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1 Introduction
1. Introduction

The City of San Diego initiated the pedestrian planning process in 2006 with the development of the Phase I Pedestrian Master Plan Citywide Implementation Framework Report, which established the guidelines for planning new or enhanced pedestrian improvements Citywide. The Pedestrian Master Plan Phases 2 and 3 effort further developed methods used in the planning process, compiled the Pedestrian Master Plan Volume 1 document, and addressed the first seven communities in the City which are included in this Volume 2 document. These communities include Barrio Logan, City Heights, Greater Golden Hill, Greater North Park, Normal Heights, Southeastern San Diego, and Uptown. The Phase 4 effort (under separate cover) addressed the next seven communities, which are College Area, Kensington-Talmadge, Ocean Beach, Old Town, Midway-Pacific Highway, Pacific Beach, and San Ysidro.

The Pedestrian Master Plan will help the City enhance neighborhood quality and mobility options by developing pedestrian improvement concepts, prioritizing the pedestrian improvement concepts based on technical analysis and community input, and improving the City’s ability to receive grant funding for implementation. The public will benefit from this plan as improvements are implemented which create more walkable communities that have fewer barriers, provide connections between where people live, work, play, shop and learn, and provide community-wide health and wellness benefits.

1.1 Specific Pedestrian Master Plan Objectives include:

- To guide the implementation of pedestrian improvements in a consistent manner throughout the City;
- To identify high-priority pedestrian routes for providing pedestrian improvements in each community planning area;
- To identify potential pedestrian improvements along high-priority routes that focus on improving pedestrian safety, accessibility, connectivity and walkability in each community; and
- To engage community members in the process of identifying and prioritizing potential pedestrian projects in each community planning area.

1.2 Goals of the Pedestrian Master Plan

During the development of the Citywide Implementation Framework Report (Phase I), the City worked closely with a Project Working Group (PWG) to define the vision statement, goals and objectives of the Pedestrian Master Plan. Through this process, four main goals emerged:

- Safety: Create a safe pedestrian network free of barriers and tripping hazards that has sufficient street crossings, buffers pedestrians from vehicles and has facilities wide enough to accommodate peak pedestrian use.
• Accessibility: Make facilities accessible to pedestrians of all abilities and meet all local, state and federal requirements.

• Connectivity: Develop a complete pedestrian network that provides direct and convenient connections for neighborhoods, employment centers, transit stations, public places and community destinations.

• Walkability: Create pedestrian facilities that offer amenities to encourage usage and to enhance the pedestrian experience.

These goals are the foundation for identifying needs in the community, developing recommendations for improvements and developing a plan for improving mobility at intersections and along street segments City-wide. Three expected outcomes were developed to describe the results of implementing the four supporting goals described above:

• Neighborhood Quality: When walkable communities are provided, they enhance neighborhood quality by providing opportunities for social interaction, enhanced economic development and healthy lifestyles.

• Alternative Transportation: When walkable communities are provided, they support walking as a primary means of transportation, support transit and bike mobility options and can also improve the beginning and end of vehicular trips when the driver becomes a pedestrian.

• Cost Effectiveness: When funded equitably and appropriately, pedestrian improvements can combine public and private investments for the good of the public and can lower expenses related to vehicular and transit investments.

1.3 Pedestrian Priority Model

The Pedestrian Priority Model (PPM), described in detail in the Pedestrian Master Plan Volume 1 document, was developed to determine areas within the City of San Diego most in need of evaluation for pedestrian improvements. It is also used to prioritize communities for the preparation of individual sections of the Plan and to help prioritize improvement concepts so as to provide the greatest benefit. The PPM identifies existing and potential pedestrian activity areas City-wide. The model utilizes existing data available City-wide as part of an extensive GIS database.

The model has three basic components, which include:

• Pedestrian Attractors

• Pedestrian Generators

• Pedestrian Detractors

When these three sub-models are combined, they create the Pedestrian Priority Model. Each sub-model identifies relevant characteristics of each particular area in geographic space and assigns a numeric value for each of these characteristics. The score per area is then added to create a ranking for that particular area in geographic space.
The Attractor, Generator and Detractor grid cell points were overlaid on top of each other to provide a total composite value for each cell. The composite value identifies the areas that have a higher pedestrian priority score. The score of each community is then normalized by dividing it by the community’s acreage. This allows the comparison of communities based on a common denominator and identifies the communities with high densities of pedestrian priority. The final composition map is provided in Figure 1-1.

The ranked communities have been grouped by natural breaks, as summarized in Table 1-1 and illustrated in Figure 1-2.

This ranking was used as a guide to determine the order of Plan development. The results of this map coincide with the higher pedestrian activity levels found in the traditional grid layout of the older communities, and with those communities having higher concentrations and mixtures of land use and higher numbers of pedestrian-involved crashes.

1.4 Phases 2 and 3 Communities

A total of seven communities are included in this Phases 2 & 3 Master Planning effort:

- Barrio Logan
- City Heights
- Greater Golden Hill
- Greater North Park
- Normal Heights
- Southeastern San Diego
- Uptown

For each of these seven communities, a focused pedestrian plan has been developed that identifies community pedestrian infrastructure needs and recommendations.
Figure 1-1: Updated Final Pedestrian Priority Model

Source: City of San Diego; Alta Planning + Design, 2008
### Table 1-1: Updated Community Pedestrian Priority Model Points and Rankings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Updated Ranking</th>
<th>Community Planning Area</th>
<th>Average PPM Points</th>
<th>Updated CPA Ranking Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Centre City</strong></td>
<td>230.0</td>
<td><strong>1 (210-230 points)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Greater North Park</td>
<td>229.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mid-City: Normal Heights</td>
<td>226.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mid-City: City Heights</td>
<td>222.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Southeastern San Diego</td>
<td>220.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Uptown</td>
<td>218.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Greater Golden Hill</td>
<td>212.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ocean Beach</td>
<td>209.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>San Ysidro</td>
<td>205.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Pacific Beach</td>
<td>202.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>College Area</td>
<td>199.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Midway-Pacific Highway</td>
<td>196.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Barrio Logan</td>
<td>193.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mid-City: Kensington-Talmadge</td>
<td>191.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Old San Diego</td>
<td>188.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Linda Vista</td>
<td>187.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mid-City: Eastern Area</td>
<td>185.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mission Beach</td>
<td>179.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Southeastern: Encanto Neighborhoods</td>
<td>171.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Otay Mesa-Nestor</td>
<td>164.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Clairemont Mesa</td>
<td>160.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Serra Mesa</td>
<td>144.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Mission Valley</td>
<td>140.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Skyline-Paradise Hills</td>
<td>138.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>135.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Carmel Mountain Ranch</td>
<td>132.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>La Jolla</td>
<td>132.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Navajo</td>
<td>131.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Kearny Mesa</td>
<td>127.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Peninsula</td>
<td>122.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Rancho Bernardo</td>
<td>114.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Mira Mesa</td>
<td>113.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Balboa Park</td>
<td>113.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Reserve</td>
<td>112.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Rancho Penasquitos</td>
<td>111.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Tierrasanta</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Scripps Miramar Ranch</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Mission Bay Park</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1-1: Updated Community Pedestrian Priority Model Points and Rankings (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Updated Ranking</th>
<th>Community Planning Area</th>
<th>Average PPM Points</th>
<th>Updated CPA Ranking Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Carmel Valley</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Torrey Pines</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Sabre Springs</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Miramar Ranch North</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>6 (80-100 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Los Penasquitos Canyon Preserve</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Torrey Highlands</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Tijuana River Valley</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>7 (55-75 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Via de la Vallee</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Torrey Hills (Sorrento Hills)</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Otay Mesa</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>NCFUA Subarea II</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>8 (35-45 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Pacific Highlands Ranch</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>San Pasqual</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Black Mountain Ranch</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Fairbanks Country Club</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>East Elliott</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Del Mar Mesa</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Rancho Encantada</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Introduction

Figure 1-2: Pedestrian Priority Model Community Ranking

Source: Alta Planning + Design (May 13, 2009)
2 Method
2. Method

Six key steps were followed in this improvement concept identification and prioritization process as outlined below:

1. The pedestrian route type is determined for all pedestrian routes in the community.
2. Study area roadways and intersections were ranked according to pedestrian priority factors, such as pedestrian demand, detractors, and proximity to public facilities.
3. Pedestrian improvement focus areas were developed by assembling the highest ranking roadways and intersections within the study area into cohesive units with similar urban characteristics;
4. Field reviews were conducted in the focus areas to identify pedestrian issues.
5. The locations of pedestrian improvement concepts were ranked by roadway and intersection priority score, and all locations of improvement concepts ranking above 12 points were defined as the High-Priority Pedestrian Improvement Area locations (there were 68 in total).
6. Additional field reviews and traffic engineering assessments were conducted in the High-Priority Pedestrian Improvement Area locations to refine recommendations.

2.1 Pedestrian Route Type Development

All walkways in the City of San Diego fit into one of seven categories:

1. District: A district route includes sidewalks in the more intensive mixed use and concentrated areas of the city.
2. Corridor: A corridor sidewalk is associated with major arterials and linear corridors that provide for mixed uses with at least a moderate level of density.
3. Connector: A connector sidewalk is often along a lower density corridor with few connections to adjacent land uses.
4. Neighborhood: A neighborhood sidewalk is limited to areas of lower density and single use residential areas.
5. Ancillary Facilities: A variety of special use facilities that do not fit the above definitions can be classified as ancillary. These are often away from street edges.
6. Path: A path is a linear hard surface that is not connected to the edge of a street.
7. Trail: A trail is unpaved and is not a focus of the Pedestrian Master Plan.

Volume 1 of the Pedestrian Master Plan goes into great detail on the characteristics of each route type. Using these characteristics, all of the pedestrian routes in each of the seven Phases 2&3 communities were classified into one of the seven Route Types. Route Types were initially developed using the Pedestrian Model and refinements were made based on field review of existing conditions, knowledge of existing land uses and other factors. Route types for each of the communities can be found in the community’s section found later in this plan.
2.2 Ranking Roadways and Intersections by Pedestrian Priority

A ranking process was developed and applied to all roadways and intersections within the study area using input factors associated with pedestrian use and need. The resulting pedestrian priority ranking for each roadway and intersection was ultimately utilized to define locations of high-priority pedestrian improvement areas.

The ranking process used four key inputs related to pedestrian use and need – Pedestrian Demand (which is comprised of Pedestrian Attractors and Pedestrian Generators), Pedestrian Detractors, Route Type, and Proximity to Public Facilities. Point values associated with each of the four input factors are summed and utilized to rank all study area roadway segments and intersections.

The following discussion summarizes the rationale for including each of the input factors in the ranking process and their respective point systems.

**Pedestrian Demand Model (Attractors + Generators)**

A GIS raster-based Pedestrian Demand Model was developed by summing the Attractor Model raster and the Generator Model raster values. Pedestrian Demand Model values were classified into four categories and assigned points based upon their relative pedestrian demand ranking (very high = 4, high = 3, medium = 2, and low = 1).

All community roadways and intersections were then intersected with the Pedestrian Demand Model raster, resulting in all roadway segments and intersections having a pedestrian demand point value.

**Pedestrian Detractor Model**

The GIS raster-based Pedestrian Detractor Model values are classified into five categories and locations are assigned points based upon relative pedestrian detractor ranking (very high = 5, high = 4, medium = 3, low = 2, very low = 1). All community roadways and intersections are then intersected with the Pedestrian Detractor Model raster, resulting in roadway segments and intersections being assigned a pedestrian detractor point value.

**Route Types**

Route types were assigned point values with District Routes ranking highest and Neighborhood Routes ranking lowest (District = 4, Corridor = 3, Connector = 2, Neighborhood = 1). Intersections were assigned point values according to the route type classifications of the intersecting streets, with higher values assigned to the District and Corridor streets.

**Public Facilities**

Proximity of a roadway segment or intersection to schools, parks, and libraries was used as an input factor. Three classes of proximity and point values were developed: roadways and intersections within one-eighth of mile were assigned a point value of 2, within one-eighth to one-quarter mile received a point value of 1, and greater than one-quarter mile received a point value of 0.
2. Method

2.3 Defining Project Focus Areas

Project focus areas consisting of high ranking roadways and intersections were identified to more narrowly define locations for field review and for developing pedestrian improvement concepts. Project focus areas were developed using the roadway and intersection ranking score, as described in the previous section, and similarities in urban environment characteristics.

Project focus areas are defined by the highest ranking roadways and intersections in the study area. Standard deviations from the mean ranking score were used as the basis for identifying three tiers of roadways and intersections. Tier 1 locations are defined by ranking scores 2 standard deviations above the mean, Tier 2 locations fall between 1.5 and 2 standard deviations of the mean score, and Tier 3 locations are defined by scores falling between 1 and 1.5 standard deviations of the mean.

Roadway segments in the first two tiers – with the exception of short segments in residential areas – were then assembled into separate project focus areas based upon similarities in urban environment types. Urban environment types include Freeway Conflict areas, Urban Villages, School-Park areas, Commercial areas and Residential areas, and are further described below:

- **Freeway Conflict Focus Areas** are locations where pedestrians must cross at freeway on-off ramps or walk along freeway overpasses or underpasses.
- **Urban Village Focus Areas** are locations with a dense street network, a variety of land uses, and considerable existing pedestrian activity.
- **School-Park Focus Areas** are locations where accessibility, safety and walkability related to schools and parks need special consideration.
- **Commercial Focus Areas** are locations along roadways providing access to significant amounts of commercial land uses.
- **Residential Focus Areas** are primarily residential roadways with higher traffic volumes and speeds than local streets.

2.4 Developing Pedestrian Improvement Concepts

Upon identification of focus areas, 50-foot scale base maps were prepared with the City’s high resolution aerial photography and utilized with field trips by a consultant traffic engineer to document potential pedestrian improvements. A key objective was to document opportunities for improvements to the pedestrian environment that would enhance safety, accessibility, walkability and connectivity.

A vast majority of the improvement concepts were developed at intersection locations, where the likelihood of pedestrian interaction with the automobile is the highest. If the consultant team traffic engineer developed improvement concept recommendations resulting in changes to the existing cross-section over an area encompassing many intersections and roadway segments (such as recommending raised medians), the improvement concept was considered a single concept location for the purposes of the location rankings discussed in Step 5. If such an improvement concept spanned multiple focus areas, then the change in focus area type was used to separate the larger improvement area into smaller areas for the purposes of the rankings.
2.5 Ranking Pedestrian Improvement Concept Locations

Locations were ranked in order from the highest to lowest score to support identification of high-priority improvement concept locations. Every intersection was assigned a ranking score through the process described in Section 1. Improvement concept locations for corridors were assigned a ranking score using the system described in Section 1, weighting the point values by the length of each respective segment, and then averaging. Those intersection and corridor improvement locations scoring 12.5 out of 15 points were considered as High-Priority Improvement Concept locations.

In the case where corridor or intersection recommendations have been generated based upon other city planning efforts, such as the Hillcrest Mobility Study, these recommendations were carried forward in this Plan. High-Priority Improvement Concept locations defined as corridors according to the convention in step 4 were segmented into smaller units on the basis of their focus area boundaries.

2.6 Refining Recommendations for High-Priority Improvement Areas

The final stage of this process involved refining the High-Priority Pedestrian Improvement Concepts and developing Pedestrian Improvement Area Concept Sheets. For each improvement area, an area description is provided, along with a summary of improvement recommendations and planning level cost estimates using recent unit cost estimates for the area.

The process for refining recommendations for high-priority Improvement Areas was multi-step and involved not only physical review of the existing conditions, but also input from the community, review of accident history and research of ongoing planning efforts within these planning areas.

Sixty-eight high-priority improvement concepts were developed for the seven Phases 2 & 3 communities. For each Improvement Area, recommendations and cost estimates are provided along with a conceptual sketch of the recommendations. The Improvement Area details are provided in community sections later in this plan.

The City of San Diego was updating the comprehensive pedestrian crossing policy at the time this document was prepared. The policy will be used to assess the implementation of all new marked crosswalks and/or enhanced crosswalks City-wide. This plan includes multiple recommendations to evaluate the feasibility of implementing new marked crosswalks and/or enhanced crosswalks. As part of the feasibility assessment, all potential marked crosswalk locations shall be evaluated based on the updated city policy.

Enhanced marked crosswalks improve the visibility of crossings and pedestrians beyond the typical signage and striping on the pavement. Several additional features such as flashing beacons, in-pavement flashers, Hawk signals and overhead signage, curb extensions and median refuges could be added to a marked crosswalk to meet the goal of providing an enhanced marked crosswalk. The Pedestrian Master Plan includes recommendations to assess the feasibility of implementing enhanced marked crosswalks. A detailed assessment of the sites should be conducted to determine the features most appropriate for each location. This assessment should be based on the updated city policy.
2. Method

2.7 Community Input Process

The Community Input Process included multiple involvement opportunities and avenues. For the Barrio Logan and Uptown communities, outreach and community input was incorporated into their community plan update processes.

- **Project Website Survey**: An online survey was posted on the project website where participants could enter information regarding key areas of concern, recommendations and other comments. The survey also asked questions about walking routes, frequency of walking trips and purpose of walking trips in order to gain an understanding of the community responding to this survey.

- **Project Website Information**: Material from workshops, meetings and activities was posted on the City’s website including walk audit forms that could be completed and submitted by community members to identify pedestrian issues.

- **Community Group Presentations**: Presentations were made by the project team to community planning groups at the project initiation as well as project wrap up.

- **Open House Meetings**: Workshops were conducted in Fall 2008 for the communities of City Heights, Greater Golden Hill and Greater North Park, Normal Heights, and Southeastern San Diego. For the Barrio Logan and Uptown communities, outreach was folded into mobility planning workshops scheduled for their community plan update processes.

In addition to the formal meetings and presentations listed above, the project team received numerous emails and phone calls pertaining to the project. Not all community pedestrian issues are addressed in the Pedestrian Master Plan. Many requests by the community were more appropriately addressed by other departments within the City of San Diego. Street Division addresses street and street lighting maintenance issues. Similarly, Transportation Engineering Operations Division evaluates needs for crosswalks and traffic signals, as well as signal timing issues. City staff was on-hand at all community meetings to help determine the appropriate course of action for participants whose concerns either fell outside of the Pedestrian Master Plan focus areas or would be better addressed through a different department.

Following the completion of this document, the City will present to the communities the ranking of Improvement Areas during regularly scheduled Community Planning Group Meetings. The intent of the presentations to the Community Planning Groups is to receive input on the rankings and document comments received during the presentation. The comments received and associated responses will be summarized in a technical memorandum and will be provided as an attachment to the final Pedestrian Master Plan Phases 2&3 Volume 2 document.
2.8 Community Pedestrian Plans

This remainder of this document contains sections for each of the seven Phases 2&3 communities: Barrio Logan, City Heights, Greater Golden Hill, Greater North Park, Normal Heights, Southeastern San Diego and Uptown. Each community’s section includes figures showing the pedestrian routes, focus areas, potential pedestrian environment improvement measures, high-priority improvement locations, and pedestrian improvement concept sheets for the highest-priority locations.

Each improvement concept sheet includes a description, a summary of issues at the location, improvement recommendations, and a planning-level cost estimate based on unit costs for typical improvements.
3. Greater North Park

3.1 Area Description
Greater North Park is located in the central part of the City of San Diego, along the southern rim of Mission Valley south towards Balboa Park, and bordered by City Heights to the east and Uptown to the west.

The community is primarily residential in nature, with a mix of single-family residences along local streets, and multi-family residential along and adjacent to key commercial corridors. These commercial corridors bisect the community, primarily University Avenue, El Cajon Boulevard, and Adams Avenue in an east-west alignment, and 30th Street in a north-south alignment. Commercial uses are generally pedestrian-oriented, with the occasional exception.

Owing to its origins as one of Downtown San Diego’s original “streetcar suburbs,” the streets are largely level in slope, primarily designed in a grid pattern, except where canyonland topography and subsequent slope prevents it, and feature mature planted trees in both the public right-of-way and private properties. Sidewalks are typically in place, and their conditions vary.

3.2 Inventory of Missing Sidewalks and Curb Ramps
As part of this project, a visual inspection of field conditions was conducted to inventory missing sidewalks, missing curb ramps, and to identify the presence of sidewalk obstructions within the study areas on any pedestrian route designated above “neighborhood” in the community. In addition, in 2011, SANDAG developed a regional sidewalk inventory using aerial photography, and provided mapping files for existing sidewalks. Missing sidewalks and curb ramps are illustrated in Figure NP-1.
Figure NP-1: Greater North Park Missing Sidewalks and Curb Ramps
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3. Greater North Park

3.3 Route Types

All roadways within the Greater North Park Area were defined based on pedestrian functionality as defined in the Pedestrian Master Plan Volume I Framework Document. There are four key route types included in the Greater North Park Area: District, Corridor, Connector, and Neighborhood.

- **District**: A district route includes sidewalks in the more intensive mixed use and concentrated areas of the city.
- **Corridor**: A corridor sidewalk is associated with major arterials and linear corridors with a moderate level of density.
- **Connector**: A connector sidewalk is often along a lower density corridor with few connections to adjacent land uses.
- **Neighborhood**: A neighborhood sidewalk is limited to areas of lower density and single use residential areas.

Figure NP-2 illustrates the Route Type Classifications defined within the Greater North Park Community.
Figure NP-2: Greater North Park Route Types and Land Uses
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3.4 Focus Areas

Focus Areas narrow down the locations within each community studied in the Master Plan. The locations that are not within the Focus Areas are located in low density residential areas, industrial areas, or areas with lower demand for pedestrian activity. The Pedestrian Priority Model (PPM) was used to calculate a priority score for all routes within the Greater North Park community. Point values associated with each of the five key priority factors, as defined in the Phase I Framework Document, were summed to provide an overall priority score.

Once the routes had an associated score, the mean and standard deviation was calculated specific for the Phases 2 and 3 communities, which was used to determine the Tier 1 (highest ranking) and Tier 2 (second highest ranking) routes. Tier 1 and Tier 2 routes were used to identify the focus areas.

Focus areas were refined as a result of the existing conditions needs assessment and input from the community. Figure NP-3 illustrates the Greater North Park Focus Areas.

