San Die	go Unified	Port District	
Docume	mt No	60864	
Filed	OCT :	1 0 2013	
	Office of	the District Clerk	

# **ATTACHMENT 1 to the**

# FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

## ADDENDUM

to the

### FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

for the

# CHULA VISTA BAYFRONT MASTER PLAN AND PORT MASTER PLAN AMENDMENT

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NUMBER 2005081077

**UPD NUMBER 83356-EIR-658** 

### SAN DIEGO UNIFIED PORT DISTRICT

**3165 Pacific Highway** 

San Diego, California 92101

Diling 120

## **JULY 2013**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. 25

1.0	Intro	oduction	
	1.1	Purpose and Background	
	1.2	CEQA Framework for Addendum	
	1.3	Determination	
2.0	Proi	ect Description	3
		Location and Setting	
		Project Characteristics	
3.0	Envi	ironmental Checklist	5
4.0	Con	clusion	
Appe	endix /	Α	follows page 32

i

:11

60864 PAGE 2

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1 PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND

This document constitutes an Addendum to the April 2010 Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) originally prepared for the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan and Port Master Plan Amendment (CVBMP), which was certified by the Board of Port Commissions on May 18, 2010, by Resolution No. 2010-78 (Clerk Document Number 56562). The FEIR for the CVBMP analyzed environmental impacts associated with the redevelopment of land and water along the Chula Vista Bayfront with a variety of public amenities, a resort conference center, hotel and retail commercial uses, and environmental enhancements. As part of the redevelopment, several existing streets were proposed to be extended and several new streets were proposed to be constructed. In order to accommodate full build-out of the CVBMP, H Street was proposed to be extended and constructed as a 4-lane major street as contemplated and analyzed in the FEIR.

The purpose of this Addendum is to evaluate whether revisions to the H Street extension component of the CVBMP (hereafter referred to as the original Project) would result in any new or substantially more adverse significant effects or require any new mitigation measures not identified in the FEIR. No other changes are proposed to the original Project.

Similar to the original Project, the revisions to the H Street extension component of the original Project would consist of the construction of roadway improvements that would provide for an east-west connection between the City of Chula Vista's urban core and the Chula Vista bayfront. H Street would continue to be extended westward from the existing H Street right-of-way terminus at the San Diego and Arizona Eastern (SD&AE) railroad crossing to Marina Parkway. The minor revisions to the H Street extension differ from the original Project in the following manner:

- The 16-foot-wide median will be removed, and a 10-foot-wide center turn lane will be added;
- The landscaped parkways on both sides of H Street will be widened to 9 feet wide;
- A 12-foot-wide Class I bicycle path will be provided along the south side of H Street; and
- Landscape plantings will be modified to provide a consistent street tree theme.

All other components of the original Project, including BMPs and LID strategies, would be included in the revisions to the original Project.

This Addendum, together with the FEIR, will be used by the San Diego Unified Port District (District) when considering approval of the minor revisions to the original Project.

1

#### 1.2 CEQA FRAMEWORK FOR ADDENDUM

When a lead agency has already prepared an EIR, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) mandates that "no subsequent or supplemental environmental impact report shall be required by the lead agency or any responsible agency, unless one or more of the following events occurs: (a) substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the environmental impact report; (b) substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is being undertaken which will require major revisions in the environmental impact report; (c) new information, which was not known and could not have been known at the time the environmental impact report was certified as complete, becomes available" (Cal. Pub. Res. Code, §21166). State CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 clarifies that a subsequent EIR or supplemental EIR is only required when "substantial changes" occur to a project or the circumstances surrounding a project, or "new information" about a project implicates "new significant environmental effects" or a "substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects."

When only some changes or additions to a previously certified EIR are necessary and none of the conditions described in Public Resources Code Section 21166 or Section 15162 of the State CEQA Guidelines calling for the preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR are met, CEQA allows the lead agency to prepare and adopt an addendum. (State CEQA Guidelines, §15164(a).)

#### 1.3 DETERMINATION

As verified in this Addendum, the analyses and the conclusions in the FEIR remain current and valid. The proposed revisions to the H Street extension component of the original Project would not cause new significant effects not identified in the FEIR nor increase the severity of environmental effect as analyzed in the FEIR, and, hence, no new mitigation measures would be necessary to reduce significant effects (see Section 3.0 Environmental Checklist). No change has occurred with respect to circumstances surrounding the revisions to the original Project that would cause new or substantially more severe significant environmental effects than were identified in the FEIR. In addition, no new information has become available that shows that the revisions to the original Project would cause new or substantially more severe significant environmental effects that shows that the revisions to the original Project would cause new or substantially more severe significant environmental effects that shows that the revisions to the original Project would cause new or substantially more severe significant environmental effects that shows that the revisions to the original Project would cause new or substantially more severe significant environmental effects which have not already been analyzed in the FEIR.

Therefore, no further environmental review is required beyond this Addendum. This Addendum incorporates all of the applicable mitigation measures detailed in the FEIR. With this Addendum, the revisions to the original Project would still be within the framework of the evaluation for the original Project as documented in the FEIR.

2

July 2013

### 2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

#### 2.1 LOCATION AND SETTING

The original Project is located along the northern boundary of the former Goodrich south campus in Chula Vista, California. The original Project site occupies approximately 4.25 acres. The revisions to the original Project would occur within the same footprint as the original Project.

#### 2.2 **PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS**

The original Project included the construction of roadway improvements that would provide for an east-west connection between the City of Chula Vista's urban core and the Chula Vista bayfront. The original Project proposed to extend westward from the existing H Street right-of-way terminus at the San Diego and Arizona Eastern (SD&AE) railroad crossing to Marina Parkway. Proposed improvements associated with the H Street extension included roadway paving, median, sidewalks, landscaping, drainage and utilities. The original Project was implemented to fulfill the obligations established by the 1999 Goodrich Relocation Agreement (Relocation Agreement) and the 2010 Second Amendment to Relocation Agreement (Second Amendment), and was also found to be consistent with the build-out scenario contemplated under the approved CVBMP.

The original Project included the following design features for the H Street extension component:

- Divided roadway with a 24-foot-wide travel lane in each direction and a 16-footwide landscaped median;
- 5-foot-wide sidewalks on each side of the roadway, with 7-foot wide landscaping and swales between the curb and sidewalk;
- Minimum of 3 feet of landscape buffer between the sidewalk and Goodrich property;
- Appropriate roadway transitions at each terminus point to existing roadway improvements, including Marina Parkway between H Street and Sandpiper Way, striping, signal modification, and pedestrian crossing at west side of Bay Boulevard;
- Removal of existing railroad tracks and ties at non-operational crossing;
- Driveway access to adjacent Goodrich property;
- Storm drain systems to accommodate the ultimate build-out of the bayfront analyzed in the CVBMP (i.e., 72-inches or less in diameter capacity);
- Potable water and recycled water system with lines of 8- to 16-inches in diameter;
- Dry utilities, including gas, electric and communications;
- Street lighting;
- Landscape and irrigation system; and

Revisions to H Street Extension Project Addendum

3

July 2013

• Post-construction storm water mitigation Best Management Practices (BMPs), including Low Impact Development (LID) strategies.

The revisions to the original Project, which are contemplated in this Addendum, include the following minor changes:

- The 16-foot-wide median will be removed, and a 10-foot-wide center turn lane will be added;
- The landscaped parkways on both sides of H Street will be widened to 9 feet wide;
- A 12-foot-wide Class I bicycle path will be provided along the south side of H Street; and
- Landscape plantings will be modified to provide a consistent street tree theme.

All other components of the original Project, including BMPs and LID strategies, will be included in the revisions to the original Project.

Revisions to H Street Extension Project Addendum

4

60864

PAGE

	· · ·	New		No Substantial Change
<b>I.</b> .	Aesthetics	Potentially Significant Impact	More Severe Impact	from Previous Analysis
Wo	ould the project:			
a.	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			
b.	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings along a scenic highway?			
c.	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			
d.	Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?			

### 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

a. – d. The revisions to the original Project would not include the 16-foot-wide landscaped median; thus, west-facing views along H Street, which is identified as a Vista Area and View Corridor in the certified Port Master Plan, would be improved due to the absence of tall trees and other vegetation. No scenic highway is located in the vicinity of the Project site, so the revisions to the original Project would have no effect on scenic highways. Furthermore, the original Project and revisions to the original Project would improve the overall visual quality of the Project area by redeveloping a visually degraded, highly underutilized site. Finally, the revisions to the original Project would not introduce new lighting aside from that previously identified in the original The revisions to the original Project would continue to comply with all Project. applicable aesthetics mitigation measures identified in the FEIR for the CVBMP. Therefore, the impacts originally identified in the FEIR for the CVBMP would remain unchanged with implementation of the revisions to the H Street extension component of the original Project.

Revisions to H Street Extension Project Addendum

5

No **Substantial** New Change Potentially More from Significant Severe Previous II. Agricultural and Forestry Resources Impact Analysis Impact In determining whether impacts on agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts on forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project, and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in the Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project: Convert Prime Farmland, Unique  $\square$ Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use? b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural  $\boxtimes$ use or conflict with a Williamson Act contract?  $\square$ c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?

**Revisions to H Street Extension Project** Addendum

a.

6

July 2013

PAGE

d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

e. Involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

**a.** – **e.** The revisions to the original Project would have no effect on Farmland or forest land. The revisions to the original Project would be located within an existing developed area absent of Farmland or forest land. The impacts originally identified in the FEIR for the CVBMP would remain unchanged with implementation of the revisions to the H Street extension component of the original Project.

Revisions to H Street Extension Project Addendum

7

 $\boxtimes$ 

 $\boxtimes$ 

				. •
	Air Quality	New Potentially Significant Impact	More Severe Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis
est ma ma	nen available, the significance criteria ablished by the applicable air quality inagement or air pollution control district by be relied upon to make the following terminations. Would the project:			
a.	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			
b.	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			
C.	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is a nonattainment area for an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			
d.	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			$\boxtimes$
e.	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			

**a.** – **e.** The revisions to the original Project would not necessitate additional grading or earthwork as all of the improvements would be completed within the same footprint identified in the original Project as analyzed in the FEIR. No additional construction-related truck trips would be required as the scope of construction is substantially similar to the original Project. Also, the roadway extension would continue to be constructed and operate as a 4-lane major roadway. Because there is no change in roadway capacity, no change in air emissions from vehicular traffic would occur. Finally, the revisions to the original Project would not release additional pollutants or objectionable odors aside from those already identified in the FEIR. The revisions to the original Project would continue to comply with all applicable air quality mitigation measures identified in the FEIR. Therefore, the impacts originally identified in the FEIR for the CVBMP would remain unchanged with implementation of the revisions to the H Street extension component of the original Project.

IV.	Biological Resources	New Potentially Significant Impact	More Severe Impact	No Substantia Change from Previous Analysis
Wo	uld the project:			
a.	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			
b.	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			
с.	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			
d.	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?			
θ.	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			

.

i

f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

**a.** – **f.** The revisions to the original Project would be completed within the same footprint identified in the original Project as analyzed in the FEIR, and, therefore, would not have any new substantial adverse effect on the following: a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species; any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community; any federally protected wetlands; or the movement of any fish or wildlife species. The revisions to the original Project would continue to comply with all applicable biological resources mitigation measures identified in the FEIR. Therefore, the impacts originally identified in the FEIR for the CVBMP would remain unchanged with implementation of the revisions to the H Street extension component of the original Project.

Revisions to H Street Extension Project Addendum

10

 $\boxtimes$ 

Г

V.	Cultural Resources	New Potentially Significant Impact	More Severe Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis
Wo	ould the project:			
a.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?			$\boxtimes$
b.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?			
C.	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			

**a.** – **c.** The revisions to the original Project would not necessitate additional grading or earthwork aside from that already identified for the original Project. In addition, no additional existing structures would be demolished for implementation of the revisions to the original Project. The revisions to the original Project would continue to comply with all applicable cultural resources mitigation measures identified in the FEIR. Therefore, the impacts originally identified in the FEIR for the CVBMP would remain unchanged with implementation of the revisions to the H Street extension component of the original Project.

VI.	Geology and Soils	New Potentially Significant Impact	More Severe Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis
Wo	uld the project:	•		
a.	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:		·	
	1. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			
	2. Strong seismic ground shaking?			$\boxtimes$
•	<ol> <li>Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</li> </ol>			$\boxtimes$
	4. Landslides?			$\boxtimes$
b.	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			
C.	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project and potentially result in an onsite or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?			
d.	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?			$\boxtimes$
е.	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems in areas where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?			
_,	sions to H Street Extension Project 12	<u></u>		

f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

**a.** – **f.** The revisions to the original Project would be constructed within the same footprint identified in the original Project. The revisions to the original Project do not include the construction of new buildings or other structures aside from those already contemplated in the original Project; thus, no new impacts related to fault rupture, groundshaking, ground failure, landslides, or unstable soils would occur. Additionally, the revisions to the original Project would continue to comply with all applicable geology and soils mitigation measures identified in the FEIR. Therefore, the impacts originally identified in the FEIR for the CVBMP would remain unchanged with implementation of the revisions to the H Street extension component of the original Project.

 $\square$ 

 $\boxtimes$ 

Revisions to H Street Extension Project Addendum

13

VII	. Greenhouse Gas Emissions	New Potentially Significant Impact	More Severe Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis
Wo	build the project:	·		
a.	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			
b.	Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			

**a.** – **b.** The revisions to the original Project would not necessitate additional grading or earthwork as all of the improvements would be completed within the same footprint identified in the original Project as analyzed in the FEIR. No additional constructionrelated truck trips would be required as the scope of construction is substantially similar to the original Project. Also, the roadway extension would continue to be constructed and operate as a 4-lane major roadway and would not increase roadway capacity. Because there would be no change in roadway capacity, no change in greenhouse gas emissions from vehicular traffic would occur. Finally, the revisions to the original Project would provide a Class I bicycle path and sidewalks on either side of the extended H Street, which are intended to encourage non-automobile transportation; these components may have a beneficial effect on greenhouse gas emissions when compared to the original Project. The revisions to the original Project would continue to comply with all applicable greenhouse gas emissions mitigation measures identified in the FEIR. Therefore, the impacts originally identified in the FEIR for the CVBMP would remain unchanged with implementation of the revisions to the H Street extension component of the original Project.

Revisions to H Street Extension Project Addendum

14

VII	I. Hazards and Hazardous Materials	New Potentially Significant Impact	More Severe Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis
Wo	ould the project:			
<b>a.</b>	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			
<b>b.</b> .	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			
C.	Emit hazardous emissions or involve handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			
d.	Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?			
e.	Be located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, be within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?			
f.	Be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?			
g.	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			
				•

 $\boxtimes$ 

.

h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

**a.** – **h.** The revisions to the original Project would not transport or release additional hazardous materials aside from those already identified in the original Project. The truck haul route would also be identical to that identified in the original Project. The revisions to the original Project would be constructed within the same footprint as the original Project, so new impacts associated with hazardous materials sites, airports, airstrips, or wildland fires would not occur. Also, appropriate emergency access would continue to be included as part of the revisions to the original Project. Finally, the revisions to the original Project would continue to comply with all applicable hazards and hazardous materials mitigation measures identified in the FEIR. Therefore, the impacts originally identified in the FEIR for the CVBMP would remain unchanged with implementation of the revisions to the H Street extension component of the original Project.

Revisions to H Street Extension Project Addendum

IX.	Hydrology and Water Quality	New Potentially Significant Impact	More Severe Impact	Substantial Change from Previous Analysis
Wo	uld the project:			
a.	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			$\boxtimes$
b.	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, resulting in a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			
C.	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation onsite or offsite?			
d.	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding onsite or offsite?			
e.	Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			
f.	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			

: •

Revisions to H Street Extension Project Addendum

•

17

g.	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?		
h.	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect floodflows?		
<b>i.</b>	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?		
j.	Contribute to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?		$\boxtimes$

a. - j. The revisions to the original Project would be constructed within the same footprint as the original Project and would not necessitate additional grading or earthwork than identified by the original Project. Therefore, new impacts related to water quality and groundwater supplies would not occur. The revisions to the original Project would alter the site's existing drainage patterns; however, the revisions would continue to be appropriately designed with relation to stormwater drainages, which would ensure that erosion, siltation, and flooding do not occur. As previously identified, the revisions to the original Project would continue to implement appropriate BMPs and LID strategies, which would further control stormwater runoff. Finally, no new structures would be constructed aside from those identified in the original Project, so no new impacts related to flood hazards, levee or dam failure, or seiche, tsunami, or mudflow would not occur. The revisions to the original Project would continue to comply with all applicable hydrology and water quality mitigation measures identified in the FEIR. Therefore, the impacts originally identified in the FEIR for the CVBMP would remain unchanged with implementation of the revisions to the H Street extension component of the original Project.

Revisions to H Street Extension Project Addendum

18

X. Land Use and Planning	New Potentially Significant Impact	More Severe Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis
Would the project:			
<ul> <li>Physically divide an established community?</li> </ul>			$\boxtimes$
b. Conflict with any applicable land use pla policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, b not limited to, a general plan, specific pla local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	ut		
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?			$\boxtimes$

**a.** – **c.** The revisions to the original Project would not divide an established community, conflict with an applicable land use plan, or conflict with an applicable habitat conservation plan. The revisions to the original Project would be constructed within the same footprint identified in the original Project, and no established community exists within the limits of the original Project. The revisions to the original Project are also consistent with the certified Port Master Plan. The revisions to the original Project would continue to comply with all applicable land use and planning mitigation measures identified in the FEIR. Therefore, the impacts originally identified in the FEIR for the CVBMP would remain unchanged with implementation of the revisions to the H Street extension component of the original Project.

Revisions to H Street Extension Project Addendum

XI.	Mineral Resources	New Potentially Significant Impact	More Severe Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis
Wo	ould the project:			
a.	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?			$\boxtimes$
b.	Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?			

**a.** – **b.** The revisions to the original Project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or state, or a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local plan. The revisions to the original Project would be constructed within the same footprint identified in the original Project, and no mineral resources are known to occur or have been discovered within the limits of the original Project site. Therefore, the impacts originally identified in the FEIR for the CVBMP would remain unchanged with implementation of the revisions to the H Street extension component of the original Project.

XII	. Noise	New Potentially Significant Impact	More Severe Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis
Wo	ould the project:			
а.	Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in a local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?			
b.	Expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			$\boxtimes$
C.	Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			
d.	Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			
e.	Be located within an airport land use plan area, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			
f.	Be located in the vicinity of a private airstrip and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			

**a.** – **f.** The revisions to the original Project would not require any additional construction aside from that identified for the original Project. In addition, it is anticipated that similar construction methods to those proposed as part of the original Project would be employed as part of the revisions to the original Project; thus, construction noise levels would be similar to those identified in the FEIR. Therefore, no additional noise or vibrations would be generated by the revisions to the original Project. Additionally, the revisions to the original Project would not introduce new land uses that were not already analyzed in the FEIR, so new permanent increase in ambient noise would occur.

Revisions to H Street Extension Project Addendum

21

Finally, the revisions to the original Project would be constructed within the same footprint as the original Project, so additional impacts associated with airport noise levels would not occur. The revisions to the original Project would continue to comply with all applicable noise mitigation measures identified in the FEIR. Therefore, the impacts originally identified in the FEIR for the CVBMP would remain unchanged with implementation of the revisions to the H Street extension component of the original Project.

Revisions to H Street Extension Project Addendum

XII	I. Population and Housing	New Potentially Significant Impact	More Severe Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis
Wo	ould the project:			
a.	Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			
b.	Displace a substantial number of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			
<b>C.</b> <sup>-</sup>	Displace a substantial number of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			

**a.** – **c.** The revisions to the original Project would not induce substantial population growth or displace existing housing or people. The revisions to the original Project do not involve the construction of homes or businesses, and no existing housing units or people occupy the original Project site. The revisions to the original Project would continue to comply with all applicable population and housing mitigation measures identified in the FEIR. Therefore, the impacts originally identified in the FEIR for the CVBMP would remain unchanged with implementation of the revisions to the H Street extension component of the original Project.

Revisions to H Street Extension Project Addendum

23

PAGE

25

XIV. Public Services	New Potentially Significant Impact	More Severe Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis
Would the project:		,	
a. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or a need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:			
Fire protection?			$\boxtimes$
Police protection?			$\boxtimes$
Schools?			$\boxtimes$
Parks?			$\boxtimes$
Other public facilities?			$\boxtimes$

**a.** The revisions to the original Project would not result in additional demand for fire or police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities. Because the revisions to the original Project would not alter the proposed roadway capacity, no additional park users would be accommodated that could cause the need for additional parks aside from those already identified in the FEIR. The revisions to the original Project would continue to comply with all applicable public services mitigation measures identified in the FEIR. Therefore, the impacts originally identified in the FEIR for the CVBMP would remain unchanged with implementation of the revisions to the revisions to the H Street extension component of the original Project.

24

PAGE 26

	7. Recreation ould the project:	New Potentially Significant Impact	More Severe Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis
a.	Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			
b.	Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			

**a.** – **b.** The revisions to the original Project would not result in an increase in use of existing parks or other recreational facilities. Because the revisions to the original Project would not alter the proposed roadway capacity, no additional park users would be accommodated that could cause the physical deterioration of existing parks. The revisions to the original Project would include a Class I bicycle path; however, all improvements would occur within the same footprint identified for the original Project. Therefore, no additional physical effects on the environment would occur as a result of the revisions. In addition, the Class I bicycle path would provide additional recreational opportunities along the waterfront. The revisions to the original Project would continue to comply with all applicable recreation mitigation measures identified in the FEIR. Therefore, the impacts originally identified in the FEIR for the CVBMP would remain unchanged with implementation of the revisions to the H Street extension component of the original Project.

Revisions to H Street Extension Project Addendum

25

xv	I. Transportation/Traffic	New Potentially Significant Impact	More Severe Impact	No Substantia Change from Previous Analysis
Wc	build the project:			
a.	Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation, including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including, but not limited to, intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?			
b.	Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level-of-service standards and travel demand measures or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			
C.	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?			
d.	Substantially increase hazards because of a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			$\boxtimes$
e.	Result in inadequate emergency access?			$\boxtimes$
f.	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?			

