	Year 2005 % Of Total Person Trips	Year 2030 % Of Total Person Trips	Year 2005 Person Trips	Year 2030 Person Trips	Net % Person Trips Increase From Year 2005 To Year 2030
Drive Alone Auto	78.8%	73.0%	690,548	736,697	7%
Carpool	12.2%	12.4%	106,587	124,785	17%
Transit	5.6%	11.5%	49,380	115,707	134%
Bike & Walk	3.4%	3.1%	30,085	31,883	6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	876,600	1,009,072	15%

*6:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Focused Transit Investment Areas

Citywide comparisons of transit and automobile use provide only partial understanding of the role of each mode in a comprehensive mobility system. The street and freeway system extends to all developed areas within the City and is available for use 24 hours a day, seven days a week. In contrast, transit investments are typically focused in specific areas to increase the capacity and accessibility of the transportation system, and transit services are usually programmed to offer their highest levels of service during peak commute hours with service dropping off in times of lower demand. Citywide mode split comparisons dilute the significance of transit's contributions to the mobility system by spreading out transit trips over times and areas that transit was not designed to serve.

In order to gain information on the role of transit in areas where significant transit investments have been made or are planned, data from the College Area, University, and Uptown communities was compiled as a part of the impact analysis. This data is derived from the same Transportation Model that was used to report on citywide impacts; a subset of the citywide data was collected by focusing in on smaller subareas.

College Area Community

A substantial investment in transit services have been made in the College Area through the extension of San Diego Trolley services and the ongoing operation of a bus/trolley transit center at San Diego State University (SDSU). While higher-quality transit services do not exist throughout

the entire community, the core, higher intensity areas are well-served. Note that Year 2005 conditions do not include the Trolley extension to SDSU. The MOBILITY 2030 plan identifies the El Cajon Boulevard Bus Rapid Transit project, which would connect SDSU to Downtown San Diego via College Ave/El Cajon Blvd/Park Blvd. Bus Rapid Transit services are also planned in the I-15 corridor, providing connections from the area to job centers to the north. This BRT service will be accessed via the El Cajon Blvd BRT service and local buses in the University Ave corridor.

Table 3.15-11 compares Year 2030 and Year 2005 peak period, home-to-work trips by travel mode in the College Area community. Key findings include:

- Transit trips are expected to increase from 6.2 percent to 17 percent of all peak period trips. This is an increase of approximately 203 percent (or 2,300 trips).
- Drive alone auto trips decrease from 77 percent to 68.5 percent of total peak hour trips.
- Bike and walk trips decrease from 4.6 percent to 3.5 percent of all peak period trips.

At 17 percent, the College Area has a higher projected transit mode split (home-to-work transit ridership during the peak hours) than the 11.5 percent citywide transit mode split shown on **Table 3.15-10.**

***Table 3.15-11**
Comparison of College Area Community
Home-to-work Peak Period Travel Mode
Year 2030 vs. Year 2005

Measure	Year 2005 % Of Total Person Trips	Year 2030 % Of Total Person Trips	Year 2005 Person Trips	Year 2030 Person Trips	Net % Person Trips Increase From Year 2005 To Year 2030
Drive Alone Auto	77.0%	68.5%	14,040	13,734	-2%
Carpool	12.2%	11.0%	2,225	2,203	-1%
Transit	6.2%	17.0%	1,126	3,409	203%
Bike & Walk	4.6%	3.5%	840	697	-17%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	18,231	20,043	10%

* 6:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.

University Community

The University community is currently served by local bus, express bus, and shuttle services. A transit center exists at the University Towne Center Shopping Center. Major Year 2030 transit service improvements planned for this area include:

- The Mid Coast trolley line extension from Old Town Transit Center to the University of California, San Diego (UCSD) and University City;
- The Nobel Coaster Station;
- Bus Rapid Transit services along the I-805 corridor connecting South Bay, Mid-City, and East County with the University City area; and

- The "Super Loop" shuttle, which is a higher-speed, limited-stop shuttle connecting residential and employment areas within the University City and UCSD communities.

Table 3.15-12 compares Year 2030 and Year 2005 peak period, home-to-work trips by travel mode in the University Community. Key findings include:

- Transit trips are expected to increase from 2.5 percent to 13.6 percent of all peak period trips. This is an increase of approximately 517 percent (or 12,400 trips).
- Drive alone auto trips decrease from 82.3 percent to 71.6 percent of all peak hour trips.
- Bike and walk trips decrease from 2.9 percent to 2.4 percent of all peak period trips.

At 13.6 percent, the University area has a higher projected transit mode split (home-to-work transit ridership during the peak hours) than the 11.5 percent citywide transit mode split shown on **Table 3.15-10**.