Table NP-1 provides the potential pedestrian environment improvement measures for each focus area.
Figure NP-3: Greater North Park Focus Areas
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### Table NP-1: Greater North Park Focus Areas & Potential Pedestrian Environment Improvement Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Focus Area Type</th>
<th>Route Type</th>
<th>Council District</th>
<th>Potential Pedestrian Environment Improvement Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1          | El Cajon Boulevard          | Park Boulevard to I-805 SB Ramps | Commercial      | Corridor   | District 3      | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• Provide pedestrian refuges  
• Provide traffic calming  
• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions  
• Minimize pedestrian conflict from free right turning vehicles through intersection reconfiguration and/or treatments |
| 2          | University Avenue           | Park Boulevard to Kansas Street | Commercial      | Corridor   | District 3      | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| 3          | 30th Street                 | Polk Street to Gunn Street | Urban Village   | District and Corridor | District 3 | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• Enhanced audible/visual crosswalk signals  
• High visibility crossing treatments  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| 4          | University Avenue           | Illinois Street to I-805 SB Ramps | Commercial      | District and Corridor | District 3 | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections  
• Enhanced audible/visual crosswalk signals  
• High visibility crossing treatments  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| 5          | Park Boulevard               | Meade Avenue to Lincoln Avenue | Commercial      | Corridor   | District 3      | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• Provide pedestrian refuges  
• Provide traffic calming  
• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections  
• High visibility crossing treatments  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
### Table NP-1: Greater North Park Focus Areas & Potential Pedestrian Environment Improvement Measures (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Focus Area Type</th>
<th>Route Type</th>
<th>Council District</th>
<th>Potential Pedestrian Environment Improvement Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6          | Park Boulevard   | Lincoln Avenue to Robinson Avenue | Urban Village | Corridor   | District 3       | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections  
• Increase crossing safety  
• Mid-City Rapid Bus EIR  
• Enhanced audible/visual crosswalk signals  
• High visibility crossing treatments  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions |
| 7          | Park Boulevard   | Robinson Avenue to Upas Street | Residential     | Corridor   | District 3       | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• Provide traffic calming  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions  
• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections |
| 8          | Florida Street   | Polk Avenue to Upas Street    | Residential     | Connector  | District 3       | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• Provide pedestrian refuges  
• Provide traffic calming  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions  
• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections |
| 9          | Texas Street     | Meade Avenue to Wightman Street | Residential     | Connector  | District 3       | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions  
• Provide pedestrian refuges  
• Provide traffic calming  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions  
• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections |
### 3. Greater North Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Focus Area Type</th>
<th>Route Type</th>
<th>Council District</th>
<th>Potential Pedestrian Environment Improvement Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>30th St.</td>
<td>Adams Ave. to Polk Ave.</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>• Reduced crossing distances at intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide pedestrian refuges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide traffic calming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>30th St.</td>
<td>Gunn St. to Dwight St.</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>• Reduced crossing distances at intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide pedestrian refuges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide traffic calming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>30th St.</td>
<td>Dwight St. to Capps St.</td>
<td>School/Park</td>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>• Reduced crossing distances at intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide pedestrian refuges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide traffic calming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>30th St.</td>
<td>Capps St. to Upas St.</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>• Reduced crossing distances at intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide pedestrian refuges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide traffic calming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5 Improvement Areas

Locations within the focus areas were ranked in order to identify the highest-priority locations in the Greater North Park Community for development of improvement sheets.

Improvements are divided into either intersection improvements or corridor improvements. Intersection improvements focus on a single intersection. Corridor improvements focus on improvements either along a roadway or through a series of intersections.

For the Greater North Park Community, fourteen Improvement Areas were defined, which are shown in Figure NP-4 and summarized in Table NP-2.

Recommendations for each improvement area are described on the Improvement Concept Sheets that follow.
High-Priority Project Locations Across Phases 2 and 3 Study Area

Figure NP-4: Greater North Park High-Priority Improvement Area Locations
### Table NP-2: Greater North Park High-Priority Improvement Area Locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Improvement Area</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NP1</td>
<td>Park Blvd and University Avenue</td>
<td>Crosswalk upgrades and other elements consistent with Mid-City Rapid Bus and University Avenue Mobility Plan projects</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP2</td>
<td>Park Blvd and El Cajon Blvd</td>
<td>Crosswalk improvements, pedestrian refuge island, curb extension, signal improvements</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP3</td>
<td>Florida Street and El Cajon Blvd</td>
<td>Curb extensions, crosswalk improvements</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP4</td>
<td>Utah Street and El Cajon Blvd</td>
<td>Crosswalk and signal improvements</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP5</td>
<td>30th Street and El Cajon Blvd</td>
<td>Implement Mid-City Rapid Bus improvements</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP6</td>
<td>Texas Street and El Cajon Blvd</td>
<td>Implement Mid-City Rapid Bus improvements, signal improvements</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP7</td>
<td>Park Blvd and Essex St</td>
<td>Feasibility study of extending curb at existing crosswalk</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP8</td>
<td>Oregon St and El Cajon Blvd</td>
<td>Curb extensions, crosswalk improvements, implement Mid-City Rapid Bus improvements</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP9</td>
<td>30th St and North Park Way</td>
<td>Crosswalk improvements, signal improvements</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP10</td>
<td>University Ave (Kansas St - 31st St)</td>
<td>Implement University Avenue Mobility Plan, crosswalk improvements, striping enhancements</td>
<td>4C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP11</td>
<td>30th St (Polk Ave - Gunn St)</td>
<td>Raised median, streetscape improvements, intersection improvements, roadway enhancements</td>
<td>15C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP12</td>
<td>University Ave (Park Blvd - Kansas St)</td>
<td>Implement University Avenue Mobility Plan, lighting upgrades, crosswalk improvements, striping enhancements</td>
<td>10C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP13</td>
<td>University Ave (31st St - Boundary St)</td>
<td>Implement University Avenue Mobility Plan</td>
<td>9C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These recommendations are developed at a planning level only, and implementation should consider the specific conditions of the project area, including drainage, transit facilities, and other concerns as appropriate.
Description and Issues

This high-priority intersection is an east-west gateway between the North Park and Hillcrest neighborhoods. Park Boulevard is a Corridor route type and University Avenue is a Corridor route type east of the intersection and a District route type west of the intersection. Pedestrian activity levels are partially due to the large senior housing complex located on three corners of the intersection; and the convergence of the MTS bus routes 1, 7, 10, and 11. The improvement area is a signalized intersection. Both Park Boulevard and University Avenue are four-lane streets with center left-turn lanes and raised medians on the north, west, and south intersection legs. Current pedestrian improvements include advance limit lines at crosswalks at all four legs of the intersection and a median extension to the crosswalk on the south leg of the intersection on Park Boulevard. One-way alleys on the east intersection leg adjacent to University Avenue connect the Georgia Street bridge to Park Boulevard. One utility box is found within the public right-of-way on the southeast corner of the intersection. Posted speed limits are 25 mph along University Avenue and 35 mph along Park Boulevard. University Avenue average daily vehicle trips (ADTs) are 21,700 west of the intersection and 19,700 east of the intersection. Park Boulevard ADTs are 14,600 north of the intersection and 14,400 south of the intersection. Thirteen pedestrian crashes were reported here between 1998 and 2007.

Recommended Improvements

A Implement the Mid-City Rapid Bus Project.
B Implement the University Avenue Mobility Plan (UAMP) final preferred concept.

Cost Estimate: None in addition to Mid City Rapid and UAMP costs

*These recommendations are developed at a planning level only, and implementation should consider the specific conditions of the project area, including drainage, transit facilities, and other concerns as appropriate.*
Description and Issues

This priority improvement area is at a complex intersection of three major arterial streets, El Cajon Boulevard, Normal Street, and Park Boulevard. Park Boulevard has two through southbound travel lanes and a left turning lane. Northbound, Park Boulevard has two through lanes and left-and right-turning lanes. El Cajon Boulevard has two travel lanes westbound turning onto Normal Street and one turning lane onto Park Boulevard. Northbound Normal Street has two lanes for left-turning traffic onto Park Boulevard and two lanes that allow motorists to continue onto El Cajon Boulevard. Southbound Normal Street has three lanes which continue onto Washington Street toward SR-163.

Recommended Improvements

- Install pedestrian refuge.
- Pending an update to City policy, upgrade existing transverse yellow crosswalks to high-visibility yellow crosswalks with advanced limit lines.

Cost Estimate: $60,000 - $100,000
Description and Issues
This intersection improvement is located at the intersection of Florida Street, a pedestrian Connector, and El Cajon Boulevard, a pedestrian Corridor. Kindred Hospital occupies the northwest corner of the intersection. Small retail and other commercial uses cover the remainder of the area. The intersection is signalized with push-buttons and pedestrian signal heads. Utility boxes are found in the public right-of-way on the southwest and northeast intersection corners. Florida Street is a two-lane, primarily residential, street with a posted speed limit of 25 mph and an average of 3,700 daily vehicle trips. El Cajon Boulevard has an average of 22,700 daily vehicle trips west of the intersection and 24,000 daily vehicle trips east of the intersection. It has six travel lanes with left-turn pockets and landscaped medians and a posted speed limit of 35 mph. El Cajon Boulevard serves as a major mid-city corridor connecting the City Heights, University Heights, and North Park neighborhoods.

Recommended Improvements

A. Study the feasibility of curb extensions into El Cajon Boulevard on all four corners of the intersection, including an analysis of crowning issues.

B. Pending an update to City policy, upgrade existing crosswalks to high visibility crosswalks with advanced limit lines on all four intersection legs.

C. If conditions warrant, consider upgrading existing pedestrian signal heads to pushbutton-integrated accessible pedestrian signals that provide an audible and vibrotactile indication of the WALK signal, and consider adding a Leading Pedestrian Interval (LPI) to the WALK phase at all intersection legs.

D. Implement the Mid-City Rapid Bus final preferred concept including, but not limited to the following concepts:
   - Study the feasibility of a bus/ped bulb out curb extensions, including an analysis of crowning issues.
   - Add advance limit lines 4' from the crosswalk.

Cost Estimate: $200,000 - $250,000

*These recommendations are developed at a planning level only, and implementation should consider the specific conditions of the project area, including drainage, transit facilities, and other concerns as appropriate.*
Description and Issues

This high-priority improvement area is a signalized intersection located in a commercial area within northern North Park. Utah Street is a two-lane collector roadway with Class II bike lanes, a 25 mph posted speed limit, and approximately 2,900 average daily vehicle trips (ADTs) north of the intersection and 3,900 ADTs south of the intersection. El Cajon Boulevard is a six-lane major arterial with a 35 mph posted speed limit west of the intersection and a 30 mph posted speed limit east of the intersection with 35,200 average daily vehicle trips (ADTs). Utah Street is a pedestrian Connector route type and El Cajon Boulevard is a Corridor route type west of the intersection and a District route type east of the intersection. Bus stops with benches on the northwest and southwest corners of the intersection provide access to MTS local bus routes 1, 6, and 15. A utility box is located within the public right-of-way on the southeast corner of the intersection.

Recommended Improvements

- Consider upgrading existing audible pedestrian signals to pushbutton-integrated accessible pedestrian signals that provide an audible and vibrotactile indication of the WALK signal.
- Pending an update to City policy, upgrade existing crosswalks to high visibility crosswalks with advanced limit lines on all four intersection legs.

Cost Estimate: $10,000 - $15,000
Improvement Area NP5 | 30th Street and El Cajon Boulevard (North Park)

Description and Issues

This intersection improvement is located at the signalized intersection of two pedestrian Corridors along 30th Street and El Cajon Boulevard. El Cajon Boulevard is a 6-lane street with left-turn pockets and landscaped medians. It has a posted speed limit of 30 mph and an average of 35,200 daily vehicle trips west of the intersection and 36,300 east of the intersection. 30th Street experiences 13,000 daily trips north of the intersection and 12,400 south of the intersection and a posted speed limit of 25 mph. 30th Street is also lower capacity with two-lanes and a center turn lane. In addition to vehicular activity, the area experiences transit and pedestrian activity. The intersection is about 1.3 miles from the Boulevard Transit Plaza and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) is planned for El Cajon Boulevard. Both El Cajon Boulevard and 30th Street are predominately lined with commercial and retail land uses. At this intersection, commercial uses are found on all four corners including a mixed-use building with commercial and multifamily housing located on the northwest corner. A utility box is located in the public right-of-way on the southwest corner of the intersection. Eight pedestrian-involved collisions were reported at this location between 1998 and 2007. The Mid-City Rapid Bus Project has planned several intersection improvements.

Recommended Improvements

(A) Implement the Mid-City Rapid Bus concept at this intersection, including the following elements:
   - A bus/ped bulb out curb extension on the northwest and southeast corners of the intersection.
   - Queue jumping pockets on El Cajon Boulevard

(B) Install landscaping enhancements where feasible.

(C) Pending an update to City policy, upgrade existing crosswalks to high visibility crosswalks with advanced limit lines on all four intersection legs.

Cost Estimate: ($5,000 - $10,000 for landscaping, none for Mid City Rapid Bus Improvements)

These recommendations are developed at a planning level only, and implementation should consider the specific conditions of the project area, including drainage, transit facilities, and other concerns as appropriate.
Description and Issues

This intersection improvement area is located at the intersection of Texas Street, a pedestrian Connector, and El Cajon Boulevard, a pedestrian Corridor. Both of these roadways are lined with commercial land uses. At this intersection, gas stations occupy the northwest and northeast corners which generate driveway traffic. The intersection is signalized with push-button pedestrian signals. A utility box is located in the public right-of-way on the southwest corner. Texas Street is a four-lane street with a posted speed limit of 35 mph north of the intersection with an average of 19,600 daily vehicle trips. South of the intersection, it has a 30 mph post speed limit and receives an average of 12,000 daily vehicle trips. El Cajon Boulevard is busier with an average of 24,000 daily vehicle trips west of the intersection and 35,200 daily vehicle trips east of the intersection. It has six travel lanes with left-turn pockets and landscaped medians and a posted speed limit of 35 mph. This active intersection is located along the boundary of the University Heights and North Park neighborhoods of the North Park community planning area.

Recommended Improvements

A) Implement the Mid-City Rapid Bus final preferred concept at this location, including the following elements:
   - A bus/ped bulb out curb extension on the northwest and southeast corners of the intersection.
   - Queue jumping pockets on El Cajon Boulevard.

B) Pending an update to City policy, upgrade existing crosswalks to high visibility crosswalks with advanced limit lines on all four intersection legs.

Cost Estimate: $15,000 - $20,000
Description and Issues

This improvement area is located in a mixed retail and residential area along the border of North Park and Uptown. The area is an unsignalized T-intersection of Park Boulevard, a Corridor route type, and Essex Street, a Residential route type. Park Boulevard is a four-lane street with a 35 mph posted speed limit and 14,400 average daily vehicle trips (ADTs). Essex Street is a two-way local street with no lane delineation. Recent pedestrian improvements include a high visibility crosswalk, pedestrian warning signage, and a raised median are located on the north intersection leg. MTS bus stops are located nearby toward the intersection of Park Boulevard and University Avenue. Five pedestrian crashes were reported at this location between 1998 and 2007. Pedestrian improvements would enhance walkability and connectivity.

Recommended Improvements

Extend the curb on the east side of Park Boulevard at the existing crosswalk. (This project is complete).

Cost Estimate: N/A
Description and Issues
This improvement area is located at the signalized intersection of a major commercial corridor and a residential street in northern North Park. North Park Community Park occupies the southeast corner and commercial land uses occupy the other three corners of the intersection. A utility box is located within the public right-of-way on the southwest corner. El Cajon Boulevard is a six-lane roadway with left-turn pockets and landscaped medians, serving frequent express and local bus traffic. MTS route 1, 6, and 15 buses stop at this intersection that is about a mile and a half west of the Boulevard Transit Plaza. The Mid-City Rapid Bus service is also planned for this corridor. The posted speed limit along El Cajon Boulevard is 35 mph with 25,200 average daily vehicle trips (ADTs). Oregon Street is a two-lane roadway with a striped right-turn lane on the north intersection leg. El Cajon Boulevard is categorized as a pedestrian Corridor and Oregon Street, a Residential route. Four pedestrian crashes were reported at this location between 1998 and 2007.

Recommended Improvements

A. Study the feasibility of curb extensions on all four corners of the intersection.
B. Pending an update to City policy, upgrade existing crosswalks to high visibility crosswalks with advanced limit lines on all four intersection legs.

Cost Estimate: $150,000 - $200,000

These recommendations are developed at a planning level only, and implementation should consider the specific conditions of the project area, including drainage, transit facilities, and other concerns as appropriate.
Description and Issues
This high-priority improvement is a signalized intersection located in central North Park in a dense commercial area with high pedestrian activity levels. Both 30th Street and North Park Way are Corridor route types. 30th Street is a two-lane collector with a center left-turn lane, a 25 mph posted speed limit, and 13,000 average daily vehicle trips (ADTs) north of the intersection and 11,100 south of the intersection. North Park Way is a two-lane local street with a 25 mph posted speed limit and 7,500 ADTs. The northwest and southwest corners have utility boxes in the public right-of-way. Five pedestrian crashes were reported at this location between 1998 and 2007. One sheltered bus stop at the southwest corner of the intersection provides access to MTS local bus route 2. Recent new development includes a large parking structure at the intersection.

Recommended Improvements

A. Pending an update to City policy, upgrade existing crosswalks to high visibility crosswalks with advanced limit lines on all four intersection legs.

B. Upgrade existing pedestrian signal heads to countdown pedestrian signal heads.

Cost Estimate: $10,000 - $15,000
Description and Issues

This corridor improvement extends along University Avenue from Kansas Street to 31st Street. University Avenue is a 4 lane street, with two lanes running eastbound and two that run westbound between Kansas Street and 31st Street, with periodic left turn pockets; however, just east of 30th Street the westbound travel is reduced to one lane for the remainder of the improvement area. University Avenue has a 25 mph posted speed limit and average daily vehicle trips ranging from 19,700 between Kansas Street and 30th Street and 22,000 between 30th Street and 31st Street. The corridor is perhaps the most prominent pedestrian District in North Park attracting a significant amount of pedestrian activity due its dense mix of restaurants, small retail, and other commercial uses. The corridor hosts the North Park community sign as well as pedestrian-oriented design features such as pedestrian-scale lighting, street trees, and wide, red brick sidewalks. MTS local bus routes 2, 6, 7, and 10 stop along the corridor, connecting North Park to downtown, Old Town, and neighborhoods as far as La Mesa. The corridor contains sixteen utility boxes within the public right-of-way, many of which are artistically painted. Sixteen pedestrian-involved collisions were reported along the corridor between 1998 and 2007, including eight collisions at the intersection of University Avenue and 30th Street. The corridor is classified as a pedestrian District route. It is within the study area of the University Avenue Mobility Plan. The University Avenue Mobility Plan's recommendations for this pedestrian District include curb extensions, raised landscaped median, re-striped and new enhanced crosswalks, and transit only lanes. Refer to the University Avenue Mobility Plan for specific recommendations.

Recommended Improvements

A. Implement the University Avenue Mobility Plan, including, but not limited to the following concepts:

- Curb extensions on the northwest and northeast corners at Kansas Street intersection, southwest and southeast corners of the 29th Street intersection, all four corners of 30th and University, southwest corner of Ray Street intersection, northwest and northeast corners of Ohio Street intersection, and northwest and northeast corners of Illinois Street intersection.

- A new enhanced mid-block crosswalk at the east leg of the Kansas Street and University intersection and west leg of Ohio Street and University.

- A raised median along University Avenue.

- Remove of traffic signal at University and Ohio Street and replace with an enhanced pedestrian crossing.

B. Repaint crosswalks and stop bars as necessary.

Cost Estimate: $1,000,000 - $1,500,000

These recommendations are developed at a planning level only, and implementation should consider the specific conditions of the project area, including drainage, transit facilities, and other concerns as appropriate.
Improvement Area NP11 | 30th Street from Polk Avenue to Gunn Street (North Park)

**Description and Issues**

This corridor improvement extends along 30th Street from Polk Avenue to Gunn Street. 30th Street is a two-lane street with a center turn-lane between Polk Avenue and Lincoln Avenue, a two-lane street with painted medians and left-turn intersection pockets between Lincoln Avenue and University Avenue, and two-lane street with a center turn lane between University Avenue and Gunn Street. The posted speed limit along the corridor is 25 mph and average daily vehicle trips range from 11,100 to 13,000. The corridor is a part of the primary North Park commercial area. It attracts a significant amount of pedestrian activity due its dense mix of restaurants, small retail, other commercial, and residential uses. The corridor contains ten utility boxes within the public right-of-way. Twenty-seven pedestrian crashes were reported at this location between 1998 and 2007, including eight crashes at the active intersection of 30th Street and University Avenue. The corridor is classified as a pedestrian Corridor route.

**Recommended Improvements**

1. Study the feasibility of installing a raised median at all four legs of the 30th Street/Gunn Street intersection and the 30th Street/Polk Avenue intersection.
2. Install street trees and pedestrian-scale lighting where deficient along the corridor.
3. Refer to priority improvement area 5 for University and 30th intersection recommendations.
4. Study the feasibility of constructing either a median or bicycle lanes on 30th Street.

**Cost Estimate:** $225,000 - $300,000

*These recommendations are developed at a planning level only, and implementation should consider the specific conditions of the project area, including drainage, transit facilities, and other concerns as appropriate.*
Description and Issues

This corridor improvement area extends along University Avenue from Park Boulevard to Kansas Street. University Avenue is a four-lane street with left-turn pockets. Along this corridor, University Avenue has a 25 mph posted speed limit and approximately 20,000 average daily vehicle trips. The corridor is predominately commercial surrounded by multifamily and single family residential. Two senior housing and assisted living centers are located in close proximity to the corridor. The area lacks the pedestrian-oriented features found further east along University Avenue in the center of North Park. There is no sidewalk on the north side of University Avenue between Park Boulevard and Florida Street - pedestrians are prohibited along this segment and are encouraged to use the overcrossing.

The location is classified as a pedestrian District route west of Park Boulevard and a pedestrian Corridor east of Florida Street. The MTS local bus route 7 stops along the corridor. Fifty-seven pedestrian-involved collisions were reported along the corridor between 1998 and 2007, including 13 at the intersection of Park Boulevard and University Avenue. The corridor improvement area overlaps with the University Avenue Mobility Plan study area from the Florida Street/University Avenue intersection to the improvement corridor eastern terminus. The study’s recommendations for this corridor include curb extensions, raised landscaped median, re-striped and new enhanced crosswalks, and transit only lanes.

Recommended Improvements

A. Study the feasibility of implementing the University Avenue Mobility Plan, including, but not limited to the following concepts:
   - Curb extensions on the northwest and northeast corners at Alabama Street, Louisiana Street, Arizona Street, Oregon street, and Idaho street, all four corners at the Utah Street intersection, the southeast corner of 28th street intersection, the southwest and southwest corners of Granada street and 29th Street.
   - A new enhanced side-block crosswalk at the north and south legs of the Alabama Street intersection and Idaho Street intersection.
   - A new enhanced mid-block crosswalk at Alabama Street and at the west leg at Idaho Street.
   - Remove mid-block crosswalk at Pershing Street and University.
   - A raised median along University Avenue.
   - Install new traffic signals at Arnold Avenue and Oregon Street intersections.