**a.- f.** The revisions to the original Project would not conflict with any plans, policies, or ordinances related to the effectiveness of the circulation system because the roadway

extension would continue to be constructed and operate as a 4-lane major roadway. A traffic memorandum entitled Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan Traffic Analysis Review, California prepared by Rick Engineering in July 2013 (see Appendix A) identified that the revisions to the original Project would continue to service the CVBMP at acceptable level of service (LOS) ratios. The traffic memorandum identified that, since preparation of the FEIR, a few of the land uses within the CVBMP area have changed. However, the traffic memorandum concluded that the current roadway cross sections for H Street are consistent with the CVBMP conceptual plans and comply with all applicable mitigation measures identified in the FEIR; thus, no new significant effects on the roadway network would occur. Finally, the traffic memorandum concluded that the roadway geometry proposed for H Street and Bay Boulevard would operate at an acceptable LOS for peak hour conditions and would accommodate all queued vehicles without spilling onto the railroad tracks. Therefore, the revisions to the original Project would not conflict with an applicable congestion management program. Also, no changes to emergency access are proposed. Finally, no change in air traffic patterns would occur from the revisions to the original Project. Finally, the revisions to the original Project include a Class I bicycle path, which would augment existing bicycle facilities in the area. The revisions to the original Project would continue to comply with all applicable transportation/traffic mitigation measures identified in the FEIR. Therefore, the impacts originally identified in the FEIR for the CVBMP would remain unchanged with implementation of the revisions to the H Street extension component of the original Project.

Revisions to H Street Extension Project Addendum

xv	II. Utilities and Service Systems	New Potentially Significant Impact	More Severe Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis
Wo	ould the project:			
a.	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			$\boxtimes$
b.	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			
C.	Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			
d.	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or would new or expanded entitlements be needed?			
e.	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			
f.	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			$\boxtimes$
g.	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			

**a.** – **g.** The revisions to the original Project would not result in additional demand for wastewater treatment, water supplies, or landfill capacity as the revision propose substantially the same features as the original Project. No sanitary sewer facilities would be included as part of the revisions to the original Project. Finally, no additional

Revisions to H Street Extension Project Addendum

28

landfill capacity would be required as the scope of grading and earthwork is substantially similar to the original Project. In addition, the reduction in landscaping from removal of the landscaped median would result in a small reduction in the overall demand for water. The revisions to the original Project would not include any new stormwater drainage facilities aside from those already identified in the original Project, so no new physical impacts would occur. As previously noted, the revisions would continue to be appropriately designed with relation to stormwater drainages and would continue to implement appropriate BMPs and LID strategies, which would further control stormwater runoff. The revisions to the original Project would continue to comply with all applicable utilities and service systems mitigation measures identified in the FEIR. Therefore, the impacts originally identified in the FEIR for the CVBMP would remain unchanged with implementation of the revisions to the H Street extension component of the original Project.

Revisions to H Street Extension Project Addendum

29



**a**. – **c**. The revisions to the original Project would not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, reduce biological resources, or eliminate cultural resources because the revisions to the original Project are substantially similar to the original Project and would occur within the same footprint identified in the original Project. The revisions to the original Project would not result in new cumulatively considerable impacts or new environmental impacts on human being because the scope of the Project, including both construction and operation, would also be substantially similar to that identified in the original Project. The revisions to the original Project. The revisions to the original Project would continue to comply with all applicable mitigation measures identified in the FEIR. Therefore, the impacts originally identified in the FEIR for the CVBMP would remain unchanged with implementation of the revisions to the H Street extension component of the original Project.

Revisions to H Street Extension Project Addendum

30

#### **Environmental Determination**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

□ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

□ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions to the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have an impact on the environment that is "potentially significant" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis, as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☑ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the project, nothing further is required.

Signature

UE SVE NISMIHIRA

Printed Name

For

Revisions to H Street Extension Project Addendum

31

PAGE

60864

### 4.0 CONCLUSION

On the basis of the evaluation presented in Section 3, the revisions to the original Project would not trigger any of the conditions listed in Section 1.2 of this Addendum, requiring preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR. Thus, this Addendum satisfies the requirements of CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15164. The revisions to the original Project do not introduce new significant environmental effects, substantially increase the severity of previously identified significant environmental effects, or show that mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible.

Overall, the revisions to the Project would result in the substantially similar effects to those of the original Project with similar construction and operations as those originally proposed and would therefore generate substantially comparable effects. The revisions to the original Project would not result in new significant effects or effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the FEIR. All applicable mitigation measures from the FEIR would be included as part of the revisions to the original Project.

The analyses and conclusions in the FEIR remain current and valid. The revisions to the original Project would not cause new or substantially more severe significant effects than identified in the FEIR, and thus no new mitigation measures would be required. No change has occurred with respect to circumstances surrounding the revisions to the original Project that would cause new or substantially more severe significant environmental effects than identified in the FEIR, and no new information has become available that shows that the project would cause significant environmental effects not already analyzed in the FEIR.

Therefore, no further environmental review is required beyond this Addendum to the FEIR.

Revisions to H Street Extension Project Addendum

32

July 2013

PAGE 34

# Appendix A



July 18, 2013

Ms. Linda Scott San Diego Unified Port District 3165 Pacific Highway San Diego, California 92112

#### SUBJECT: CHULA VISTA BAYFRONT MASTER PLAN TRAFFIC ANALYSIS REVIEW (RICK ENGINEERING COMPANY JOB NUMBER 15939-K)

Dear Ms. Scott:

Rick Engineering Company performed a review of the traffic analyses performed to date for the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan (CVBMP). More specifically, the following traffic analysis were reviewed: *CVBMP Final Environmental Impact Report* (FEIR) (Dudek, April 2010), *CVBMP Traffic Impact Analysis* (Kimley-Horn, March 2008), *CVBMP Pacifica Development Traffic Analysis* (Kimley-Horn, October 2007), and *CVBMP Gaylord Traffic Analysis* (Kimley-Horn, October 2007). The review also compares the existing approved uses for the CVBMP development, with the current land use plan, and assesses the impact to the local roadways in the vicinity of the project. The following summarizes our findings.

#### TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS (KIMLEY-HORN) AND FEIR (DUDEK)

The traffic studies were reviewed to verify accuracy and to compare to the current land use plan. The following discrepancies were found with the review:

- Phase I: Both traffic analyses reported the same number of total trips, however, the Dudek study showed a Fire Station (located on Parcel H-17) proposed for this phase (Table 4.2-10), and the Kimley-Horn study did not (Table 4-4). The Fire Station is shown to generate 400 daily trips.
- Phase II: Both traffic analysis reported the same number of total trips, however, the Kimley-Horn study showed a 2-acre Industrial Business Park (located on Parcel H-17) proposed for this phase (Table 4-5), and the Dudek study did not (Table 4.2-11). The Industrial Business Park is shown to generate 400 daily trips.
- Phase III: Both traffic analyses reported the same number of trips, and there are no discrepancies.
- Phase IV: Both traffic analyses reported the same number of trips, and there are no discrepancies.

It should be noted that the discrepancy between Phase I and Phase II regarding the Fire Station and the Industrial Business Park (both located on Parcel H-17) is considered negligible, with no additional impact related to traffic, as both proposed developments are shown to be located on the same parcel and generate the same amount of traffic. Refer to Attachment 1 for the trip generation tables from the Dudek and Kimley-Horn studies.

 5620 Friars Road
 • San Diego, California 92110-2596
 • (619) 291-0707
 • Fax (619) 291-4165
 • rickengineering.com

 SAN DIEGO
 RIVERSIDE
 ORANGE
 SACRAMENTO
 SAN LUIS OBISPO
 BAKERSFIELD
 PHOENIX
 TUCSON
Ms. Linda Scott July 18, 2013 Page 2 of 4

### LAND USE

Since the preparation of the FEIR, a few of the land uses within the CVBMP land area have changed. The changes are as follows:

Phase I: S-1 (Sweetwater District) moved from Phase IV to Phase I, and the land use was revised from a 750 room Resort Hotel to a 237 stall RV Park.

H-3 (Harbor District) decreased from a 2,000 room Hotel to a 1,600 room Resort Conference Center. Access for this parcel was previously assumed to be primarily along H Street, with the main entrance and exit on H Street, west of Marina Parkway, and a truck driveway located along H Street, directly opposite Marina Parkway. A secondary driveway for the parcel was assumed on E Street, north of H Street.

Phase II: H-23 increased from a 500 room Hotel to a 1,250 room Resort Hotel; the 100,000 sf of Cultural use decreased to 25,000 sf, and the 100,000 sf of Retail increased to 175,000 sf. There has not been a focused analysis completed for this parcel, identifying access points.

Phase III: No change.

Phase IV: S-1 was removed and assumed to be constructed as a 237 stall RV Park in Phase I.

### TRIP GENERATION

The trip generation for the revised land uses was calculated based on trip generation rates in SANDAG's Brief Guide of Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates for the San Diego Region, April 2002 (which is the same methodology utilized in the Kimley-Horn and Dudek studies), and compared to the trip generation in the FEIR. The revised trip generation is summarized as follows:

	<u>FEIR</u>	Current Land Use Plan	Difference
Phase I:	30,842 veh/day	28,427 veh/day	2,415 fewer daily trips
Phase II:	25,190 veh/day	34.090 veh/day	8,900 more daily trips
Phase I&II			6,485 more daily trips
Phase III:	8.685 veh/day	8.685 veh/day	no change
Phase I, II, &III		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	6,485 more daily trips
Phase IV:	14,600 veh/day	8.600 veh/day	6,000 fewer daily trips
Phase I, II, III, & IV	79,317 veh/day	78,317 veh/day	485 more daily trips

Refer to Attachment 2 for summary of the trip generation for each phase of the current land use plan.

Ms. Linda Scott July 18, 2013 Page 3 of 4

### POTENTIAL IMPACTS

The traffic generated by the current land use plan was distributed to the project vicinity for Phase II, Phase III, and Phase IV, and compared to City of Chula Vista General Plan roadway classification capacities, and the Mitigation Measures documented in FEIR Section 4.2.5. No further analysis was prepared for Phase I, as this phase is projected to generate less traffic with the current land use plan.

The total additional traffic generated by the current land use plan (485 daily trips) is not anticipated to have any significant impacts on the roadway network within the vicinity of the project, assuming that the roadway cross sections are constructed as follows:

Segment

### Roadway Cross Section

H Street, Marina Parkway to Street A H Street, Street A to I-5 Ramps Street C, Marina Parkway to Street A J Street, Marina Parkway to Street A J Street, Street A to Bay Boulevard J Street, Bay Boulevard to I-5 Ramps Marina Parkway, H Street to Street C Marina Parkway, Street C to J Street Street A, H Street to Street C Street A, Street C to J Street 4 Lane Major Street
5 Lane Major Street
2 Lane Class II Collector
4 Lane Major Street
6 Lane Major Street
6 Lane Major Street
3 Lane Class II Collector
3 Lane Class II Collector
4 Lane Class I Collector
4 Lane Class I Collector

The roadway cross sections identified above are consistent with the current Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan, Sweetwater and Harbor Districts, Conceptual Plan – June 19, 2013, the plans for the H Street Extension Project – July 11, 2013, and the Mitigation Measures Section 4.2.5 of the FEIR.

Refer to Attachment 3 for the Phase II, Phase III, and Phase IV mitigation requirements from the FEIR and the current land use plan.

### H STREET AND BAY BOULEVARD INTERSECTION GEOMETRY

The intersection of H Street and Bay Boulevard was analyzed using the Synchro software to determine if the geometry proposed by the current land use plan is adequate for peak hour conditions. Based on the results of the capacity and queuing analysis, for all phases of development, the geometry as proposed is anticipated to operate at an acceptable LOS for peak hour conditions, and accommodate all queued vehicles without spilling across the railroad tracks. The geometry is proposed as follows:

### Intersection of H Street and Bay Boulevard

- o Eastbound: 3 through lanes, 1 right-turn lane
- o Westbound: 2 through lanes with a shared right-turn lane
- o Northbound: 1 left-turn lane, 1 shared through/right-turn lane
- o Southbound: 1 left-turn lane, 1 shared through/right-turn lane

Ms. Linda Scott July 18, 2013 Page 4 of 4

Refer to Attachment 4 for the capacity analysis printouts.

### CONCLUSION

The change in land use for the CVBMP is anticipated to result in a minor increase in traffic when compared to the trip generation in the FEIR (485 more daily trips) for full build conditions (all four phases of development). As a result of the net increase in trips, no additional impacts are anticipated to occur, as long as the roadway cross sections described in the Potential Impacts section of this letter are constructed. The roadway cross sections described above correspond with the following plan sets:

- Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan, Sweetwater and Harbor Districts, Conceptual Plan June 19, 2013.
- H Street Extension Project July 11, 2013.

It is recommended that once driveway locations are determined for H-23 that a focused traffic analysis is prepared for this parcel, to determine if any additional impacts will occur at the adjacent intersections and roadways. Additionally, if any access points change for H-3, a revision to the traffic analysis prepared for this parcel should be performed, to determine any impacts to the adjacent intersections and roadways, and to verify that the currently planned cross sections are adequate.

60864

PAGE

39

Sincerely,

RICK ENGINEERING COMPANY

Br. R. 86

Brian R. Stephenson, P.E., T.E., P.T.O.E. Principal Project Manager

### Attachments

cc: Kevin Gibson, Rick Engineering Company

# Attachment 1

Trip Generation from Dudek and Kimley-Horn Studies

# Summary of Phase I Trip Generation **TABLE 4.2-10**

Phase         Parcel         Land Use         Units1         Trip Rate <sup>2</sup> Daily Trips         In         Out         Total         In         Out         Total           Sweetwater District         Sweetwater District         Sweetwater District         900         59         58         117         41         40         81           Sweetwater District         Subtotal         10         1         m         20,000         59         58         117         41         40         81           I arbor District         Harbor District         20,000         720         480         1,200         960         640         1,600           I H-13, H-14         Residential         1,500         du         6         1         du         9,000         144         576         720         567         243         810           I H-13, H-1         Signature Park         18         ac         50         1         ac         900         59         58         117         41         40         81           I H-13, H-14         Fire Station         2         2         2         2         2         2         3         48           I H-15         Fire Statitin	: ; ; ;					•. • •			A.N	A.M. Peak Hour	lour		P.M. Peak Hour	our	
trict         trict         Signature Park       18       Ac       50       1       ac       900       59       58       117       41       40         H-14       Hotel       2,000       m       10       1       m       20,000       720       950       567       243         H-14       Residential       2,000       m       10       1       m       20,000       144       576       720       960       567       243         P-1       Signature Park       18       ac       500       144       576       720       567       243         P-1       Signature Park       18       ac       500       144       576       177       41       40         Residential       2       360       640       38       10       41       40         P-1       Signature Park       18       ac       50       ac       300       59       58       117       41       40         Shoreline Promenade       8.4       ac       5       1       ac       29,942       924       117       203       1570       364 <th colst<="" th=""><th>Phase</th><th>Ĺ</th><th>-</th><th>Units</th><th></th><th>Trip Rat</th><th>le<sup>2</sup></th><th>Daily Trips</th><th>ln.</th><th>Oct</th><th>Total</th><th></th><th>Out</th><th>Total</th></th>	<th>Phase</th> <th>Ĺ</th> <th>-</th> <th>Units</th> <th></th> <th>Trip Rat</th> <th>le<sup>2</sup></th> <th>Daily Trips</th> <th>ln.</th> <th>Oct</th> <th>Total</th> <th></th> <th>Out</th> <th>Total</th>	Phase	Ĺ	-	Units		Trip Rat	le <sup>2</sup>	Daily Trips	ln.	Oct	Total		Out	Total
Image: Signature Park       18       Ac.       50       I       ac.       900       59       58       117       41       40         H-14       Hotel       900       59       58       117       41       40         H-14       Residential       2,000       m       10       I       m       20,000       720       480       1,200       960       640         P-1       Signature Park       1,500       du       6       I       du       3,000       144       576       720       567       243         P-1       Signature Park       18       ac       50       I       ac       900       59       58       117       41       40         Fire Station       2       1       ac       50       I       ac       900       59       58       117       41       40         Shoreline Promenade       8.4       ac.       50       I       ac       40       38       10       48       10       38       36       36       36       36       36       36       36       36       36       36       36       36       36       36       36       36 </td <td>Sweeth</td> <td>vater District</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>:</td> <td>. 1</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>ţ</td> <td></td>	Sweeth	vater District			:	. 1							ţ		
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		S-2	Signature Park			50 1	ŝ	006	59	28	111	41	40	8	
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Subtot	al						006	59	58	117	41	40	81	
H-3       Hotel       20,000       m       10       1       m       20,000       720       480       1,200       960       640         H-13, H-14       Residential       1,500       du       6       1       du       9,000       144       576       720       567       243         H-3, HP-1       Signature Park       18       ac       50       1       ac       900       59       58       117       41       40       38         H-17       Fire Station       2       ac       200       1       ac       400       38       10       48       10       38         H-17       Fire Station       2       ac       200       1       ac       420       38       10       48       10       38         H-17       Fire Station       8       ac       5       1       ac       42       1       1       2 <td< td=""><td>Harbor</td><td>District</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>	Harbor	District													
H-13, H-14     Residential     1,500     du     6     1     du     9,000     144     576     720     567     243     8       H-8, HP-1     Signature Park     18     ac     50     1     ac     900     59     58     117     41     40     38     10     48     10     38     10     38     10     38     10     38     10     38     10     38     10     38     10     38     10     38     10     38     10     38     10     38     10     38     10     38     10     38     10     38     10     38     10     38     10     38     29     29     29     29     28     2		H <u>-</u> 3	Hotel	2,000	m	10 / /	E	20,000	720	480	1,200	<b>096</b>	640	1,600	
H-8, HP-1     Signature Park     18     ac     50     1     ac     900     59     58     117     41     40       H-17     Fire Station     2     ac     200     1     ac     400     38     10     48     10     38       H-17     Fire Station     2     ac     200     1     ac     42     1     1     2     2     2       HP-3     Shoreline Promenade     8.4     ac.     5     1     ac     42     1     1     2     2     2     2       HP-3     Shoreline Promenade     8.4     ac.     5     1     ac     42     1     1     2     2     2     2       HP-3     Shoreline Promenade     8.4     ac.     5     1     ac     29,942     924     1,115     2,039     1,571     924     2,4		H-13, H-14	Residential	1,500	лр,	6 1	ŋp	000'6	144	576	720	567	243	810	
H-17     Fire Station     2     ac     200     //     ac     400     38     10     48     10     38       HP-3     Shoreline Promenade     8.4     ac     5     /     ac     42     1     1     2     2     2       AP-3     Shoreline Promenade     8.4     ac     5     /     ac     42     1     1     2     2     2       AP-3     Shoreline Promenade     8.4     ac     5     /     ac     42     1     1     2     2     2       AP-3     Shoreline Promenade     8.4     ac     5     /     ac     29,942     924     1,115     2,039     1,571     924     2/       AP-3     Shoreline Promenade     Soleta     24     923     1,173     2,156     1,611     964     2,1	_	H-8, HP-1	Signature Park	18	ŝ	50 /	gc	006	59	58	117	41	40	8	
HP-3     Shoreline Promenade     8.4     ac.     5     1     ac.     2     2     2     2     2     2       1     1     2     2     1     1     1     2     2     2     2       1     1     2     2     2     1     1     2     2     2     2       1     2     2     2     2     2     2     2     2       1     2     2     2     2     2     2     2     2       1     2     2     2     2     2     2     2     2       2     3     3     3     3     3     3     3     3	 _	H-17	Fire Station	2		500	ac	400	38	9	48	10	8	48	
29,942     924     1,115     2,039     1,570     924       30,842     983     7,173     2,156     1,611     964	÷.	HP-3	Shoreline Promenade	8.4	ac.	5 1	ac	42.	1	1	2	2	2	9	
翻》 ★96% 不同1951.20 ★951.27 ~ 722.11 代 1886 ~ 1927年306。1111日,111日,11日,11日,11日,11日,11日,11日,11日,	Subtot	ál						29,942		1,115		1,570	924	2,494	
	Total		가 가 가 가 가 가 가 가 가 가 가 가 가 가 가 가 가 가 가					30,842	983	1,173	<u></u>		964		

SOURCE: Kimley-Hom and Associates 2008. m = room; ac = acre; ksf = thousand square feet; du = dwelling unit The intensity of each land use was provided by the Port of San Diego. \*Trip Generation rates are based on SANDAG's (Not So) Brief Guide of Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates for the San Diego Region, April 2002.

1

April 2010 Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Chula Visia Bayfront Master Plan

5703-01 4.2.47

4.2

,

# **TABLE 4.2-11**

Summary of Phase II Trip Generation

								AM	I. Peak	A.M. Peak Hour	Ľ, 1	P.M. Peak Hour	lour
Phase	Parcel	LandUse	Units	167	Ë	Trip Rate <sup>2</sup>	Dally Trips	Ŀ	out	Total	Ľ	Out	Total
Harbor	Harbor District									•			
-	H-9	Retail/Commercial Recreation	50	ksf .	40	/ ksf	2,000	36	24	09	8	90	180
	H-15	Mixed Use Office	210	ksf	17 1	/ ksf	3,570	418	46	464	100	400	500
	H-15	Visitor Hotel	250	E	80	/ _m	2,000	09	40	100	56	84	140
	H-15	Retail	120	ksf	40	/ ksf	4,800	86	58	144	216	216	432
=	H-15	General Office	8	ksf	20	/ ksf	1,800	227	25	252	47	187	234
	H-23	Hotel	500	E	10	/ m	5,000	180	120	300	240	160	400
	H-23	Cultural	100	ksf	16	/ ksf	1,600	2	10	32	80	80	160
	H-23	Retail	100	ksf	40	/ ksf	4,000	72	48	120	180	180	360
=	HP-28	H Street Pier	0.4	ac	50	/ ac	20	1	2	3.	1	1.	2
Subtotal	ł.						25,190	1,140	383	1,523	1,020	1,436	2,456
Total				, ,, ,,			25,190	1,140	383	1,523	1,020	1,020 1,436	2,456
SOURCE:	Kimley-Horn	SOURCE: Kunley-Hom and Associates 2008. Let = thrusand enurate feet an = anter this = chaining in the											5. marti - 4. ar
	ממוות מתהמות י												

nsi = prousario square reet, ac = acret, ou = owening unit The intensity of each land use was provided by the Port of San Diego. "The Generation Rates are based on SANDAG's (Not So) Brief Guide of Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates for the San Diego Region, April 2002.