***Table 3.15-12**
Comparison of University Community
Home-to-work Peak Period Travel Mode
Year 2030 vs. Year 2005

Measure	Year 2005 % Of Total Person Trips	Year 2030 % Of Total Person Trips	Year 2005 Person Trips	Year 2030 Person Trips	Net % Person Trips Increase From Year 2005 To Year 2030
Drive Alone Auto	82.3%	71.6%	79,810	77,739	-2.6%
Carpool	12.3%	12.3%	11,963	13,324	11%
Transit	2.5%	13.6%	2,397	14,785	517%
Bike & Walk	2.9%	2.4%	2,805	2,678	-4.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	96,976	108,526	12%

* 6:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Uptown Community

The Uptown Community is currently served by some of the region's most frequent local bus services. The MOBILITY 2030 plan shows introduction of Bus Rapid Transit service using along the 4th/5th Avenue corridor linking Uptown with Downtown and Mission Valley.

Table 3.15-13 compares Year 2030 and Year 2005 peak period, home-to-work trips by travel mode in the Uptown Community. Key findings include:

- Transit trips are expected to increase from 10.5 percent to 17.7 percent of all peak period trips. This is an increase of approximately 90 percent (or 3,700 trips).
- Drive alone auto trips decrease from 71 percent to 64.8 percent of all peak hour trips, a three percent decrease.
- Bike and walk trips decrease from 7.3 percent to 6.7 percent of all peak period trips, a four percent decrease.

At 17.7 percent, the Uptown area has a higher projected transit mode split (home-to-work transit ridership during the peak hours) than the 11.5 percent citywide transit mode split shown on **Table 3.15-10.**

***Table 3.15-13**
Comparison of Uptown Community
Home-to-work Peak Period Travel Mode
Year 2030 vs. Year 2005

Measure	Year 2005 % Of Total Person Trips	Year 2030 % Of Total Person Trips	Year 2005 Person Trips	Year 2030 Person Trips	Net % Person Trips Increase From Year 2005 To Year 2030
Drive Alone Auto	71.0%	64.8%	28,185	28,901	3%
Carpool	11.2%	10.7%	4,450	4,784	8%
Transit	10.5%	17.7%	4,164	7,890	90%
Bike & Walk	7.3%	6.7%	2,891	3,013	4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	39,690	44,588	12%

* 6:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.

A major focus of the Draft General Plan is to create more walkable and transit-oriented communities. Policies in the Mobility Element address the need for multimodal system investments, an interconnected street and path system, for implementation of traffic calming and transit priority measures, for improved transit services, and for development of a Pedestrian Master Plan. Urban Design Element policies provide guidance on how to design pedestrian-transit-oriented development, and the Land Use Element calls for development of mixed-use, walkable village centers in areas served by the transit system.

The Draft General Plan has policies that call for the City to work with SANDAG to implement the City's General Plan policies and priorities for transportation improvements. Implementation of the Draft General Plan would support SANDAG's Smart Growth Concept Map, which would allow the City to compete for Smart Growth Incentive Funds that could be used for multimodal transportation improvements. The SANDAG Transportation Model forecasts that transit trips will increase, but shows a decrease in pedestrian and bicycle trips (see discussion on Model limitations provided above). The decrease in pedestrian and bicycle trips is a significant impact. However, there are many uncertainties associated with the multi-year implementation of the Draft General Plan and regional transportation plans that could result in the achievement of mode splits that differ from what has been projected. Uncertainties include potential changes in the availability of funding sources, project approval or construction delays, transportation infrastructure design changes due to environmental impacts, new studies or information that result in design changes, and new development projects that require new or different facilities.

In addition, a major update to the MOBILITY 2030 plan is underway which could result in the adoption of different strategies and projects that are unknown at this time. As a result, it is infeasible at this Program EIR level to provide specific mitigation that would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. As such, there is potential for significant unavoidable impacts related to multimodal transportation. For these reasons, at the Program EIR level, impacts to the multimodal trips are considered significant and unavoidable. Environmental analysis would be

required for any future projects (i.e., the RTP update, community plan updates, private development projects, and CIP projects); identification of project-specific mitigation measures would be determined at that time.

Could implementation of the proposed General Plan create an average demand for parking that could substantially exceed the available supply?

As infill development occurs there will likely be increase impacts to neighborhood traffic and parking. Parking management solutions will need to be more complex and tailored to meet varying situations. The Draft General Plan seeks to create conditions that will reduce the demand for parking, and the space devoted to the automobile, through factors including: mixed-use development; comfortable, attractive sidewalks; multiple and direct pedestrian street connections; high quality transit service; improved bicycle facilities; and use of parking management tools.

The parking needs of new development would be provided in accordance with the City's Land Development Regulations, including use of shared parking and Transit Area parking reductions (discussed in Section 13.15.1) where applicable. Solutions for parking problems that currently exist, or that would be exacerbated by the projected increased in population growth in the City and region, would be addressed using a mix of parking supply, management, and demand solutions. The Mobility Element, **Table ME-3**, Parking Strategies Toolbox, contains a menu of options that may be tailored for specific applications as needed.