B. Install pedestrian-scale lighting where deficient along the corridor to increase walkability and improve safety.

C. Repaint crosswalks and stop bars as necessary.

Cost Estimate: $2,000,000 - $3,000,000

These recommendations are developed at a planning level only, and implementation should consider the specific conditions of the project area, including drainage, transit facilities, and other concerns as appropriate.
Description and Issues

This corridor improvement extends along University Avenue from 31st Street to Boundary Street. University Avenue is a four-lane street with turn pockets at same intersections except for the segment between 30th Street and 32nd Street where the westbound lanes are reduced from two to one. University Avenue has a 25 mph posted speed limit and average daily vehicle trips ranging from 22,000 between 31st Street and 32nd Street and 30,200 between 32nd Street and Boundary Street. While vehicular traffic increases east 32nd Street, pedestrian activity decreases. West of 32nd Street land uses are primarily retail, restaurant, and small commercial uses; whereas east of 32nd Street through the I-805 on/off ramps, land uses are more auto-oriented. Accordingly, the corridor is classified as a pedestrian District route west of 32nd Street and a pedestrian Corridor east of 32nd Street. The MTS local bus route 7 stops along the corridor. The corridor contains five utility boxes within the public right-of-way. Eight pedestrian-involved collisions were reported along the corridor between 1998 and 2007. The corridor improvement area is within the University Avenue Mobility Plan study area. The study’s recommendations for this corridor include curb extensions into Iowa Street, raised landscaped median, re-striped and new enhanced crosswalks, and transit only lanes. Refer to the University Avenue Mobility Plan for specific recommendations.

Recommended Improvements

Implement the University Avenue Mobility Plan, including, but not limited to the following concepts:

- Curb extensions on the northwest and northeast corners at the Iowa Street intersection.
- A new enhanced mid-block crosswalk at the east leg of the Iowa Street, University intersection and Herman Avenue.
- A raised median along University Avenue.

Cost Estimate: None in addition to University Avenue Mobility Plan

These recommendations are developed at a planning level only, and implementation should consider the specific conditions of the project area, including drainage, transit facilities, and other concerns as appropriate.
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4 City Heights
4. City Heights

4.1 Area Description
The community of City Heights is located in the eastern-central part of the City of San Diego, along the southern rim of Mission Valley, and is bordered by the College area and Eastern area to the east, Greater North Park to the west, and State Route 94 to the south.

The community is primarily residential in nature, with a mix of single-family residences along local streets, and multi-family residential along and adjacent to key commercial corridors. These commercial corridors bisect the community, primarily University Avenue and El Cajon Boulevard in east-west alignments, and Fairmount and Euclid Avenues in north-south alignments. Commercial uses are a mix of vehicular and pedestrian-oriented types, and activity on the streets is significant.

The streets are largely level in slope, primarily laid out in a grid pattern, except where canyonland topography and subsequent slope prevents it, and feature mature planted trees in both the public right-of-way and private properties, although not at the levels of several other communities within San Diego. Sidewalks are typically in place, and their conditions vary.

4.2 Inventory of Missing Sidewalks and Curb Ramps
A visual inspection of field conditions was conducted to inventory missing sidewalks, missing curb ramps, and to identify the presence of sidewalk obstructions within the study areas and on any pedestrian route designated above “neighborhood” in the community. In addition, the City of San Diego and SANDAG provided detailed information regarding existing curb ramps and missing sidewalks. GIS files for existing sidewalks and curb ramps were provided by SANDAG for inclusion in the base mapping efforts.

Missing sidewalks and curb ramps from this exercise are illustrated in Figure CH-1.
Figure CH-1: City Heights Missing Sidewalks and Curb Ramps

City Heights Study Area and Missing Sidewalks

- Alta Sidewalk Inventory (2009)
- Roadways Inventoried (2009)
- SANDAG Sidewalk Inventory (2011)
- SANDAG Inventory Not Verified

- Parks
- Schools
- Study Focus Area
4.3 Route Types

All roadways within City Heights were defined based on pedestrian functionality as defined in the Phase I Framework Document. There are four key route types included in City Heights: District, Corridor, Connector and Neighborhood. Figure CH-2 illustrates the Route Type Classifications defined within the City Heights Community.

- **District**: A district route includes sidewalks in the more intensive mixed use and concentrated areas of the city.

- **Corridor**: A corridor sidewalk is associated with major arterials and linear corridors with a moderate level of density.

- **Connector**: A connector sidewalk is often along a lower density corridor with few connections to adjacent land uses.

- **Neighborhood**: A neighborhood sidewalk is limited to areas of lower density and single use residential areas.
Figure CH-2: City Heights Route Types and Land Uses

City Heights Route Types and Land Uses
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- PARKS AND RECREATION
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Source: Alta Planning + Design
4.4 Focus Areas

Focus Areas narrow down to the locations within each community studied in the Master Plan. The locations that are not within the Focus Areas are located in low density residential areas, industrial areas, or areas with lower demand for pedestrian activity. The Pedestrian Priority Model (PPM) was used to calculate a priority score for all routes within the City Heights community. Point values associated with each of the five key priority factors, as defined in the Phase I Framework Document, were summed to provide an overall priority score. Once the routes had an associated score, the mean and standard deviation was calculated specific for the City Heights community, which was used to determine the Tier 1 (highest ranking) and Tier 2 (second highest ranking) routes. Tier 1 and Tier 2 routes were included in the Focus Area. Focus areas were refined as a result of the existing conditions needs assessment and input from the community. Figure CH-3 illustrates the City Heights Area routes.
Figure CH-3: City Heights Focus Areas

City Heights Focus Areas

[Map of City Heights Focus Areas with numbered areas and markers for various types of focus areas.]

Project Focus Area Types
- Freeway Conflict Focus Area
- Urban Village Focus Area
- School Park Focus Area
- Commercial Focus Area
- Residential Focus Area

Project Focus Area Number (Keyed to Table 4)

April 5, 2010
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Focus Area Type</th>
<th>Route Type</th>
<th>Council District</th>
<th>Potential Pedestrian Environment Improvement Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1          | El Cajon Boulevard | I-805 SB Ramps to I-805 NB Ramps | Freeway Conflict | Corridor | District 3 and District 9 | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions  
• Minimize pedestrian conflict from free right turning vehicles through intersection reconfiguration and/or treatments |
| 2          | El Cajon Boulevard | 33rd Street to Cherokee Avenue | Commercial | Corridor | District 3 and District 9 | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• High visibility crossing treatments  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions |
| 3          | El Cajon Boulevard | Cherokee Avenue to 39th Street | School/Park | Corridor and Connector | District 3 and District 9 | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• High visibility crossing treatments  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions  
• Provide pedestrian refuges  
• Provide traffic calming  
• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections |
| 4          | El Cajon Boulevard | I-15 SB Ramps to I-15 NB Ramps | Freeway Conflict | Corridor and Connector | District 3 and District 9 | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• High visibility crossing treatments  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions |
| 5          | El Cajon Boulevard | Central Avenue to Van Dyke Avenue | Commercial | Corridor | District 9 | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• High visibility crossing treatments  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Focus Area Type</th>
<th>Route Type</th>
<th>Council District</th>
<th>Potential Pedestrian Environment Improvement Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6          | El Cajon Boulevard    | 44th Street to 54th Street   | Commercial      | Corridor   | District 9       | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections     
|            |                       |                              |                 |            |                  | • High visibility crossing treatments               
|            |                       |                              |                 |            |                  | • Provide pedestrian refinements                   
|            |                       |                              |                 |            |                  | • Provide traffic calming                          
|            |                       |                              |                 |            |                  | • Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections 
|            |                       |                              |                 |            |                  | • Improved ADA/accessibility conditions            |
| 7          | Orange Avenue         | Swift Avenue to Cherokee Avenue | Residential     | Connector | District 9       | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections     
|            |                       |                              |                 |            |                  | • High visibility crossing treatments               
|            |                       |                              |                 |            |                  | • Provide pedestrian refinements                   
|            |                       |                              |                 |            |                  | • Provide traffic calming                          
|            |                       |                              |                 |            |                  | • Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections 
|            |                       |                              |                 |            |                  | • Improved ADA/accessibility conditions            |
| 8          | Orange Avenue         | Central Avenue to Van Dyke Avenue | Residential     | Connector | District 9       | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections     
|            |                       |                              |                 |            |                  | • High visibility crossing treatments               
|            |                       |                              |                 |            |                  | • Provide pedestrian refinements                   
|            |                       |                              |                 |            |                  | • Provide traffic calming                          
|            |                       |                              |                 |            |                  | • Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections 
|            |                       |                              |                 |            |                  | • High visibility crossing treatments               
|            |                       |                              |                 |            |                  | • Improved ADA/accessibility conditions            |
| 9          | 52nd Street           | Trojan Avenue to Polk Avenue | School/Park     | Connector | District 9       | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections     
| Orange Avenue | 51st Street to 54th Street |                              |                 |            |                  | • High visibility crossing treatments               
|            |                       |                              |                 |            |                  | • Improved ADA/accessibility conditions            
|            |                       |                              |                 |            |                  | • Provide traffic calming                          |
### Table CH-1: City Heights Focus Areas & Potential Pedestrian Environment Improvement Measures (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Focus Area Type</th>
<th>Route Type</th>
<th>Council District</th>
<th>Potential Pedestrian Environment Improvement Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>University Avenue</td>
<td>I-805 SB Ramps to I-805 NB Ramps</td>
<td>Freeway Conflict</td>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>District 3 and District 9</td>
<td>• Reduced crossing distances at intersections  &lt;br&gt; • Improved ADA/accessibility conditions  &lt;br&gt; • Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections  &lt;br&gt; • Minimize pedestrian conflict from free right turning vehicles through intersection reconfiguration and/or treatments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>University Avenue</td>
<td>Swift Avenue to 40th Street</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>District 9</td>
<td>• Reduced crossing distances at intersections  &lt;br&gt; • Provide pedestrian refuges  &lt;br&gt; • Provide traffic calming  &lt;br&gt; • Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections  &lt;br&gt; • High visibility crossing treatments  &lt;br&gt; • Improved ADA/accessibility conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>University Avenue</td>
<td>I-15 SB Ramps to I-15 NB Ramps</td>
<td>Freeway Conflict</td>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>District 9</td>
<td>• Reduced crossing distances at intersections  &lt;br&gt; • Improved ADA/accessibility conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>University Avenue</td>
<td>Central Avenue to Van Dyke Avenue</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>District 9</td>
<td>• Reduced crossing distances at intersections  &lt;br&gt; • Provide pedestrian refuges  &lt;br&gt; • Provide traffic calming  &lt;br&gt; • Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections  &lt;br&gt; • High visibility crossing treatments  &lt;br&gt; • Improved ADA/accessibility conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table CH-1 City Heights Focus Areas & Potential Pedestrian Environment Improvement Measures (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Focus Area Type</th>
<th>Route Type</th>
<th>Council District</th>
<th>Potential Pedestrian Environment Improvement Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>University Avenue</td>
<td>44th Street to 54th Street</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>District 9</td>
<td>• Reduced crossing distances at intersections&lt;br&gt;• Provide pedestrian refuges&lt;br&gt;• Provide traffic calming&lt;br&gt;• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections&lt;br&gt;• High visibility crossing treatments&lt;br&gt;• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions&lt;br&gt;• Minimize pedestrian conflict from free right turning vehicles through intersection reconfiguration and/or treatments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>El Cajon Boulevard</td>
<td>Van Dyke Avenue to 44th Street</td>
<td>Urban Village</td>
<td>District, Corridor and Connector</td>
<td>District 9</td>
<td>• Reduced crossing distances at intersections&lt;br&gt;• High visibility crossing treatments&lt;br&gt;• Provide pedestrian refuges&lt;br&gt;• Provide traffic calming&lt;br&gt;• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections&lt;br&gt;• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions&lt;br&gt;• Enhanced audible/visual crosswalk signals&lt;br&gt;• High visibility crosswalks&lt;br&gt;• Walkways modified of utility obstructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orange Avenue</td>
<td>Van Dyke Avenue to Fairmount Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University Avenue</td>
<td>Van Dyke Avenue to 44th Street</td>
<td>Urban Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43rd Street</td>
<td>El Cajon Boulevard to Landis Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fairmount Avenue</td>
<td>El Cajon Boulevard to Landis Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table CH-1: City Heights Focus Areas & Potential Pedestrian Environment Improvement Measures (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Focus Area Type</th>
<th>Route Type</th>
<th>Council District</th>
<th>Potential Pedestrian Environment Improvement Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 16         | 43rd Street | Landis Street to Fairmount Avenue | School/Park | Corridor and Connector | District 9 | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• Shorten mid-block crossing distances  
• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions |
|            | Fairmount Avenue | Landis Street to Maple Street | School/Park | Corridor and Connector | District 9 | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions |
| 17         | Fairmount Avenue | Maple Street to Home Avenue | Residential | Connector | District 9 | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions |
| 18         | 54th Street | El Cajon Boulevard to University Avenue | Commercial | Connector | District 9 | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions |
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4.5 Improvement Areas

Overlaying the existing conditions, physical conditions assessment and community input, Improvement Areas were defined within the Focus Area for the City Heights Community. Improvement Areas are defined as either intersection improvements or corridor improvements. Intersection improvements focus on a single intersection or a group of intersections within a reasonable proximity of one another. Corridor improvements focus on improvements either along a roadway or through a series of intersections.

For the City Heights community, twenty-eight Improvement Areas were defined, which are illustrated in Figure CH-4 and summarized in Table CH-2. On the pages following the figure and table, recommendations for each Improvement Area are described in detail.
Figure CH-4: City Heights High-Priority Improvement Area Locations
### Table CH-2: City Heights High-Priority Improvement Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Improvement Area</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CH1</td>
<td>Fairmount Ave and El Cajon Blvd</td>
<td>Signal improvements, curb extensions, crosswalk improvements</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH2</td>
<td>Fairmount Ave and University Ave</td>
<td>Signal improvements, curb extensions, crosswalk improvements</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH3</td>
<td>University Ave at 43rd St</td>
<td>Curb extensions, crosswalk improvements</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH4</td>
<td>40th St and El Cajon Blvd</td>
<td>Implement Mid-City Rapid Bus improvements, signal improvements</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH5</td>
<td>43rd St and El Cajon Blvd</td>
<td>Implement Mid-City Rapid Bus improvements, signal improvements, median extension</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH6</td>
<td>Fairmount Ave and Orange Ave</td>
<td>Signal improvements, curb extensions, crosswalk improvements</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH7</td>
<td>Euclid Ave and University Ave</td>
<td>Signal improvements, curb extensions</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH8</td>
<td>35th St and El Cajon Blvd</td>
<td>Implement Mid-City Rapid Bus improvements, bus curb extensions, signal improvements</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH9</td>
<td>Euclid Ave and El Cajon Blvd</td>
<td>Signal improvements, crosswalk improvements</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH10</td>
<td>Wabash Ave and University Ave</td>
<td>Crosswalk improvements, signal improvements, median upgrade, signage enhancements</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH11</td>
<td>Swift Ave and University Ave</td>
<td>Signal improvements</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH12</td>
<td>52nd St and University Ave</td>
<td>Signal improvements, curb extensions, crosswalk improvements</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH13</td>
<td>Fairmount Ave and Redwood St/ Poplar St</td>
<td>Signal improvements, curb extensions, median upgrade, turn restrictions, crosswalk improvements</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Improvement Area</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Ranking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH14</td>
<td>36th St and El Cajon Blvd</td>
<td>Curb extensions, crosswalk improvements</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH15</td>
<td>Menlo Ave and El Cajon Blvd</td>
<td>Signal improvements, curb extensions, crosswalk improvements</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH16</td>
<td>41st St and University Ave</td>
<td>Signal improvements, curb extensions, crosswalk improvements</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH17</td>
<td>Marlborough Ave and University Ave</td>
<td>Signal improvements, bus/ped curb extensions, crosswalk improvements</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH18</td>
<td>42nd St and University Ave</td>
<td>Signal improvements, curb extensions, crosswalk improvements</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH19</td>
<td>47th St and University Ave</td>
<td>Curb extensions, crosswalk improvements, bus/pedestrian curb extensions</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH20</td>
<td>University Ave (I-15 NB ramps - Van Dyke Ave)</td>
<td>Curb extensions, median installation</td>
<td>2C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH21</td>
<td>University Ave (Van Dyke Ave - 44th St)</td>
<td>Curb extensions, access management, pedestrian crossing treatment</td>
<td>4C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH22</td>
<td>University Ave (40th St - I-15 ramps)</td>
<td>Curb extensions, signal improvements, crosswalk improvements, lane width reductions, median enhancements</td>
<td>6C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH23</td>
<td>University Ave (44th St - Winona Ave)</td>
<td>Access management, curb extensions, crosswalk improvements</td>
<td>8C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH24</td>
<td>Orange Ave (40th St - Central Ave)</td>
<td>Curb extensions</td>
<td>19C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH25</td>
<td>University Ave (Lincoln Ave - 40th St)</td>
<td>Median installation, curb extensions</td>
<td>13C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH26</td>
<td>El Cajon Blvd (Chamoune - Estrella Ave)</td>
<td>Curb extensions, median installation, landscaping enhancements</td>
<td>16C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Improvement Area CH1 | Fairmount Avenue and El Cajon Boulevard (City Heights)

Description and Issues

The intersection of Fairmount Avenue and El Cajon Boulevard is located in a pedestrian district in north-central City Heights, bordering the Normal Heights boundary. To the north, Fairmount Avenue is a two-lane, one-way roadway with two north-bound lanes and 11,400 ADTs and a speed limit of 25 mph. To the south, Fairmount Avenue is a three-lane roadway with two north-bound lanes and one south-bound lane with 11,400 average daily vehicle trips (ADTs) and a speed limit of 30 mph. El Cajon Boulevard is a four-lane arterial with 34,400 ADTs west of the intersection and 32,800 ADTs east of the intersection. The posted speed limit along El Cajon Boulevard at this location is 35 mph. MTS bus routes 1, 13, and 15 use sheltered bus stops on the southwest and southeast corners. The intersection has commercial and retail uses on all four corners. One utility box is located on the southwest corner of the intersection. Five pedestrian crashes were reported at this location between 1998 and 2007. The intersection is signalized with standard white painted crosswalks on all sides.

Recommended Improvements

- Upgrade pedestrian heads to countdown pedestrian signals. Consider upgrading existing pedestrian signals to pushbutton-integrated accessible pedestrian signals that provide an audible and vibrotactile indication of the WALK signal.
- Preserve right turn lane on El Cajon Boulevard by filling unused space between lanes.
- Pending an update to City policy, upgrade existing crosswalks to high visibility crosswalks with advanced limit lines on all four intersection legs.

Cost Estimate: $100,000 - $125,000
**Description and Issues**

The intersection of Fairmount Avenue and University Avenue is located in a pedestrian district in north-central City Heights. University Avenue is a four-lane major arterial with 30,800 average daily vehicle trips (ADTs) west of the intersection and 25,900 ADTs east of the intersection. Express and local bus traffic use sheltered bus stops on the northwest and northeast corners of the intersection, connecting to MTS local bus routes 7, 10, and 13. The posted speed limit along University Avenue at this location is 30 mph. Fairmount Avenue is a three-lane roadway with two north-bound lanes and one south-bound lane, totaling 12,900 ADTs. The intersection has commercial and office uses on all four corners. The entire block one the northwest corner is in the process of being redeveloped. One utility box is located on the southwest corner of the intersection. Three pedestrian crashes were reported at this location between 1998 and 2007.

**Recommended Improvements**

- **A** Upgrade pedestrian signal heads to countdown pedestrian signals. Consider upgrading existing pedestrian signals to pushbutton-integrated accessible pedestrian signals that provide an audible and vibrotactile indication of the WALK signal.
- **B** Study the feasibility of curb extensions on the northeast and southeast corners of the intersection.
- **C** Pending an update to City policy, upgrade existing crosswalks to high visibility crosswalks with advanced limit lines on all four intersection legs.

**Cost Estimate:** $100,000 - $150,000

*These recommendations are developed at a planning level only, and implementation should consider the specific conditions of the project area, including drainage, transit facilities, and other concerns as appropriate*
Description and Issues
University Avenue has three lanes east of 43rd Street and four lanes west of 43rd Street. It carries between 25,000 and 30,000 average daily trips (ADT). The intersection is signalized with transverse crosswalks at each intersection leg. The corridor is classified as a Pedestrian District and Corridor route.

Recommended Improvements

- **Study the feasibility of curb extensions on all four corners of the intersection.**
- **Pending an update to City policy, upgrade existing crosswalks to high visibility crosswalks with advanced limit lines on all four intersection legs.**
- **See Corridor Improvement Area Sheets 4C: University Avenue from Van Dyke Avenue to 44th Street.**

Cost Estimate: $175,000 - $200,000

*These recommendations are developed at a planning level only, and implementation should consider the specific conditions of the project area, including drainage, transit facilities, and other concerns as appropriate.*
Description and Issues

The intersection of 40th Street and El Cajon Boulevard is located in a pedestrian district in north-central City Heights, bordering the Normal Heights and Kensington-Talmadge boundaries. To the north, 40th Street is the off ramp from the I-15 southbound. To the south, 40th Street has two south-bound lanes. One lane is the on-ramp to I-15 southbound, and the other is a street-level roadway with 7,500 average daily vehicle trips (ADTs) and a speed limit of 25 mph. El Cajon Boulevard is a six-lane primary arterial with 22,900 ADTs west of the intersection and 32,400 ADTs east of the intersection. The posted speed limit along El Cajon Boulevard at this location is 35 mph. Express and local bus traffic use two sheltered bus stops to the north of the intersection, connecting to MTS local bus routes 1 and 15, and MTS express bus routes 210 and 960. The intersection is a freeway overpass to the east and has commercial and residential uses to the west. One utility box is located on the northwest corner of the intersection and one is located at the southeast corner. Three pedestrian crashes were reported at this location between 1998 and 2007. The intersection is signalized with yellow painted crosswalks on all sides. Improvements are planned as part of the SR-15 Mid-City Bus Rapid Transit Project.

Recommended Improvements

Implement the SR-15 Mid-City Bus Rapid Transit Project, including, but not limited to the following improvements:

- New fourth-leg pedestrian crossings at both intersections.
- Curb extensions on both sides of the street.
- Directional yellow high-visibility crosswalks with advance limit lines on El Cajon Boulevard.
- Upgrade pedestrian signal heads to countdown pedestrian signals. Upgrade pedestrian signals to pushbutton-integrated accessible pedestrian signals that provide an audible and vibrotactile indication of the WALK signal.