April 2010 Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan

5703-01 4.2-48

# Summary of Phase III Trip Generation **TABLE 4.2-12**

· ·			.					AM	. Peak	A.M. Peak Hour P.M. Peak Hour	P.M	. Peak	Hour
Phase	Parcel	Land Use	, Un	ts1	Units <sup>1</sup> Trip Rate <sup>2</sup>	tate <sup>2</sup>	Daily Trips		Out	In Out Total		In Out	Total
Harbor District	District												, i 
	H-21	Retail	150	ksf	40	/ ksf	6,000	108	72	180	270	270	540
Ĩ	HP-23A	Industrial Business Park	1.0	gc	ŝ	/ ac	50	3	4	7	2	3	ک
Subtotal	1 Ann		: : : :				6,050	111	- 22	187	272	272 273	545
<b>Otay District</b>	strict												-
III	0-1/0-2	Industrial Business Park <sup>3</sup>					1,200	115	29	144	29.	115	144
I	0-3	RV Park	236	qu	ŝ	. np / /	1,180	28	66	94	78	52	130
	OP-1/OP-3	South Park	51	ac	5	/ ac	255	5	2	10	10	9	8
Subtota							2,635	148	101	249	117	177	294
Total				Н		1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1	8,685	259	176	435 389 450	389	450	8
SOURCE	SOURCE: Kimley-Horn and Associates 2008	Associates 2008.					1			:			
ksf = thous	ksf = thousand square feet												

The intensity of each land use was provided by the Port of San Diego. <sup>2</sup>The Generation rates are based on SANDAG's (Not So) Brief Guide of Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates for the San Diego Region, April 2002. <sup>3</sup> The size of the industrial business park has not been determined, but trips for its use, which is consistent with the General Plan, have been assumed as shown:

April 2010. Einal Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan

5703-01 4.2-49

		allanda da anti-angla da angla da angla Angla da angla da ang							A.N	I. Peak	Hour 🚽	P.N	I. Peak	Hour
Phase	Parcel	Land Use	Uni	ts' 🕴	T	rip	Rate <sup>2</sup>	Daily Trips	În	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Sweetw	ater Dist	rict							· · .					
IV .	S-3	Mixed Use Commercial	120	ksf	17	1	ksf	2,040	239	26	265	57	229	286
IV .	S-4	Office	120	ksf	17	1	ksf	2,040	239	26	265	57	229	286
IV	S-1	Resort Hotel	750	m	8	1	m	6,000	180	120	300	168	252	420
Subtota	1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					144 - 155 - 1	10,080	658	172	830	282	710	992
Harbor	District						···· · ·			_				
IV I	H-12	Ferry Terminal/Restaurant	25	ksf <sup>-</sup>	100	1	ksf	2,500	15	10	25	140	60	200
IV	H-18	Office	100	ksf	20	1	ksf	2,000	252	28	280	52	208	260
ĪV	HP-28	H Street Pier	0.40	ac	50	1	ac	20	1	2	3	1	1	2
Subtota	ľ					•		4,520	268	40	308	193	269	462
Total							· · · ·	14,600	926	212	1,138	475	979	1,454

### **TABLE 4.2-13** Summary of Phase IV Trip Generation

SOURCE: Kimley-Horn and Associates 2008. ksf = thousand square feet

The Intensity of each land use was provided by the Port of San Diego. <sup>2</sup>Trip Generation rates are based on SANDAG's (Not So). Brief Guide of Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates for the San Diego Region, April 2002.

Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan

5703-01 4.2-50

60864 PAGE ЦЦ

4.2

April 2010

Philippia

Total Project Trip Generation Summary

			• • •						A.M. Peak Hour			P.M. Peak Hour	
Phase	Parcel	and the stand the stand of the stand	Uniter		Trip Rate <sup>2</sup>		Daily Trips	q	Out	Total	l I	Out	Total
Sweetwater District	let.												
	41 1	Resort Hotel	750 Rm	8	1	Ē	9000	180	120	300:	168	252	420
	S-2	Signature Park		99	1		006	<b>6</b> 5	58	211,		40	: <b>61</b> :
	8-3	Mixed Use Commercial	120 Ksf	17	/ Kst	<del>د</del> ,	2.040	662	26	265	- 25	229	286
	5	Office .		24	. 1		2,040	239	58	265	<i>L</i> S	228	286
Subtotal							10,980	717	230		323	. 150	1,073
Harbor District						1							4
1	2	Hotel	2.000 Rm	10	1.	e e	20,000	720	480	1,200	<b>360</b>	099	1,600
	H-8/HP-1	Stigneture Park	<u> </u>	20	-		300	59	58	117	41	40	81
	H-0	Retail/Commercial Recreation	÷	4	-	4	2,000	8	24	8	8	8	180
	H-12	Feny Terminal/Restaurent		90 <u>1</u>	~	1	2,500	15	10	25	140	8	200
	H-13H-14	Residential :		9	-		0006	144	576	720	567	243	610
	H-15	Mixed Use Office	210 Kst	11			3,570	418	46	464	100	400	200
	.H-15:	Visitor Hotel		8		F	2,000	89	40	8	66	84	140
	H-15	Retai		4	-		4,800	88	58	144	216	216	432
- - -	H:15	General Office	90 Kst	20		4	1,800.	221	25	252	47	187	234
	H-17	Fire Station	'2.0 Ac.	200	-		400	>36	10	.48	10	38.	48
	H-18	Office	100 Ksf	2	- t	<del>يا</del> -	2,000	292	28	280	52	208	260
	H-21	Retail		40	<u> </u>	<b>1</b> 1	6,000	108	<i>u</i> 1	180	270	.270	540
4	H23	Hotel		10		E	5,000	180	120	300	.240	160	400
	H-23	Cultural	100 Ksf	9		4	1,600	22	10	32	90	80	160
	H23	Retail	100 Kaf	40	1 Kst	st <sup>.</sup>	4,000	22	<b>8*</b>	120	180	180	360
4	HP-3	Shorefine Promenade	8.4 Ac	2	1	0	42	1999 - 1997 -	ł	2	2	2	. 3. 1
	HP-23A	Industrial Business Park		50	-	0	20	3:	4 .	7	2	3	. 5
	HP-28	H Street Prer		3	-	0	20.		2	3		1	2
ţ.	HP-28	H Street Pler		8	· · ·		30		2	3	1	ł	2.
Subtotal							65,706	2,443	1,613	4,055	3,055	2,902	256'5
Otay District										-			
	0-104	Industrial Business Park					1,200	115	29.	144	29	115	144
	0-3A/0-3B	RV Park	236 du	ę	1 du	7	1,180	28	98	94	78.	52	130
	OP-1A/B and OP-3	South Park	510 ac	LC.	ж /		255	<b>.</b>	ي. ب	9	Q	Q	8
Subtotal				, ,			2.635	148	101	249	117	11	787
Total							79,317	3,308	1,943	5,251	3,495	3,829	1324

жŗ

wixen della

42

PAGE 45

April 2010. Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan

5703-01 4 2-51

		P		LE 4-4 D PROJECT ERATION SU	MMARY						
						TACAL ON ST		ACCOUNTS ON THE		Stand Party	1.ed - 5
<u>Eha</u>	A REAL PROPERTY AND A		Sweetwal	ter District	DailyRope	RIAN BATT		<u>URIQUER</u>	ant in the	ALCAUCE	1.01
	S-2	Signature Park	18:0 ac	50 / ac	900	59	58	117	41	40	81
		Subfota	for: Sweetwater Di	strict	900	59	58	. 117	141	40	81
		Landored and a state of second land	Harbot	District	and the second secon						
	H-3	Hotel	2,000 m	10 / m	20,000	720	480	1,200	960	640	1,60
	H-8/HP-1	Signature Park	18 ac	50 / ac	900	59	58	117	41	40	81
2.3	H-13/H-14	Residential	1,500 du	6 / du	9,000	144	576	720	567	243	810
	HP-03	50 Baywalk	8.4 ac	5 / ac	42	1	1	2	2	1	3
		Subtota	for: Harber District		29,942	924	1.115	2,039	1,570.	924	2,49
				Tatal	30,842	983	1 173	2.156	1.611	064	2.57

(2) The intensity of each land use was provided by the Port of San Diego
 (3) Trip Generation rates are based on SANDAG's Brief Guide of Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates for the San Diego Region, April 2002
 Kottestowara 2007 The Generation 2007 The Generation

#### 60864 PAGE 46

		PHAS	E II TRIP GEN	ERATION SU	MMARY						
Pha				Tup Has	And the second		THE PROPERTY AND	ングの次日にあるアファンス		1 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	- Marcelleroz
				r District		and posterior concerns					
п	H-9	Retail/Commercial Recreation	50 ksf	40 / ksf	2,000	36	24	60	90	90	180
α	H-15	Mixed Use Office	210 ksf	17 / ksf	3,570	418	46	464	100	400	500
1	H-15	Visitor Hotel	250 mi	8/m	2,000	60	40	100	56	84	140
Ц	H-15	Retail	120 ksf	40 / ksf	4,800	86	58	144	216	216	432
Π	H-15	Général Office	90 ksf	20 / ksf	1,800	227	25	252	47	187	234
<u>n</u>	H-17	Industrial Business Park	2 ac	200 / 86	.400	38	10	48	10	38	48
0	H-23	Hotel	500 m	'10 / rm	5,000	1.80	120	300	240	160	400
0	H-23	Cultural	100 ksf	16 / ksf	1,600	22	10	32	80	80	160
1	H-23	Retail	100 ksf	40 / ksf	4,000	72	48	120	180	180	360
I	HP-28	H Street Pier	0.4 ac	50 / ac	20	1	2	3	. 1	1	2
		and the second	Harbor Distric		25,190	1.140	383	1,523	1.029	1,436	2,45
			an a		22 .00	1	207	1.523	1 070	1 476	-

(1) See Table 4-3 for the SANDAG trip generator category used for each land use description.
 (2) The intensity of each land use was provided by the Port of San Diego
 (3) Trip Generation rates are based on SANDAG's Brief Guide of Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates for the San Diego Region, April 2002
 Kirstsutting Science 2(8) Trip Generation (2) Trip Generatio (2) Trip Generation (2) Trip Gen

4-10

	•	PHAS	TABL PROPOSEL DE LII TRIP GEN	PROJECT	MMARY						
			之後的時間, 使用的时候, 你们的问题。		Contraction of the second		2000 AL 2017	1011 A 17 205		200 & R & B &	20
			Harbor		144 AUTO 14 AUTO 14 AUTO 14 AUTO				and a fundamental serve	Contract Office	
ш	H-21	Retail	150 ksf	40 / ksf	6,000	108	72	180	270	270	54
Ш	HP-23A	Industrial Business Park	1.0 ac	50 / ac	50	3	4	7	2	3	5
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Subtotal fo	r: Harbor District		6.050	m	76	187	272	273	\$4
			Otay D	)istrict							in the second
ш	0-1/0-2	Industrial Business Park 4.	Sec. 1		1,200	115	29	1,44	29	115	14
ш	0-3	RV Park	236 du	5/ du	1,180	28	66	94	78	52	13
Π	OP-1/OP-3	South Park	51 ac	S/ ac	255	5	5	10	10	10	20
die 1 die 1	to parts	Subtotal fo	: Olay District		2,635	148	101	249	117	177	29
E Str	ter trut	A CALL AND A	and the second sec	Total:	8.685	259	176	435	389	450	83

(1) See Table 4-3 for the SANDAG trip generator category used for each land use description.
(2) The intensity of each land use was provided by the Port of San Diego
(3) Trip Generation rates are based on SANDAG's Brief Guide of Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates for the San Diego Region, April 2002
(4) The size of the industrial business park has not been determined, but trips for the use, which is consistent with the General Plan, have been assumed as shown.

K-10954 TrafficExcelOption 245P Trip Gen vises [PIII Trip Gen

		PHA		LE 4-7 D PROJECT VERATION SU	MMARY						
	<b>二、上口:二、</b> 一、一、一、一、一、一、一、一、一、一、一、一、一、一、一、一、一、一、一			neo Rock I			Culc Ho	un i			
				ter District				tin linde <del>y Alexa</del>			
IV	S-1	Resort Hotel	750 m	8/m	6,000	180	120	300	168	252	420
IV	S-3	Mixed Use Commercial	120 ksf	17 / ksf	2,040	239	26.	265	57	229	286
IV	S-4	Office	120 ksf	17 / ksf	2,040	239	26	265	57	229.	286
		Subtotal fo	r: Sweetwater Di	strict.	10,080	658	172	\$30	282	710	.992
			Harbor	District				and the second s			
rv	H-12	Ferry Terminal/ Restaurant	25 ksf	100 / ksf	2,500	15	10	25	140	60	200
IV	H-18	Office	100 ksf	20. / ksf	2,000	252	28	280	52	208	260
IV .	HP-28	H Street Pier	0.40 ac	50./ ac	20	1	2	3	1	1	2
			r: Harbor Distric		4,520	268	-40	308	193	269	462
		an a		Total:	14,600		212	1.138	475	979	1.45

22

See Table 4-3 for the SANDAG trip generator category used for each land use description.
 The intensity of each land use was provided by the Port of San Diego
 Trip Generation rates are based on SANDAG's Brief Guide of Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates for the San Diego Region, April 2002

### 60864 PAGE 49

		TOTAL P	and all the second s	LE 4-8 D PROJECT GENERATION	V SUMMA	RY					
							C.P.edk Ph	ut in a		M.P.Eak-I	Le de Lour La
Pho	ie an Parvel	in in the state	的自由部	THURLEY			The second s	New York Contraction	AND PARAMETERS	10000000000	and the court
		The second se	Sweetwa	ter District		1	200			1	
rv	S-1	Resort Hotel	750 m	8/m	6,000	180	120	300	168.	252	420
1	S-2	Signature Park	18.0 ac	50 / ac	900	59	58	117	41	40	81
V	S-3	Mixed Use Commercial	120 ksf	17 / ksf	2,040	239	26	265	_57	229	286
V	S-4	Office	120 ksf	17 / ksf	2,040	239	26	265	57	229	286
		Subtoral fo	r: Sweetwater Di	strict	10.980	717	230	947	323	750	1.07
	CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR		Harbo	r District				N (Anno 1 of 1 1 1 2 7		1999 (1999) (1999) (1999) (1999) (1999) (1999) (1999) (1999) (1999) (1999) (1999) (1999) (1999) (1999) (1999) (1999) (1999) (1999)	Second Constants
1	H-3	Hotel	2,000 rm	10 / m	20,000	720	480	1,200	960	640	1,60
	H-8/HP-1	Signature Park	18.0 ac	50 / ac	900	59	58	117	41	40	81
α	H-9	Retail/Commercial Recreation	50 ksf	40 / ksf	2,000	36	24	60	90	90	180
IV	H-12	Ferry Terminal/ Restaurant	25 ksf	100 / ksf	2,500	15	10	25	140	60	200
Í.	H-13/H-14	Residential	1,500 du	6 / iðu.	9,000	144	576	720	567	243	810
I	H-15	Mixed Use Office	210 ksf	17 / ksf	3,570	418	46	464	100	400	500
I	H-15	Visitor Hotel	250 m	8 / mi	2,000	60	40.	100	56	84	140
I	H-15	Retail	120 ksf	40 / ksf	4,800	86	58	144	216	216	432
ı	H-15	General Office	90 ksf	20 / ksf	1,800	227	25	252	47	187	234
I	H-17	Industrial Business Park	2.0 ac	200 / ac	400	38	10	48	10	38	-48
v	H-18	Office	100 ksf	20 / ksf	2,000	252	28	280	52	208	260
ц	H-21	Retail	150 ksf	40 / ksf	6,000	108	72	180	270	270	540
I	H-23	Hotel	500 m	10 / m	5,000	180	120	300	240	160	400
I	H-23	Cultural	100 ksf	16 / ksf	1,600	22	10	32	80	.80	160
I	H-23	Retail	100 ksf	40 / ksf	4,000	72	48.	120	180	180	360
[	HP-03	50' Baywalk	8.4 ac	5 / ac	42	1	1	2	2	1	3
n	HP-23A	Industrial Business Park	1.0 ac	50 / ac	50	3	4	7	2	3	5
1	HP-28	H Street Pier	0.4 ac	50 / ac	20	1	.2	3	1	1	2
v	HP-28	H Street Pier	0.4 ac	50 / ac	20	1	2	3	1	1	2
		Subtatal for	: Harhor District		65,7112	2.443	1.612	4,055	3.055	2,902	5,95
			Otav 1	District							
ш	0-1/0-2	Industrial Business Park <sup>4</sup>			1,200	115	29	144	29	115	144
ц	0-3	RV Park	236 du	5/ du	1,180	28	66	94	78	52.	130
п	OP-1/OP-3	South Park	51.0 ac	5/ ac	255	5	5	10	10	10	20
		Subtotal for	: Otay District		2.635	1-(8	(U)	249	117	177	294
The state				Total:	79,317	3.308	1.943	5.251	3 195	5.829	7.32

(1) See Table 4-3 for the SANDAG trip generator category used for each land use description.
(2) The intensity of each land use was provided by the Port of San Diego
(3) Trip Generation rates are based on SANDAG's Brief Guide of Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates for the San Diego Region, April 2002
(4) The size of the industrial business park has not been determined, but trips for the use, which is consistent with the General Plan, have been assumed as shown.

## Attachment 2

Summary of Current Land Use Plan Trip Generation

	AM Peak Hour PM Peak Hour	Out Total In Out Total	59 58 117 41 40 81 58 59 58 57 65 78 50 58 50 58 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50		<b>ATT 777 671</b>	<u>384 960 768 512 1</u>	576 720 567 243 58 317 41 40	10	1 2 2 1 M30 1 2 1 200	1000 1000'T 1/40'T	- Linet
·	Daily Trips	<b>4</b>	900	DOL C	1000/2	16,000	000'6	400	42	74-017	1.4.4.6.2
Phase I	Trip Rate		ac			<u></u>		-	ăĊ		o RV Park:
Table 1 Trip Generation - Phase I	Trip		50	<u> </u>		10	9 Q	200	5	-	d use revised t
Trip Ge	Units		18 ac 7a7 ctalle					2 ac	90 20 90		ase I, and lan
						1,600	7,50	• 	-		phase IV to Ph
	Land Use		Signature Park RV Park				Residential Signatiure Dark	Fire Station	Shoreline Promenade		Note: H-3 decreased from 2,000 rooms to 1,600 rooms. 5-1 moved from Phase IV to Phase I, and land use revised to RV Park
	Parcel		5-3 2-3	÷.			H-13, H-14 H-8 HP-1	1	HP-3		om 2,000 room:
	Phase	Sweetwater District		Subtotal	Judicial Harbor District			,	Subtotal		Vote: H-3 decreased fro

1997-50 (J) 1

÷.

12.1.2.2

~5

er eder ware

and strategy i

PAGE 52

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· ·		180	500	140	234	1,000	40	2	3,158	3,158	8 	
	Date Drack Lines	LCAK DOUL	06	400	84	187	400	20	n N	1,713	1,713		×
		N.L.	06	100	26	47	600	20		1,445	1,445		
			60	464	100	252	750	8 6	017	1,991	1,991	1,499	
	and Hood	AW PEAK HOUL	24	46	04 0	55 2	300	<u>, 19</u>	4 N	581	581		
		AM	36	418	60	227	450	9	971	1,410	1,410		
	Dotto Teles		2.000	3,570	2,000	1,800	12,500	400	20	34,090	34,090	060°48	
hase II		ale	ksf	lsf.	E	s s	E	ksf.	ac				
Table 2 Trip Generation - Phase II		I rip kate	40	17	<u>∞ ;ç</u>	<u>20</u>	9	9	50				
T rip Gene		S.	ksf	i jş	Ē	is ja	E	ksf	ksr ac	,			
		OUICS	Sol	210	250	06	1,250	25	4/T				i
		Lang Use	Ratail/Commercial Recreation	Mixed Use Office	Visitor Hotel	ketau General Office	Resort Hotel	Cultural	Ketali H Street Pièr				
- - - -	1.22.6	Parcel	liia		H-15				HP-28 HP-28			om 500 rooms	
		Phase -	Harbor District							Subtotal	Total	Note: H-23 Increased from 500 rooms to 1,250 rooms.	