While there are Draft General Plan policies and existing regulations that are designed to minimize parking impacts, there may still be localized parking impacts in the future. Therefore, at the Program EIR level, impacts to parking are considered significant and unavoidable. Environmental analysis would be required for any future projects (i.e., community plan updates, redevelopment plans, private development projects, and CIP projects); identification of project-specific mitigation measures would be determined at that time.

3.15.4 Mitigation Framework

Goals, policies, and recommendations enacted by the City combined with existing regulations described above provide a framework for developing project level protection measures for future discretionary projects which may increase traffic congestion, decrease multimodal trips, or create a demand for parking that substantially exceeds the available supply. The City's process for evaluation of discretionary projects includes environmental review and documentation pursuant to CEQA as well as an analysis of those projects for consistency with the goals, policies and recommendations of the General Plan and the applicable community plan. In general, implementation of the above policies and compliance with established regulations would minimize impacts. Compliance with regulations is required of all projects and is not considered to be mitigation. However, it is possible that for certain projects, adherence to regulations may not adequately address traffic and parking impacts and such projects would require additional measures to avoid or reduce significant impacts. These additional measures would be considered mitigation.

For each future discretionary project requiring mitigation (i.e., measures that go beyond what is required by existing regulations), project-specific measures will be identified that reduce significant project-level impacts to less than significant, or the project level impact may remain significant and unavoidable where no feasible mitigation exists. Where mitigation is determined to be necessary and feasible, these measures will be included in a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the project. Future development is to be designed to avoid or mitigate significant impacts by using appropriate measures designed to achieve the factors listed below.

Walkable Communities – (see Draft General Plan policies ME-A.1 thru ME-A-9 for the policy foundation):

- A safe and comfortable pedestrian environment.
- A complete, functional, and interconnected pedestrian network, that is accessible to pedestrians of all abilities.
- Greater walkability achieved through pedestrian friendly street, site and building design.
- Walking as a viable travel choice, particularly for trips of less than one-half mile.

Street and Freeway System – (see Draft General Plan policies ME-C.1 thru ME-C.10 for the policy foundation):

- A street and freeway system that balances the needs of multiple users of the public right-of-way.
- An interconnected street system that provides multiple linkages within and between communities.
- Safe and efficient street design that minimizes environmental and neighborhood impacts.
- Vehicle congestion relief.
- Well maintained streets.

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) – (see Draft General Plan policies ME-E.1 thru ME-E.8 for the policy foundation):

- Reduced single-occupant vehicular traffic on congested streets and freeways.
- Improved performance and efficiency of the street and freeway system, by means other than roadway widening or construction (although roadway widening or construction may still be required).
- Expanded travel options and improved personal mobility.
- Project related bicycling support infrastructure such as safe and secure bike storage, and showers and lockers for bicyclists.

Bicycling – (see Draft General Plan policies ME-F.1 thru ME-F.6 for the policy foundation):

- Bicycling as a viable travel choice, particularly for trips of less than five miles.
- Project-specific components of safe and comprehensive local and regional bikeway network.
- Environmental quality, public health and mobility benefits through increased bicycling.

***Parking Management* – (**see Draft General Plan policies ME-G.1 thru ME-G.5 for the policy foundation):

- Parking that is reasonably available when and where it is needed through management of the supply.
- Solutions to project-specific parking issues through implementation of a broad range of parking management tools and strategies.
- New development with adequate parking through the application of innovative citywide parking regulations.
- Increased land use efficiencies in the provision of parking.

The Mitigation Framework may be updated, expanded and refined when applied to specific future projects based on project-specific design and changes in existing conditions, and local, state and federal laws.

3.15.5 Significance of Impact with Mitigation Framework

At this time, no specific projects have been proposed, and therefore it is not possible to propose feasible mitigation measures to reduce project-level impacts. It is infeasible in this Program level EIR to provide specific mitigation that would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. As such, significant unavoidable impacts related to transportation/traffic/circulation/parking remain.

Notes and References

City of San Diego.

1997 Municipal Code, Chapter 13, Article 2, Division 8: Parking Impact Overlay Zone Regulations.

2000 Municipal Code, Chapter 14, Article 2, Division 5: Parking Regulations.

2001 Municipal Code, Chapter 13, Article 2, Division 9: Residential Tandem Parking Overlay Zone.

2002 *Bicycle Master Plan.* May 2002.

2004 Council Policy 100-18. *Community Parking District Policy.* November 15, 2004.

2004 Manager's Report. *Analysis of Parking Task Force Recommendations.* No. 04-133. Land Use and Housing Committee. Agenda of June 16, 2004.

2005 Manager's Report. *Community Parking Districts.* No. 05-100. Land Use and Housing Committee. Agenda of April 20, 2005.

SANDAG.

2006 Revenue Constrained *Regional Transportation Plan: Update 2006.* February 2006.