Cost Estimate: None in addition to Mid-City Rapid Bus Project

These recommendations are developed at a planning level only, and implementation should consider the specific conditions of the project area, including drainage, transit facilities, and other concerns as appropriate.
Description and Issues

The intersection of 43rd Street and El Cajon Boulevard is located in an active pedestrian district in north-central City Heights, bordering the Normal Heights boundary. 43rd Street is a one-way roadway with two southbound lanes, a posted speed limit of 30 mph, 7,000 ADTs to the north and 10,400 ADTs to the south. El Cajon Boulevard is a six-lane arterial with 34,400 ADTs and posted speed limits of 40 mph to the west of the intersection and 35 mph to the east. Three local bus routes use two sheltered bus stops to the northeast and southeast of the intersection. The intersection has commercial or office uses on all four corners. Three utility boxes are located on the southwest corner of the intersection. Four pedestrian crashes were reported at this location between 1998 and 2007. The intersection is signalized with standard white painted crosswalks on all sides. Improvements are planned as part of Phase 1 of the Mid-City Rapid Bus Project.

Recommended Improvements

- Implement the Mid-City Rapid Bus Project, including, but not limited to the following improvements:
  - Bus curb extensions on the northeast and southeast corners of the intersection.
  - Upgrade pedestrian signal heads to countdown pedestrian signals. Consider upgrading existing pedestrian signal heads to pushbutton-integrated accessible pedestrian signals that provide an audible and vibrotactile indication of the WALK signal.
  - Consider extending landscaped median on west side of intersection to the crosswalk.
  - Pending an update to City policy, upgrade existing crosswalks to high visibility crosswalks with advanced limit lines on all four intersection legs.

Cost Estimate: $175,000 - $200,000

These recommendations are developed at a planning level only, and implementation should consider the specific conditions of the project area, including drainage, transit facilities, and other concerns as appropriate.
Description and Issues

The intersection of Fairmount Avenue and Orange Avenue is located in a pedestrian district in north-central City Heights. Fairmount Avenue is a three-lane collector roadway with two north-bound lanes and one south-bound lane. Fairmount Avenue has a posted speed limit of 30 mph with 11,400 average daily trips (ADTs) to the north and 12,900 ADTs to the south of the intersection. Orange Avenue is a two-lane major arterial with a center turn lane, having a posted speed limit of 30 mph, 13,000 ADTs west of the intersection and 10,700 ADTs east of the intersection. The roadway has local bus traffic and this intersection has sheltered bus stops on the southwest and southeast corners of the intersection, connecting to MTS Route 13. The intersection has commercial land use on the southeast corner, a dentist’s office on the northeast corner, a service station on the northwest corner, and residential land use on the southwest corner. One utility box is located on the southwest corner of the intersection. Six pedestrian crashes were reported at this location between 1998 and 2007.

Recommended Improvements

- Consider upgrading existing pedestrian signals to pushbutton-integrated accessible pedestrian signals that provide an audible and vibrotactile indication of the WALK signal. At minimum, upgrade pedestrian signal heads to countdown pedestrian signals.
- Study the feasibility of curb extensions on the northeast corner of the intersection.
- Pending an update to City policy, upgrade existing crosswalks to high visibility crosswalks with advanced limit lines on all four intersection legs.

Cost Estimate: $50,000 - $75,000
Description and Issues

The intersection of Euclid Avenue and University Avenue is located in a pedestrian district in northeast City Heights. University Avenue is a four-lane major arterial with 22,500 average daily vehicle trips (ADTs) west of the intersection and 22,600 ADTs east of the intersection. MTS local bus routes 7 and 10 use an unsheltered bus stop on the southwest corner of the intersection. The posted speed limit along University Avenue at this location is 35 mph. Euclid Avenue is a two-lane roadway with 12,100 ADTs north of the intersection and 14,100 ADTs south of the intersection. The intersection has commercial uses on all four corners. One utility box is located on the southwest corner of the intersection. Six pedestrian crashes were reported at this location between 1998 and 2007. The intersection is signalized with high-visibility (yellow ladder) crosswalks.

Recommended Improvements

A. Consider upgrading existing pedestrian signals to pushbutton-integrated accessible pedestrian signals that provide an audible and vibrotactile indication of the WALK signal. At minimum, upgrade pedestrian signal heads to countdown pedestrian signals.

B. Study the feasibility of curb extensions into University Avenue on the northwest and northeast corners of the intersection.

Cost Estimate: $150,000 - $175,000
Description and Issues

The intersection of 35th Street and El Cajon Boulevard is located in a pedestrian district in northwestern City Heights, bordering the Normal Heights boundary. 35th Street is a minor connector two-lane roadway with bicycle facilities and parking on both sides of the street. At this location, 35th Street has a posted speed limit of 25 mph, 4,800 average daily trips (ADTs) to the north of the intersection and 5,100 ADTs to the south. El Cajon Boulevard is a six-lane primary arterial with 32,200 ADTs to the west of the intersection, 22,900 ADTs to the east, and a posted speed limit of 35 mph. The roadway has local bus traffic with two unsheltered bus stops at the northeast and southwest corners of the intersection, connecting to MTS local bus routes 1 and 15. The intersection has commercial uses on all four corners. Ten pedestrian crashes were reported at this location between 1998 and 2007. The intersection is signalized with standard white painted crosswalks on all sides. The Mid-City Rapid Bus Project has proposed several enhancements for the intersection as part of Phase 1.

Recommended Improvements

A. Implement the Mid-City Rapid Bus Project, including, but not limited to the following improvements:
   - Bus curb extensions at future Rapid Bus stops on both sides of the street

B. Consider expanding bus curb extensions into 35th Street as well.

C. Upgrade pedestrian signal heads to countdown pedestrian signals. Consider upgrading existing pedestrian signals to pushbutton-integrated accessible pedestrian signals that provide an audible and vibrotactile indication of the WALK signal.

D. Pending an update to City policy, upgrade existing crosswalks to high visibility crosswalks with advanced limit lines on all four intersection legs.

Cost Estimate: $100,000 - $150,000
### Description and Issues

The intersection of Euclid Avenue and El Cajon Boulevard is located in a pedestrian district in northeast City Heights, on the border of the Kensington-Talmadge community boundary. Euclid Avenue is a two-lane roadway with a center turn lane and parking on both sides. At this location, Euclid Avenue has a posted speed limit of 25 mph, 9,100 average daily vehicle trips (ADTs) north of the intersection, and 12,100 ADTs south of the intersection. El Cajon Boulevard is a four-lane major arterial with a center turn lane and a posted speed limit of 35 mph, having 32,800 ADTs west of the intersection and 27,100 ADTs east of the intersection. MTS local bus routes 1 and 15 use unsheltered bus stops one block to the east and one block to the west of the intersection. The intersection has commercial uses on all four corners. Three utility boxes are located on the southwest corner of the intersection. Six pedestrian crashes were reported at this location between 1998 and 2007. This is a signalized intersection with standard white painted crosswalks on all sides.

### Recommended Improvements

- **A** Upgrade pedestrian signal heads to countdown pedestrian signals. Consider upgrading existing pedestrian signals to pushbutton-integrated accessible pedestrian signals that provide an audible and vibrotactile indication of the WALK signal.

- **B** Pending an update to City policy, upgrade existing crosswalks to high visibility crosswalks with advanced limit lines on all four intersection legs.

**Cost Estimate:** $10,000 - $20,000

---

*These recommendations are developed at a planning level only, and implementation should consider the specific conditions of the project area, including drainage, transit facilities, and other concerns as appropriate.*
**Description and Issues**

This complex five-legged intersection in western City Heights includes a right turn slip lane to the I-805 northbound on-ramp. The crosswalk traversing the slip lane lacks pedestrian warning signage. University Avenue through City Heights is a busy pedestrian-oriented corridor with some pedestrian amenities, specifically a pocket park to the north of the intersection and decorative pavement sidewalks. University Avenue is also a four-lane corridor with auto-oriented commercial land uses and frequent express and local bus traffic. This intersection has a bus stop on the northeast corner. Posted speed limits along University at by this intersection are 30 mph with 27,000 average daily vehicle trips (ADTs) which decreases substantially (16,200 ADTs) east of the on-ramp. Wabash Avenue is a three-lane roadway with two northbound lanes and one south-bound lane. Southbound vehicles on Wabash Avenue are channeled on to the I-805 on-ramp. Eight pedestrian crashes were reported at this location between 1998 and 2007. This intersection is signalized and has standard white painted crosswalks on all sides.

**Recommended Improvements**

Pending an update to the City of San Diego pedestrian crossing policy, consider upgrading existing standard crosswalks to high visibility crosswalks with advanced limit lines.

Consider upgrading existing pedestrian signals with accessible countdown pedestrian signal heads.

Extend center median on the south leg of the intersection to the crosswalk to provide a pedestrian refuge*.

Install pedestrian warning signage at the approach and location of uncontrolled crosswalk traversing the freeway on-ramp slip lane*.

* Improvements on I-805 ramps will require coordination with Caltrans.

**Cost Estimate:** $75,000 - $100,000
Improvement Area CH11 | Swift Avenue and University Avenue (City Heights)

Description and Issues

The intersection of Swift Avenue and University Avenue is located in a pedestrian district in northwestern City Heights. Swift Avenue is a two-lane residential roadway with parking on both sides and posted speed limits of 2 mph to the north and 25 mph to the south. University Avenue is a two-lane collector with a center turn lane, 16,200 average daily vehicle trips (ADTs), and a posted speed limit of 30 mph. The roadway has local bus traffic with an unsheltered bus stop on the southeast corner of the intersection, connecting to MTS local bus routes 7, 10, and 966. The intersection has commercial land uses on all four corners. Three utility boxes are located on the southeast corner of the intersection. Three pedestrian crashes were reported at this location between 1998 and 2007. The intersection is signalized with decorative colored paving in the crosswalks on all four sides.

Recommended Improvements

Upgrade pedestrian signal heads to countdown pedestrian signals. Consider upgrading existing pedestrian signal heads to pushbutton-integrated accessible pedestrian signals that provide an audible and vibrotactile indication of the WALK signal.

Cost Estimate: $10,000 - $20,000
Description and Issues

The intersection of 52nd Street and University Avenue is located in a pedestrian district in eastern City Heights. 52nd Street Avenue is a two-lane residential roadway with parking on both sides and a posted speed limit of 25 mph. University Avenue is a four-lane collector with 22,600 average daily vehicle trips (ADTs) and a posted speed limit of 35 mph. MTS local bus routes 7 and 10 use unsheltered bus stops on the northeast and southwest corners of the intersection. The intersection has commercial land use on the southeast corner, industrial use on the northwest corner, multi-family residential on the southwest, and a County of San Diego Public Health Center on the northeast corner. Ten pedestrian crashes were reported at this location between 1998 and 2007, and improvements here are a top priority for City Heights. Bike lanes are proposed on University Avenue as part of the Bicycle Master Plan, but designs have not been finalized. Recommendations at this intersection will not preclude the striping of bike lanes in the future.

Recommended Improvements

- Upgrade pedestrian signal heads to countdown pedestrian signals. Consider upgrading existing pedestrian signal heads to pushbutton-integrated accessible pedestrian signals that provide an audible and vibrotactile indication of the WALK signal.
- Study the feasibility of curb extensions on all corners of the intersection, particularly the curb cut for the San Diego Rescue Mission on the northwest corner. Add bus bulb out curb extensions on the northeast and southwest corners of the intersection.
- Pending an update to City policy, upgrade existing crosswalks to high visibility crosswalks with advanced limit lines on all four intersection legs.

Cost Estimate: $200,000 - $250,000
Description and Issues

This location is a 5-legged intersection with Fairmount Avenue extending north and south of the intersection, Redwood Street extending east, Poplar Street extending southwest, and Glenfield Street extending northwest in central City Heights. Fairmount Avenue is a three-lane collector roadway with two north-bound lanes and one south-bound lane. Fairmount Avenue is a four-lane major collector. North of the intersection, Fairmont Avenue has a posted speed limit of 30 mph with 17,700 average daily trips (ADTs). To the south, Fairmount Avenue has a posted speed limit of 35 mph and 19,200 ADTs. Redwood Street, and Poplar Street are two-lane residential roadways with parking on both sides and have posted speed limits of 25 mph. Glenfield Street is a one-lane, one-way westbound street with parking on both sides. Fairmont Avenue and Poplar Street have local bus traffic and this intersection has unsheltered bus stops on the northwest, northeast, and southwest corners of the intersection, connecting to MTS local bus routes 13 and 965. The intersection has commercial land uses on all five corners. Two utility boxes are located on the east corners of the intersection. Five pedestrian crashes were reported at this location between 1998 and 2007.

Recommended Improvements

A  Upgrade pedestrian signal heads to countdown pedestrian signals. Consider upgrading existing pedestrian signals to pushbutton-integrated accessible pedestrian signals that provide an audible and vibrotactile indication of the WALK signal.

B  If supported, evaluate to add a curb extension between Poplar and Glenfield.

C  If supported, extend median north of Redwood to crosswalk.

D  If supported, evaluate to prohibit northbound left turn on to Glenfield.

E  Pending an update to City policy, upgrade existing crosswalks to high visibility crosswalks with advanced limit lines on all four intersection legs.

Cost Estimate: $125,000 - $200,000
Description and Issues

The intersection of 36th Street and El Cajon Boulevard is located in a pedestrian district in northwestern City Heights, bordering the Normal Heights boundary. 36th Street is a minor connector two-lane roadway with a speed limit of 25 mph. El Cajon Boulevard is a six-lane primary arterial with 22,900 ADTs and a posted speed limit of 35 mph. The roadway has local bus traffic with two unsheltered bus stops at the northwest and southwest corners of the intersection, connecting to MTS local bus routes 1 and 15. The intersection has commercial uses on all four corners. Nine pedestrian crashes were reported at this location between 1998 and 2007. The intersection is unsignalized with one standard white painted crosswalk on the western leg.

Recommended Improvements

- Study the feasibility of curb extensions on the northwest and southwest corners of the intersection, or relocation of existing bus stops.
- Pending an update to the City’s pedestrian crossing policy, consider upgrading existing standard crosswalk to high visibility crosswalk and stencil advance yield teeth.
- Evaluate for additional crossing enhancements such as in-pavement flashers, rapid flashing beacon, HAWK, or traffic signal.

Cost Estimate: $125,000 - $200,000

These recommendations are developed at a planning level only, and implementation should consider the specific conditions of the project area, including drainage, transit facilities, and other concerns as appropriate.
Description and Issues
The intersection of Menlo Avenue and El Cajon Boulevard is located in a pedestrian district in north-central City Heights, bordering the Normal Heights boundary. Menlo Avenue is a two-lane residential roadway with one north-bound lane, one south-bound lane, and a posted speed limit of 25 mph. El Cajon Boulevard is a four-lane major arterial with 32,800 ADTs and a posted speed limit of 35 mph. MTS local bus routes 1 and 15 use unsheltered bus stops to the southwest and southeast, one block from the intersection. The intersection has commercial and strip retail uses on all four corners. Two utility boxes are located on the southwest corner of the intersection. Five pedestrian crashes were reported at this location between 1998 and 2007. The intersection is signalized with standard yellow painted crosswalks on all sides.

Recommended Improvements

Upgrade pedestrian signal heads to countdown pedestrian signals. Consider upgrading existing pedestrian signal heads to pushbutton-integrated accessible pedestrian signals that provide an audible and vibrotactile indication of the WALK signal.

Study the feasibility of curb extensions on the northeast and southeast corners of the intersection.

Pending an update to City policy, upgrade existing crosswalks to high visibility crosswalks with advanced limit lines on all four intersection legs.

Cost Estimate: $150,000 - $200,000
Description and Issues

The intersection of 41st Street and University Avenue is located in a pedestrian district in north-central City Heights. 41st Street is a two-lane residential roadway with one north-bound lane and one south-bound lane with a posted speed limit of 25 mph. University Avenue is a four-lane arterial with 30,800 average daily vehicle trips (ADTs) and a posted speed limit of 30 mph. Sheltered bus stops one block west and one block east of the intersection serve MTS local bus routes 7, 10, 965, and 966, and express routes 210 and 960. The intersection has an elementary school to the north, a taco shop to the southwest, and a church to the southeast. One utility box is located on the northwest corner of the intersection. Four pedestrian crashes were reported at this location between 1998 and 2007. The intersection is signalized with yellow painted crosswalks on all four intersection legs.

Recommended Improvements

A. Upgrade pedestrian signal heads to countdown pedestrian signals. Consider upgrading existing pedestrian signal heads to pushbutton-integrated accessible pedestrian signals that provide an audible and vibrotactile indication of the WALK signal.

B. Study the feasibility of curb extensions on the northeast, southeast, and southwest corners of the intersection, consistent with other planning studies in the area.

C. Pending an update to the City’s pedestrian crossing policy, consider upgrading existing standard crosswalks to high visibility crosswalks on all four intersection legs.

Cost Estimate: $125,000 - $200,000

These recommendations are developed at a planning level only, and implementation should consider the specific conditions of the project area, including drainage, transit facilities, and other concerns as appropriate.
Description and Issues

The intersection of Marlborough Avenue and University Avenue is located in a pedestrian district in north-central City Heights. Marlborough Avenue is a two-lane residential roadway with one north-bound lane and one south-bound lane with a posted speed limit of 25 mph. University Avenue has one west-bound lane, two east-bound lanes, and a center turn lane. At this location, University Avenue has 30,800 average daily vehicle trips (ADTs) and a posted speed limit of 30 mph. MTS local bus routes 7 and 10 use sheltered bus stops to the northeast and southeast of the intersection. The intersection has commercial uses on all four corners. One utility box is located on the southwest corner of the intersection. Fifteen pedestrian crashes were reported at this location between 1998 and 2007. The intersection is signalized with yellow painted crosswalks on all four sides.

Recommended Improvements

Upgrade pedestrian signal heads to countdown pedestrian signals. Consider upgrading existing pedestrian signal heads to pushbutton-integrated accessible pedestrian signals that provide an audible and vibrotactile indication of the WALK signal.

Pending an update to the City’s pedestrian crossing policy, consider upgrading existing standard crosswalks to high visibility yellow crosswalks on all four intersection legs, consistent with other planning studies in the area.

Study the feasibility of curb extensions on the northeast, northwest, and southwest legs of intersection.

Consider adding a bus/ped bulb out curb extension at the southeast corner of the intersection.

Cost Estimate: $125,000 - $200,000
Description and Issues

The intersection of 42nd Street and University Avenue is located in a pedestrian district in north-central City Heights. 42nd Street is a two-lane residential roadway with one north-bound lane and one south-bound lane with a posted speed limit of 25 mph. University Avenue has one west-bound lane, two east-bound lanes, and a center turn lane. At this location, University Avenue has 30,800 average daily vehicle trips (ADTs) and a posted speed limit of 30 mph. A sheltered bus stop one block west of the intersection serves MTS local bus routes 7 and 10. The intersection has a post office on the southwest corner, retail strip land use on the northwest corner, and commercial uses to the east. One utility box is located on the southwest corner of the intersection. Four pedestrian crashes were reported at this location between 1998 and 2007. The intersection is signalized with standard white painted crosswalks on all four sides.

Recommended Improvements

A Upgrade pedestrian signal heads to countdown pedestrian signals. Consider upgrading existing pedestrian signals to pushbutton-integrated accessible pedestrian signals that provide an audible and vibrotactile indication of the WALK signal.

B Study the feasibility of curb extensions on all four corners of the intersection.

C Pending an update to City policy, upgrade existing crosswalks to high visibility crosswalks with advanced limit lines on all four intersection legs.

Cost Estimate: $150,000 - $200,000
Description and Issues

The intersection of 47th Street and University Avenue is located in a pedestrian district in northeast City Heights. 47th Street is a two-lane residential roadway with a posted speed limit of 25 mph. University Avenue has two east-bound lanes, one west-bound lane, and a center turn lane. At this location, University Avenue has 22,500 average daily vehicle trips (ADTs) and a posted speed limit of 35 mph. MTS local bus routes 7 and 10 use unsheltered bus stops on the northeast and southwest corners of the intersection. The intersection has multi-family residential land use on the southwest corner, office use on the northeast corner, and commercial land uses on the northwest and southeast corners. Four pedestrian crashes were reported at this location between 1998 and 2007. This intersection is unsignalized and does not have any crosswalks.

Recommended Improvements

A) Study the feasibility of curb extensions on the northwest and southeast legs of intersection.
B) Pending an update to City policy, upgrade existing crosswalks to high visibility crosswalks with advanced limit lines on all four intersection legs.
C) Consider adding a bus/ped bulb-out curb extension and new bus pad at the southwest and northeast corner of the intersection.

Cost Estimate: $125,000 - $200,000

These recommendations are developed at a planning level only, and implementation should consider the specific conditions of the project area, including drainage, transit facilities, and other concerns as appropriate.
### Description and Issues

This corridor improvement area extends along University Avenue from the Interstate 15 northbound ramps to Van Dyke Avenue. University Avenue is a three-lane street with a center turn lane from 41st Street to Van Dyke Avenue, and a four-lane roadway along the one-block between 41st Street and the I-15 ramps. University Avenue has a 30 mph posted speed limit and 30,800 average daily vehicle trips (ADTs) along the entire segment. Land uses along the corridor include commercial uses along both sides of University Avenue, a post office on the southwest corner of 42nd Street, and a church on the southeast corner of 41st Street. Sheltered bus stops on the northeast and southeast corners of the intersection with Marlborough Avenue serve MTS local bus routes 7, 10, 965 and 966. The corridor contains eight utility boxes within the public right-of-way, many of which are artistically painted. Thirty-one pedestrian-involved collisions were reported along the corridor between 1998 and 2007, including fifteen collisions at the intersection of Marlborough Avenue. All of the intersections along this corridor are signalized. The intersection at the I-15 northbound ramps has standard yellow painted crosswalks on the north, east, and south sides of the intersection. The intersections at 41st Street and Marlborough Avenue have standard yellow painted crosswalks all sides, and the intersections at 42nd Street and Van Dyke Avenue have standard white painted crosswalks on all sides of the intersection. The corridor is classified as a pedestrian Corridor route.

### Recommended Improvements

1. Consider installing curb extensions at all four corners of the intersections with Marlborough Avenue and 42nd Street. Install curb extensions at northeast, southeast, and southwest corners of intersection with 41st Street.

2. Evaluate access management from 41st Street to Van Dyke Avenue by installing a 10’ median with turning pockets at major intersections. Access to alleyways will be restricted.