·····

60864 PAGE 53

we construct a present of the second s

'eet

ţ,

60864 PAGE 54

	Total	286	286	2/5	200 260 3	462	1,034
; :	PM Peak Hour	6	229	458	60 208 1	269	727
	PM	57	57	114	140 52	193	307
	Total	265	265	230	25 280 3	308	838
	AM Peak Hour	26	56	22	7 <u>8 10</u>	40	6
	AM	239	239	478	15 252	268	746
	Daily Trips	2,040	2,040	4,080	2,500 2,000	4,520	8,600
ase IV		ksf	ksf		ksf ksf		4
Table 4 eration - Ph	Trîp Rate	17	17		100 20	3	
Table 4 Trip Generation - Phase IV		ksf	ksf	_	ksf Ksf	; ;	
	Units	120	120		25 100		
- - -					ut		<u> </u>
	Land Use	ommercial		10. a. anna 1.	Ferry Terminal/Restaurant Office Li Stroot Dier		
		Mixed Use Commercial	Office		Ferry Termina Office Li Stroot Dier		
	Parcel	5-3			H-12 H-18 H0 20		
	Se		S	ict I			
	Phase Supplicities	N.	N	Subtotal Harbor District	222	Subtotal	Total

60864 PAGE 55

a. A start of the start

			μ	ip Gener	Table 5 Trip Generation - All Phases	l Phàse	- ŭn						
Phase	Parcel	Land Use	Units	51	Trip Rate	ate	Daily Trips	AM	AM Peak Hour		Nd	PM Peak Hour	
Sweetwater District								L	Out	Total	e	Out	Total
	S-2	Signature Park	18	ac	50	ac	006;	59		117		40	81
		RV Park	237	stalls	ر <del>کا</del>	stall	1,185	28	67	95	78	52	130
<u>N</u>	S-3	Mixed Use Commercial	120	ţ	17	lsf.	2,040	239	26	265	57	229	286
Ň	St4	Office	120	ksf	17	ksf	2;040	239	26	265	21	229	286
Subtotal		-					6,165	565	177	742	233	550	783
Harbor District					-						•		ز
•	H-3:	Resort Conference Center	1,600	, m	10	'n	16,000	576	384	960	768	512	1,280
	H-13, H-14	Residential	1,500	du.	9	du	000'6	144	576	720	567	243	810
	H-8, HP-1	Signature Park	18	g	20	ac	006	59	58	117	41	40	
	H-17	Fire Station	7	s S	200	ac	400	38	10	48	9	38	48
	ĤP≟3	Shoreline Promenade	00	ac	Ņ	ac	42	H	<b></b> i	14	7	7	
	6-H	Retall/Commercial Recreation	20	ksf	04	ksf	2,000	36	24	09	06	06	180
	H-15	Mixed Use Office	210	ksf	1	ksf	3,570	418	46	464	100	400	500
	H-15	Visitor Hotel	250	E	80	Ē	2,000	99	40	100	56	84	140
	H-15	Retail	120	ksf	40	ksf	4,800	86	89 20	144	216	216	432
	H-15	General Office	06	ksf	20	ksf	1,800	227	25	252	47	187	234
	H-23	Resort Hotel	1,250	E	10	E	12,500	450	300	750	600	400	1,000
	H-23	Cultural	25	lsf.	16	ksf	400	9	2	80	20	20	40
	H-23	Retail	175	ksf	9	ksf	7,000	126	84	210	315	315	630
	HP-28	H Street Pier	0.4	ac	50	S	20	न	2	Ċ.	-	् <del>त्</del> नः	
ĨĬ.	H-21	Retail	150	<b>I</b> SF	40	ksf	6,000	108	22	180	270	270	540
=	HP-23A	Industrial Business Park	1.0	ac	50	ac	SQ	m	4	2	N	m	
≥.	H-12	Ferry Terminal/Restaurant	25	ksf	100	ksf	2,500	15	9	25	140	9	200
≥	H-18	Office	100	ksf.	20	ksf	2,000	252	28	280	22	208	260
۲. ۲.	HP-28	H Street Pier	0.4	ac	50	ac	20	्त	2	3	<b>.</b>	Ę.	
Subtotal							71,002	2,607	1,726	4,333	3,298	3,090	6,388
Otay District													
8	0-1/0-2	Industrial Business Park					1,200	115	29	144	29	115	144
=	6.0	RV Park	236	đu	-iC):	qr	1,180	28	66	94	78	52	130
	OP-1/OP-3	South Park	<u>5</u> 1	ä	ŝ	ac	255	ů.	'n	10	10	P	20
Subtotal							2,635	148	100	248	117	177	294
	The second secon						man and the second s						

·920

27910

60864 PAGE 56

Phase	Daily Trips	AN	AM Peak Hour		PR	PM Peak Hour	
Trips from Revised DEIR, May 2008 (Dudek)		5	Out	Total	Ĺ	out	Total
	30,842	983	1,173	2,156	1,611	964	2,575
	25,190	1,140	383	1,523	1,020	1,436	2,456
	8,685	259	176	435	389	450	839
	14,600	926	212	1,138	475	979	1,454
Total	79,317	3,308	1,944	5,252	3,495	3,829	7,324
Trips based on Current Land Use Plan							
	28,427	905	1,154	2,059	1,507	927	2,434
	34,090	1,410	581	1,991	1,445	1,713	3,158
	8,685	259	176	435	389	450	839
-	8,600	746	92	838	307	727	1,034
	79,802	3,320	2,003	5,323	3,648	3,817	7,465
Difference in Trips between Revised DEIR and Curre	d DEIR and Current Land Use Plan	ć					
	(2,415)	(28)	(61)	(26)	(104)	(37)	(141)
	8,900	270	198	468	425	277	702
	0	0	Ö	Ő	Ö	0	0
	(6,000)	(180)	(120)	(300)	(168)	(252)	(420)
Total Difference in Trips	485	12	59	11	153	(12)	141

بهمر د بالجن ال

1

New 2012

Nerthan dealog

ł

ŝ

· . . . . .

i, and in

u tu ka tu iki

.21

rear a later to rear

### Attachment 3

## Mitigation Requirements from DEIR





÷

n e vilsa

Surger and a state of the second s



5-73

The An

2102 RS.ibmlADT Fig

Proposed Project - Phase II Roadway Segment Trip Assignment

K-00954510008Traffee

n 2102 REviewJADT Fig NCP

2. 24. 1

1. 14.



5-83

IN ADT V

una 11 P

-----

eren en er

Proposed Project - Phase II Plus Project Conditions ADT Volumes Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan



- 1 a 0

1.0474-04

Example: The state

1000



1.11.1.151

้า เรราะ



1755 C 115 h

11



1. 2.1

. . . . <sup>1</sup>. <sup>1</sup>.

gen nor

17

K1095451000TriallicEcontOption 2(02 REadem)ADT Fig NP/Proposed Project - Phone N/ Reaching Segment Top Assignment

Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan

in an an an

1. 11 H I. I.

[.



1 in 1:

negativ.

K109645100017amilis/EconOption 2402 RB.dom/ADT Fig NPPropaged Project - Phase IV Pile Project Conditions ADT Volume

Capacity (v/c) ratios were calculated for each roadway segment. It should be noted that the capacity of a roadway is equal to the maximum LOS E pursuant to the Chula Vista General Plan (2005). *Table 4.2-1* summarizes the capacities and LOS for each Circulation Element and Urban Core Circulation Element roadway.

Facility		Acceptable		Leve	l of Service	(LOS)	
Class <sup>a</sup>	Lanes	l L <b>òs</b> 🐳	A (.6)	B (.7)	C (.8)	D (.9)	E (1.0)
<b>Circulation Element Ro</b>	adways	· · · · · · · · · · · · ·			.~	- 14 - 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14	
Expressway	7/8	C	52,500	61,300	70,000	78,800	87,500
Prime	6	C	37,500	43,800	50,000	56,300	62,500
Major Street	6	C	30,000	35,000	40,000	45,000	50,000
	5	C	26,250	30,650	35,000	39,400	43,750
	4	C	22,500	26,300	30,000	33,800	37,500
Class   Collector	4	C	16,500	19,300	22,000	24,800	27,500
Class II Collector	2	C	9,000	10,500	12,000	13,500	15,000
Class III Collector	2	C.	5,600	6,600	7,500	8,400	9,400
Urban Core Circulation	Element	Roadways		an in the second			······································
Gateway Street	6	D	40,800	47,600	54,400	61,200	68,000
	4	D.	28,800	33,600	38,400	43,200	48,000
Urban Arterial	4	D	25,200	29,400	33,600	37,800	42,000
Commercial Blvd.	4	D	22,500	26,250	30,000	33,750	37,500
Downtown Promenade	4	D	22,500	26,250	30,000	33,750	37,500
	2	D	9,600	11,200	12,800	14,400	16,000

# TABLE 4:2-1 Roadway Segment Capacity and Level of Service

Note: Shaded cells correspond to the acceptable traffic volumes for each roadway.

The adopted Circulation Element roadways are considered to be Class I Collector Streets and above, and the Urban Core Circulation Element roadways are considered to be six-lane Gateway Streets and below.

Street classifications, discussed in more detail below and identified for specific roadway segments in the study area as shown in *Figure 4.2-2*, are based on standards provided in the 2005 Chula Vista General Plan.

To determine LOS, traffic counts were conducted during peak commute periods. Existing A.M. (7:00 A.M. to 9:00 A.M.) and P.M. (4:00 P.M. to 6:00 P.M.) peak-hour turning movement counts were conducted by Southland Car Counters, Turning Point Traffic Service, and Traffic Data Service Southwest. These intersection counts were taken during several different times of the day in 2004 and 2005. Traffic volumes along segments of F Street, J Street, and Bay Boulevard were collected by Field Data Services in 2006. The remaining roadway segment traffic volumes were provided by the City of Chula Vista and Traffic Data Services Southwest (which collected data on two segments of Broadway). In addition, Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. conducted supplemental roadway counts for older count locations. Existing freeway volumes (2004) were

s2.

202013

**TABLE 4.2-21** 

4.2

Phase II Conditions Roadway Segment Level of Service Summary

Section 1.25	mesurs					<u> </u>									1	S Lan Mger				::	د در مردر	le car asier	e .				
	IMPACT?		NO	NO	Ň	9	ON	Q		NO	NO.	ŐN		Q	Q	DIRECT	Q	Q		Q	DIRECT	DIRECT	Q		Q	ŇŎ	
Project Trips	(Percent)		0	12	L 1	4	S	Ċ,		9	3	2		4	23	24	12	8		27	42	27	12	· · · · · · · · ·	10	8	
Project	ADT		6	318	1,192	1,193	756	504		353	313	252		644	4,104	9,574	4,922	2,357		5,311	13,216	9,116	2,683		2,015	1,934	a.
e II Ne Dject	ros		В	Ä	A	. 60.	A	A		A	Ö	Å		۲ ن	Υ.	х Ч	۵	с		2 V	3A	۵	Ä		A	A	
Phase II Baseline Plus Project	ADT		6,041	2,612	17,567	29,818	28,744	19,972		6,099	11,515	11,007	15.867	16,672-	A11 194406	Curyuranaeos	40,325	31,113	20602	19,640	107TBacasy	33,657	21,881		19,345	23,809	
le e	LOS		В	A	A	A	A	A		A	Ö	A		Ö	AL	CHR	Ö	æ		A	Sac V	B	Ä		A	٨	
Phase II Baseline	ADT		6,034	2,294	15,834	28,355	27,988	19,468		5,746	11,202	10,755		15,028	14,263	29,621	35,402	28,755		15,784	18,998	24,675	19,198		17,329	21,874	
Acceptable	Volume		7,500	7,500	30,000	43,200	43,200	37,800		33,750	14,400	33,750		17,000	30,000	30,000	43,200	37,800		30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000		43,200	43,200	:
	Roadway Classification	and the second se	2 Lanes Class III Collector	2 Lanes Class III Collector	4 Lanes Major Street	4 Lanes Gateway Street	4 Lanes Gateway Street	4 Lanes Urban Arterial		4 Lanes Downtown Promenade	2 Lanes Downtown Promenade	4 Lanes Downtown Promenade		3 Lanes Class II Collector	4 Lanes Major Street	4 Lanes Major Street	4 Lanes Gateway Street	4 Lanes Urban Arterial		4 Lanes Major Street	4,Lanes Major Street	4 Lanes Major Street	4 Lanes Major Street		4 Lanes Gateway Street	4 Lanes Gateway Street	
	Roadway Segment	E Street	H.Street to Carlot ACC Dwy	West of Bay Blvd	Bay Boulevard to I-5 Ramps	I-5 Ramps to Woodlawn Avenue	Woodlawn Avenue to Broadway	Broadway to 3rd Avenue	Lagoon St/F Street	Bay Boulevard to Broadway	Broadway to 4th Avenue	4th Avenue to 3rd Avenue	H Street	West of Marina Parkway	Marina Parkway to Street A	Street A to I-5 Ramps	1-5 Ramps to Broadway	Broadway to 3rd Avenue	J Street	Marina Parkway to Street A	Street A to Bay Boulevard	Bay Boulevard to I+5 Ramps	I-5 Ramps to Broadway	L Street	Bay Boulevard to Industrial Way	Industrial Way to Broadway	

5703-01 4.2-103

5. C. 1

		TABLE 4.2-21 (Cont.)	21 (Cont.)							
	Postway Classification	Acceptable Volume	Phase II Baseline ANT I C		Phase II Baseline Plus Project ANT I O		Project ADT	Project Trips (Percent)	INDACT?	
Marina Parkwav			-	22	10. 22.0	222				
H Street to Street C	3 Lanes Class III Collector	17,000	166'2	A	6,080	Y	4,722	25	NO	
Street C to J Street	3 Lane Class II Collector	17,000	9,991	A	12,039	AB.	5,981	50	NO	······
Bay Boulevard				and the second	13,595					
E Street to F Street	2 Lanes Class II Collector	12,000	9,984	8	10,104	В	120	Ë	0N	
F Street to H Street	2 Lanes Class III Collector	7,500	4,318	A	4,608	Y	559	12	,NO	
H Street to J Street	2 Lanes Class III Collector	7,500	5,451	A	5,479	A	702	13	Q	
J Street to L Street	2 Lanes Class II Collector	12,00	6,696	A	10,918	0	4,221	66	ON	
L Street to 1-5 Ramps	2 Lanes Class II Collector	12,000	4,403	A	5,159	×	756	15	9	
South of I-5 Ramps	2 Lanes Class III Collector	7,500	4,403	Ă	5,159	Ä	756	15	ON N	
Broadway										
C Street to E Street	4 Laries Commercial Boulevard	33,750	26,304	C	26,325	с С	20	0	NO	
E Street to H Street	4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard	33,750	26,312	Ċ.	26,816	ပ	504	5	NO	
H Street to K Street	4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard	33,750	30,316	D	30,840	D	524	2	NO	
K Street to L Street	4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard	33,750	26,878	C	27,130	o	252	ł	NO	
South of L Street	4 Lanes Major Street	30,000	27,512	C	28,228	C	715	3	NO	
Street A					8.72Y	· .		•		· · · ·
H Street to Street C (a)	2 Lanes Class III Collector	7,500	•	•	1631	2	5,470	75	NO	
Street C to J Street	2 Lanes Class III Collector	7,500	5,246	A.	12,030	F.S.	8,104	64	DIRECT	₹.
Street C					Sec N		-		- 100 - 10	
Marina Parkway to Street A (a)	2 Lanes Class III Collector	7,500	•	•	2,085	A	1,544	74	NO	
SOURCE: Kimley-Hom and Associates 2008. ADT = Average Daily Trips, LOS = Level of Service Bold values indicate roadway segments operating at LOS E or F. Bold and shaded values indicate project significant impact. * Roads will be built to given classification with Phase I of the Proposed Project as required to provide site frontage.	008. of Service perating at LOS E or F. Bold and shad with Phase I of the Proposed Project as	led values indicate I s required to provide	project significa site frontage.	ant Impac						
			,							
April:2010	-								5703-01	
Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for	R) for the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan	er Plan							4.2-104	_+

PAGE 68 60864

Section 47.5 Mt3dm Masurds

Class II N Lee Class E Calcolor 322 300

**TABLE 4.2-27** 

Phase III Conditions With Extension of E Street Roadway Segment Level of Service Summary