### Cost Estimate: $800,000 - $100,000

These recommendations are developed at a planning level only, and implementation should consider the specific conditions of the project area, including drainage, transit facilities, and other concerns as appropriate.
Description and Issues

This corridor improvement area extends along University Avenue from Van Dyke Avenue to 44th Street. University Avenue is a three-lane street with a center turn lane from Van Dyke Avenue to 43rd Street, and a four-lane roadway along the two blocks between 43rd Street and 44th Street. University Avenue has a 30 mph posted speed limit from Van Dyke Avenue to Fairmount Avenue and 35mph from Fairmount Avenue to 44th Street. From Van Dyke Avenue to 43rd Street, Average daily vehicle trips on University Avenue range from 22,500 to 30,800 along the corridor. Land uses along the corridor include commercial, office, and shopping. MTS local bus routes 7, 10, and 13 travel along the corridor, using an unsheltered bus stop on the southeast corner of Van Dyke Avenue and sheltered bus stops on the northeast corner of 43rd Street, the northwest corner of Fairmount Avenue, the northwest corner of 44th Street, and the southwest corner of 44th Street. The corridor contains eight utility boxes within the public right-of-way, many of which are artistically painted. Thirteen pedestrian-involved collisions were reported along the corridor between 1998 and 2007, including four collisions at the intersection of 43rd Street. The intersections at Van Dyke Avenue, 43rd Street, and Fairmount Avenue are signalized with standard white painted crosswalks on all sides of the intersection. The intersection at 44th Street is unsignalized with a high visibility (white ladder) crosswalk on the west side. The corridor is classified as a pedestrian District and Corridor route.

Recommended Improvements

A. Study the feasibility of curb extensions on all four legs of intersections with Van Dyke Avenue and 43rd Street and on the northeast and southwest corners of Fairmount Avenue.

B. Consider access management along University Avenue. A possible design may be a 10’ median on University Avenue that terminates at major intersections.

C. Consider curb extensions at the uncontrolled crosswalk on University at 44th Street. Evaluate for additional pedestrian crossing treatments, such as Rectangular Rapid Flash Beacons and pedestrian refuge medians.

Cost Estimate: $600,000 - $700,000

These recommendations are developed at a planning level only, and implementation should consider the specific conditions of the project area, including drainage, transit facilities, and other concerns as appropriate.
Improvement Area CH22 | University Avenue from 40th Street to I-15 NB ramps (City Heights)

Description and Issues

This corridor improvement area extends along University Avenue from 40th Street to the Interstate 15 north-bound ramps. At this location, University Avenue is a four-lane freeway overpass with designated bus lanes with a 30 mph posted speed limit and 30,800 average daily vehicle trips (ADTs) along the entire corridor. Land uses along the corridor include commercial and office on the northwest and southeast corners and vacant on the southwest and northeast corners of the corridor surrounding the freeway overpass. The corridor is home to the I-15 Transit Plaza and has heavy express and local bus traffic, including five sheltered bus stops which connect to MTS local bus routes 7, 10, 965, and 966, and MTS express bus routes 210 and 960. The corridor contains four utility boxes within the public right-of-way, many of which are artistically painted. Three pedestrian-involved collisions were reported along the corridor between 1998 and 2007, including four collisions at the intersection of 43rd Street. The corridor is classified as a pedestrian Corridor route.

Recommended Improvements

A. Implement SR-15 Mid City BRT Station improvements:
   - Fourth leg pedestrian crosswalks at both intersections at both intersections.
   - Direction curb ramps on all corners and additional curb extensions where feasible.

B. Install accessible pedestrian countdown signals at all approaches at University Avenue and 40th Street intersection.

C. Pending an update to City policy, upgrade existing crosswalks to high visibility yellow crosswalks with advanced limit lines on all four intersection legs.

Cost Estimate: $350,000 - $500,000

These recommendations are developed at a planning level only, and implementation should consider the specific conditions of the project area, including drainage, transit facilities, and other concerns as appropriate.
Improvement Area CH23 | University Avenue from 44th Street to Winona Avenue (City Heights)

**Description and Issues**

This corridor improvement area extends along University Avenue from 44th Street to Winona Avenue. University Avenue is a three-lane street with a center turn lane and has a 35 mph posted speed limit along the entire corridor. From 44th Street to Winona Avenue, University Avenue has approximately 32,400 average daily vehicle trips (ADTs). Land uses along the corridor are mainly commercial, office, and retail. There are residential uses on the corners of 46th Street and 47th Street. MTS local bus routes 7 and 10 use twelve unsheltered bus stops along the corridor. The corridor contains six utility boxes within the public right-of-way, many of which are artistically painted. Fifty three pedestrian-involved collisions were reported along the corridor between 1998 and 2007, including seven collisions at the intersection of Chamoune Avenue and six collisions at three different intersections, including Euclid Avenue, Menlo Avenue, and at Winona Avenue. The corridor is classified as a pedestrian Corridor route.

**Recommended Improvements**

A. Evaluate access management on University Avenue between Highland Avenue and Winona Avenue. One possibility would be a 10’ median that restricts left turns to and from minor streets.

B. Study the feasibility of curb extensions at several locations along the corridor:
   - Northeast and southeast intersection with Highland Avenue
   - All four legs of intersections with Chamoune Avenue, 46th Street, and 47th Street
   - Northeast and southeast corners of Winona Avenue.
   - Southeast corner of 44th Street intersection.

C. Pending update to City policy, stripe high-visibility crosswalk with a median refuge on west leg of intersection of Estrella Avenue. Evaluate for additional crossing treatments.

**Cost Estimate:** $1,500,000 - $2,000,000

These recommendations are developed at a planning level only, and implementation should consider the specific conditions of the project area, including drainage, transit facilities, and other concerns as appropriate.
### Description and Issues

This corridor improvement area extends one block along Orange Avenue from 40th Street to Central Avenue. At this location, Orange Avenue is a two-lane freeway overpass with a center turn lane, a 30 mph posted speed limit, and 13,000 average daily trips (ADTs) along the entire corridor. Land uses along the corridor include multi-family residential on the west side of the 40th Street intersection and the east side of the Central Avenue intersection. The corridor has no bus traffic and has had no reported pedestrian collisions between 1998 and 2007. The corridor contains two utility boxes within the public right-of-way, both of which are artistically painted. The intersection at 40th Street is signalized with standard yellow painted crosswalks on the north, west, and south sides of the intersection. The corridor is classified as a pedestrian Connector route.

### Recommended Improvements

- Consider installing curb extension at southwest corner of Orange Avenue and Central Avenue.

### Cost Estimate

Cost Estimate: $40,000 - $60,000

*These recommendations are developed at a planning level only, and implementation should consider the specific conditions of the project area, including drainage, transit facilities, and other concerns as appropriate.*

---

**Improvement Area CH24 | Orange Avenue from 40th Street to Central Avenue (City Heights)**

**PMP Phases 2 and 3**  
**Ranking: C19/19**

---

[Diagram of the area showing the location of improvements]
Description and Issues

This corridor improvement area extends along University Avenue from Lincoln Avenue to 40th Street. University Avenue is a two-lane major road with a center turn lane and parking on both sides from Lincoln Avenue to 39th Street. In the one block segment from 39th Street to 40th Street, University Avenue becomes three lanes with two east-bound lanes, one west-bound lane, and a center median. University Avenue has a 30 mph posted speed limit and 16,200 average daily vehicle trips (ADTs) from Lincoln Avenue to 35th Street and 17,300 ADTs from 35th Street to 40th Street. Land uses along the corridor include commercial, retail, and office. Three sheltered bus stops and five unsheltered bus stops connect to MTS local bus routes 7, 10, 965, and 966. The corridor contains thirty six utility boxes within the public right-of-way, many of which are artistically painted. Twenty six pedestrian-involved collisions were reported along the corridor between 1998 and 2007, including four collisions at the intersection of 39th Street. The Swift Avenue and 35th Street intersections are signalized with decorative paving in the crosswalks. High visibility (yellow ladder) crosswalks exist on the signalized Wilson Avenue intersection. The 39th Street and 40th Street intersections are also signalized with standard white painted crosswalks at 39th Street and yellow crosswalks at 40th Street. The corridor is classified as a pedestrian Corridor route.

Recommended Improvements

A. Evaluate the feasibility of access management such as installing 10’ raised median on University Avenue between 35th Street and 39th Street, opening into left-turn pockets at major street intersections.

B. Study the feasibility of installing 6’ curb extensions on all four corners of the intersections of University Avenue with Wilson Avenue, 36th Street, Cherokee Avenue, 37th Street, and 38th Street.

C. Study the feasibility of installing 6’ curb extensions on the northwest, southeast, and southwest corners of 39th Street.

Cost Estimate: $1,500,000 - $2,000,000
Description and Issues

This corridor improvement area extends along El Cajon Boulevard from Chamoune Avenue to Estrella Avenue. El Cajon Boulevard is a four-lane roadway with a center turn lane, parking on both sides, and a 35 mph posted speed limit along the entire corridor. The corridor has 32,800 average daily trips (ADTs) from Chamoune Avenue to Euclid Avenue and 27,100 ADTs from Euclid Avenue to Estrella Avenue. Land uses along the corridor are commercial and office. The corridor has local bus traffic, including two sheltered bus stops and four unsheltered bus stops, connecting to MTS local bus routes 1 and 15. The corridor contains sixteen utility boxes within the public right-of-way, many of which are artistically painted. Twenty three pedestrian-involved collisions were reported along the corridor between 1998 and 2007, including six collisions at the intersection of Euclid Avenue. The combination of pedestrian attracting land uses, amenities, and significant vehicular traffic create potential conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles. The intersections at Chamoune Avenue, Menlo Avenue, and Euclid Avenue are signalized with standard white painted crosswalks. The corridor is classified as a pedestrian Corridor route.

Recommended Improvements

**A** Consider installing curb extensions on southeast and southwest legs of the intersection with Chamoune Avenue and at the north end of existing crosswalk on the east leg.

**B** Evaluate access management such as installing raised median along El Cajon Avenue, prohibiting left turns at Estrella Avenue and onto 46th Street and 47th Street northbound through signage and physical measures.

**C** Consider access management the intersection with Estrella Avenue. Stripe high-visibility crosswalks.

**D** Consider installing street trees and other landscaping where deficient along corridor.

Cost Estimate: $300,000 - $500,000
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5. Southeastern San Diego

5.1 Area Description
The community of Southeastern San Diego is located between State Routes 94 and 54, immediately east of Downtown San Diego and west of Interstate 805.

Land uses in the community are mixed, with a combination of single- and multi-family residential, commercial, and industrial uses, with denser parts of the community found in the western portion of the Community Planning Area. Key commercial corridors include Imperial Avenue, Commercial Avenue, and Market Street.

Development in the area occurred in a somewhat haphazard fashion, and streets vary greatly in slope. Sidewalks are typically in place except along a handful of key corridors, and their conditions vary.

5.2 Inventory of Missing Sidewalks and Curb Ramps
A visual inspection of field conditions was conducted to inventory missing sidewalks, missing curb ramps, and to identify the presence of sidewalk obstructions within the study areas and on any pedestrian route designated above “neighborhood” in the community. In addition, the City of San Diego and SANDAG provided detailed information regarding existing curb ramps and missing sidewalks. GIS files for existing sidewalks and curb ramps were provided by SANDAG for inclusion in the base mapping efforts.

Missing sidewalks and curb ramps from this exercise are illustrated in Figure SE-1.
Figure SE-1: Southeastern San Diego Missing Sidewalks and Curb Ramps
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5.3 Route Types

All roadways within Southeast were defined based on pedestrian functionality as defined in the Phase I Framework Document. There are four key route types included in Southeast: District, Corridor, Connector and Neighborhood. Figure SE-2 illustrates the Route Type Classifications defined within the Southeast Area Community.

- **District**: A district route includes sidewalks in the more intensive mixed use and concentrated areas of the city.
- **Corridor**: A corridor sidewalk is associated with major arterials and linear corridors with a moderate level of density.
- **Connector**: A connector sidewalk is often along a lower density corridor with few connections to adjacent land uses.
- **Neighborhood**: A neighborhood sidewalk is limited to areas of lower density and single use residential areas.
Figure SE-2: Southeastern San Diego Pedestrian Route Types and Land Uses

Southeastern Route Types and Land Uses
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Focus Areas narrow down to the routes within each community studied in the Master Plan. In most cases routes that are not within the Focus Area are located in low density residential areas, industrial areas, or areas with low demand for pedestrian activity. The Pedestrian Priority Model (PPM) was used to calculate a priority score for all routes within the Southeast community. Point values associated with each of the five key priority factors, as defined in the Phase I Framework Document, were summed to provide an overall priority score. Once the routes had an associated score, the mean and standard deviation was calculated specific for the Southeast community, which was used to determine the Tier 1 (highest ranking) and Tier 2 (second highest ranking) routes. Tier 1 and Tier 2 routes were included in the Focus Area. Focus areas were refined as a result of the existing conditions needs assessment and input from the community. Figure SE-3 illustrates the Southeast Area Focus Area routes.
Figure SE-3: Southeastern San Diego Focus Areas

Southeastern San Diego Focus Areas

---

Project Focus Area Types:
- Freeway Conflict Focus Area
- Urban Village Focus Area
- School/Park Focus Area
- Commercial Focus Area
- Residential Focus Area
- Special Consideration (Light Rail Corridor)

Legend:
- Project Focus Area Number
- 0 2,000 Feet
- April 5, 2010

City of San Diego
## Table SE-1: Southeastern San Diego Focus Areas & Potential Pedestrian Environment Improvement Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Focus Area Type</th>
<th>Route Type</th>
<th>Council District</th>
<th>Potential Pedestrian Environment Improvement Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1          | Market Street | I-5 NB Ramps to 33rd Street | Commercial | Corridor and Connector | District 8 | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• Provide pedestrian refuges  
• Provide traffic calming  
• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions |
| 2          | Market Street | 33rd Street to 36th Street | Freeway | Connector | District 8 and District 9 | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections  
• High visibility crossing treatments  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions  
• Minimize pedestrian conflict from free right turning vehicles through intersection reconfiguration and/or treatments |
| 3          | Market Street | 36th Street to 40th Street | Commercial | Connector | District 9 | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions  
• Vehicular access management |
| 4          | Imperial Avenue | I-5 NB Ramps to 32nd Street | Residential | District, Corridor and Connector | District 8 | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• Provide pedestrian refuges  
• Provide traffic calming  
• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections  
• Increase crossing safety  
• Enhanced audible/visual crosswalk signals  
• High visibility crossing treatments  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions  
• Minimize pedestrian conflict from free right turning vehicles through intersection reconfiguration and/or treatments |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Focus Area Type</th>
<th>Route Type</th>
<th>Council District</th>
<th>Potential Pedestrian Environment Improvement Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5          | Commercial Street | 19th Street to 32nd Street | Light Rail Corridor | Connector | District 8 | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• Provide pedestrian refuges  
• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions |
| 6          | National Avenue | I-5 NB Ramps to 29th Street | Freeway | Corridor | District 8 | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• Provide pedestrian refuges  
• Provide traffic calming  
• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions  
• Minimize pedestrian conflict from free right turning vehicles through intersection reconfiguration and/or treatments |
| 7          | National Avenue | 29th Street to I-15 | Residential | Corridor and Connector | District 8 | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• Provide pedestrian refuges  
• Provide traffic calming  
• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections  
• Increase crossing safety  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions |
| 8          | National Avenue | I-15 to 36th Street | School/Park | Connector | District 9 | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• Provide pedestrian refuges  
• Provide traffic calming  
• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions |
| 9          | National Avenue/Logan Avenue | 36th Street to 45th Street | Residential | Connector | District 4 and District 9 | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• Provide pedestrian refuges  
• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions |
### Table SE-1: Southeastern San Diego Focus Areas & Potential Pedestrian Environment Improvement Measures (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Focus Area Type</th>
<th>Route Type</th>
<th>Council District</th>
<th>Potential Pedestrian Environment Improvement Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 10         | Logan Avenue| 45th Street to I-805         | School/Park     | Connector  | District 4 and 9 | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• Provide pedestrian refuges  
• Provide traffic calming  
• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions |
| 11         | Kearney Avenue | Commercial Street to Cesar E. Chavez Parkway | Residential | Connector | District 8      | • Improved ADA/accessibility conditions |
| 12         | 25th Street  | G Street to Commercial Street | Residential     | District, Corridor and Connector | District 8 | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• Provide pedestrian refuges  
• Provide traffic calming  
• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections  
• Enhanced audible/visual crosswalk signals  
• High visibility crossing treatments  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions |
| 13         | 32nd Street  | F Street to Island Avenue    | Residential     | Connector  | District 8      | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions |
| 14         | 32nd Street  | Island Avenue to K Street    | School/Park     | Connector  | District 8      | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions |
| 15         | 32nd Street  | K Street to Valle Avenue     | Residential     | Connector  | District 8      | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• High visibility crossing treatments  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Focus Area Type</th>
<th>Route Type</th>
<th>Council District</th>
<th>Potential Pedestrian Environment Improvement Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 16         | 43rd Street | Logan Avenue to Boston Avenue  | Residential     | Connector  | District 9       | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections  
• High visibility crossing treatments  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions  
• Minimize pedestrian conflict from free right turning vehicles through intersection reconfiguration and/or treatments |
| 17         | 43rd Street | Boston Avenue to Beta Street   | Freeway         | Connector  | District 9       | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions |
| 18         | 43rd Street | Beta Street to Delta Street    | Residential     | Connector  | District 8 and District 9 | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions  
• Minimize pedestrian conflict from free right turning vehicles through intersection reconfiguration and/or treatments |
5.5 Improvement Areas

Overlaying the existing conditions, physical conditions assessment and community input, Improvement Areas were defined within the Focus Area for the Southeast Community. Improvement Areas are defined as either intersection improvements or corridor improvements. Intersection improvements focus on a single intersection or a group of intersections within a reasonable proximity of one another. Corridor improvements focus on improvements either along a roadway or through a series of intersections.

For the Southeast Community, eight Improvement Areas were defined, which are illustrated in Figure SE-4 and summarized in Table SE-2. On the pages following the figure and table, recommendations for each Improvement Area are described in detail.
Figure SE-4: Southeastern San Diego High-Priority Improvement Area Locations
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Improvement Area</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SE1</td>
<td>43rd St and Logan Ave</td>
<td>Crosswalk improvements, signal improvements</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE2</td>
<td>32nd St and Market St</td>
<td>Median installation, curb extensions, crosswalk improvements</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE3</td>
<td>32nd St and Ocean View Blvd</td>
<td>Curb extensions</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE4</td>
<td>Boundary St and Market St</td>
<td>Curb extensions, crosswalk improvements</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE5</td>
<td>24th St and Market St</td>
<td>Lane reduction, pedestrian signals, curb extensions, crosswalks</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE6</td>
<td>Market St (22nd St - 33rd St)</td>
<td>Bike lanes, road diet, sidewalk improvements, landscaping enhancements</td>
<td>17C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE7</td>
<td>25th St (G St - Commercial St)</td>
<td>Road diet, landscaping enhancements, sidewalk improvements, signal improvements</td>
<td>18C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Description and Issues

The 43rd Street/Logan Avenue intersection was a two-way stop-controlled T-intersection, with the westbound and the northbound right-turn movements uncontrolled. This intersection is located in an area with a mix of residential, commercial, and public space. The intersection is bordered to the north by open space and Mountain View Beckworth Library. The southeast corner is occupied by multi-family housing. Posted speed limits are 35 mph along Logan Avenue and 43rd Street in this location. Average daily vehicle trips (ADTs) are 14,000 along 43rd Street and significantly lower (8,500 ADTs) along Logan Avenue. This intersection is served by the MTS bus routes 11 and 955; there is a sheltered bus stop immediately south of the intersection. Two pedestrian crashes were reported at this location between 1998 and 2007. Both Logan Avenue and 43rd Street are classified as pedestrian Corridor route types. This intersection was recently realigned to connect National Avenue and Logan Avenue at 43rd Street.

Recommended Improvements

Recommended Improvements

This project has been completed.

Cost Estimate: N/A

These recommendations are developed at a planning level only, and implementation should consider the specific conditions of the project area, including drainage, transit facilities, and other concerns as appropriate.
Description and Issues

The intersection of 32nd Street and Market Street is a signalized intersection in the north-central area of the Southeastern San Diego community. 32nd Street is a two-lane collector roadway with parking on both sides and a posted speed limit of 30 mph. At this location, 32nd Street has 9,500 average daily trips (ADTs) to the north of the intersection and 6,500 ADTs to the south. Market Street is a four-lane collector with 10,600 ADTs to the west of the intersection, 21,500 ADTs to the east, and a posted speed limit of 35 mph. The roadway has local bus traffic with two unsheltered bus stops at the northwest and southwest corners of the intersection, connecting to MTS local bus route 5. The intersection has industrial use on the northeast corner and commercial uses on the other three corners. Three utility boxes are located on the southwest corner of the intersection. Two pedestrian crashes were reported at this location between 1998 and 2007.

Recommended Improvements

A. Study the feasibility of reducing the number of travel lanes west of 32nd Street and installing a raised median as part of the community plan update.

B. Study the feasibility of curb extensions on all four corners of the intersection.

C. Pending installation of curb extensions, and an update to City policy, upgrade existing crosswalks to high visibility crosswalks with advanced limit lines on all four intersection legs.

Cost Estimate: $225,000 - $300,000

These recommendations are developed at a planning level only, and implementation should consider the specific conditions of the project area, including drainage, transit facilities, and other concerns as appropriate.
**Description and Issues**

The intersection of 32nd Street and Ocean View Boulevard is a signalized intersection in the Southeastern San Diego community. 32nd Street is a two-lane collector roadway with parking on both sides and a posted speed limit of 35 mph. At this location, 32nd Street has 5,200 average daily trips (ADTs) to the north of the intersection and 5,500 ADTs to the south. Ocean View Boulevard is a two-lane collector with a center turn lane, parking on both sides, and a posted speed limit of 30 mph. To the west, Ocean View Boulevard has 8,300 ADTs, and to the east has 18,300 ADTs. The roadway has local bus traffic with one unsheltered bus stop at the northwest corner of the intersection, connecting to MTS local bus route 3. The intersection has commercial uses on the northwest corner and health care uses on the other three corners. Four utility boxes are located at this intersection, two on the southeast corner and two on the southwest corner. Seven pedestrian crashes were reported at this location between 1998 and 2007.

**Recommended Improvements**

- **Study the feasibility of curb extensions on the receiving ends of all four legs of the intersection.**
- **Pending an update to City policy, upgrade existing crosswalks to high visibility crosswalks with advanced limit lines on all four intersection legs.**

**Cost Estimate:** $160,000 - $200,000
Description and Issues

The intersection of Boundary Street and Market Street is located in the northeastern area of the Southeastern community. Boundary Street is a two-lane collector roadway with parking on the east side and a posted speed limit of 35 mph, dead-ending at Market Street from the north, and having 3,400 average daily trips (ADTs). Market Street is a four-lane collector with 26,500 ADTs and a posted speed limit of 35 mph to the west of the intersection, and 18,100 ADTs and a posted speed limit of 30 mph to the east. The roadway has local bus traffic with one unsheltered bus stop to the south of the intersection, connecting to MTS local bus route 5. The intersection has a cemetery on the southwest corner, industrial uses on the northwest and southeast corners, and residential land uses on the northeast corner. One pedestrian crash was reported at this location between 1998 and 2007.

Recommended Improvements

- Study the feasibility of a curb extension into Boundary Street on the northeast corner of the intersection.
- Pending an update to City policy, upgrade existing crosswalks to high visibility crosswalks with advanced limit lines.

Cost Estimate: $50,000 - $100,000
**Description and Issues**

The intersection of 24th Street and Market Street is located in an active pedestrian district in the northwestern area of the Southeastern community. 24th Street is a minor two-lane roadway with parking on both sides and a posted speed limit of 20 mph. Market Street is a busy four-lane collector with a center turn lane. At this location, Market Street has 10,000 average daily trips (ADTs) and a posted speed limit of 35 mph. The roadway has local bus traffic with one unsheltered bus stops at the northwest corner of the intersection, connecting to MTS local bus routes 3 and 5. The intersection has commercial uses on the northeast and southwest corners, an elementary school on the northwest corner, and residential uses on the southeast corner. Three utility boxes are located at this intersection, one at the northwest corner and two at the southeast corner. Three pedestrian crashes were reported at this location between 1998 and 2007. The importance of this location as a pedestrian Residential-Corridor route type with high pedestrian activity levels suggests that pedestrian amenities should be provided to enhance pedestrian comfort and alert motorists to the presence of pedestrians.

**Recommended Improvements**

- **A** Refer to Corridor Improvement Area SE49 for recommendation to reconfigure traffic lanes from four lanes to two lanes with a two-way center left turn lane.
- **B** Consider upgrading existing pedestrian signal heads to pushbutton-integrated accessible pedestrian signals that provide an audible and vibrotactile indication of the WALK signal. At minimum, upgrade pedestrian signal heads to countdown pedestrian signals.
- **C** Study the feasibility of curb extensions on the northeast and southeast corners of the intersection.
- **D** Pending installation of curb extensions, and an update to City policy, upgrade existing standard crosswalks to high visibility crosswalks on all four intersection legs.

**Cost Estimate:** $300,000-$350,000
**Description and Issues**

This corridor improvement area extends along Market Street from 22nd Street to 33rd Street southbound ramps. Market Street is a four-lane roadway with a center turn lane, parking on both sides, and a 35 mph posted speed limit along the entire corridor. The corridor has approximately 10,000 average daily trips from 22nd Street to 25th Street to 28th Street, 12,700 ADT from 28th Street to 30th Street, 10,600 ADT from 30th Street to 32nd Street, and 21,500 ADT east of 32nd Street. Land uses are mostly commercial, retail, and residential, with industrial and warehousing uses on the southwest corner of 29th Street and surrounding the intersection with 33rd Street. Civic uses include an elementary school on the northwest corner of 24th Street and two churches. The corridor has local bus traffic, including 20 unsheltered bus stops, connecting to MTS local bus routes 3 and 5. The corridor right of way contains 16 utility boxes, many of which are artistically painted. Twenty four pedestrian collisions were reported along the corridor between 1998 and 2007, including four collisions at 25th Street and three collisions at 22nd Street. Pedestrian-attracting land uses, amenities, and significant vehicular traffic combine to create potential conflicts between road users. The intersections at 22nd Street and 24th Street are signalized with standard yellow painted crosswalks. The intersections at 25th Street, 30th Street, and 32nd Street are signalized with standard white painted crosswalks. The corridor is classified as a pedestrian Corridor and Connector route.

**Recommended Improvements**

- **A** Reconfigure traffic lanes from four lanes to two lanes with a two-way center left turn lane and install 6’ wide bike lanes.
- **B** Install landscaping where deficient along the corridor.

**Cost Estimate:** $435,000 - $600,000

*These recommendations are developed at a planning level only, and should consider the specific conditions of the project area, including drainage, transit facilities, and other concerns as appropriate.*
**Description and Issues**

This corridor improvement change extends along 25th Street from G Street to Commercial Street. 25th Street is a 4-lane collector with a 30 mph posted speed limit and average daily vehicle trips ranging from 7,000 to 15,000. The corridor is predominately residential with commercial and office uses concentrated around the 25th Street/Market Street intersection and the 25th Street/Imperial Avenue intersection. The five bus stops along this corridor provide access to MTS local bus routes 3, 4, and 5. The bus stops lack shelters and benches except at Market Street and at Imperial Avenue, where only benches exist. The corridor contains twenty-four utility boxes within the public right-of-way. Thirteen pedestrian crashes were reported along the corridor between 1998 and 2007, including four crashes at the intersection of 25th Street and Market Street. 25th Street is a pedestrian Corridor route type north of Market Street, a Connector route type from Market Street to L Street, and a District route type south of L Street.

**Recommended Improvements**

- **A** Reconfigure traffic lanes from four lanes to two lanes with a two-way center turn lane and install 6’ wide bike lanes.
- **B** Install landscaping where deficient along the corridor
- **C** Replace approximately 200’ of severely distressed sidewalk, curb, and gutter along the east side of 25th Street between Market Street and Island Avenue
- **D** Upgrade existing pedestrian signal heads to countdown pedestrian signal heads at the 25th Street/Market Street intersection.

Note: Installing landscaping requires that a maintenance assessment district (MAD) or other funding mechanism for ongoing maintenance be in place prior to this aspect of the improvement concept moving forward.

**Cost Estimate:** $150,000 - $200,000

These recommendations are developed at a planning level only, and should consider the specific conditions of the project area, including drainage, transit facilities, and other concerns as appropriate.
6. Uptown

6.1 Area Description

The Uptown community is located immediately north of Downtown San Diego, and is bordered by Mission Valley to the north, I-5 to the west, and Greater North Park and Balboa Park to the east. The community has a gradual uphill slope from south to north, and from west to east, particularly in the areas immediately east of I-5.

Housing in the community is a mix of older single-family neighborhoods and infill multi-family redevelopment from several eras. Several commercial corridors bisect the community, primarily University Avenue, El Cajon Boulevard, and Washington Street in an east-west alignment, and several blocks from First Avenue to Sixth Avenue in a north-south alignment. Commercial uses are generally pedestrian-oriented and feature extensive sidewalk amenities.

The community is home to an extensive connected grid street network, with several exceptions caused by the presence of canyonlands, particularly in the western portion of the study area. Mature street trees are widespread and consistent, and landscaping on private property is abundant and typically well-maintained.

6.2 Inventory of Missing Sidewalks and Curb Ramps

A visual inspection of field conditions was conducted to inventory missing sidewalks, missing curb ramps, and to identify the presence of sidewalk obstructions within the study areas and on any pedestrian route designated above “neighborhood” in the community. In addition, the City of San Diego and SANDAG provided detailed information regarding existing curb ramps and missing sidewalks. GIS files for existing sidewalks and curb ramps were provided by SANDAG for inclusion in the base mapping efforts.

Missing sidewalks and curb ramps from this exercise are illustrated in Figure U-1.
Figure U-1: Uptown Missing Sidewalks and Curb Ramps

Uptown Study Area with Missing Sidewalks and Curb Ramps

Alta Sidewalk Inventory (2009)
Roadways Inventoried (2009)
SANDAG Sidewalk Inventory (2011)
SANDAG Inventory Not Verified

Figure U-1: Uptown Missing Sidewalks and Curb Ramps
6.3 Route Types

All roadways within the Uptown Area were defined based on pedestrian functionality as defined in the Phase I Framework Document. There are four key route types included in the Uptown Area: District, Corridor, Connector and Neighborhood. Figure U-2 illustrates the Route Type Classifications defined within the Uptown Community.

- **District**: A district route includes sidewalks in the more intensive mixed use and concentrated areas of the city.
- **Corridor**: A corridor sidewalk is associated with major arterials and linear corridors with a moderate level of density.
- **Connector**: A connector sidewalk is often along a lower density corridor with few connections to adjacent land uses.
- **Neighborhood**: A neighborhood sidewalk is limited to areas of lower density and single use residential areas.
Figure U-2: Uptown Pedestrian Route Types and Land Uses
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6.4 Focus Areas

Focus Areas narrow down to the routes within each community studied in the Master Plan. In most cases routes that are not within the Focus Area are located in low density residential areas, industrial areas, or areas with low demand for pedestrian activity. The Pedestrian Priority Model (PPM) was used to calculate a priority score for all routes within the Uptown community. Point values associated with each of the five key priority factors, as defined in the Phase I Framework Document, were summed to provide an overall priority score. Once the routes had an associated score, the mean and standard deviation was calculated specific for the Uptown community, which was used to determine the Tier 1 (highest ranking) and Tier 2 (second highest ranking) routes. Tier 1 and Tier 2 routes were included in the Focus Area. Focus areas were refined as a result of the existing conditions needs assessment and input from the community. Figure U-3 illustrates the Uptown Focus Area routes.
Figure U-3: Uptown Focus Areas
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### 6. Uptown

Table U-1: Uptown Focus Areas & Potential Pedestrian Environment Improvement Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Focus Area Type</th>
<th>Route Type</th>
<th>Council District</th>
<th>Potential Pedestrian Environment Improvement Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1          | Washington Street| I-5 to Goldfinch Street  | Freeway         | Corridor and Connector            | District 3       | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
|            |                  |                          |                 |                                   |                  | • Increase crossing safety  
|            |                  |                          |                 |                                   |                  | • Improved ADA/accessibility conditions                                                                         |
| 2          | 4th Avenue       | Washington Street to Elm Street | Special Consideration (Hillcrest Mobility Study) | District and Corridor | District 3 | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
|            |                  |                          |                 |                                   |                  | • Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections  
|            |                  |                          |                 |                                   |                  | • High visibility crossing treatments  
|            |                  |                          |                 |                                   |                  | • Enhanced audible/visual crosswalk signals  
|            |                  |                          |                 |                                   |                  | • Improved ADA/accessibility conditions                                                                         |
| 3          | 5th Avenue       | Washington Street to Elm Street | Special Consideration (Hillcrest Mobility Study) | District and Corridor | District 3 | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
|            |                  |                          |                 |                                   |                  | • Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections  
|            |                  |                          |                 |                                   |                  | • High visibility crossing treatments  
|            |                  |                          |                 |                                   |                  | • Enhanced audible/visual crosswalk signals  
|            |                  |                          |                 |                                   |                  | • High visibility crosswalks  
|            |                  |                          |                 |                                   |                  | • Improved ADA/accessibility conditions                                                                         |
| 4          | 6th Avenue       | Washington Street to Elm Street | Special Consideration (Hillcrest Mobility Study) | District and Corridor | District 3 | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
|            |                  |                          |                 |                                   |                  | • Hillcrest Mobility Study  
|            |                  |                          |                 |                                   |                  | • Enhanced audible/visual crosswalk signals  
|            |                  |                          |                 |                                   |                  | • High visibility crossing treatments  
|            |                  |                          |                 |                                   |                  | • Improved ADA/accessibility conditions                                                                         |
| 5          | Elm Street       | 1st Street to 6th Street | Residential     | Connector                        | District 3       | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
|            |                  |                          |                 |                                   |                  | • Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections  
|            |                  |                          |                 |                                   |                  | • High visibility crossing treatments  
|            |                  |                          |                 |                                   |                  | • Improved ADA/accessibility conditions                                                                         
|            |                  |                          |                 |                                   |                  | • Minimize pedestrian conflict from free right turning vehicles through intersection reconfiguration and/or treatments |
### Table U-1: Uptown Focus Areas & Potential Pedestrian Environment Improvement Measures (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Focus Area Type</th>
<th>Route Type</th>
<th>Council District</th>
<th>Potential Pedestrian Environment Improvement Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6          | Hawk Street  | Washington Street to University Avenue       | Residential     | Connector and Residential| District 3      | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• Increase crossing safety  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions                                           |
|            | University Avenue | Ibis Street to Albatross Street                |                 |                         |                 |                                                                                                                        |
| 7          | Washington Street | 8th Avenue to Lincoln Avenue                  | Freeway         | Corridor and Connector  | District 3      | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• Vehicular access management  
• Increase crossing safety  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions  
• Minimize pedestrian conflict from free right turning vehicles through intersection reconfiguration and/or treatments |
|            | Lincoln Avenue | Vermont Street to Cleveland Avenue            |                 |                         |                 |                                                                                                                        |
|            | Richmond Street | Washington Avenue to Vermont Street           |                 |                         |                 |                                                                                                                        |
| 8          | Normal Street | Lincoln Avenue to Park Boulevard              | Urban Village   | Corridor and Connector  | District 3      | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections  
• Enhanced audible/visual crosswalk signals  
• High visibility crossing treatments  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions                                                                                     |
|            | Washington Street | Cleveland Avenue to Normal Street             |                 |                         |                 |                                                                                                                        |
|            | Campus Avenue  | Tyler Avenue to Normal Avenue                 |                 |                         |                 |                                                                                                                        |
| 9          | University Avenue | 3rd Avenue to Park Boulevard                  | Urban Village   | District                | District 3      | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• High visibility crossing treatments  
• Enhanced audible/visual crosswalk signals  
• High visibility crosswalks                                                                                                  |
| 10         | Robinson Avenue | 3rd Avenue to 6th Avenue                     | Urban Village   | Corridor and Connector  | District 3      | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• Enhanced audible/visual crosswalk signals  
• High visibility crossing treatments  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions                                                                                     |
### Table U-1: Uptown Focus Areas & Potential Pedestrian Environment Improvement Measures (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Focus Area Type</th>
<th>Route Type</th>
<th>Council District</th>
<th>Potential Pedestrian Environment Improvement Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Washington Street</td>
<td>3rd Avenue to 6th Avenue</td>
<td>Urban Village</td>
<td>District and Corridor</td>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>• Reduced crossing distances at intersections&lt;br&gt; • Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections&lt;br&gt; • Improved ADA/accessibility conditions&lt;br&gt; • Enhanced audible/visual crosswalk signals&lt;br&gt; • High visibility crossing treatments&lt;br&gt; • Minimize pedestrian conflict from free right turning vehicles through intersection reconfiguration and/or treatments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Washington Street</td>
<td>Albatross Street to 1st Avenue</td>
<td>School/Park</td>
<td>Corridor and Connector</td>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>• Reduced crossing distances at intersections&lt;br&gt; • Vehicular access management&lt;br&gt; • High visibility crossing treatments&lt;br&gt; • Improved ADA/accessibility conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Avenue</td>
<td>Albatross Street to 1st Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Washington Street</td>
<td>Hawk Street to Albatross Street</td>
<td>Urban Village</td>
<td>Corridor and Connector</td>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>• Reduced crossing distances at intersections&lt;br&gt; • Vehicular access management&lt;br&gt; • Enhanced audible/visual crosswalk signals&lt;br&gt; • High visibility crosswalks&lt;br&gt; • Improved ADA/accessibility conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldfinch Street</td>
<td>Fort Stockton Drive to Washington Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Goldfinch Street</td>
<td>Washington Street to Bush Street</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Connector</td>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>• Reduced crossing distances at intersections&lt;br&gt; • High visibility crossing treatments&lt;br&gt; • Improved ADA/accessibility conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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6.5 Improvement Areas

Overlying the existing conditions, physical conditions assessment and community input, Improvement Areas were defined within the Focus Area for the Uptown Community. Improvement Areas are defined as either intersection improvements or corridor improvements. Intersection improvements focus on a single intersection or a group of intersections within a reasonable proximity of one another. Corridor improvements focus on improvements either along a roadway or through a series of intersections.

For the Uptown Community, eleven Improvement Areas were defined, which are illustrated in Figure U-4 and summarized in Table U-2. On the pages following the figure and table, recommendations for each Improvement Area are described in detail.
Figure U-4: Uptown High-Priority Improvement Area Locations

High-Priority Improvement Locations Across Phases 2 and 3 Study Area
### Table U-2: Uptown High-Priority Improvement Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Improvement Area</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U1</td>
<td>Park Blvd and El Cajon Blvd</td>
<td>Crosswalk improvements, pedestrian refuge island, curb extension, signal improvements</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U2</td>
<td>Campus Ave/Polk Ave and Normal St/Washington St</td>
<td>Intersection reconfiguration, crosswalk improvements, signal improvements</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U3</td>
<td>Albatross St and Washington St</td>
<td>Curb extensions, landscaping enhancements, crosswalk improvements</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U4</td>
<td>Front St and Washington St</td>
<td>Landscaping enhancements, signal improvements, curb extensions</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U5</td>
<td>First Ave and Washington St</td>
<td>Curb extensions, signal improvements, crosswalk improvements</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U6</td>
<td>Goldfinch St and Washington St</td>
<td>Signal improvements</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U7</td>
<td>Eagle St and Washington St</td>
<td>Crosswalk improvements</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U8</td>
<td>Centre St and University Ave</td>
<td>Curb extensions, crosswalk improvements</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U9</td>
<td>First Ave and Elm St</td>
<td>Curb extensions, crosswalk improvements, signal improvements</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U10</td>
<td>Park Blvd and University Ave</td>
<td>Crosswalk upgrades and other elements consistent with Mid-City Rapid Bus and University Avenue Mobility Plan projects</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U11</td>
<td>3rd Ave and Washington Ave</td>
<td>Curb extensions, crosswalk improvements, extend medians</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U12</td>
<td>Fourth Ave (Washington St - Robinson Ave)</td>
<td>Implement Hillcrest Corridor Mobility Plan</td>
<td>1C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U13</td>
<td>Fifth Ave (Washington St - Robinson Ave)</td>
<td>Implement Hillcrest Corridor Mobility Plan</td>
<td>3C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U14</td>
<td>Sixth Ave (Washington St - Robinson Ave)</td>
<td>Implement Hillcrest Corridor Mobility Plan</td>
<td>11C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Improvement Area U1 | Park Boulevard at El Cajon Boulevard (Uptown/North Park)

Description and Issues

This priority improvement area is at a complex intersection of three major arterial streets, El Cajon Boulevard, Normal Street, and Park Boulevard. Park Boulevard has two through southbound travel lanes and a left turning lane. Northbound, Park Boulevard has two through lanes and left-and right-turning lanes. El Cajon Boulevard has two travel lanes westbound turning onto Normal Street and one turning lane onto Park Boulevard. Northbound Normal Street has two lanes for left-turning traffic onto Park Boulevard and two lanes that allow motorists to continue onto El Cajon Boulevard. Southbound Normal Street has three lanes which continue onto Washington Street toward SR-163.

Recommended Improvements

- Install pedestrian refuge.
- Pending an update to City policy, upgrade existing transverse yellow crosswalks to high-visibility yellow crosswalks with advanced limit lines.

Cost Estimate: $60,000 - $100,000

These recommendations are developed at a planning level only, and implementation should consider the specific conditions of the project area, including drainage, transit facilities, and other concerns as appropriate.
Description and Issues

This location is a five-legged intersection located in Uptown’s University Heights neighborhood. Major and low volume roadways converge at the intersection. Campus Avenue and Polk Avenue are two-lane roadways with less than 3,000 and 6,000 average daily vehicle trips, respectively, and posted speed limits of 25 mph. Washington Street is a six-lane street with a left-turn pocket and median. Normal Street has six lanes with median and left turn pockets on the north leg and four lanes with a wide median south of the intersection. Normal Street has a posted speed limit of 25 mph north of the intersection with an average of 23,600 daily vehicle trips. South of the intersection, Normal Street receives a fraction of those volumes with 4,300 average daily trips and a posted speed limit of 35 mph. The low traffic volumes suggest the potential to create open space. Washington Street experiences 28,200 average daily vehicle trips and has a posted speed limit of 40 mph. A pedestrian refuge exists on the southwest corner of Washington Street and Normal Street. A school, church, moderate density residential development, retail stores, and SR-163 ramps are all located in close proximity to the intersection. The median on the southwest intersection leg contains a utility box.

Recommended Improvements

| Study the feasibility of reconfiguring the intersection by reducing the south leg of Normal Street to two lanes and widening its median, expanding and landscaping the pedestrian refuge. |
| Pending installation of curb extensions, and an update to City policy, upgrade existing crosswalks to high visibility crosswalks with advanced limit lines on all four intersection legs. |
| Upgrade existing pedestrian signals to countdown pedestrian signal heads. |
| Conduct a study to evaluate changes to signal phasing and pedestrian crossings to consider adding a pedestrian crossing on the west side of the intersection. |

Cost Estimate: $250,000 - $400,000
**Description and Issues**

This high-priority improvement area is located at the intersection of Washington Street, a pedestrian Corridor, and Albatross Street, a pedestrian Connector. Intersection right of way is controlled by stop signs on Albatross Street at the approaches of Washington Street. Albatross Street is a 2-lane local street. It has a posted speed limit of 25 mph. Through this area, Washington Street is a major vehicular corridor, receiving 27,400 average daily vehicle trips. It is a four-lane street with raised medians and a left-turn pocket on the west leg of the intersection. The speed limit is 35 mph. Washington street is lined with commercial uses in this highly urbanized part of Uptown’s Hillcrest neighborhood. At this intersection, there is a combination of office, arterial commercial, retail and multifamily housing, including a mixed use building situated on the southwest corner. Three pedestrian-involved collisions were reported at this location between 1998 and 2007.

**Recommended Improvements**

- Study the feasibility of curb extensions on all four corners of the intersection, if compatible with existing bus stops along Washington.
- Landscape the raised median on the east leg of the intersection.
- Install crosswalks across the north and south intersection legs of Albatross Street.

**Cost Estimate: $125,000 - $200,000**

These recommendations are developed at a planning level only, and implementation should consider the specific conditions of the project area, including drainage, transit facilities, and other concerns as appropriate.
Description and Issues

This high-priority intersection is located in a dense urban area of Uptown at the intersection of Washington Street, a pedestrian Corridor, and Front Street, a pedestrian Connector route. At this signalized intersection, Washington Street is a four-lane street with raised medians. Washington Street has a posted speed limit of 35 mph and an average of 27,400 daily vehicle trips west of the intersection and 27,700 east of the intersection. Front Street receives significantly less vehicular traffic with 6,200 average daily vehicle trips north of the intersection. Front Street is a one-way street north of the intersection with three southbound travel lanes and a posted speed limit of 25 mph. On the south leg, Front Street is a two-way street and dead ends 150 feet south of the intersection at Florence Elementary School. Commercial land uses with pedestrian-oriented frontages line the majority of Washington Street within Uptown, including at this intersection where commercial uses occupy all four corners. A future public library branch is planned for a building located on the southwest corner. The southwest corner also contains a utility box within the public right-of-way and a MTS bus route 83 stop, however the stop lacks a bench and shelter. Five pedestrian crashes were reported at this location between 1998 and 2007.