Acceptable         Baseline         Mitigated         Project           volume.         ADT         LOS         ADT         LOS         ADT         C           7,500         6,050         B         4,800         A         A         D         ADT         LOS         ADT         ADT         LOS         ADT         ADT         ADT         ADT         ADT         ADT         ADT				Phase III	, III,	Phase III Plus Project	<b>III</b> lect		Project		R	2211-1122
Addrey Segment         Reading Classification         Volume         ADT         LOS         ADT         Clos         ADT         Close         ADT         ADT<			Acceptable	Basel	ine	Mitigate	ed .	Project	Trips		<b>.</b>	
Discrete PC, Dwy         2 Lanes Class III Collector         7,500         6,00         B         4,800         A         0         0         0           By Bird         2         2         2         0         2         370         A         7,872         D         2         0         0         1           By Bird         2         2         37,800         2,970         A         7,872         D         2         0         0         1           Event Un -5 Flamps         4         Lanes Class III Collector         7,500         2,970         B         2,611         B         2,601         B         3         3         1<	Roadway Segment	Roadway Classification	Volume	ADT	SOT	ADT	ros	ADT	(Percent)	*	<b>.</b> 	securs.
In Sectional TCL:         T,500         6,050         B         4,800         A         0         0         0           Bay Bind         2 Lames Class III Collector         7,500         2,970         A         19,223         A         102         0         0           Bay Bind         2 Lames Class III Collector         7,500         2,970         B         22,933         B         2,814         1         1           Stored tob: F Ramps         4 Lames Class III Collector         7,500         29,011         B         261         1         1           Vooddamn Avenue         4 Lames Untain Arterial         37,200         28,750         6,100         A         5,517         A         174         1         1           Vooddamn Avenue         2 Lames Downtown Promenade         33,750         6,100         A         6,577         A         387         6           Vooddamn Avenue         2 Lames Downtown Promenade         33,750         11,470         A         11,557         A         87         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1 <td>Street</td> <td></td>	Street											
Bay Bird         2 Lanee Class III Collector         7,500         2,970         A         7,872         D         2         0           Bard Uo 15 Rempts         4 Lanes Class III Collector         30,000         17,570         A         19,230         B         261         1           Invertiol 15 Rempts         4 Lanes Class III Collector         37,800         19,990         A         29,011         B         261         1           In Nomule         1 Lanes Class Ways Street         37,800         19,990         A         20,114         A         142         1           P Street         2 Lanes Class II Collector         37,800         19,520         6,100         A         6,577         A         122         2         7           P Street         33,750         6,100         A         11,577         A         137         1         1         1           P Street         33,750         11,470         A         11,577         A         466         4         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1	H Street to Severate C Dwy	2 Lanes Class III Collector	7,500	6,050	B	4,800	A	0	0	Q		
Bevert to 1-5 Rampes         4 Lanes Major Street         30,000         17,570         A         182/30         F         16           se to Wooddawn Avenue         4 Lanes Gatewey Street         43,200         29,800         B         261         1         1           Avenue         4 Lanes Gatewey Street         37,300         19,960         A         20,301         B         261         1         1           Avenue         4 Lanes Gatewey Street         37,500         6,100         A         6,577         A         387         6         7         A         387         6         7         A         387         6         7         A         387         7         A         387         7         A         387         A         A         387         A         A         387         A         A         4         A	West of Bay Blvd	2 Lanes Class III Collector	7,500	2,970	A	7,872	ā	5	ò	CUMULATIVE		
set 0 Woodlawn Avenue         4 Lanes Gateway Street         43,200         28,750         A         29,433         B         261         1           Avenue to Broadway         4 Lanes Gateway Street         43,200         28,750         A         29,011         B         261         1           Avenue to Broadway         4 Lanes Gateway Street         43,200         28,750         A         29,011         B         261         1           Avenue to Broadway         4 Lanes Untown Promenade         74,400         11,520         C         11,787         C         267         2         2           V to 4th Avenue         2 Lanes Downtown Promenade         74,000         11,520         C         11,787         C         267         2         2         2           V to 4th Avenue         2 Lanes Downtown Promenade         74,000         15,200         C         11,557         A         87         1         3           Atteret         3 Lanes Downtown Promenade         77,000         15,200         14,500         12,557         A         87         1         1         3           Atteret         3 Lanes Downtown Promenade         77,000         15,200         14,500         11,557         A         87	Bay Boulevard to I-5 Ramps	4 Lanes Major Street	30,000	17,570	A	19,230	A	182	<b>.</b>	Q		
In Avenue lo Broadway         4 Lanes Gatevey Street         43,200         28,750         A         29,011         B         261         1           If void Avenue         1 Lanes Urban Anterial         37,800         19,960         A         20,114         A         17.4         1           If States Urban Anterial         37,500         19,960         A         20,1154         A         17.4         1           If States Urban Anterial         33,750         6,100         A         6,177         A         87         6           Vio 4th Avenue         2 Lanes Downtown Promentade         14,400         11,520         C         11,787         C         267         2           Attents         1 Lanes Downtown Promentade         14,400         11,520         A         11,557         A         87         1           Attent         1 Lanes Major Street         30,000         18,450         A         14,557         A         487         1         1           Attent         1 Lanes Major Street         30,000         18,450         A         438         7         2         2         2         2         2         2         2         2         2         2         2	I-5 Ramps to Woodlawn Avenue	4 Lanes Gateway Street	43,200	29,820	8	29,433	æ	261		<u>S</u>		
y to 3rd Avenue         1 Lames Urban Arterial         37,300         19,900         A         20,154         A         174         F           F Street         evart to Broadway         2 Lames Downtown Promenade         37,300         1,470         A         6,577         A         387         6           v to 4th Avenue         2 Lanes Downtown Promenade         33,750         11,470         A         1,157         A         457         7         2           v to 4th Avenue         2 Lanes Downtown Promenade         33,750         11,470         A         11,557         A         458         4         1           ue to 31d Avenue         3 Lanes Class If Collector         17,000         16,120         C         11,277         A         458         4         1           darine Parkway         3 Lanes Class If Collector         37,000         16,120         C         11,377         A         458         4         1         1         2	Woodlawn Avenue to Broadway	4 Lanes Gateway Street	43,200	28,750	A	29,011	B	261		Ň	<u> </u>	
F Street           evard to Broadway         4 Lanes Downtown Promenade         33,750         6,100         A         6,577         A         387         6           evard to Broadway         4 Lanes Downtown Promenade         33,750         11,470         C         11,557         A         387         6           evard to Broadway         4 Lanes Downtown Promenade         33,750         11,470         C         11,557         A         87         6           ue to 3rd Avenue         2 Lanes Downtown Promenade         33,750         11,470         C         11,557         A         458         4           darine Parkway         3 Lanes Class II Collector         17,000         18,120         C         11,357         A         458         4         4           darine Parkway         3 Lanes Class II Collector         37,000         42,470         D         42,844         D         752         2         2           vis Street         3 Lanes Major Street         30,000         31,120         C         14,869         7         14         0         752         2         2         2         2         2         2         2         2         2         2         2	Broadway to 3rd Avenue	4 Lanes Urban Arterial	37,800	19,980	A	20,154	A	174	-	NO	F	
event to Broadway4 Lanes Downtown Promenade $33,750$ $6,100$ A $6,577$ A $387$ 6y to 4th Avenue2 Lanes Downtown Promenade $14,400$ $11,507$ C $267$ 22ue to 3rd Avenue2 Lanes Downtown Promenade $33,750$ $11,470$ C $267$ 22ue to 3rd Avenue3 Lanes Downtown Promenade $33,750$ $11,470$ C $11,557$ A $87$ 1darme Partway3 Lanes Downtown Promenade $33,750$ $16,120$ C $11,2367$ A $466$ 4darme Partway3 Lanes Clilector $30,000$ $18,450$ $40,50$ $A^*$ $14$ $0$ $720$ $26$ bi 1,5574 Lanes Major Street $39,200$ $40,010$ $03,540$ $A^*$ $A^*$ $46$ $4$ $4$ sto Broadway4 Lanes Major Street $30,000$ $19,540$ $C$ $31,50$ $C$ $34,60$ $B^*$ $7$ $2$ $2$ sto Broadway6 Lanes Major Street $30,000$ $19,540$ $D$ $22,844$ $D$ $722$ $23$ $23$ sto Broadway6 Lanes Major Street $30,000$ $21,340$ $A$ $22,844$ $D$ $722$ $2$ $2$ sto Bay Boulevard6 Lanes Major Street $30,000$ $21,340$ $A$ $20,456$ $A$ $460$ $3$ $3$ sto Bay Street $40,000$ $21,340$ $A$ $22,846$ $A$ $480$ $3$ $4$ sto Bay Street $40,000$ <	agoon St/ F Street											
V10 4ft Nenue2 Lanes Downtown Promenade14,40011,520C11,787C2672ue to 3rd Avenue4 Lanes Downtown Promenade33,75011,470A11,557A672dafina Parkway3 Lanes Class II Collector17,00016,120C11,376A4684dafina Parkway3 Lanes Class II Collector17,00016,120C11,376A4684dafina Parkway3 Lanes Class II Collector17,00018,450AA4684dafina Parkway5 Lanes Major Street30,00018,450AA46840.5 Ramps5 Lanes Major Street33,20040,010D35596A74229 Colfector14,10031,120C31,509C368B775229 Colfector31,610B31,610B37,603C34,08B79 Colfector31,610B37,50021,940C4,880B779 Colfector31,610B37,603C34,08B3539 Colfector4 Lanes Major Street40,00031,410B37,603C3,408B39 Colfector14 colfector30,00019,540A22,653B6339 Colfector41 colfector43,20023,810A20,0454A5339 Colfector<	Bay Boulevard to Broadway	4 Lanes Downtown Promenade	33,750	6,100	A.	6,577	¥	387	G	Q	<u></u>	
ue to 3rd Ävenue         4 Lanes Downtrown Promenade         33,750         11,470         A         11,557         A         677         1           Anima Parkway         3 Lanes Class II Collector         17,000         16,120         C         (1,3757         A         458         4         P         4           Anima Parkway         3 Lanes Class II Collector         17,000         16,120         C         (1,3757         A         458         4         P         4         P         4         P         458         4         P         458         4         P         4         P         4         P         4         P         4         P         4         P         4         P         4         P         4         P         4         P         P         4         P         P         4         P         P         4         P         P         4         P         P         A         4         P         P         A         4         P         P         A         4         P         P         A         4         P         A         4         P         A         4         P         A         4         P         A	Broadway to 4th Avenue	2 Lanes Downtown Promenade	14,400	11,520	ပ	11,787	S	267	Ċ,	Q		
III A TANKEIII A TANKEIIII A TANKEIIIII A TAN	4th Avenue to 3rd Avenue	4 Lanes Downtown Promenade	33,750	11,470	Å	11,557	¥	87	T	9 Q		
Matrine Parkway         3 Lanes Class II Collector         17,000         16,120         C         11,375         A         458         4           arkway to Street X         4 Lanes Major Street         30,000         18,450         Ari 53e1 14,869         A'         14         0           arkway to Street X         5 Lanes Major Street         39,200         40,010         035 59e 33,416         B'         772         2           sto Broadway         5 Lanes Major Street         39,200         42,8470         D'         42,844         D'         752         2         2           sto Broadway         4 Lanes Galeway Street         30,000         19,540         C         31,509         C         31,509         C         31,600         9           sto Broadway Loster         31,410         B37,503         31,410         B37,653         B         5,635         3         3           sto Bay Boulevard         6 Lanes Major Street         30,000         31,410         B37,653         C         3,408         9         5         3         3           sto Bay Boulevard         6 Lanes Major Street         30,000         21,410         A         22,555         B         6         65         3         3	Street					712,11					Ï	
arkway to Street         14,50         14,556         14,565         14,565         14,565         14,565         14,565         14,565         14,565         14,565         14,565         14,565         14,575         22         22           to1-5 Ramps         5 Lanses Major Street         39,200         40,010         D35555 33,475         8°C         772         2         2           sto Broadway         1 Lanses Gateway Street         37,300         31,120         C         31,509         C         752         2         2           sto Broadway         1 Lanses Major Street         30,000         19,540         A         2,5450         C         3,480         13           sto Broadward         6 Lanses Major Street         30,000         19,540         A         2,4360         B         3,460         13           sto Bay Bouleward         6 Lanses Major Street         40,000         31,410         B 57,553         B         6,635         2         2           sto Bay Bouleward         6 Lanses Major Street         40,000         21,940         A         2,635         2         3         3           sto Bay to Bay to Broadway         4 Lanses Major Street         40,0000         21,940         A	West of Marina Parkway	3 Lanes Class II Collector	17,000	16,120	, C	11.373	ŀ .	458	4	9	[]	
ICI-5 Ramps         5 Lanes Major Street         39,200         40,010         D3559s 33,416         B*C         772         2           st o Broadway         4 Lanes Gateway Street         43,200         42,470         D         42,844         D'         752         2           st o Broadway         4 Lanes Gateway Street         43,200         42,470         D         42,844         D'         752         2           st o Broadway         4 Lanes Urbari Arterial         37,800         19,540         A         24,460         B'         5,635         23           artway to Street         40,000         31,410         B <b>57</b> , <b>35</b> ,846         B'         5,635         23         3           st o Bay Boulevard         6 Lanes Major Street         40,000         31,410         B <b>57</b> , <b>35</b> ,846         B'         5,635         23         3           st o Bay Boulevard         6 Lanes Major Street         40,000         31,410         A         24,460         A'         66         3         3           st o Bay Boulevard         6 Lanes Major Street         40,000         31,410         A         24,460         A'         66         3         3           st o Bay Boulevard         4 Lanes Major Street <t< td=""><td>Marina Parkway to Street A</td><td>4 Lanes Major Street</td><td>30,000</td><td>18,450</td><td>AIST</td><td>57 14,269</td><td>÷.,</td><td>14</td><td>Ō</td><td>N</td><td><u>.</u></td><td></td></t<>	Marina Parkway to Street A	4 Lanes Major Street	30,000	18,450	AIST	57 14,269	÷.,	14	Ō	N	<u>.</u>	
st D Broadway         d Lanes Gateway Street         43,200         42,470         D         42,644         D         752         2           y to 3rd Avenue         d Lanes Gateway Street         37,800         31,120         C         31,509         C         389         1           arkway to Street X         d Lanes Major Street         30,000         19,540         A         24,460         B         5,555         23           is bay Boulevard         6 Lanes Major Street         40,000         31,410         B 37,653         C         4,880         13           is bay Boulevard         6 Lanes Major Street         30,000         21,410         B 37,653         C         4,880         9           is bay Boulevard         6 Lanes Major Street         30,000         21,410         B 37,653         C         4,880         9           is to Broadway         4 Lanes Gateway Street         30,000         21,940         A         22,635         B         665         3         1           iway to Broadway         4 Lanes Gateway Street         43,200         19,350         A         20,0454         A         665         3         1	Street A to 1-5 Ramps	5 Lanes Major Street	39,200	40,010	D 355	80 33 ATG		772	2	ġ	·	
y to 3rd: Avenue       4 Lanes Urban Arterial       37,800       31,120       C       31,509       C       389       F       I         arkway to Street A       4 Lanes Major Street       30,000       19,540       A       24,460       B       5,635       23         in Bay Boulevarid       6 Lanes Major Street       30,000       31,410       B       37,653       C       4,880       13         in Bay Boulevarid       6 Lanes Major Street       30,000       31,410       B       37,653       C       4,880       9       9         evart to 1-5 Ramps       6 Lanes Major Street       30,000       21,940       A       22,635       B       695       3       3         evart to I-5 Ramps       6 Lanes Major Street       30,000       21,940       A       22,635       B       695       3       3         evart to I-5 Ramps       4 Lanes Gateway Street       43,200       19,350       A       22,635       A       695       3       1         evart to Broadway       4 Lanes Gateway Street       43,200       23,810       A       24,265       A       455       2       2       1         evart to Broadway       4 Lanes Gateway Street       43,200	-5 Ramps to Broadway	4 Lanes Gateway Street	43,200	42,470	, d	42,844	Ö	752	5	NO		
Tarkway to Street X       4 Lanes Major Street       30,000       19,540       A       24,460       B       5,635       23       23         to Bay Boulevard       6 Lanes Major Street       40,000       31,410       B 37,653       C       4,800       13         evard to I-5 Ramps       6 Lanes Major Street       40,000       31,410       B 37,653       C       3,408       9         evard to I-5 Ramps       6 Lanes Major Street       30,000       21,940       A       22,655       B       605       3       9         st to Broadway       4 Lanes Gateway Street       30,000       21,940       A       22,655       B       605       3       3         levard to Industrial Way       4 Lanes Gateway Street       43,200       23,810       A       20,0454       A       455       2       3       1         IWay to Broadway       4 Lanes Gateway Street       43,200       23,810       A       24,265       A       455       2       2       3       1         Iway to Broadway       4 Lanes Gateway Street       43,200       23,810       A       24,265       A       455       2       2       3       1         Iway to Broadway       4 Lanes Gat	Broadway to 3rd Avenue	4 Lanes Urban Arterial	37,800	31,120	ပ	31,509	o	389	÷.	Q		
arkway to Street Å       4 Lanes Major Street       30,000       19,540       A       24,460       B       5,635       23       23         to Bay Boulevard       6 Lanes Major Street       40,000       31,410       B 37,653       C       4,880       13         to Bay Boulevard       6 Lanes Major Street       40,000       31,410       B 37,653       C       4,880       13         tevard to I-5 Ramps       6 Lanes Major Street       40,000       31,410       B 37,653       C       3,408       9         tevard to I-5 Ramps       6 Lanes Major Street       30,000       21,940       A       22,635       B       695       3       3         st to Broadway       4 Lanes Gateway Street       43,200       19,350       A       22,635       A       695       3       3         levard to Industrial Way       4 Lanes Gateway Street       43,200       19,350       A       24,265       A       455       2       3       3         levard to Industrial Way       4 Lanes Gateway Street       43,200       19,350       A       24,265       A       455       2       2       3       3       3         levard to Industrial Way       4 Lanes Gateway Street       43,20	treet					25822						
IOD Bay Boulevarid         6 Lanes Major Street         40,000         31,410         B 57,653         C         4,880         13           evard to I-5 Ramps         6 Lanes Major Street         40,000         33,660         B         37,653         C         4,880         9           sto Broadway         4 Lanes Major Street         30,000         21,940         A         22,635         B         665         3         9           sto Broadway         4 Lanes Major Street         30,000         21,940         A         22,635         B         695         3         9           levard to Industrial Way         4 Lanes Gateway Street         43,200         19,350         A         24,265         A         455         2         2           IWay to Broadway         4 Lanes Gateway Street         43,200         23,810         A         24,265         A         455         2         2	Varina Parkway to Street A	4 Lanes Major Street	30,000	19,540	Å	24,460		5,635	23	Ň		
levard to 1-5 Ramps         6 Lanes Major Street         40,000         33,660         B         37,653         C         3,408         9           ss to Broadway         4 Lanes Major Street         30,000         21,940         A         22,635         B         695         3         9           svard to Industrial Way         4 Lanes Gateway Street         43,200         19,350         A         22,635         A         695         3         9           Iway to Broadway         4 Lanes Gateway Street         43,200         19,350         A         24,265         A         455         2         2	Street A to Bay Boulevard	6 Lanes Major Street	40,000	31,410	B39	NE 36,846	, Q	4,880	13	2	ŕ	
sto Broadway       4 Lanes Major Street       30,000       21,940       A       22,635       B       695       3       1         levard to Industrial Way       4 Lanes Gateway Street       43,200       19,350       A       20,0454       A       695       3       1         Iway to Broadway       4 Lanes Gateway Street       43,200       23,810       A       24,265       A       455       2       3       1         Immerital Impact Report (EIR) for the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan       23,810       24,265       A       455       2       3       1	3ay Boulevard to I-5 Ramps	6 Lanes Major Street	40,000	33,660	Ē	37,653	Ö	3,408	6	ğ		
levard to Industrial Way 4 Larnes Gateway Street 43,200 19,350 A 20,0454 A 695 3 1 Way to Broadway 4 Larnes Gateway Street 43,200 23,810 A 24,265 A 455 2 m 455 1 m montal Impact Report (EIR) for the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan	-5 Ramps to Broadway	4 Lanes Major Street	30,000	21,940	¥	22,635	ß	695	ŝ	<u>8</u>		
levard to Industrial Way 4 Lanes Gateway Street 43,200 19.350 A 20,0454 A 695 3 1 Way to Broadway 4 Lanes Gateway Street 43,200 23.810 A 24,265 A 455 2 M 455 1 m montal Impact Report (EIR) for the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan	itreet									• 		
I Way to Broadway  4 Lanes Gateway Street 43,200 23,810 A 24,265 A 455 2	Bay Boulevard to Industrial Way	4 Lanes Gateway Street	43,200	19,350	A	20,0454	¥.	695	ເມ	ON N		
nmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan	Industrial Way to Broadway	4 Lanes Gateway Street	43,200	23,810	¥	24,265	Ä	455	<b>,</b>	NO	i - 1	
onmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan					*					19 		
	rii 2010									5703-01		
	ial Environmental Impact Report (El	IR) for the Chula Vista Bayfront Maste	r Plan							4.2-167		

60864 PAGE

69

4.2							Traff	Traffic and Circulation	culation		
	<u> </u>	<b>TABLE 4.2-27 (Cont.)</b>	27 (Cont.)								· ›.
		Acceptable	Phase III Baseline		Phase III Plus Project Mitigated	ect =	Project	Project Trips		Saturday and	
Roadway Segment	Roadway Classification	Volume	ADT	ros	ADT	ros	ADT	(Percent)	IMPACT?		
Marina Parkway					10.700						
H Street to Street C	3 Lanes Class II Collector	17,000	060'6	A	9,468	A .	652	7	NO.		
Street C to J Street	3 Lane Class II Collector	17,000	12,040	A	13,008	8	946	7	N	<u> </u>	а. <sup>с</sup>
Bay Boulevard					14654					I	
E Street to F Street	2 Lanes Class II Collector	12,000	11,610	ò	11,472	0	0	ò	Q		
F Street to H Street	2 Lanes Class III Collector	7,500	4,980	A	5,120	Y	441	60	ON		
H Street to J Street	2 Lanes Class III Collector	7,500	5,630	Ð	7,061	0	439	60	<u>8</u>	· · · ·	
J Street to L Street	2 Lanes Class II Collector	12,000	10,970	O	11,302	ပ	1,033	6	ON		ĩ
L Street to I-5 Ramps <sup>1</sup>	2 Lanes Class II Collector	12,000	5,310	A	5,780	A	524	6	. ON "		. <b>*</b>
South of 1-5 Ramps	2 Lanes Class III Collector	7,500	5,310	Å	5,571	¥	261	5	NO	•	;
Broadway										v (1000) (1000)	
C Street to E Street	4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard	33,750	26,330	J	26,390	ت	09	0	QN		.,
E Street to H Street	4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard	33,750	26,820	S.	26,994	c	174	1.	ON		. : : .
H Street to K Street	4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard	33,750	31,090	٥	31,324	<b>D</b>	234		Q		: <u></u>
K Street to L Street	4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard	33,750	27,130	ပ	27,217	ပ	87	0	9	<u> </u>	
South of L Street	4 Lanes Major Street	30,000	28,230	ပ	28,371	ပ	141	0	Q	<u>`</u> T	:
Street					1,931						
H Street to Street C.	2 Lanes Class III Collector	7,500	7,300	(Ö	10,504	́К.	938	67	DIRECT	1 2 7 7 7 7 7	
Street C to J Street	4 Lanes Class I Collector	22,000	12,630	Ans	A 17543 16468	¥ R	1,690	10	02		
J Street to Street B (a)	2 Lanes Class III Collector	7,500		•	3,838	A	2,813	73	NO		
Street A to Bay Boulevard (a)	2 Lanes Class III Collector	7,500	1		1,746	4	122	41	0N		
Marina Parkway to Street A	2 Lanes Class III Collector	7,500	2.090	A	2.065	- Y -	e	o	0N		:
SOURCE: Kimley-Horn and Associates 2008. ADT = Average Daily Trips, LOS = Level of Service	2008. I of Service				Jess's					Ï	·
Bold values indicate roadway segments operating at LOS E or F. Bold and shaded values indicate project significant impact, A Roads will be built to given classification with Phase I of the project as required to provide site frontage.	operating at LOS E or F. Bold and shad n with Phase 1 of the project as required to	ed values indicate provide site front	. project significa age.	int impact.				,			
April 2010									5703-01		
Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan	ER) for the Chula Vista Bayfront Maste	ır Plan							4.2-168		
											·· .
											.a.,

								thomating the article article		
	Phase IV Condition	TABLE 4.2-30 ns Roadwav Segment Level of Service Summary	TABLE 4.2-30  wav Segment	Level of	Service Su	Mmarv			<u></u>	
										ŕ
		Accentable	Phase IV Baseline	⊳ a	Phase IV Baseline Plus Prolect	seline ect	Project	Project Trips		27+ 475
Roadway Segment	Roadway Classification	Volume	ADT	SOT	ADT	ros	ADT	(Percent)	IMPACT?	33
										•
H Street to Seelond ROC Driveway	2 Lanes Class III Collector	7,500	4,810	A	5,809	B	1,008	17	ON	
Called PCC Driveway to F	D London II Collordor	WW.01	č 700	X	0000		301-0	ΥC ΥC	Ŭ	
Burdent F Street to Bay Boulevard	2 Lanes Class II Collector	12:000	8,790		16.279	Ч	7.705	47	DIRECT	Ť
Bay Boulevard to 1-5 Ramps	4 Lanes Major Street	30,000	19,230	A	26,289	6	6,950	26	Q	1
I-5 Ramps to Woodlawn Avenue	4 Lanes Gateway Street	43,200	29,440	8	33,608	S	4,168	12	N	
Woodlawn Avenue to Broadway	4 Lanes Gateway Street	43,200	29,010	В	32,472	B	3,462	11	NO	[ ]
Broadway to 3rd Avenue	4 Lanes Urban Arterial	37,800	20,150	A	23,063	A	2,913	13	Q	
Lagoon St/ F Street					- 		1			
E Street to Bay Boulevard (a)	2 Lanes Class III Collector	7,500	-		2,630	×.	2,413	6	Q N	- T
Bay Boulevard to Broadway	4 Lanes Downtown Promenade	33,750	6,580	¥ (	8,325	40	1,744	12	2 2	<b>—</b>
Broadway to 4th Avenue Ath Avenue to 3rd Avenue	Z Lanes Downtown Promenade	14,400 32.760	10 7EN	 ⊳`د	10 007	⊳د	484	4 0		- <u>-</u>
		no inn	1-100	c.	12 235	<	11-1	J	2	
West of Marina Parkway	3 Lanes Class II Collector	17,000	11,380	A	12,620	· V	1,140	6	ON	F
Marina Parkway to Street A	4 Lanes Major Street	30,000	15,170	ANM	A M.448 15,001	A A	791	5	ON.	:
Street A to I-5 Ramps	5 Lanes Major Street	39,200	33,120	BJUYS	2 34 688	C e	1,467	4	NO	
I-5 Ramps to Broadway	4 Lanes Gateway Street	43,200	48,420	u.	F 49,203	u	783	2	DIRECT	
Broadway to 3rd Avenue	4 Lanes Urban Artérial	37,800	31,510	U U	32,063	0	553	5	Q	-1
					87,891					
Marina Parkway to Street A	4 Lanes Major Street	30,000	24,460	œ	26,049	، ن	2,488	တ	ON	- <u>1</u>
Street A to Bay Boulevard	6 Lanes Major Street	40,000	36,340	0	C	8	2.226 1336			31-50
Bay Boulevard to I-5 Hamps	6 Lanes Major Street	40,000	37,650	ي ن	38,913	5	1,262		Q	Т
I-5 Ramps to Broadway	4 Lanes Major Street	30,000	22,770	8	23,131	8	361	5	ON	
burber Deur Deutleunert to Teductrict Mour	41 anon Origination Oliverit	000.07	00000	V		V	000	c		-•[·
Day Douiovalo to Industrial way. Industrial Way to Broadway	4 I anes Gateway Street	43,200	24.270	Ā	24 531	c A	261	<b>.</b>		ŀ
fairman a					SV2.	•	22			
H Street to Street C	3 Lanes Class II Collector	17,000	9,470	A	10,866	A *	1,386	13	Q	