Recommended Improvements

**A** Landscape median or provide street trees on the sides of the intersection.

**B** Evaluate both sides for accessible signals to facilitate safe crossings for visually impaired individuals, including countdown pedestrian signal heads.

**C** Study the feasibility of curb extension into Washington Street on the northwest corner and pocket park amenities in the proposed curb extension on the northeast corner.

**D** Pending installation of curb extensions, and an update to City policy, upgrade existing crosswalks to high visibility yellow crosswalks with advanced limit lines on all four intersection legs.

Cost Estimate: $100,000 - $150,000
Improvement Area U5 | First Avenue and Washington Street (Uptown)

Description and Issues
This high-priority intersection is located in a dense urban area of Uptown at the signalized intersection of Washington Street, a pedestrian Corridor, and First Avenue, a connector route. At this intersection, Washington Street is a four-lane street with left-turn pockets and raised medians. Washington Street has a posted speed limit of 35 mph and an average of 27,700 daily vehicle trips. First Avenue is a two-lane, one-way northbound roadway with a posted speed limit of 25 mph and an average of 5,500 trips north of the intersection. South of the intersection, First Avenue is two-way, with a posted speed limit of 30 mph and an average of 7,300 daily vehicle trips. Two utility boxes are located within the public right-of-way on the southwest and southeast corners of the intersection. This predominately commercial area hosts several education and medical facilities, including the nearby UCSD Medical Center, Scripps Mercy Hospital, and Florence Elementary School. Florence Elementary School is located just south of this high-priority intersection along First Avenue. Four pedestrian-involved crashes were reported at this location between 1998 and 2007.

Recommended Improvements

A. Study the feasibility of curb extensions on southeast and southwest corners of intersection, add marked crosswalk to east leg of intersection.

B. Upgrade pre-timed pedestrian signals with push button activated countdown pedestrian signal heads.

C. Pending installation of curb extensions, and an update to City policy, upgrade existing crosswalks to high visibility crosswalks with advanced limit lines on all four intersection legs.

Cost Estimate: $100,000 - $150,000

These recommendations are developed at a planning level only, and implementation should consider the specific conditions of the project area, including drainage, transit facilities, and other concerns as appropriate.
**Description and Issues**

This high-priority intersection is located at the intersection of a pedestrian Connector, Goldfinch Street, and a Corridor, Washington Street. The intersection features relatively new curb extensions, ADA compliant curb ramps, and red brick crosswalks and corners to enhance the comfort and quality of the pedestrian environment. Utility boxes are located within the public right-of-way on the southwest and northeast corners; those on the southwest corner are painted decoratively. The intersection is signalized. At the intersection, Washington Street is a 4-lane roadway with center left-turn pockets and medians. Washington Street has a posted speed limit of 45 mph west of the intersection with an average of 23,300 daily vehicle trips and 35 mph east of the intersection with an average of 23,100 daily vehicle trips. Daily vehicular trips are significantly lower along Goldfinch Street with 12,200 average daily trips north of the intersection and 5,900 south of the intersection. Goldfinch’s posted speed limit is 25 mph. The intersection is in the Mission Hills neighborhood commercial area which features a mix of restaurants, retail, offices, and other pedestrian attracting land uses including a public library. Residential areas surround the intersection. Three pedestrian-involved collisions were report at this location between 1998 and 2007.

**Recommended Improvements**

- Project was recently completed, curb extensions and decorative crosswalks installed.

**Cost Estimate: N/A**

These recommendations are developed at a planning level only, and implementation should consider the specific conditions of the project area, including drainage, transit facilities, and other concerns as appropriate.
Description and Issues

This high-priority area is located in a dense urban area of Uptown at the intersection of Washington Street, a pedestrian Corridor, and Eagle Street, a Residential route type. Intersection right of way is controlled by stop signs on Eagle Street. At this intersection, Washington Street is a four-lane street with left-turn pockets and raised medians. The median on the west leg of the intersection is landscaped. Washington Street has a posted speed limit of 35 mph and 23,100 average daily vehicle trips (ADT) west of the intersection increasing to 27,400 ADT east of the intersection. Eagle Street is a two-way local street with no painted lane delineation on the south leg. The north leg has a double yellow line. As a residential street, it receives significantly less vehicular traffic (4,500 ADT) than Washington Street. No pedestrian-involved collisions were reported at this location between 1998 and 2007.

Recommended Improvements

Pending installation of curb extensions, and an update to City policy, install high-visibility crosswalks across the north and south legs of Eagle Street.

Cost Estimate: $1,000 - $5,000
Improvement Area U8 | Centre Street and University Avenue (Uptown)

Description and Issues
This intersection improvement area is located within the dense commercial area of the Hillcrest neighborhood at the intersection of Centre Street, a Residential pedestrian route, and University Avenue, a pedestrian District. University Avenue is a four-lane street with average daily vehicle trips of 26,500 and a posted speed limit of 25 mph. Predominately residential, Centre Street is a two-lane street that receives substantially less vehicular traffic than University Avenue and has an average vehicular speed of 20 mph. Traffic is controlled at the intersection by stop signs on Centre Street at the approaches of University Avenue. Two pedestrian-involved collisions were reported at this unsignalized intersection between 1998 and 2007. This intersection’s proximity to dense commercial and residential land uses indicates that pedestrian enhancements at this location would improve pedestrian comfort and reduce potential for pedestrian-vehicular conflicts.

Recommended Improvements

A Study the feasibility of curb extensions on all four corners of the intersection

B Pending installation of curb extensions, and an update to the City policy, install high visibility crosswalks across the north and south intersection legs of Centre Street

Cost Estimate: $150,000-$200,000

These recommendations are developed at a planning level only, and implementation should consider the specific conditions of the project area, including drainage, transit facilities, and other concerns as appropriate
Improvement Area U9 | First Avenue and Elm Street (Uptown)

Description and Issues

This intersection improvement area is located in south Uptown’s Banker’s Hill neighborhood at the intersection of two pedestrian Connectors, First Avenue and Elm Street. The intersection is signalized and there are crosswalks on all legs except for the I-5 northbound on-ramp. Pedestrians are prohibited from crossing the I-5 ramp. A utility box is located within the public right-of-way on the northwest corner of the intersection. At this intersection, First Avenue is a one-way northbound 3-lane street with a left-turn lane and a shared through/left-turn lane on the south leg to facilitate merging onto the I-5 on-ramp. Elm Street is also a three-lane street with two westbound lanes and one eastbound lane. First Avenue has a posted speed limit of 30 mph and an average of 4,100 daily vehicle trips north of the intersection. The south leg receives approximately 26,500 daily vehicle trips, due to I-5 on-ramp traffic. Elm Street experiences average daily volumes of 9,400 trips. Elm Street has a posted speed limit of 25 mph. One pedestrian-involved collision was reported at this location between 1998 and 2007. Commercial office is the primary land use type in the area and San Diego Rescue Mission is located at the northeast corner.

Recommended Improvements

Study the feasibility of installing curb extensions on the northeast, northwest, and southeast corners, and realigning the existing crosswalks on the north and south intersection legs.

Pending installation of curb extensions, and an update to City policy, upgrade existing crosswalks to high visibility crosswalks with advanced limit lines on all four intersection legs.

Upgrade existing pedestrian signals to countdown pedestrian signal heads.

Cost Estimate: $125,000 - $200,000

These recommendations are developed at a planning level only, and implementation should consider the specific conditions of the project area, including drainage, transit facilities, and other concerns as appropriate.
Description and Issues

This high-priority intersection is an east-west gateway between the North Park and Hillcrest neighborhoods. Park Boulevard is a Corridor route type and University Avenue is a Corridor route type east of the intersection and a District route type west of the intersection. Pedestrian activity levels are partially due to the large senior housing complex located on three corners of the intersection; and the convergence of the MTS bus routes 1, 7, 10, and 11. The improvement area is a signalized intersection. Both Park Boulevard and University Avenue are four-lane streets with center left-turn lanes and raised medians on the north, west, and south intersection legs. Current pedestrian improvements include advance limit lines at crosswalks at all four legs of the intersection and a median extension to the crosswalk on the south leg of the intersection on Park Boulevard. One-way alleys on the east intersection leg adjacent to University Avenue connect the Georgia Street bridge to Park Boulevard. One utility box is found within the public right-of-way on the southeast corner of the intersection. Posted speed limits are 25 mph along University Avenue and 35 mph along Park Boulevard. University Avenue average daily vehicle trips (ADTs) are 21,700 west of the intersection and 19,700 east of the intersection. Park Boulevard ADTs are 14,600 north of the intersection and 14,400 south of the intersection. Thirteen pedestrian crashes were reported here between 1998 and 2007.

Recommended Improvements

A Implement the Mid-City Rapid Bus Project.
B Implement the University Avenue Mobility Plan (UAMP) final preferred concept.

Cost Estimate: None in addition to Mid City Rapid and UAMP costs
Description and Issues

This high-priority improvement area is located in a dense urban area of Uptown at the intersection of Third Avenue, a Residential route, and Washington Street, a Corridor route. Intersection right of way is controlled by stop signs on Third Avenue at the approaches of Washington Street. Washington Street is a four-lane street with raised medians. It has a posted speed limit of 35 mph and an average of 27,700 daily vehicle trips. Third Avenue is a two-lane roadway with average vehicle speeds of 20 mph. North of the intersection, Third Avenue is one-way northbound. A MTS bus stop is located on the northwest corner, providing access to bus routes 3, 10, and 83. This predominately commercial area includes several education and medical facilities, including the nearby UCSD Medical Center, Scripps Mercy Hospital, dermatology centers, and Florence Elementary School. Six pedestrian-involved collisions were reported at this intersection between 1998 and 2007. The combination of pedestrian attracting land uses, combined with relatively high vehicular volumes and the lack of pedestrian infrastructure at the intersection, indicates that pedestrian improvements would enhance pedestrian comfort and reduce the potential for pedestrian-vehicular conflicts.

Recommended Improvements

A Study the feasibility of extending the existing medians through the intersection and extending the curbs on the southwest and southeast corners of the intersection

B Pending installation of curb extensions and median extensions, and an update to the City policy, install crosswalks on all legs of the intersection

Cost Estimate: $100,000-$150,000

These recommendations are developed at a planning level only, and implementation should consider the specific conditions of the project area, including drainage, transit facilities, and other concerns as appropriate.
Description and Issues

This corridor improvement area extends along Fourth Avenue from Washington Street to Robinson Avenue. Fourth Avenue is a one-way street with two southbound travel lanes. 4th Avenue has a 30 mph posted speed limit and average daily vehicle trips ranging from 8,800 between Washington Street and University Avenue and 11,800 between University Avenue and Robinson Avenue. The corridor attracts a considerable amount of pedestrian activity due its dense mix of restaurants, small retail, and office uses and due to its centrality within the Hillcrest neighborhood. MTS local and express bus routes 1, 3, 11, and 120 serve the corridor, connecting Hillcrest to adjacent communities and downtown. Some of the bus stops lack shelters and benches. The corridor contains five utility boxes within the public right-of-way, many of which are artistically painted. Thirteen pedestrian-involved collisions were reported along the corridor between 1998 and 2007, including five collisions at the intersection of Fourth Avenue and University Avenue. The location is classified as a pedestrian District route. It is within the study area of a current corridor study, the Hillcrest Corridor Mobility Plan. The study’s draft recommendations for this pedestrian District consist of intersection bulb-outs, upgraded crosswalks, pedestrian countdown signal heads, angle parking, and a proposed Rapid Bus transit stop. Refer to the Hillcrest Corridor Mobility Plan for specific recommendations.

Recommended Improvements

A) Implement the Hillcrest Corridor Mobility Plan final concept

Cost Estimate: None in addition to Hillcrest Corridor Mobility Plan

These recommendations are developed at a planning level only, and implementation should consider the specific conditions of the project area, including drainage, transit facilities, and other concerns as appropriate.
Description and Issues

This corridor improvement area extends along Fifth Avenue from Washington Street to Robinson Avenue. Fifth Avenue is a one-way street with three northbound travel lanes. Fifth Avenue has a 25 mph posted speed limit and average daily vehicle trips ranging from 11,700 between Washington Street and University Avenue and 11,000 between University Avenue and Robinson Avenue. The corridor attracts a considerable amount of pedestrian activity due to its dense mix of restaurants, small retail, and other commercial uses and due to its centrality within the Hillcrest neighborhood. MTS local and express bus routes 1, 3, 10, 11, 83, and 120 serve the corridor, connecting Hillcrest to adjacent communities and downtown. Some of the bus stops lack shelters and benches. The corridor contains eight utility boxes within the public right-of-way, many of which are artistically painted. Twelve pedestrian-involved collisions were reported along the corridor between 1998 and 2007, including seven collisions just north of the Fifth Avenue and University Avenue intersection. The corridor is classified as a pedestrian District route. It is within the study area of a current corridor study, the Hillcrest Corridor Mobility Plan. The study’s draft recommendations for this pedestrian District consist of intersection bulb-outs, pedestrian countdown signal heads, modified high visibility crosswalks and mid-block high visibility crossings, angle parking, and a proposed Rapid Bus transit stop. Refer to the Hillcrest Corridor Mobility Plan for specific recommendations.

Recommended Improvements

Implement the Hillcrest Corridor Mobility Plan final concept.

Cost Estimate: None in addition to Hillcrest Corridor Mobility Plan

These recommendations are developed at a planning level only, and implementation should consider the specific conditions of the project area, including drainage, transit facilities, and other concerns as appropriate.
Description and Issues

This corridor improvement area extends along Sixth Avenue from Washington Street to Robinson Avenue. Sixth Avenue is a 4-lane street with left turn pockets at the University Avenue intersection. North of the Sixth Avenue/University Avenue intersection, Sixth Avenue crosses under Washington Street and merges into State Route 163. Posted speed limits and vehicular traffic volumes increase closer to State Route 163. The posted speed limit is 40 mph near Washington Street, 35 mph between Washington Street and University Avenue and 25 mph between University Avenue and Robinson Avenue. Average daily vehicle trips range from 38,800 north of University Avenue to 23,900 between University Avenue and Robinson Avenue. The corridor is densely lined with commercial land uses except for north of University Avenue where development subsides approaching State Route 163. The corridor contains nine utility boxes within the public right-of-way. Ten pedestrian crashes were reported along this corridor between 1998 and 2007, including five crashes at the intersection of Sixth Avenue and University Avenue. The corridor is classified as a pedestrian District route. It is within the study area of the University Avenue Mobility Plan. The study recommendations for this pedestrian District include curb extensions, lane re-striping, and re-striped enhanced crosswalks. Refer to the University Avenue Mobility Plan for specific recommendations.

Recommended Improvements

A) Implement the University Avenue Mobility Plan Final Concept.

Cost Estimate: None in addition to Hillcrest Corridor Mobility Plan

These recommendations are developed at a planning level only, and implementation should consider the specific conditions of the project area, including drainage, transit facilities, and other concerns as appropriate.
7. Barrio Logan

7.1 Area Description
Barrio Logan is located immediately south of Downtown San Diego, and is bordered by the San Diego Bay to the west, Interstate 5 to the east, and the City of National City to the South. Several industrial and commercial uses can be found in the community, although pockets of single and multifamily residential development are also present.

Pedestrian activity in the corridor is often limited to the neighborhoods and adjacent strip commercial land uses, and vehicular activity is high. Pedestrian amenities are typically present with the exception of a handful of vehicular corridors, particularly Harbor Drive. Landscaping and street trees are not as prevalent as in other urban core communities, and the pedestrian environment suffers somewhat from the prevalence of land uses designed to serve vehicles and industrial uses.

7.2 Inventory of Missing Sidewalks and Curb Ramps
A visual inspection of field conditions was conducted to inventory missing sidewalks, missing curb ramps, and to identify the presence of sidewalk obstructions within the study areas and on any pedestrian route designated above “neighborhood” in the community. In addition, the City of San Diego and SANDAG provided detailed information regarding existing curb ramps and missing sidewalks. GIS files for existing sidewalks and curb ramps were provided by SANDAG for inclusion in the base mapping efforts.

Missing sidewalks and curb ramps from this exercise are illustrated in Figure BL-1.
Figure BL-1 Barrio Logan Missing Sidewalks and Curb Ramps
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7.3 Route Types

All roadways within Barrio Logan were defined based on pedestrian functionality as defined in the Phase I Framework Document. There are four key route types included in the Barrio Logan area: District, Corridor, Connector and Neighborhood. Figure BL-2 illustrates the Route Type Classifications defined within the Barrio Logan Community.

- **District**: A district route includes sidewalks in the more intensive mixed use and concentrated areas of the city.
- **Corridor**: A corridor sidewalk is associated with major arterials and linear corridors with a moderate level of density.
- **Connector**: A connector sidewalk is often along a lower density corridor with few connections to adjacent land uses.
- **Neighborhood**: A neighborhood sidewalk is limited to areas of lower density and single use residential areas.
Figure BL-2: Barrio Logan Pedestrian Route Types and Land Uses

Source: Alta Planning + Design

Land Uses:
- Residential
- Commercial and Office
- Industrial
- Transportation, Utilities & Military
- Parks and Recreation
- Education
- Existing or Future Mixed Use

Route Types:
- District
- Corridor
- Connector
- Neighborhood
7.4 Focus Areas

Focus Areas narrow down to the routes within each community studied in the Master Plan. In most cases routes that are not within the Focus Area are located in low density residential areas, industrial areas, or areas with low demand for pedestrian activity. The Pedestrian Priority Model (PPM) was used to calculate a priority score for all routes within the Barrio Logan community. Point values associated with each of the five key priority factors, as defined in the Phase I Framework Document, were summed to provide an overall priority score. Once the routes had an associated score, the mean and standard deviation was calculated specific for the Barrio Logan community, which was used to determine the Tier 1 (highest ranking) and Tier 2 (second highest ranking) routes. Tier 1 and Tier 2 routes were included in the Focus Area. Focus areas were refined as a result of the existing conditions needs assessment and input from the community. Figure BL-3 illustrates the Barrio Logan Focus Area routes.
### Table BL-1: Barrio Logan Focus Areas & Potential Pedestrian Environment Improvement Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Focus Area Type</th>
<th>Route Type</th>
<th>Council District</th>
<th>Potential Pedestrian Environment Improvement Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1          | National Avenue  | 16th Street to Cesar E. Chavez Parkway | Residential     | Corridor   | District 8       | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections
• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions |
| 2          | National Avenue  | Cesar E. Chavez Parkway to SR-75 Underpass | School/Park     | Corridor   | District 8       | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections
• Provide pedestrian refuges
• Provide traffic calming
• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions |
| 3          | Logan Avenue     | Commercia l Street to Cesar E. Chavez Parkway | Residential     | Corridor   | District 8       | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections
• Provide pedestrian refuges
• Provide traffic calming
• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions
• Minimize pedestrian conflict from free right turning vehicles through intersection reconfiguration and/or treatments |
| 4          | Logan Avenue     | Cesar E. Chavez Parkway to SR-75 Underpass | School/Park     | Corridor   | District 8       | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections
• Provide pedestrian refuges
• Provide traffic calming
• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions |
Table BL-1: Barrio Logan Focus Areas & Potential Pedestrian Environment Improvement Measures (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Focus Area Type</th>
<th>Route Type</th>
<th>Council District</th>
<th>Potential Pedestrian Environment Improvement Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cesar E. Chavez Parkway</td>
<td>I-5 to Logan Avenue</td>
<td>Freeway Conflict</td>
<td>Connector</td>
<td>District 8</td>
<td>• Reduced crossing distances at intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide pedestrian refuges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide traffic calming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cesar E. Chavez Parkway</td>
<td>Logan Avenue to Bayfront Street</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>District and Connector</td>
<td>District 8</td>
<td>• Reduced crossing distances at intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Enhanced audible/visual crosswalk signals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• High visibility crossing treatments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.5 Improvement Areas

Overlying the existing conditions, physical conditions assessment and community input, Improvement Areas were defined within the Focus Area for the Barrio Logan Community. Improvement Areas are defined as either intersection improvements or corridor improvements. Intersection improvements focus on a single intersection or a group of intersections within a reasonable proximity of one another. Corridor improvements focus on improvements either along a roadway or through a series of intersections.

For the Barrio Logan Community, two Improvement Areas were defined, which are illustrated in Figure BL-4 and summarized in Table BL-2. On the pages following the figure and table, recommendations for each Improvement Area are described in detail.
Figure BL-4: Barrio Logan High-Priority Improvement Area Locations

High-Priority Improvement Locations Across Phases 2 and 3 Study Area

- Freeway Conflict Project Corridor
- School/Park Project Corridor
- Intersection Project Locations
- Urban Village Project Corridor
- Commercial Project Corridor
### Table BL-2: Barrio Logan High-Priority Improvement Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Improvement Area</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BL1</td>
<td>National Ave and Cesar E. Chavez Pkwy</td>
<td>Implement Barrio Logan Community Update, signal improvements, crosswalk improvements</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL2</td>
<td>Cesar E. Chavez Pkwy and Logan Ave</td>
<td>Implement Barrio Logan Community Update, signal improvements, crosswalk improvements</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These recommendations are developed at a planning level only, and implementation should consider the specific conditions of the project area, including drainage, transit facilities, and other concerns as appropriate.
Description and Issues
The Cesar E. Chavez Parkway/National Avenue intersection is surrounded by a mix of undeveloped, commercial, light industrial, and institutional land uses. A City fire station is located on the north corner of the intersection and the San Diego Community College Cesar Chavez Campus is located on National Avenue west of the intersection. Cesar E. Chavez Parkway is a three-lane road with center turn lanes to the south of the intersection and a six-lane roadway to the north. Posted speed limits along Cesar E. Chavez Parkway are 35 mph south of the intersection, reduced to 25 mph north of the intersection. National Avenue is a two-lane roadway with on-street parking and a posted speed limit of 30 mph. Average daily vehicle trips along Cesar E. Chavez Parkway are 12,900 and 5,100 along National Avenue. Two utility boxes are found in the public right-of-way within this improvement area. The intersection is served by the MTS bus route 901 which connects downtown, Barrio Logan, Coronado, and Imperial Beach. Three pedestrian crashes were reported at the Cesar E. Chavez Parkway/National Avenue intersection between 1998 and 2007, making it the second highest pedestrian crash location in Barrio Logan during that time period. The Barrio Logan Community Plan Update is currently underway and includes a draft street cross-section for Cesar E. Chavez Parkway. The draft cross-section proposes a sixteen-foot raised median, five-foot sidewalks, and five-foot sidewalk buffer along with on-street parking, a southbound travel lane with sharrows, a northbound bike lane, and two northbound travel lanes.

Recommended Improvements

A. Implement the final Barrio Logan Community Update cross-section and recommendations (not shown).
B. Consider upgrading existing pedestrian signal heads to push-button integrated accessible pedestrian signals that provide an audible and vibrotactile indication of the WALK signal. At a minimum, upgrade pedestrian signal heads to countdown pedestrian signals.
C. Pending an update to City policy, consider upgrading the existing standard crosswalks to high visibility crosswalks with advanced limit lines on all intersection legs.

Cost Estimate: $10,000 - $20,000
### Description and Issues

The Cesar E. Chavez Parkway/Logan Avenue intersection receives relatively high volumes of vehicular traffic, with average daily vehicle trips of 12,900 along Cesar E. Chavez Parkway and 8,200 along the eastern segment of Logan Avenue that leads to I-5 and SR-75 access ramps. Posted speed limits are 25 mph along Logan Avenue and Cesar E. Chavez Parkway. A small shopping complex is located on the southwest corner of the intersection and Chicano Park borders the northern leg of the intersection. The intersection is served by the MTS bus routes 901 and 11. A total of seven pedestrian crashes were reported at this location between 1998 and 2007. The Barrio Logan Community Plan Update is currently underway and includes a draft street cross-section for Cesar E. Chavez Parkway. The draft cross-section proposes a sixteen-foot raised median, five-foot sidewalks, and five-foot sidewalk buffer along with on-street parking, a southbound travel lane with sharrows, a northbound bike lane, and two northbound travel lanes.

### Recommended Improvements

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td>Implement the final Barrio Logan Community Update cross-section and recommendations (not shown).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td>Pending an update to City policy, consider upgrading the existing standard crosswalks to high visibility crosswalks with advanced limit lines on all intersection legs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td>Consider upgrading existing pedestrian signals to countdown pedestrian signal heads.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cost Estimate:** $10,000 - $20,000

*These recommendations are developed at a planning level only, and should consider the specific conditions of the project area, including drainage, transit facilities, and other concerns as appropriate.*
8 Greater Golden Hill
8. Greater Golden Hill

8.1 Area Description

The Greater Golden Hill community is located in the central part of the City of San Diego, along the eastern edges of Downtown and Balboa Park, and by State Route 15 to the east, State Route 94 to the south, and the Greater North Park community to the north.

The community is primarily residential in nature, with a mix of single- and multi-family residences. Multi-family residential is generally located along and adjacent to key corridors. Commercial uses are neighborhood in scale and generally pedestrian-oriented.

Owing to its origins as one of Downtown San Diego’s original “streetcar suburbs,” the streets are largely level in slope with the exception of those on the western edge of the community, and almost exclusively designed in a grid pattern, with the exception of some interruptions due to canyons in the eastern portion of the community. The community features mature planted trees in both the public right-of-way and private properties. Sidewalks are present almost everywhere in the community, although their conditions vary.

8.2 Inventory of Missing Sidewalks and Curb Ramps

A visual inspection of field conditions was conducted to inventory missing sidewalks, missing curb ramps, and to identify the presence of sidewalk obstructions within the study areas and on any pedestrian route designated above “neighborhood” in the community. In addition, the City of San Diego and SANDAG provided detailed information regarding existing curb ramps and missing sidewalks. GIS files for existing sidewalks and curb ramps were provided by SANDAG for inclusion in the base mapping efforts.

Missing sidewalks and curb ramps from this exercise are illustrated in Figure GH-1.
Figure GH-1 Greater Golden Hill Missing Sidewalks and Curb Ramps
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8. Greater Golden Hill

8.3 Route Types

All roadways within Greater Golden Hill were defined based on pedestrian functionality as defined in the Phase I Framework Document. There are four key route types included in Greater Golden Hill: District, Corridor, Connector and Neighborhood. Figure GH-2 illustrates the Route Type Classifications defined within the Greater Golden Hill Community.

- District: A district route includes sidewalks in the more intensive mixed use and concentrated areas of the city.
- Corridor: A corridor sidewalk is associated with major arterials and linear corridors with a moderate level of density.
- Connector: A connector sidewalk is often along a lower density corridor with few connections to adjacent land uses.
- Neighborhood: A neighborhood sidewalk is limited to areas of lower density and single use residential areas.
Figure GH-2: Greater Golden Hill Pedestrian Route Types and Land Uses

Source: Alta Planning + Design
8.4 Focus Areas

Focus Areas narrow down to the routes within each community studied in the Master Plan. In most cases routes that are not within the Focus Area are located in low density residential areas, industrial areas, or areas with low demand for pedestrian activity. The Pedestrian Priority Model (PPM) was used to calculate a priority score for all routes within the Greater Golden Hill community. Point values associated with each of the five key priority factors, as defined in the Phase I Framework Document, were summed to provide an overall priority score. Once the routes had an associated score, the mean and standard deviation was calculated specific for the Greater Golden Hill community, which was used to determine the Tier 1 (highest ranking) and Tier 2 (second highest ranking) routes. Tier 1 and Tier 2 routes were included in the Focus Area. Focus areas were refined as a result of the existing conditions needs assessment and input from the community. Figure GH-3 illustrates the Greater Golden Hill Focus Area routes.
Figure GH-3: Greater Golden Hill Focus Areas
## 8. Greater Golden Hill

### Table GH-1: Greater Golden Hill Focus Areas & Potential Pedestrian Environment Improvement Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Focus Area Type</th>
<th>Route Type</th>
<th>Council District</th>
<th>Potential Pedestrian Environment Improvement Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19th Street</td>
<td>B Street to C Street</td>
<td>Freeway Conflict</td>
<td>Connector</td>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>• Reduced crossing distances at intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B Street</td>
<td>19th to 20th Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide pedestrian refuges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Freeway Conflict</td>
<td>Connector</td>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>• Provide traffic calming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Freeway Conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Freeway Conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25th Street</td>
<td>A Street to C Street</td>
<td>Urban Village</td>
<td>District and Connector</td>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>• Reduced crossing distances at intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B Street</td>
<td>24th Street to 26th Street</td>
<td>Urban Village</td>
<td>District and Connector</td>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Urban Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide traffic calming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Urban Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Enhanced audible/visual crosswalk signals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Urban Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• High visibility crossing treatments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Urban Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25th Street</td>
<td>Russ Boulevard to A Street</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Connector</td>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>• Reduced crossing distances at intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Connector</td>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Connector</td>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>25th Street</td>
<td>C Street to F Street</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>District and Corridor</td>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>• Reduced crossing distances at intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>District and Corridor</td>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>• Provide pedestrian refuges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>District and Corridor</td>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>• Provide traffic calming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>District and Corridor</td>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>District and Corridor</td>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>• Enhanced audible/visual crosswalk signals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>District and Corridor</td>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>• High visibility crossing treatments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>District and Corridor</td>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table GH-1: Greater Golden Hill Focus Areas & Potential Pedestrian Environment Improvement Measures (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Focus Area Type</th>
<th>Route Type</th>
<th>Council District</th>
<th>Potential Pedestrian Environment Improvement Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5          | B Street | 29th Street to 30th Street | Residential | Connector | District 3 | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• Provide pedestrian refuges  
• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections  
• Provide traffic calming  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions |
| 6          | 30th Street | B Street to Broadway | Residential | Corridor and Connector | District 3 | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• Provide pedestrian refuges  
• Provide traffic calming  
• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions |
8. Greater Golden Hill

8.5 Improvement Areas

Overlaying the existing conditions, physical conditions assessment and community input, Improvement Areas were defined within the Focus Area for the Barrio Logan Community. Improvement Areas are defined as either intersection improvements or corridor improvements. Intersection improvements focus on a single intersection or a group of intersections within a reasonable proximity of one another. Corridor improvements focus on improvements either along a roadway or through a series of intersections.

For the Barrio Logan Community, one Improvement Areas was defined, which is illustrated in Figure GH-4 and summarized in Table GH-2. On the pages following the figure and table, recommendations for the Improvement Area are described in detail.
Figure GH-4: Greater Golden Hill High-Priority Improvement Area Locations
8. Greater Golden Hill

Table GH-2: Greater Golden Hill High-Priority Improvement Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Improvement Area</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GHI</td>
<td>25th Street and B Street</td>
<td>City has recently completed improvements at this location</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Improvement Area GH1 | 25th Street and B Street (Greater Golden Hill)

#### Description and Issues

This intersection improvement area is located at the northern terminus of the 25th Street pedestrian District that extends from the 25th Street/B Street intersection south to the intersection of 25th Street and Broadway. The intersection is a part of a corridor study, the 25th Street Renaissance Project, that will redesign the six blocks of 25th Street between SR-94 and Balboa Park in order to enhance the community character and support pedestrian activity along this corridor. The intersection is all-way stop controlled. 25th Street is a 2-lane street north of B Street and 4-lane street south of B Street. B Street has a posted speed limit of 30 mph and an average of 10,600 daily vehicle trips, which is relatively high for Greater Golden Hill. B Street, a pedestrian Connector, experiences about half the average daily vehicle trips of 25th Street and has posted speed limits of 25 mph west of the intersection and 30 mph east of the intersection.

The 25th Street District is a community commercial center, lined primarily with local restaurants and shops. B Street also provides access to 25th Street Park to the north and Balboa Park further north. One pedestrian-involved collision was reported at this intersection between 1998 and 2007.

#### Recommended Improvements

Intersection improvements have recently been completed.

#### Cost Estimate: N/A

These recommendations are developed at a planning level only, and implementation should consider the specific conditions of the project area, including drainage, transit facilities, and other concerns as appropriate.
9 Normal Heights
9. Normal Heights

9.1 Area Description
Normal Heights is located in the central part of the City of San Diego, northeast of downtown. The community is primarily residential in nature, with a mix of single-family residences along local streets, and multi-family residential along and adjacent to key commercial corridors such as Adams Avenue. Commercial uses are neighborhood in scale and generally pedestrian-oriented.

The streets are largely level in slope with the exception of those on the western edge of the community, and almost exclusively designed in a grid pattern. The community features extensive mature planted trees in both the public right-of-way and private properties. Sidewalks are present almost everywhere in the community, although their conditions vary.

9.2 Inventory of Missing Sidewalks and Curb Ramps
A visual inspection of field conditions was conducted to inventory missing sidewalks, missing curb ramps, and to identify the presence of sidewalk obstructions within the study areas and on any pedestrian route designated above “neighborhood” in the community. In addition, the City of San Diego and SANDAG provided detailed information regarding existing curb ramps and missing sidewalks. GIS files for existing sidewalks and curb ramps were provided by SANDAG for inclusion in the base mapping efforts.

Missing sidewalks and curb ramps from this exercise are illustrated in Figure NH-1.
Figure NH-1 Normal Heights Missing Sidewalks and Curb Ramps

- Alta Sidewalk Inventory (2009)
- SANDAG Sidewalk Inventory (2011)
- SANDAG Inventory Not Verified

Study Focus Area

Normal Heights Study Area and Missing Sidewalks

- Normal Heights

- Study Area

- Missing Sidewalks

Map showing the Normal Heights Study Area with missing sidewalks and curb ramps. The map includes a legend with different symbols indicating the Alta Sidewalk Inventory and SANDAG Sidewalk Inventory, along with a focus area.
9. Normal Heights

9.3 Route Types

All roadways within Barrio Logan were defined based on pedestrian functionality as defined in the Phase I Framework Document. There are four key route types included in Normal Heights: District, Corridor, Connector and Neighborhood. Figure NH-2 illustrates the Route Type Classifications defined within the Normal Heights Community.

- **District**: A district route includes sidewalks in the more intensive mixed use and concentrated areas of the city.
- **Corridor**: A corridor sidewalk is associated with major arterials and linear corridors with a moderate level of density.
- **Connector**: A connector sidewalk is often along a lower density corridor with few connections to adjacent land uses.
- **Neighborhood**: A neighborhood sidewalk is limited to areas of lower density and single use residential areas.
Figure NH-2: Normal Heights Pedestrian Route Types and Land Uses

Normal Heights Route Types and Land Uses

**LAND USES**

- Residential
- Commercial and Office
- Industrial
- Transportation, Utilities & Military
- Parks and Recreation
- Institutions
- Education
- Existing or Future Mixed-Use

**ROUTE TYPES**

- District
- Corridor
- Connector
- Neighborhood

Source: Alta Planning + Design (October 2008)
9. Normal Heights

9.4 Focus Areas

Focus Areas narrow down to the routes within each community studied in the Master Plan. In most cases routes that are not within the Focus Area are located in low density residential areas, industrial areas, or areas with low demand for pedestrian activity. The Pedestrian Priority Model (PPM) was used to calculate a priority score for all routes within the Normal Heights community. Point values associated with each of the five key priority factors, as defined in the Phase I Framework Document, were summed to provide an overall priority score. Once the routes had an associated score, the mean and standard deviation was calculated specific for the Normal Heights community, which was used to determine the Tier 1 (highest ranking) and Tier 2 (second highest ranking) routes. Tier 1 and Tier 2 routes were included in the Focus Area. Focus areas were refined as a result of the existing conditions needs assessment and input from the community. Figure NH-3 illustrates the Normal Heights Focus Area routes.
Normal Heights Project Improvement Areas

Figure NH-3: Normal Heights Focus Areas

Project Focus Area Types
- Freeway Conflict Focus Area
- Urban Village Focus Area
- School/Park Focus Area
- Commercial Focus Area
- Residential Focus Area

Project Focus Area Number (Keyed to Table 6)

Normal Heights Project Focus Areas

April 5, 2010
### Table NH-1: Normal Heights Focus Areas & Potential Pedestrian Environment Improvement Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Focus Area Type</th>
<th>Route Type</th>
<th>Council District</th>
<th>Potential Pedestrian Environment Improvement Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1          | Adams Avenue  | I-805 to Hawley Boulevard      | Commercial            | District and Corridor    | District 3       | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• Provide pedestrian refuges  
• Provide traffic calming  
• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions  
• Enhanced audible/visual crosswalk signals  
• High visibility crosswalks |
| 2          | 25th Street   | Adams Avenue to Madison Avenue | Urban Village + School/Park | District, Connector and Residential | District 3 | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• Provide pedestrian refuges  
• Provide traffic calming  
• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections  
• Enhanced audible/visual crosswalk signals  
• High visibility crosswalks  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions |
| 3          | Adams Avenue  | Wilson Avenue to E. Mountain View Drive | Commercial | Corridor | District 3 | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• Provide pedestrian refuges  
• Provide traffic calming  
• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections  
• High visibility crossing treatments  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions |
| 4          | Adams Avenue  | E. Mountain View Drive to 40th Street | School/Park | Corridor | District 3 | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
• High visibility crossing treatments  
• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions |
### Table NH-1: Normal Heights Focus Areas & Potential Pedestrian Environment Improvement Measures (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Focus Area Type</th>
<th>Route Type</th>
<th>Council District</th>
<th>Potential Pedestrian Environment Improvement Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5          | 40th Street | Adams Avenue to Monroe Avenue  | School/Park + Freeway Conflict | Connector | District 3        | • Reduced crossing distances at intersections  
**• Reduce pedestrian-motorist conflicts by limiting vehicular turning movements at intersections**  
**• High visibility crossing treatments**  
**• Improved ADA/accessibility conditions**  
**• 40th Street Promenade Plan** |
9.5 Improvement Areas

Overlaying the existing conditions, physical conditions assessment and community input, Improvement Areas were defined within the Focus Area for the Barrio Logan Community. Improvement Areas are defined as either intersection improvements or corridor improvements. Intersection improvements focus on a single intersection or a group of intersections within a reasonable proximity of one another. Corridor improvements focus on improvements either along a roadway or through a series of intersections.

For the Normal Heights Community, five Improvement Areas were defined, which are illustrated in Figure NH-4 and summarized in Table NH-2. On the pages following the figure and table, recommendations for each Improvement Area are described in detail.
Figure NH-4: Normal Heights High-Priority Improvement Area Locations

High-Priority Improvement Locations Across Phases 2 and 3 Study Area
### 9. Normal Heights

**Table NH-2: Normal Heights High-Priority Improvement Areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Improvement Area</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NH1</td>
<td>35th Street at Adams Avenue</td>
<td>Curb extensions</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH2</td>
<td>East Mountain View Drive at Adams Avenue</td>
<td>Curb extensions and improved crossings</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH3</td>
<td>Adams Avenue from Hawley Blvd to Wilson Avenue</td>
<td>Curb extensions and median installations</td>
<td>7C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH4</td>
<td>Adams Avenue from Wilson Avenue to East Mountain View Drive</td>
<td>Curb extensions, improved crossings, and median installations</td>
<td>12C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH5</td>
<td>Adams Avenue from West Mt. View Drive to Hawley Blvd (Normal Heights)</td>
<td>Curb extensions and median installations</td>
<td>14C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Description and Issues**

The intersection of 35th Street and Adams Avenue occurs in a pedestrian-oriented retail district adjacent to a park and elementary school. There are existing yellow high-visibility crosswalks. Curb extensions would help to create more space for pedestrians in the intersection and increase visibility.

**Recommended Improvements**

- Study the feasibility of curb extensions on all four corners of the intersection.

**Cost Estimate:** $150,000 - $200,000
Description and Issues
This high-priority improvement area is located at the East Mountain View Drive and Adams Avenue intersection in eastern Normal Heights. East Mountain View Drive is a two-lane residential roadway with parking on both sides and a posted speed limit of 20 mph. Adams Avenue is a two-lane roadway with a center left-turn lane and parking on both sides. At this location, Adams Avenue has a posted speed limit of 30 mph, with 21,400 estimated ADTs on both sides of the intersection. The roadway has local bus traffic and this intersection has unsheltered bus stops one block west of the intersection and one block east, connecting to MTS local bus route 11. The intersection has commercial and residential land uses on all four corners.

Recommended Improvements

- Install curb extensions on all four corners of the intersection,
- Pending an update to City policy, stripe high-visibility crosswalk on east intersection leg.
- See also corridor Improvement Concept Sheet NH4: Adams Avenue from Wilson Avenue to East Mountain View Drive.

Cost Estimate: $150,000 - $200,000
Description and Issues

This three-block priority corridor along Adams Avenue combines features of pedestrian District and Corridor route types. The Adams Avenue corridor has high pedestrian activity throughout Normal Heights. This three-block segment is near Adams Avenue Park, Adams Elementary school, and numerous pedestrian-oriented commercial land uses. The corridor is served by the MTS bus route 11 and has moderate transit ridership rates. Adams Avenue is a 2-lane roadway with a center left-turn lane and approximately 17,000 average daily vehicle trips (ADTs). Traffic volumes are relatively high for a two-lane roadway. The combination of pedestrian attracting land uses, amenities, and significant vehicular traffic create potential conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles. Only one intersection along this corridor is signalized, the 35th Street/Adams Avenue intersection. High visibility (yellow ladder) school crosswalks exist on the north and south legs of the Mansfield Street/Adams Avenue intersection and on all four legs of the 35th Street/Adams Avenue intersection. High visibility (white ladder) crosswalks exist on the north and south legs of the Hawley Boulevard/Adams Avenue intersection.

Recommended Improvements

A. Study the feasibility of curb extensions on all corners of the intersections with Hawley Boulevard, Mansfield Street, and 35th Street.

B. Study the feasibility of a median in Adams Avenue, opening up to left-turn pockets at major intersections.

Cost Estimate: $500,000 - $600,000

These recommendations are developed at a planning level only, and implementation should consider the specific conditions of the project area, including drainage, transit facilities, and other concerns as appropriate.
Description and Issues
This corridor improvement area extends along Adams Avenue from Wilson Avenue to East Mountain View Drive. Adams Avenue is a two-lane roadway with a center turn lane, a 30 mph posted speed limit, and 3,000 average daily vehicle trips (ADTs) along the entire corridor. Land uses along the corridor include commercial and residential dispersed relatively evenly throughout. The corridor has local bus traffic, including one sheltered bus stop at the southeast corner of the intersection with Cherokee Avenue and one unsheltered bus stop at the northwest corner of the same intersection, which connect to MTS local bus route 11. The corridor contains six utility boxes within the public right-of-way, many of which are artistically painted. Nine pedestrian-involved collisions were reported along the corridor between 1998 and 2007, including four collisions at the intersection of Cherokee Avenue. The combination of pedestrian attracting land uses, amenities, and significant vehicular and bus traffic create potential conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles. Only one intersection along this corridor is signalized, the Cherokee Avenue/Adams Avenue intersection, but there are no crosswalks in any of the intersections. The corridor is classified as a pedestrian Corridor route.

Recommended Improvements
A. Install curb extensions at all four corners of intersections with East Mountain View Drive, Cherokee Avenue, and 36th Street.
B. Install high-visibility crosswalks at all four legs of the intersection with Cherokee Avenue.
C. Install a high visibility crosswalk on the east side of East Mountain View Drive.
D. Study the feasibility of a median along Adams Avenue that opens into left-turn pockets at major intersections.

Cost Estimate: $800,000 - $1,000,000

These recommendations are developed at a planning level only, and implementation should consider the specific conditions of the project area, including drainage, transit facilities, and other concerns as appropriate.
Description and Issues

This corridor improvement area extends along Adams Avenue from West Mountain View Drive to Hawley Boulevard. Adams Avenue is a two-lane roadway with a center turn lane, a 30 mph posted speed limit, and 17,000 average daily vehicle trips (ADTs) along the entire corridor. Land uses along the corridor are mainly commercial with eight multi-family residential parcels dispersed throughout. There is a post office on the northwest corner of the 33rd Street intersection, and this corridor is the host of the Normal Heights community sign. The corridor has local bus traffic, including one sheltered bus stop at the southwest corner of the intersection with 33rd Street and six unsheltered bus stops, connecting to MTS local bus route 11. The corridor contains sixteen utility boxes within the public right-of-way, many of which are artistically painted. Twelve pedestrian-involved collisions were reported along the corridor between 1998 and 2007, including three collisions at the intersection of 32nd Street and three collisions at the intersection of 34th Street. The combination of pedestrian attracting land uses, amenities, and significant vehicular traffic create potential conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles. The intersections at 32nd Street and Felton Street are signalized with standard white painted crosswalks at 32nd and decorative paving in the crosswalks at Felton Street. The intersection at Hawley Boulevard is unsignalized with high visibility yellow crosswalks on the north and south sides of the intersection due to proximity of Adams Elementary School. The corridor is classified as a pedestrian District and Corridor route.

Recommended Improvements

A. Install curb extensions at all four corners of intersections with Hawley Boulevard, 34th Street, and 32nd Street.
B. Install 12’ medians at midblock locations throughout the corridor.
C. Install curb extensions at south and northwest legs of West Mountain View Drive intersection.

Cost Estimate: $500,000 - $600,000

These recommendations are developed at a planning level only, and implementation should consider the specific conditions of the project area, including drainage, transit facilities, and other concerns as appropriate.