60864

71 PAGE

TABLE 4.2-30 (Cont.)         mini       mini biological       Phase if baseline       Phase if baseline       Phone         mini       and way classification       Wolune       Aur       Uos       Aur       Program         mini       and way classification       Wolune       Aur       Uos       Aur       Program         and       1.and Class II Collector       7,000       6.80       C       7,116       C       4.90         all-and Class II Collector       7,000       6.810       C       7,117       D       7.90       A         all-and Class II Collector       7,000       6.170       2.170       D       7.90       0       2.178       D       2.778       D       2.778       D       2.778       D       2.778       D       2.778       D	TABLE 4.3-30 (Cont.)       TABLE 4.3-30 (Cont.)       metric     metric     Project     Project       0.1     0.1     0.0     0.0     0.0       0.1     0.0     0.0     0.0     0.0       0.1     0.0     0.0     0.0     0.0       0.1     0.0     0.0     0.0     0.0       0.1     0.0     0.0     0.0     0.0       0.1     0.0     0.0     0.0     0.0       0.1     0.0     0.0     0.0     0.0       0.1     0.0     0.0     0.0     0.0       0.1     0.0     0.0     0.0     0.0       0.1     0.0     0.0     0.0     0.0       0.1     0.0     0.0     0.0     0.0       0.1     0.0     0.0     0.0     0.0       0.1     0.0     0.0     0.0     0.0       0.1     0.0     0.0     0.0     0.0       0.1     0.0     0.0     0.0     0.0       0.1     0.0     0.0     0.0     0.0       0.1     0.0     0.0     0.0     0.0       0.1     0.0     0.0     0.0     0.0       0.1	•	a su a contra a contra de la cont			Status - community					The action of the state of the
Metric         Project         Project         Project         Project         Project           0         1.0         1.0         0.05         MDT         1.005         MDT         1.006         MDT         Project	Mean         Transe IV Answer IV 3 Laner Class II Collector         Mean Project Answer IV Answer IV         Project Project Answer IV Answer IV         Project Project Answer IV Answer IV         Project Project Answer IV         Project Answer IV Answer IV         Project Answer IV Answer IV         Project Answer IV         Project Answer IV         Project Answer Answer IV         Project Answer Answer IV         Project Answer Answer IV         Project Answer An		2	TABLE	4.2.30 (Co	int.)					
metric         Reactinery Classification         Volume         ADT         LOS         ADT         LOS         ADT         Precision           1         3 Lane Classi II Collector         17,000         13,100         6100         1         1206         10         1206         10         1206         10         1206         10         1206         10         1206         10         1206         10         1206         10         1206         10         1206         10         1206         10         1206         10         1206         10         1206         10         1206         10         1206         10         1206         10         1206         10         1206         10         1206         11         10         12         10         1206         11         10         12         10         12         10         12         10         12         10         12         10         12         10         12         10         12         10         12         10         12         10         12         10         12         10         12         10         12         10         12         10         12         12         12         12	metric         Reactinery Classification         Volume         ADT         LOS         ADT         LOS         ADT         LOS         ADT         Precession           1         1 Larre Classi I Collector         17,000         13,100         6         12,106         10 </th <th></th> <th></th> <th>Acceptable</th> <th>Phase Baseli</th> <th>V Ne</th> <th>Phase IV Bi Plus Pro</th> <th>aseline lect</th> <th>Project</th> <th>Project Trips</th> <th></th>			Acceptable	Phase Baseli	V Ne	Phase IV Bi Plus Pro	aseline lect	Project	Project Trips	
All Lanes Class II Collector         17,000         13,100         B         3,4650         -2         1,206         10           2         Lanres Class II Collector         7,500         6,100         2         2         1         2 <th>I Lanes Class II Collector         17000         13,100         B         <math>\frac{12,860}{716}</math> <math>\frac{12}{716}</math> <math>\frac{12}{716}</math></th> <th>Roadway Segment</th> <th>Roadway</th> <th>Volume</th> <th>ADT</th> <th>LOS</th> <th>ADT</th> <th>ros</th> <th></th> <th>(Percent)</th> <th>INPACT?</th>	I Lanes Class II Collector         17000         13,100         B $\frac{12,860}{716}$ $\frac{12}{716}$	Roadway Segment	Roadway	Volume	ADT	LOS	ADT	ros		(Percent)	INPACT?
2         Larres Class II Collector         72,000         6,860         C         7,116         C         456         6           2         2         Larres Class II Collector         7,200         6,860         C         7,116         C         455         6         6         6         7,116         C         455         6         7         7         7         5         7         5         6         7         7         7         5         5         7         7         5         6         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         7         5         7         7         7         5         7<	2         Larries Class II Collector         7,500         6,600         C         7,116         C         4,305         6         6           si         2         Larres Class III Collector         7,500         6,600         C         7,116         C         4,305         6         6         7,115         C         4,305         6         6         7,116         C         7,305         6         6         7,105         C         7,305         0         2,305         0         17,105         3         3         7         0         2         176         3         3         176         3         3         176         3         3         176         0         2         176         3         3         176         176         3         3         176         17         176         17         176         17         175         176         17         176         17         176         17         176	Street C to J Street		17,000	13,100	8	14,050	U A		7	Q N
All         Control         7,500         6,700         7,700 <th< td=""><td>Image: constraint operation       <math>r_{atom}^{2}</math> <math>r_{atom}^{2}</math></td><td>Say Boulevard</td><td></td><td>10,000</td><td>1 121 11</td><td><u> </u></td><td>10,000</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>NIDEPT</td></th<>	Image: constraint operation $r_{atom}^{2}$	Say Boulevard		10,000	1 121 11	<u> </u>	10,000				NIDEPT
2         Larres Class III Collector         7,500         5,170         A         7,177         D         377         6           2         2         Larres Class III Collector         7,500         5,170         A         7,177         D         377         6           2         2         Larres Class III Collector         7,500         5,170         A         7,177         D         377         6           2         Larres Class III Collector         7,500         5,100         8,170         A         7,177         D         377         6           4         Larres Commercial Bloulevard         3,750         2,8390         C         27,680         C         5,64         0         3         6         0         2         2         16         0         2         2         3         6         0         2         2         2         3         6         0         0         3         3         0         2         2         3         3         3         0         2         2         3         3         3         3         3         3         3         3         3         3         3         3         3         3	2       Larres Class III Collector       7,500       5,110       A       7,111       C       377       C         2       Larres Class III Collector       7,500       5,110       A       7,117       D       377       C         2       Lanse Class III Collector       7,500       5,110       A       7,117       D       377       C         2       Lanse Class III Collector       7,500       5,110       A       2,173       D       373       C         4       Lanse Class III Collector       7,500       5,310       C       27,026       C       5,610       2       2       2       0       3	E Street to F Street	2 LARES CLASS IL CORECION	7 500	11,4/U	<u>،</u>	7 116	ة د	0024	2 4	
eff         2 Lames Class II Collector         12,000         6,170         A         6,347         A         733         6           2 Lames Class II Collector         7,500         6,170         A         6,347         A         176         3           1 Lames Class II Collector         7,500         6,170         A         6,347         A         176         3           1 Lames Class II Collector         7,500         2,730         2,736         2,736         2,736         2         7         3	str         2 Lanse Class II Collector         12,000         6,170         A         6,347         A         733         6           3'         2 Lanse Class II Collector         7,500         6,170         A         6,347         A         176         3           1         4 Lanse Commercial Boulevard         35,750         5,910         B         176         3         3           1         4 Lanse Commercial Boulevard         35,750         28,390         C         27,550         C         544         2         6         0         2         3         0         0         2         16         0         2         3         0         0         2         2         3         0         0         2         16         0	H Street to. J Street	2 Lanes Class III Collector	7500	7.410		7.787	á c	377	2	CUMULATIN
ef         2 Lanes Class II Collector         12,000         6,170         A         6,347         A         176         3           2         2 Lanes Class II Collector         7,500         5,910         C         27,855         C         564         3           4         Lares Commercial Boulevard         33,750         25,390         C         27,855         C         564         2           4         Lares Commercial Boulevard         33,750         23,370         23,370         C         27,855         C         66         0         2           4         Lares Commercial Boulevard         33,750         27,250         C         23,455         C         66         0         2           4         Lares Commercial Boulevard         33,750         23,370         C         27,266         C         46         0         0           4         Lares Commercial Boulevard         33,750         21,366         C         26         6         0         2           4         Lares Commercial Boulevard         33,750         23,370         C         28,455         C         86         0         0         1         2         1         1         2         1 <td>s<sup>1</sup>         2 Lanes Class II Collector         12,000         6,170         A         6,347         A         176         3           1         2 Lanes Class II Collector         7,500         5,910         C         27,855         C         590         2           1         4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard         33,750         25,990         C         27,855         C         590         2           1         4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard         33,750         27,950         C         27,855         C         46         0           1         4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard         33,750         27,250         C         27,266         C         46         0           1         4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard         33,750         27,220         C         27,266         C         46         0           1         4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard         33,750         27,220         C         27,465         C         46         0           1         4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard         33,750         27,220         C         27,465         C         46         0           1         4 Lanes Class III Collector         7,500         3,840         A         4,061         A</td> <td>J Street to L Street</td> <td>2 Lanes Class II Collector</td> <td>12.000</td> <td>11.440</td> <td>:0</td> <td>12,173</td> <td>Ō</td> <td>733</td> <td>0</td> <td>CUMULATIN</td>	s <sup>1</sup> 2 Lanes Class II Collector         12,000         6,170         A         6,347         A         176         3           1         2 Lanes Class II Collector         7,500         5,910         C         27,855         C         590         2           1         4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard         33,750         25,990         C         27,855         C         590         2           1         4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard         33,750         27,950         C         27,855         C         46         0           1         4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard         33,750         27,250         C         27,266         C         46         0           1         4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard         33,750         27,220         C         27,266         C         46         0           1         4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard         33,750         27,220         C         27,465         C         46         0           1         4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard         33,750         27,220         C         27,465         C         46         0           1         4 Lanes Class III Collector         7,500         3,840         A         4,061         A	J Street to L Street	2 Lanes Class II Collector	12.000	11.440	:0	12,173	Ō	733	0	CUMULATIN
2 Lanes Class III Collector       7,500       5,910       B       6,087       B       176       3         1       4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard       33,750       25,390       C       27,000       C       564       2         1       4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard       33,750       28,370       C       27,000       C       564       2         1       4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard       33,750       21,960       D       22,076       D       16       0         1       4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard       33,750       22,7200       C       23,750       24,466       C       46       0         1       4 Lanes Class II Collector       2000       10,570       A       1,476       A       1,276       7       7         1       2 Lanes Class III Collector       7,500       3,840       A       1,876       A       1,276       7       7         1       2 Lanes Class III Collector       7,500       1,750       A       1,876       A       1,226       7       7       7         1       2 Lanes Class III Collector       7,500       2,060       A       2,462       A       1,276       7       7       7 <td>2 Lanes Class III Collector       7,500       5,910       B       6,087       B       176       3         1       4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard       33,750       26,390       C       27,205       C       694       2         1       4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard       33,750       26,390       C       27,205       C       694       2         1       4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard       33,750       27,205       C       544       C       544       0       0         1       4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard       33,750       27,205       C       28,456       C       6       0       0         1       4 Lanes Class ICollector       7,500       16,470       A       1,876       A       1876       7       7         1       2 Lanes Class III Collector       7,500       3,440       A       1,876       A       125       7       7         1       2 Lanes Class III Collector       7,500       2,060       A       1,876       A       125       7       7       7       7       7       7       7       7       7       7       7       7       7       7       7       7       7       7<td>L Street to I-5 Ramps<sup>1</sup></td><td>2 Lanes Class II Collector</td><td>- 12,000</td><td>6,170</td><td>Ą</td><td>6,347</td><td>A</td><td>176</td><td>8</td><td>No</td></td>	2 Lanes Class III Collector       7,500       5,910       B       6,087       B       176       3         1       4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard       33,750       26,390       C       27,205       C       694       2         1       4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard       33,750       26,390       C       27,205       C       694       2         1       4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard       33,750       27,205       C       544       C       544       0       0         1       4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard       33,750       27,205       C       28,456       C       6       0       0         1       4 Lanes Class ICollector       7,500       16,470       A       1,876       A       1876       7       7         1       2 Lanes Class III Collector       7,500       3,440       A       1,876       A       125       7       7         1       2 Lanes Class III Collector       7,500       2,060       A       1,876       A       125       7       7       7       7       7       7       7       7       7       7       7       7       7       7       7       7       7       7 <td>L Street to I-5 Ramps<sup>1</sup></td> <td>2 Lanes Class II Collector</td> <td>- 12,000</td> <td>6,170</td> <td>Ą</td> <td>6,347</td> <td>A</td> <td>176</td> <td>8</td> <td>No</td>	L Street to I-5 Ramps <sup>1</sup>	2 Lanes Class II Collector	- 12,000	6,170	Ą	6,347	A	176	8	No
Image: commercial Boulevard         33,750         25,390         C         27,000         C         650         2           1         4 Larres Commercial Boulevard         33,750         25,390         C         27,565         C         564         2           1         4 Larres Commercial Boulevard         33,750         23,750         31,660         D         32,075         D         116         0           1         4 Larres Commercial Boulevard         33,750         27,250         21,566         C         564         2           1         4 Larres Commercial Boulevard         33,750         27,250         2,7156         C         27,566         C         66         0           1         4 Larres Commercial Boulevard         33,750         2,720         2,7156         C         2,7156         C         66         0	$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	South of 1-5 Ramps	2 Lanes Class III Collector	7,500	5,910	8	6,087	B	176	3	00
Image: Commercial Boulevard         33,750         25,390         C         27,505         C         594         Z           1         4 Larres Commercial Boulevard         33,750         27,556         C         564         Z           1         4 Larres Commercial Boulevard         33,750         27,220         C         27,566         C         66         Z           1         4 Larres Commercial Boulevard         33,750         27,220         C         27,566         C         66         Z         C         76         0         0         C         27,566         C         66         C         26,470         7         F         C         27,250         C         27,266         C         86,40         C         27,266         C         86,40         C         27,266         C         86,40         C         27,266         C         86,40         C         27,45         C         27,275         C         27,275         C         27,275         C         27,75	Image: Commercial Boulevard         33,750         25,390         C         7,020         C         53,076         D         1         0         0         2           1         1 almes Commercial Boulevard         33,750         25,390         C         7,030         C         7,030         C         53,750         25,390         C         9         0           1         4 Larries Commercial Boulevard         33,750         23,750         25,370         C         23,756         C         56         C         56         0         0         0         0         0         25,076         C         27,076         C         24,076         A         1,876         A         1,277         7         A         1,277         17         A         1,277         17         A	3roadway									
tio H.Street i Harres Commercial Boulevard 33,730 29,90 C 27,505 C 564 2 et to K.Street i Lanes Commercial Boulevard 33,730 21,900 C 22,005 C 46 0 et to L.Street i Lanes Commercial Boulevard 33,730 27,220 C 28,456 C 46 0 et to L.Street i 4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard 33,730 2,7220 C 28,456 C 46 0 et to L.Street i 4 Lanes Class I Collector 22,000 10,510 A 1,277 B + 1,271 7 7 et to Street B 2 Lanes Class I Collector 7,500 10,510 A 1,376 A 1,376 7 7 et to Street B 2 Lanes Class I Collector 7,500 10,510 A 1,376 A 1,376 7 7 et to Street B 2 Lanes Class III Collector 7,500 1,750 A 1,376 A 1,376 7 7 et to Street B 2 Lanes Class III Collector 7,500 2,060 A 2,460 A 1,277 7 7 et to Street B 2 Lanes Class III Collector 2,000 10,510 A 1,376 A 1,277 7 7 et to Street B 2 Lanes Class III Collector 7,500 2,060 A 2,460 A 1,376 7 7 7 et to Street B 2 Lanes Class III Collector 2,000 10,510 A 1,376 7 4 1,277 7 7 et to Street B 2 Lanes Class III Collector 2,000 10,510 A 1,376 7 4 1,277 7 7 et to Street B 2 Lanes Class III Collector 2,500 1,750 A 1,376 7 4 1,277 7 7 et to Street B 2 Lanes Class III Collector 2,500 2,060 A 2,460 A 1,277 7 7 et to Street B 2 Lanes Class III Collector 2,500 2,060 A 2,460 A 1,277 7 7 et to Street B 2 Lanes Class III Collector 2,500 2,060 A 2,460 A 1,277 7 7 et to Street B 2 Lanes Class III Collector 2,500 2,060 A 2,460 A 1,277 7 7 et to Street B 2 Lanes Class III Collector 2,500 2,060 A 2,460 A 1,277 7 7 et to Street B 2 Lanes Class III Collector 2,500 2,060 A 2,460 A 1,277 7 7 et to Street B 2 Lanes Class III Collector 2,500 2,060 A 2,460 A 1,277 7 7 et to Street B 2 Lanes Class III Collector 2,500 2,060 A 2,460 A 1,277 7 7 et to Street B 2 Lanes Class III Collector 2,500 2,060 A 2,460 A 1,277 7 7 et to Street B 2 Lanes Class III Collector 2,500 4,1750 A 2,460 A 1,277 7 7 et to Street B 2 1,277 7 7 et to Street B 2 1,277 7 7 et to	Roll       Earliest       4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard       33.750       22.950       C       27.956       C       46       0         et to K Street       4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard       33.750       21.966       C       25.970       C       25.970       C       46       0       0         et to K Street       4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard       33.750       27.2500       C       23.756       C       46       0       0         et to Street       4 Lanes Class I Collector       22.000       16.470       A       4.961       A       26       0       0         atto Street Street       2 Lanes Class II Collector       7.500       3.840       A       4.961       A       1271       7       7         Atto Bay Boulevaid       2 Lanes Class III Collector       7.500       3.840       A       4.961       A       1277       7       7       7       1         Atto Street A       2 Lanes Class III Collector       7.500       3.840       A       2.465       A       125       7       1       1       276       4       4       1       1       27       1       1       27       1       1       2.465       A       1	C Street to E Street	4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard	33,750	26,390	0	27,020	U U	630	2	2
Delta     22,000     Delta     22,000     Delta     11,876     Delta     11,876     Delta       of L Street     4 Lanes Commercial Boulevand     33,750     23,750     23,750     23,756     Delta     116     0       of L Street     4 Lanes Commercial Boulevand     33,750     23,750     27,566     C     46     0       of L Street     4 Lanes Commercial Boulevand     33,750     23,750     C     22,466     C     46       of D Street C     4 Lanes Class III Collector     22,000     16,470     A     1,976     A     1,271     7       Ato Bay Boulevald     2 Lanes Class III Collector     7,500     3,840     A     2,403     A     2,500     6       Ato Bay Boulevald     2 Lanes Class III Collector     7,500     3,840     A     2,660     A     1,876     A     1,271     7       Ato Bay Boulevald     2 Lanes Class III Collector     7,500     2,060     A     2,862     A     1,276     7     7       Ato Bay Boulevald     2 Lanes Class III Collector     7,500     2,060     A     2,862     7     7     1       Ato Bay Boulevald     2 Lanes Class III Collector     7,500     2,060     A     2,862     7     7	Interference     41 antes Commercial Boulevand     33,730     37,960     D     32,006     D     118     0       of L Street     41 antes Commercial Boulevand     33,730     77,960     C     22,7206     C     45     0       of L Street     41 antes Kommercial Boulevand     33,730     73,960     C     22,7206     C     45     0       of L Street     41 antes Kommercial Boulevand     33,730     7     1     24,456     C     45     0       of L Street     41 antes Class I Collector     22,000     16,470     A     1,876     A     125     7       Ato Bay Boulevard     21 antes Class III Collector     7,500     1,750     A     1,876     A     125     7       Ato Bay Boulevard     21 antes Class III Collector     7,500     1,750     A     1,876     A     1,275     7       Ato Bay Boulevard     21 antes Class III Collector     7,500     2,060     1,750     A     4,091     A     226     7       Ato Bay Boulevard     21 antes Class III Collector     7,500     2,050     1,750     A     4,22     17       Ato Bay Boulevard     21 antes Class III Collector     7,500     2,050     4,051     A     4,22     17 <td>E Street to H Street</td> <td>4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard</td> <td>33,750</td> <td>26,990</td> <td>0</td> <td>27,585</td> <td>с) I</td> <td>594</td> <td>8</td> <td>Q.</td>	E Street to H Street	4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard	33,750	26,990	0	27,585	с) I	594	8	Q.
et to Effect 4 Laries Gommercial Boulevard 33,750 27,720 C 28,456 C 86 0 of L Street 4 Laries Major Street 30,000 28,370 C 28,345 C 86 0 to Street B 2 Laries Class I Collector 22,000 16,510 A 1,876 E 1, 127 7 to Street B 2 Laries Class II Collector 7,500 1,640 A 1,876 E 1, 127 7 7 At D Bay Boulevard 2 2 Laries Class III Collector 7,500 1,750 A 1,876 A 1,876 7 7 1,755 7 7 1,876 8 4 1,876 7 7 1,550 1,750 1,750 1,750 7 1,17 7 1,550 1,17 1,17 1,17 1,17 1,17 1,17 1,17 1,1	et to L. Street i Lanes Commercial Boulevard 33,750 27,220 C 21,266 C 45 0 - of L. Street i Lanes Gass Connectal Boulevard 33,750 27,220 C 10,510 A 1,2756 C 86 0 - et to Street C 4 Lanes Gass Collector 22,000 10,510 A 1,275 F 2,076 F 4 0,01 A 1,277 C 2,000 10,510 A 1,277	H Street to K Street	4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard	33,750	31,960		32,076	0	116	0	
ori Listreet 4 Lanes Major Street 30,000 28,370 C 28,495 C 85 0 0 1 271 7 1 210 Street 4 Lanes Glass I Collector 22,000 16,470 A 1,975 B 1,1271 7 1 210 Street 2 Lanes Class II Collector 7,500 1,750 A 1,976 A 1,877 B 1,1271 7 1 210 Street 2 Lanes Class III Collector 7,500 1,750 A 1,876 A 1,877 7 1 22 Constant 2 Lanes Class III Collector 7,500 1,750 A 1,876 A 1,877 7 1 2 Lanes Class III Collector 7,500 2,060 A 2,462 1,877 7 1 2 Lanes Class III Collector 2,2000 1,750 A 1,876 A 1,876 7 1 2 Lanes Class III Collector 2,500 1,750 A 1,876 A 1,876 7 1 2 Lanes Class III Collector 2,500 1,750 A 1,876 A 1,876 7 1 2 Lanes Class III Collector 2,500 2,060 A 2,462 1,77 1 2 Lanes Class III Collector 2,500 2,060 A 2,462 1,17 1 2 Lanes Class III Collector 2,500 1,750 1,750 2,060 2,060 A 2,462 1,17 1 2 Lanes Class III Collector 2,500 1,750 1,	of L Street 4 Lanes Major Street 30,000 28,370 C 22,445 4 - 67 8 - 0 - 1 - 27 1	K Street to L Street	4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard	33,750	27,220	ပ ပ	27,266	ပ	45	0	ON S
Ato Street C       4 Laries Class I Collector       22,000       10,510       A       978       A       978       B       1,271       7       1         Cto J Street B       2 Lanes Class I Collector       7,500       3,840       A       4,091       A       250       6       A       250       7	etto Street C.       4 Laries Class I Collector       22.000       10,510       A       1,271       F       F         C10-JStreet B       2 Lares Class III Collector       7,500       3,840       A       1,876       B       1,271       7       F         At Bay Bouleverd       2 Lares Class III Collector       7,500       3,840       A       1,876       A       1,251       7       7         At Bay Bouleverd       2 Lares Class III Collector       7,500       1,750       A       1,876       A       125       7       7         At Bay Bouleverd       2 Lares Class III Collector       7,500       2,066       A       1,876       A       125       7       7         At Bay Bouleverd       2 Lares Class III Collector       7,500       2,066       A       2,805       7       7       7         At Rege Dialy Titley Los       2 Lares Class III Collector       7,500       2,066       A       2,402       17       17         At Rege Dialy Titley Los       2 Lares Class III Collector       7,500       2,066       A       4,22       17       17         At Rege Dialy Titley Los       2 Lares Class III Collector       7,500       2,066       A       4,22       17	South of L Street	4 Lanes Major Street	30,000	28,370	3	28,456	5	82	0	NO
Clip Street L       4 tartes values i collector       22,000       16,470       A       4,091       A       201       7       1         Clip Street L       1 Larres Class III Collector       7,500       16,470       A       1,876       A       1267       7       A         Alo Bay Boulevard       2 Larres Class III Collector       7,500       1,750       A       1,876       A       1267       7       A         Alo Bay Boulevard       2 Larres Class III Collector       7,500       1,750       A       1,876       A       125       7       A         Alo Bay Boulevard       2 Larres Class III Collector       7,500       2,060       A       2,405       A       125       7       A         Alos Bay Foulevard       2 Larres Class III Collector       7,500       2,060       A       2,405       A       4,091       A       125       7       A         Alos Bay Foulevard       2 Larres Class III Collector       7,500       2,060       A       2,405       A       4,091       A <td>ar to Street. 4 uares Class I collector 22,000 tuzito A 13754.12741 B 1 1271 7 2 10 13 16 470 A 13754.12741 B 1 1271 7 2 10 15 16 17 1 15 10 15 16 15 1 15 16 15 15 15 16 15 15 15 16 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15</td> <td>Street A</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td><b>.</b></td> <td>S/21</td> <td></td> <td>010</td> <td></td> <td></td>	ar to Street. 4 uares Class I collector 22,000 tuzito A 13754.12741 B 1 1271 7 2 10 13 16 470 A 13754.12741 B 1 1271 7 2 10 15 16 17 1 15 10 15 16 15 1 15 16 15 15 15 16 15 15 15 16 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15	Street A				<b>.</b>	S/21		010		
Cuto 1:01681       A tures vass. Nonecurity       ZZ,000       10,410       A 1,876       A       1,250       5       7       1         At 0 Bay Boulevaird       2 Lanes Class III Collector       7,500       1,750       3,840       A       1,876       A       125       7       1         At 0 Bay Boulevaird       2 Lanes Class III Collector       7,500       1,750       3,840       A       1,876       A       125       7       1         a Parkway to Street A       2 Lanes Class III Collector       7,500       2,060       A       2,402       A       4,22       17       1         A Elevage Daily Hom and Associates 200s       8       7,500       2,060       A       2,402       A       4,22       17       1         A Levage Daily Tips, LOS = Level of Service       8       4       2,402       A       4,22       17       1         A Levage paily Tips, LOS = Level of Service       8       4       4       4,22       17       1         A Levage pail       7       7       7       8       4       4,22       17       1         A Levage pail       7       7       7       7       1       2       4       4,22       <	Ato Bay Boulevaid     4 tarties vides it collector     7,500     3,840     A tarte events     P     1,471     P       Ato Bay Boulevaid     2 Lanes Class III Collector     7,500     1,750     A     1,876     A     125     7       Ato Bay Boulevaid     2 Lanes Class III Collector     7,500     1,750     A     1,876     A     125     7       a Partway to Street A     2 Lanes Class III Collector     7,500     2,060     A     2,462     A     422     17       a Partway to Street A     2 Lanes Class III Collector     7,500     2,060     A     2,462     A     422     17       a Partway to Street A     2 Lanes Class III Collector     7,500     2,060     A     2,462     A     422     17       a Parto Street A     2 Earles Class III Collector     7,500     2,060     A     2,462     A     422     17       a Parto Street A     2 Earles Class III Collector     7,500     2,060     A     2,462     17     17       a Parto Street A     2 Earles Class III Collector     7,500     2,060     4,021     422     17       a Parto Street A     2 Earles Class III Collector     7,500     2,060     4     2,462     17       a Parto Street A     2	H Street to Street C	4 Lanes Class   Collector	000'22	010,01	4	11,588	1	8/8		
at to Street B 2 Larres Class III Collector 7,500 1,750 A 1,876 A 125 7 7 A 200 By Boulevard 2 Larres Class III Collector 7,500 1,750 A 2,462 A 125 7 7 A 125 C 160 A 2,462 A 2,422 17 A 2,414 Figure strates to street A 2,422 17 A 2,424 A 2,444 A 2,422 17 A 2,444 A 2,444 A 2,424 A 2,424 A 2,444 A 2,424 A 2,424 A 2,444	Ato Bay Boulevard <u>2 Lanes Class III Collector</u> <u>7,500 3,640 A 9,091 A 220 6 1</u> <u>A Parkway to Street A 2 Lanes Class III Collector</u> <u>7,500 2,060 A 2,462 7 1</u> <u>A Parkway to Street A 2 Lanes Class III Collector</u> <u>7,500 2,060 A 2,462 7 17 1</u> Activity-Hom and Associates 2008 - Average Daily Trips. US = Level of Service values indicate rodoway segments operating at LOS E or F. Bold and shaded values indicate project significant impact.			22,000	10,4/0	A 174	144101		1/2/1		
Ato Bay Boulevard       2 Laries Class III Collector       7,500       1,750       1,756       A       1,876       A       125       7       1         a Parkway to Street A       2 Lanes Class III Collector       7,500       2,060       A       2,462       A       422       17       17         RCE: Kimley-Hom and Associates 2008.       = Average Daily Trips. LOS = Level of Service	Ato Bay Boulevard       2 Lanes Class III Collector       7,500       1,876       A       125       7         a Parkway to Street A       2 Lanes Class III Collector       7,500       2,060       A       2,462       A       422       17         RCE: Kimley-Hom and Associates 2006       8CE: Kimley-Hom and Associates 2006       8CE       2,660       A       2,462       A       422       17         RCE: Kimley-Hom and Associates 2006       8CE: Kimley-Hom and Associates 2006       8CE       8.4       4.22       17       17         a Nues indicate roadway segments operating at LOS E or F. Bold and shaded values indicate project significant impact.       8.4       4.22       17       17         2.010       8.105       8.105       9.1       8.105       9.1       17       17         2.010       8.105       9.1       8.105       9.1       8.105       9.1       17       17         2.011       1       1       1       1       1       1       17       17       17         2.011       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       17       17         2.012       1       1       1       1       1       1       1	J Street to Street B	2 Lanes class III collector	0094	3,840	<u> </u>	4,091	¥	700	0	NC I
Allo bay boulevalue <u>2 Lanes class III Collector</u> <u>7,500 2,060 A 2462 A 422 17</u> RCE: Kimley-Hom and Associates 2008. = Average Datily Trips. LOS = Level of Service a values indicate roadway segments operating at LOSE or F. Bold and shaded values indicate significant impact. 2010 2010 Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan	All Design Douteral I - Larres Class III Collector 7,500 4 1,500 4 1,000 4 4 22 17 1 RCE: Kimley-Hom and Associates 2008. = Alerage Dally Titles, LOS = Lavel of Servica values indicate, roadway segments operating at LOS E or F. Bold and shaded values indicate impact. 2010 2010 Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan	Street D	of and Class III Callacter	7,500	1 1 7EN		1 072	×	106	F	
a Parkway to Street A       2 Lanes Class III Collector       7,500       2,060       A -       422       17       -         RCE: Kimley-Horn and Associates 2008.       = Average Daily Trips; LOS = Level of Service values indicate roadway segments operating at LOS E or F. Bold and shaded values indicate inpact:	A Farkway to Street A     2 Lames Class III Collector     7,500     2,060     A     2,462     17       RCE: Kimley-Hom and Associates 2008.       - Average Datily Trips LOS = Level of Service values indicate (radivity segments operating at LOS E or F. Bold and shaded values indicate significant impact.       2010       2010       I Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Chula Visita Bayfront Master Plan	Street C		nnc <sup>1</sup>	nc /1	¢	0/0/1	<	164		
OS E or F. Bold and shaded values indicate project significant impact. Dia Vista Bayfromi Master Plan	OS E or F. Bold and shaded values indicate project significant impact. Ula Vista Bayfront Master Plan	Marina Parkway to Street A	2 Lanes Class III Collector	7,500	2,060	A	2,462		422	17	NO
		SOURCE: Kimley-Horn and Ast ADT = Average Daily Trips; LOS Bold values indicate roadway se	ociates 2008. 1 = Level of Service igments operating at LOS E or F. Bold and	shaded values in	idicate project si	gnificant imp	Z, C 1				
		4 cirl 2010									10,2073
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Final Environmental Impact R	anni (EIR) for the Chula Vista Bavfront I	Master Plan							4.2-184
			and the first and the second the second s								1

a baara a cuuma

t the let

 $(\cdots, \hat{z}^{\mathrm{II}}, \hat{q}, \cdot)$ 

ł

1

1. Area - 1.

r istana.

an ang tin

1 (wala) is

c 📬 🕐

PAGE 72
and the state

### 4.2.5 Mitigation Measures

Developers of any parcel located within the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan shall reimburse the Port, City, and/or other developers the pro-rata cost of the installation of public transportation improvements, as obligated and required by the Port and/or City based on the nexus established in the technical studies and this Draft EIR.

a. Phase I Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures shall be required to be implemented by the developer to reduce impacts to a level less than significant:

- **4.2-1** Prior to the issuance of any certificates of occupancy for any development on H-3 in Phase I, the Port or Port tenant, as appropriate, shall:
  - Construct H Street west of Marina Parkway as a 2-lane Class III Collector
  - Construct E Street as a 2-lane Class III Collector along Parcel H-3. This would provide a connection to Lagoon Drive via Marina Parkway.
  - Construct a traffic signal at H Street and Gaylord RCC Truck Driveway.

Prior to the issuance of building permits for any development on H-13 or H-14 in Phase I, the applicant shall:

- Rebuild that portion of Marina Parkway fronting H-13 and H-14 between E StreetSandpiper Way and J Street as a 3-lane Class II Collector with excess ROW used for pedestrian facilities, or secure such construction to the satisfaction to the City engineer. Frontage improvements for the remaining segments of Marina Parkway J Street and Sandpiper Way will be constructed in conjunction with the development of the adjacent parcels to these frontages in subsequent phases.
- Construct Street A north of J Street would be constructed as a 2-lane Class III Collector-, or secure such construction to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

This mitigation would reduce Significant Impact 4.2-1 to below a level of significance.

4.2-2 Prior to the issuance of any certificates of occupancy for any development on H-3 in Phase I, the Port or Port tenant, as appropriate, shall construct H Street from I-5 to Marina Parkway as a four-lane Major Street. This mitigation is provided in lieu of widening of F Street due to environmental constraints associated with the widening of F Street in the vicinity of the F&G Street Marsh. At the completion of the H-Street Extension, the Port or Port tenant, as appropriate, shall also restrict access along the segment of Lagoon Drive/F Street (between Parcel H-3 and the BF Goodrich access

April 2010	· .	5703-01
Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan		4.2-207

4.2

on F Street) to emergency vehicle access only. This mitigation would reduce **Significant Impacts 4.2-2, 4.2-4, 4.2-6, 4.2-7, and 4.2-11** to below a level of significance.

1 ge 2 g

. . .

4.2-3 Prior to the issuance of any certificates of occupancy for any development on H-3 in Phase I, the Port or Port tenant, as appropriate, shall widen H Street west of Marina Parkway from a two-lane Class III Collector to a three-lane Class II Collector. This mitigation would reduce **Significant Impact 4.2-3** to below a level of significance.

4.2-4 Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development on H-3 and building permits for any development on H-13 or H-14 in Phase I, the Port, Port tenant, or applicant, as appropriate, shall widen Bay Boulevard between E Street and F Street from a two-lane Class III Collector to a two-lane Class II Collector, or secure such widening to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. The additional roadway capacity would facilitate the flow of project traffic. This mitigation would reduce Significant Impact 4.2-5 to below a level of significance.

- **4.2-5** Prior to the issuance of building permits for any development on H-13 or H-14 in Phase I, the applicant shall construct a traffic signal at the intersection of J Street and Bay Boulevard, or secure such construction to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. The traffic signal shall be constructed and operate to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. This mitigation would reduce Significant Impacts 4.2-8 and 4.2-14 to below a level of significance.
- 4.2-6 Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development on H-3 or building permits for any development on H-13 or H-14 in Phase I, the Port, Port tenant, or applicant, as appropriate, shall construct a traffic signal at the intersection of L Street and Bay Boulevard, or secure such construction to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. The traffic signal shall be constructed and operate to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. This mitigation would reduce Significant Impacts 4.2-9 and 4.2-15 to below a level of significance.
- 4.2-7 Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for development on H-3 or building permits for any development on H-13 or H-14 in Phase I, the Port, Port tenant, or applicant, as appropriate, shall construct a traffic signal at the intersection of I-5 southbound ramps and Bay Boulevard, or secure such construction to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. The traffic signal shall be constructed and operate to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. This mitigation would reduce Significant Impacts 4.2-10 and 4.2-16 to below a level of significance.

April 2010				570	3-01
Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the	Chula Vis	sta Bayfront Mas	ter Plan	4.2	-208

4.2	Traffic and Circulation
4.2-8	The following mitigation measure would reduce, but not eliminate project impacts on Interstate 5, as identified in Significant Impacts 4.2-12, 4.2-17, 4.2-18, 4.2-29, 4.2-30, 4.2-35 through 4.2-37, and 4.2-46 through 4.2-50.
<u></u>	The Port and the City shall participate in a multi-jurisdictional effort conducted by Caltrans and SANDAG to assist in developing a detailed I-5 corridor level study that will identify transportation improvements along with funding, including federal, state regional, and local funding sources and phasing that would reduce congestion management with Caltrans standards on the I-5 south corridor from the SR-54 interchange to the Otay River (the "I-5 South Corridor") (hereinafter, the "Plan"). Local funding sources identified in the Plan shall include fair share contributions related to private and/or public development based on the nexus established in this Draft EIR as well as other mechanisms. The Plan required by this mitigation shall include the following:
	a) The responsible entities (the Entities) included in this effort will include, but may not be limited to, the City, other cities along I-5, the Port, SANDAG, and Caltrans. Other entities will be included upon the concurrence of the foregoing Entities.
	<ul> <li>b) The Plan will identify physical and operational improvements to I-5 adjacent to the project area, relevant arterial roads and transit facilities (the Improvements), that are focused on regional impacts and specific transportation impacts from the project, and will also identify the fair share responsibilities of each Entity for the construction and financing for each Improvement. The Plan will include an implementation element that includes each Entity's responsibilities and commitment to mitigate the impacts created by all phases of the Proposed Project</li> </ul>
	c) The Plan will set forth a timeline and other agreed upon relevant criteria for implementation of each Improvement.
	d) The Plan will identify the total estimated design and construction cost for each Improvement and the responsibility of each Entity for both implementation and funding of such costs.
	e) The Plan will include the parameters for any agreed upon fair-share funding to be implemented, that would require private and/or public developers to contribute to the costs, in a manner that will comply with applicable law.
	f) In developing the Plan, the Entities shall also consider ways in which the Improvements can be coordinated with existing local and regional transportation and facilities financing plans and programs, in order to avoid duplication of effort and expenditure; however, the existence of such other plans and programs shall

The states of

an the State of State of States

۰ : "

a c

· \* \*\*. ..

÷٠

5703-01 4.2-209 not relieve the Entities of their collective obligation to develop and implement the Plan as set forth in this mitigation measure. Nothing in the Plan shall be construed as relieving any Entity (or any other entity) from its independent responsibility (if any) for the implementation of any transportation improvement.

- g) The Port shall seek adoption of the Plan before the Port Board of Commissioners. and the City shall seek adoption of the Plan before the City Council upon the completion of the multi-jurisdictional effort to develop the Plan. The Port and the City shall report, to their respective governing bodies regarding the progress made to develop the Plan within 6 months of the first meeting of the entities. Thereafter, the Port and the City shall report at least annually regarding the progress of the Plan, for a period of not less than 5 years, which may be extended at the request of the City Council and/or Board of Commissioners.
- h) The Plan shall also expressly include each Entity's pledge that it will cooperate with each other in implementing the Plan.
- i) Prior to issuance of certificates of occupancy or building permits for any development of individual projects within the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan, the Port and the City shall require project applicants to make their fair share contribution toward mitigation of cumulative freeway impacts within the City's portion of the I-5 South Corridor by participating in the City's Western Traffic Development Impact Fee or equivalent funding program.

The failure or refusal of any Entity other than the Port or the City to cooperate in the implementation of this mitigation measure shall not constitute failure of the Port or the City to implement this mitigation measure; however, the Port and the City shall each use its best efforts to obtain the cooperation of all responsible Entities to fully participate, in order to achieve the goals of the mitigation measure.

- Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development on H-3 in Phase I, the Port or Port tenant, as appropriate, shall construct a westbound through lane along H Street/Gaylord RCC Driveway, which would result in widening H Street west of Marina Parkway to a three-lane Class II Collector. This mitigation would reduce Significant Impact 4.2-13 to below a level of significance.
- 4.2 10The following mitigation measure would reduce, but not eliminate impacts at . intersections of E Street and H Street associated with trolley delays, as identified in Significant Impact 4.2-19. Prior to issuance of certificates of occupancy for parcel H-3 or building permits for any development within the City, the Port and the City shall require project applicants to make their fair share contribution toward mitigation of intersection impacts at H Street and E Street within the City's jurisdiction by

4.2-9

76

participating in the City's Western Traffic Development Impact Fee or equivalent funding program.

The failure or refusal of any Entity other than the Port or the City to cooperate in the implementation of this mitigation measure shall not constitute failure of the Port or the City to implement this mitigation measure; however, the Port and the City shall each use its best efforts to obtain the cooperation of all responsible Entities to fully participate, in order to achieve the goals of mitigation measure.

However, because implementation of the physical improvements needed to reduce the significant impacts to the affected intersections will require funding from other sources in addition to the WTDIF, such as local, state and federal funds, and such funding is not certain or under the control of the Port or the City, the Port and the City cannot assure the necessary improvements will be constructed as needed or that they will be constructed within any known time schedule. Accordingly, the Proposed Project's impacts to the E Street and H Street intersections affected by an at-grade trolley crossing are considered significant and unmitigated.

#### b. Phase II Mitigation Measures

- 4.2-11 Prior to the issuance of any certificates of occupancy for any development on H-23 in Phase I, the Port or Port tenant, as appropriate, shall construct Street A between H Street to Street C as a two-lane Class III Collector, and shall construct Street C between Marina Parkway and Street A as a two-lane Class II Collector.
   The Class III Collector is a two-lane Class II Collector.
   The Class III Collector is a two-lane Class II Collector.
   The Class III Collector.
- 4.2-13 Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development in Phase II, the Port, Port tenant, or applicant, as appropriate, shall widen J Street between Street A to -74144 5 I-5 Ramps to a six-lane Major Street, or secure such construction to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. The additional roadway capacity would facilitate the flow of project traffic. This mitigation would reduce Significant Impact 4.2-22 to below a level of significance.

	5703-01
April 2010	
Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan	4.2-211

4.2	Traffic and Circulation
4.2-14	Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development in Phase II, the Port, Port tenant, or applicant, as appropriate, shall widen Street A between Street C -72/accless and J Street to a four-lane Class I Collector, or secure such construction to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. The additional roadway capacity would facilitate the flow of project traffic. This mitigation would reduce <b>Significant Impact 4.2-23</b> to below a level of significance.
4.2-15	Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development in Phase II, the Port, Port tenant, or applicant, as appropriate, shall construct a traffic signal and add an exclusive left-turn lane at each approach at the intersection of H Street and Gaylord RCC Driveway, or secure such construction to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. The traffic signal and left-turn lanes shall be built to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. This mitigation would reduce <b>Significant Impact 4.2-24</b> to below a level of significance.
4.2-16	Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development in Phase II, the Port, Port tenant, or applicant, as appropriate, shall construct a westbound and eastbound through lane along J Street at the intersection of J Street and Bay Boulevard, or secure such construction to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. The lanes shall be constructed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. This mitigation would reduce <b>Significant Impact 4.2-25</b> to below a level of significance.
4.2-17	Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development in Phase II, the Port, Port tenant, or applicant, as appropriate, shall construct a traffic signal at the intersection of H Street and Street A, or secure such construction to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. The traffic signal shall be constructed and operate to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. This mitigation would reduce <b>Significant Impact</b> <b>4.2-26</b> to below a level of significance.
4.2-18	Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development in Phase II of the development, the developer shall construct a traffic signal at the intersection of J Street and Marina Parkway. The traffic signal shall be constructed and operate to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. This mitigation would reduce <b>Significant Impact 4.2-27</b> to below a level of significance.
4.2-19	Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development in Phase II, the Port, Port tenant, or applicant, as appropriate, shall construct a traffic signal at the intersection of J Street and Street A and add an exclusive westbound right-turn lane along J Street and an exclusive southbound right-turn lane along Street A, or secure such construction to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. The traffic signal and turning lanes shall operate and be constructed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.
April 2010	mental Impact Report (EIR) for the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan 4.2-212

1 - 8- 2 -

į. ŀ I.

:

\*\*\*\*

1. TO 10 TO 20		/		· · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Final Environmental In				11 . <u>1</u>			
Cincl Environmental In		Donort (EID)	) for the Chule Vi	cto Hourson	t. Mactor	Dian	
FINAL ENVIRONMERIAL II	Dau	Reputriein		SLA DAYILUL	IL INIGOLOI	F ICUI I	
	P						

This mitigation would reduce **Significant Impact 4.2-28** to below a level of significance.

#### d. Phase III Mitigation Measures

4.2-20 Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development in Phase III, the Port, Port tenants, or applicant, as appropriate shall construct the segment of Street A that would continue south from J Street, connecting to the proposed Street B in the Otay District, as a two-lane Class III Collector. In addition, prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development in Phase III, the Port, Port tenants, as appropriate shall construct the segment of Street B that would connect to the proposed Street A, bridge over the Telegraph Canyon Creek Channel, and continue south to Bay Boulevard, as a 2-lane Class III Collector. This mitigation would reduce Significant Impact 4.2-31 to below a level of significance.

- 4.2-22 Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development in Phase III, the Port, Port tenants, or applicant, as appropriate, shall construct an exclusive eastbound right-turn lane along J Street at the intersection of J Street and Bay Boulevard, or secure such construction to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. The turning lane shall be built to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. This mitigation would reduce **Significant Impact 4.2-33** to below a level of significance.
- 4.2-23 Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development in Phase III, the Port, Port tenants, or applicant, as appropriate, shall construct an exclusive westbound right-turn lane along J Street at the intersection of J Street and I-5 NB Ramps, or secure such construction to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. The turning lane shall be built to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. This mitigation would reduce Significant Impact 4.2-34 to below a level of significance.
- 4.2-24 Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development in Phase III, the Port, Port tenants, or applicant, as appropriate, shall construct E Street from the Gaylord RCC Driveway to Bay Boulevard as a two-lane Class III Collector. This mitigation would reduce Significant Impact 4.2-38 to below a level of significance.

April 2010	5703-01
Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan	4.2-213

#### Phase IV Mitigation Measures e.

Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development in Phase IV, 4.2-25 the Port, Port tenant, or applicant, as appropriate, shall construct a new F Street segment between the proposed terminus of the existing F Street and the proposed E Street extension, ending at the SP-3 Chula Vista Nature Center parking lot, as a twolane Class III collector street, which shall also contain a Class II bike lane on both sides of the street. This mitigation would reduce Significant Impact 4.2-39 to below a level of significance

Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development in Phase IV. 4.2 - 26the Port, Port tenant, or applicant, as appropriate, shall widen E Street between F Street and Bay Boulevard to a four-lane Class I Collector, or secure such construction to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. The additional roadway capacity would facilitate the flow of project traffic. Also, the widening of this segment of E Street would facilitate the flow of project traffic on Bay Boulevard between E Street to F Street. This mitigation would reduce Significant Impacts 4.2-40 and 4.2-41 to below a level of significance.

Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development in Phase IV, the Port, Port tenant, or applicant, as appropriate, shall widen H Street between I-5 Ramps and Broadway to a 6-lane Gateway Street. The additional roadway capacity would facilitate the flow of project traffic. This mitigation would reduce Significant Impact 4.2-42 to below a level of significance. The off-site traffic improvements described in this mitigation measure for direct traffic impacts would create secondary traffic impacts. Improvements associated with these secondary impacts would be required as a result of cumulative and growth-related traffic overall, of which the Proposed Project would be a component. The Western Chula Vista TDIF identifies these improvements in a cumulative context and attributes fair share contributions according to the impact. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be responsible for a fair share contribution and would not be solely responsible for implementation of necessary secondary impact improvements.

4.2-28 Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development in Phase IV, the Port, Port tenant, or applicant, as appropriate, shall construct an eastbound through lane and an exclusive eastbound right-turn lane along E Street at the intersection of E Street and Bay Boulevard, or secure such construction to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. The lanes shall be constructed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. This mitigation would reduce Significant Impact 4.2-43 to below a level of significance.

April 2010		5703-01
Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Chula Vista Bayfront M	Master Plan	4.2-214

# 1

4.2-27

- 4.2-29 Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development in Phase IV, the Port, Port tenant, or applicant, as appropriate, shall construct an exclusive southbound right-turn lane along Bay Boulevard at the intersection of J Street and Bay Boulevard, or secure such construction to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. The lane shall be constructed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. This mitigation would reduce **Significant Impact 4.2-44** to below a level of significance.
- **4.2-30** Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development in Phase IV, the Port, Port tenant, or applicant, as appropriate, shall construct a dual southbound left-turn lane along Street A, or secure such construction to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. The lane shall be constructed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. This mitigation would reduce Significant Impact 4.2-45 to below a level of significance.

#### 4.2.6 Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.2-8 would not reduce **Significant Impacts 4.2-12**, **4.2-17**, **4.2-18**, **4.2-29**, **4.2-30**, **4.2-35** through **4.2-37**, and **4.2-46** through **4.2-49**, concerning project related impacts along I-5, to below a level of significance because implementation of the physical improvements needed to reduce significant impacts to the affected freeway segments is within the jurisdiction and control of Caltrans and not the Port or the City. The Port and the City cannot assure the necessary improvements will be constructed as needed. Accordingly, the Proposed Project's impacts to freeway segments are considered significant and unmitigated.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.2-10 would not reduce **Significant Impact 4.2-19**, concerning project related impacts on H Street and E Street intersections due to trolley delay, to below a level of significance, because implementation of the physical improvements needed to reduce significant impacts are within the jurisdiction and control of other entities and not the Port or City. The Port and the City cannot assure the necessary improvements will be constructed as needed. Accordingly, the Proposed Project's impacts to E Street and H Street intersections affected by the trolley crossings are considered significant and unmitigated

The implementation of the Mitigation Measures 4.2-1 though 4.2-7, 4,2-9, and 4.2-11 through 30 would reduce the remaining direct project related impacts to below a level of significance.



# Attachment 4

**Capacity Analysis Printouts** 



ICITPTO/085451000//Traffic/Figures/Option 2\Geometry/P1 mil geo (13-24).al

5 ti. v

	8	ŝ				14	8 	10/17	8		<u> </u>			19	g		É.				16			Î		
	21/30	Garylord Drey	8.9 K	427	/ 45 / 546 / 98 1			<b>9</b> 3	1			, 1	88 / 28 82 / 984 72 / 6 2 H St					0.9	278 533 H	1 / 339 / 848 St				2000		392 / 691 708 / 801 H/St
279 <b>/ 38</b> 87 <i>(</i> 141		Martine Phony	160 / 181 2	68 / 25		3	90 97   36	<b>/</b> 44 434 71	20				° 82/16		57)5 73)1	18 72					1	92 / 31 47 / 78	3 4		133 / 142 4	514 / 573 a
a 196 / 185		Woodlawn Ave.		102 809 104 H S	/ 1034 / 63	18		4 89 / 183		Broadwary	5	4	12 / 142 06 / 678 54 / 343 H St	19	a 100 / 128			0.4.6	207 623 55 H I	/ 830 / 244	20	s 88/221	e 340 / 560 e 102 / 192			115 / 168 609 / 784 89 / 137 H St
131 / 92 082 / 100 78 / 60	ھ چہ 50 لاہ		62/107 (A			24 50 11	18/: 18/1	233 605 262	8 8 8	Brondway	129 / 294 🍝		105/221		11 /8 88 / 7 44 / 1	9 19 19	<b>)</b> .	38 / 201 0	41 /104 +		5	28 / 163 52 / 784 52 / 211	) ig	•	184 / 157	5
88 / 185 8	e 313/537 a 102/184	and Awe	9 6	643	(147 /644 /247	22		a 8/35		But Blue	4.4	2	87, / 110 09 / 533 63 / 183 J St	23	B. 258 / 312	232 1417	Le 68 Off- Ramp	0	602 149 J 8	/ 479 / 281	24		•	LS NB On Kump	( <b>Š</b> .	367 / 312 423 / 484 481
93 / 147 411 / 726 168 / 210	÷		135 / 187 P.			-7 -40 -16	15   17   12	47 339 135	0 10		115 / 222 0	100	87 <b>8</b> 8		82 / 47 44 / 25	3 4	15 3B On Remp	and the second second		······································	22	12 / 246 12 / 691	<b>بر</b> چ		231//239 2	618/230



Leadend X/Y = AM/ PM PEAK HOUR-TURNING VOLUMES



FIGURE 5-17.1

1. 1997. 9

Kanley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

5-42 Proposed Project - Phase I Conditions Redistributed Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes(cont.)

#### Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan





e. 944

64 1

KITPTOV985451000VTraffic/FiguresIOption 2(Geometry/P2WP geo (13-24).al

 $\sigma(\gamma) = \rho_{\rm eff}$ 

. 3 ;

13	31	ŝ				14	3	<b>2</b> 8	2 2 2	ľ		· · · ·	15	<b>610</b>	a <del>1</del>					16			dung.		
	2 2 8	- 19 -	0 . Q	38 428 179 H S	647 (254		¢	<ul> <li>◆ 66/402</li> <li>◆ 32/183</li> </ul>	/\$7,3 :	0 A	94 94 92 92	1/41 1/125 1/129	\$	- <u>-</u>	c 3/0	NS SEI COT- Ramp	;0 :0	547 520 H 1	7 668 7 596 R				1-5 NB On Rump	0.0	392 / 591 932 / 1003 H.St
280 / 130 /			170/228 0	95 / 201 N		620 552 45	193	203 ÷			ê. P	aari ti a	1	5 / 963 3 / 237	. A	la 88 On Ramp				25 72	4 / 46 8 / 10	1 <del>-</del> 39 -	-	6 NGL/ 201	514 / 573_ 5
17.	• 183 / 165 • 41 / 30 • 153 / 108	Woodlann Ave	4	102 1033 104 H 8	í 1238 / 63	18		+ 441 / 894	Bruthway	80.8	531	/ 142 / 798 / 343 81	19	4 140 / 163	- 38/182 →	50h Ave	. 8. 4	693	/ 77 / 890 / 244	20	0 94/222	<ul> <li>349 / 580</li> <li>102 / 192</li> </ul>	ch Aie		1157/168 678/843 69//137 H Si
131 / 1161 / 78 /	1285 -		62 / 107 p	4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4		262 811 128	/273 /762 /301	ی د و	Broadway		105/221 ¢		81	3 / 107 3 / 836 3 / 187	9			48 / 242 6		12 570 10	9 / 16: 3 / 85: 2 / 211	3. 0 9 io 1 io	<b>,</b>	184 / 167 0	
<u>ਸ</u> ]	• 81 / 181 • 313 / 537 • 102 / 184		4 4 4	138 579 230 H 8	675 247	2		+ 32   210 + 48   210	Bay Blvd	5	292	/ 120 / 825 / 183	23	is 506/411	a 232 1417	<b>16 SB Off</b>	¢ B	878 149 JS	/ 681 / 261	24			Hā MB Qa Ramp	Q 4	367 / 312 558 / 590 J 8t
101 / 426 / 172 /		:	148 / 207 0	83 / 189		567	117 1954 1371	0 0				•	477	/ 931	4	Le SB On Rump		-			/ 542 / 856			474 / 338 e	

n manaka.

weeks S

a gate and a sec

֥

۰.





		FIGURE 5-30.1
Kintey-Hom and Associates, Inc.		Proposed Project - Phase II Plus Project Conditions
· · · ·	5-80	Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes(cont.)
A MARKAT AND A		



a gové u

 $\pi(x) \in g$ 







montala e anto e co



K:TPTO/098431000/Traffic/Figures/Option 2(Geometry/P3WP mit geo (13-24).at

3]	31	<b>Dwy</b>			<b>.14</b>	8	78 / 423 32 / 183		1	15	198	489 / 764	Dir.				<u>ل</u> ا			Range		
	16, 22 .	Gaylard Dwy	2 4 4	38 / 46 414 / 528 180 / 255 H St		89,98	e 9 8 9	\$9.9	106 / 52 885 / 1441 962 / 265 H St	: .	- 411 (881	1489	LG-EES CIT- Parado	¢.	578 ) 88 550 / 63 H St	3	·. ·			NG GN 21	8	412 / 626 1022 / 1019 H St
272 / 37 122 / 11	8 🎝 2 5	Marting Phay	101 / 227 0	98 / 202 &	65 58 4	1987 1987	04] î •		28 / 51 0 137 / 103 4 18 / 55 2	52 E	1 / 1073 4 / 268	ی ج- <sup>ا</sup>	L6 12B Ca Remp				268 781	/ 472 / 1073	4 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	di na	163 / 200 - 6	544 / 603. S
		Woedswei Ave	1	112 / 143 093 / 1252 154 / 103 H St	18	121/1217	6 481 / 974		6 112/147 6 549 (827 2 159/358 N Si	19	6 147 / 168	-	éth Ave		217 / 82 705 / 90 70 / 28 H 84	20		4 90 / 232		4th Ave	5.0.0	120 / 188 735 / 955 99 / 152 H St
166 / 92 1176 / 13 103 / 85	. ø 19 ⇒ ∿		62 / 177 & 24 / 49 ~		664	/ 309 / 824 / 297	-		152 / 321 4	62	9 / 118 2 / 850 4 / 228	0	- - - -	65 / 267 . 0			134 / 620 / 107 /	680	2		109 / 102 S	
	199-1997 (	She Ave		141 / 152 722 / 663 240 / 257 H St	22		← 32/202 a 48/210	Biry Blvd	9. 305 / 120 4. 635 / 178 4. 395 / 203 J St	23	· 6 - 581/1491	c 242/452	La 8B off. Ramp	8	960./75 154727 J 51	5	J				r Ö	382 / 322 625 / 623 J 33
105 / 18 448 / 80 175 / 22	0 0 5 <del></del>		161 / 210 a 512 / 607 ↔		38 825 288	/68 /113 /449	4 1		837 / 488 64 / 68 38 / 194	53 21	0 / 1062 2 / 457	с С	L5 88 On Ramp				333 / 461 /	635 899	a a Homeon	Rutup	630 / 360 a	-





Figure 5-43.1 Runley-Hom and Associates, Inc. 5-116 Proposed Project - Phase III Plus Project Conditions Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes(cont.)

#### Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan



, and some the

1 N. M.



1712 1

Page 1.00

6 662

K:\TPTO\085451000VTraffic/Figures\Option 2\Geometry/P4WP geo (13-24) et

hula Vista Bayl	front Master P					
2		14 <del>9</del> 8 8 g	·		16	
a, 23 / 22. Garytani Diay	6 37 / 47 6 318 / 405 2 233 / 253 H St	- 13 - 13 - 13	\$ 124 / 80 5 204 / 1947 819/952 H st	8 7 8 8 4 8 7 8 9 9 (699)746	5 99 19	n 464 / 717 n 1283 / 1047 H St
203 / 288 + 44 85 / 91 + 1	168 / 168 . a. 97 / 239 & A	5495/953 489/887 48/84	28/52 a 1900/151 a 18/53 a	425 / 1175 ⇔ 5 62 / 307 ~ 9 85 9 2	155 / 339 899 / 1138 - 5 899 / 1138 - 5 8 5 8 5 9 5 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	160 / 184 (a) 1622 / 681 (a)
<ul> <li>445 (339)</li> <li>445 (339)</li></ul>	s. 198 / 280 s. 1277 / 1281 284 / 207 H St	a 134./224 e 134./224 e 108./1162 e 108./268 Brouthway	s, 112/160 s, 800/1882 c 172/397 jist	19 14 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15	6 104 1248 6 104 1248 6 120 7310 6 120 7310 6 120 7310	e 133 / 240 e 883 - / 903 e 125 / 191 H St
257 / 92 P 191 / 1385 s 168 / 150 s	88 / 88 101 / 8 2 / 4 2 / 4 2 / 4	322 / 369 e 776 / 665 e 7 123 / 308 9 e	163 / 334 e 1546 / 981 e 141 / 253 e	230/121 4 629/627 4 140/337 5 \$140/337 5 \$140/337 5 \$140/337 5 \$140/337 5 \$140/337 5 \$150/121	142/174 2 718/907 5 126/255 5	211/1 (1980 0 505 (1982 4 88 / 109 5
a 91 / 187 c 348 / 609 c 120 / 202 ard Avia	s 154 / 165 c 623 / 688 d 266 / 263 H St	71 19/61 12/20 12/	s. 339 / 121	23 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57	24 urg our gain of the state	s. 421 / 348. c. 766 / 641 .151
106 / 185 0 488 / 879 5 179 / 243 6	167 / 216 c 594 / 669 a 101 / 207 a	62 / 87 811 / 1148	391/1463 e 80/78 e 28/204 e	505 / 1069 (a) (a) 247 / 493 (b) (b) 3 3 3	303 / 605 a 518 / 936 - 55 8 N 2 2	681 / 410 - 211 / 0 - 1

1.120

Aleboard patton 1200-7A Parastan SF FE Paras 12-34

N

to ward in all of the state of the



• 52.

	Ż		<u></u>		<b>4</b>	A.	4	<b>^</b>	Þ	>		4
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		***	7		<b>4</b> 1		ሻ	1		٢	4Î	
Volume (vph)	0	340	36	<u>0</u>	472	88	21	142	67	32	65	10
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	<u>1900</u>	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Total Lost time (s)		4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Lane Util. Factor		0.91	1.00		0.95	:	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Frt		1.00	0.85		0.98		1.00	0.95		1.00	0.98	
Fit Protected		1.00	1.00		1.00		0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	
Satd. Flow (prot)		5085	1583		3456		1770	1773		1770	1825	
Flt Permitted		1.00	1.00		1.00		0.70	1.00		0.62	1.00	
Satd. Flow (perm)		5085	1583		3456		1311	1773		1149	1825	
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Adj. Flow (vph)	.0	370	39	Ó	513	96	23	154	73	35	71	11
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	0	23	0	38	0	Ô	43	0	0	7	0
Lane Group Flow (vph)	0	370	16	0	571	0	23	184	0	35	75	Ô
Turn Type			Perm.				Perm			Perm		
Protected Phases		4		1	8			2			6	
Permitted Phases			4				.2	· •		6		
Actuated Green, G (s)		16.0	16.0		16.0		16.0	16.0		16.0	16.0	
Effective Green, g (s)		16.0	16.0		16.0		16.0	16.0		16.0	16.0	
Actuated g/C Ratio		0.40	0.40		0.40	:	0.40	0.40		0.40	0.40	
Clearance Time (s)		4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Lane Grp Cap (vph)		2034	633		1382		524	709	ni ,**	460	730	
v/s Ratio Prot		0.07	000		c0.17			.c0.10			0.04	
v/s Ratio Perm		0.07	0.01				0.02			0.03		
v/c Ratio		0.18	0.02		0.41		0.04	0.26		0.08	0.10	
Uniform Delay, d1		7.8	7.3		8.6		7.3	8.0		7.4	7.5	
Progression Factor		1.00	1.00		1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Incremental Delay, d2		0.2	0.1		0.9		0.2	0.9		0.3	0.3	
Delay (s)		8.0	7.3		9.5		7.5	8.9		7.7	7.8	
Level of Service		A	A		Å		A	A		A	A	
Approach Delay (s)		7.9	, T		9.5			8,8			7.8	
Approach LOS		A			A			A			Ă	
•••	Si in sing				ana Tanan	and and the	et na le d	ers All a sector	a da ana a		ann a thail	
Intersection Summary	China State	sterilite dati	8.8	<u>بەر ئىرا ئىر.</u> H	CM Level	of Servic	8	ar grana di	A	<u></u>	, e al norske distri	lle with the
HCM Volume to Capacity ratio			0.34	ę 1,	1999 - 1999 -				17.7			
Actuated Cycle Length (s)		•	40.0	Si	um of lost	time (s)			8.0			
Intersection Capacity Utilization	•		40.7%			of Service						
Analysis Period (min)	,		15						۰ <i>ب</i> ۲			
c Critical Lane Group			19									
<ul> <li>Onucal Falle (Croup)</li> </ul>												

HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis Rick Engineering Company

ţ

Synchro 7 - Report Page 1

#### Phase I - AM Peak Hour 7/10/2013

			<b>4</b> -	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	¢		L	
Lane Group	EBT	EBR	WBT	NBL	NBT	ŚBL	■SBT	
Lane Group Flow (vph)	370	39	609	23	227	35	82	
v/c Ratio	0.18	0.06	0.43	0.04	0.30	0.08	0.11	
Control Delay	8.1	3.6	8.9 0.0	7.7	7.0	8.0	7.3	
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Total Delay	8.1	3.6	8.9	7.7	7.0	8.0	7.3	
Queue Length 50th (ft)	18	0	42	3	21	5	9	
Queue Length 95th (ft)		-11	72	12	54	16	27	
nternal Link Dist (ft)	31 420		420		420		420	
furn Bay Length (ft)	•••	165	• •					
Base Capacity (vph)	2034	657	1420	524	752	460	737	
Starvation Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	Ó	0	
Spillback Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Storage Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	.0	
Reduced v/c Ratio	0.18	0.06	0.43	0.04	0.30	0.08	0.11	
Intersection Summary	in the second		· · · · · ·					

Queues Rick Engineering CompanySynchro 7 - Report Page 1

	۶					<u> </u>		4	P	<u>\</u>	Ļ	Ľ
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	. WBL	WBT.	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		***	7		↑₽		آلا	1		ሻ	1.	
Volume (vph)	0	420	71	0	624	28	41	76	73	183	408	17
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Total Lost time (s)		4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Lane Util. Factor		0.91	1.00		0.95		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Ent		1.00	0.85		0.99		1.00	0.93		1.00	0.99	
Fit Protected		1.00	1.00		1.00		0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	
Satd. Flow (prot)		5085	1583		3517		1770	1726		1770	1852	
Fit Permitted		1.00	1.00		1.00		0.37	1.00		0.65	1.00	
Satd. Flow (perm)		5085	1583		3517		680	1726	and the second	1219	1852	·
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Adj. Flow (vph)	0	457	77	0	678	30	45	83	79	199	443	18
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	0	46	Ó	8	0	0	47	0	0	4	0
Lane Group Flow (vph)	0	457	31	0	700	Q	45	115	<b>Q</b> :	199	457	0
Turn Type			Perm				Perm			Perm	1414 B	······
Protected Phases		4	4 <b>-</b> 2442		8			2			6	
Permitted Phases			4		<i>•</i> ·		2			6		
Actuated Green, G (s)		16.0	16.0		16.0		16.0	16.0		16.0	16.0	
Effective Green, g (s)		16.0	16.0		16.0		16.0	16.0		16.0	16.0	
Actuated g/C Ratio		0.40	0.40		0.40		0.40	0.40		0.40	0.40	
Clearance Time (s)		4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Lane Grp Cap (vph)		2034	633		1407		272	690		488	741	
v/s Ratio Prot		0.09			c0.20			0.07		Ť	c0.25	
v/s Ratio Perm			0.02				0.07			0.16		
v/c Ratio		0.22	0.05		0.50		0.17	0.17		0.41	0.62	
Uniform Delay, d1		7.9	7.3		9.0		7.7	7.7		8.6	9.6	
Progression Factor		1.00	1.00		1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Incremental Delay, d2		0.3	0.1		1.3		1.3	0.5		2.5	3.8	
Delay (s)		8.2	7.5		10.2		9.0	8.2		11.1	13.4	
Level of Service		A	A		B		Α	Α		В	В	
Approach Delay (s)		8.1			10.2			8.4			12.7	
Approach LOS		A			В			A			B	
Intersection Summary				and the second	i Second and and		a	a de la como				
HCM Average Control Delay	<u>an nà 11 đa 1</u>		10.3	Ĥ	CM Level	of Servic	e	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	B			
HCM Volume to Capacity ratio			0.56		ాళా,హెక్స్	ਆ ਦੇ ਸਾਸਟ	. '		_			
Actuated Cycle Length (s)			40.0	Si	um of lost	time (s)			8.0			
Intersection Capacity Utilization	1		54.0%			of Service			A			
Analysis Period (min)	•		15									
c Critical Lane Group			iA									.:
<ul> <li>Attracting the Attraction</li> </ul>												

HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis Rick Engineering Company

0.55

#### Phase I - PM Peak Hour 7/10/2013

		<u>``</u>	4	4	<b>^</b>	<u>\</u>	ļ	nim tirili dan munitir utidan nim ta sirilanin inga aki sada da bi yaka bingin dan tiraka mata ka sa sa sa say
Lane Group	EBT	EBR	WBT	NBL ::	NBT	SBL	SBT	
Lane Group Flow (vph)	457	77	708	45	162	199	461	
v/c Ratio	0.22	0.11	0.50	0.17	0.22	0.41	0.62	
Control Delay	8.3	3.1	10.4	9.7	5.5	11.8	13.9	
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0,0	0.0	
Total Delay	8.3	3.1	10.4	9.7	5.5	11.8	13.9	
Queue Length 50th (ft)	8.3 23 38	0	56	6	11	30	75	
Queue Length 95th (ft)	38	0 16	91	21	36	68	144	
Internal Link Dist (ft)	420		91 420		420		420	
Turn Bay Length (ft)		165						
Base Capacity (vph)	2034	679	1415	272	738	487	744	,
Starvation Cap Reductn	°O	Ó	0	.0	0	0	0	
Spillback Cap Reductn	0	0	0	Ó	0	0	0	
Storage Cap Reductn	Ò	0	0	-0	0	0	0	
Reduced v/c Ratio	0.22	0.11	0.50	0.17	0.22	0.41	0.62	

Queues Rick Engineering Company Synchro 7 - Report Page 1

24.

L. C. S. Leve

<del>Mine pi</del>t

and the second	۶		<u> </u>	- <		<u> </u>		<u> </u>	p	5	Į.	4
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	<u>N</u> BT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		<u> </u>	۴		仲		٦	4		ሻ	1	16 2 - 14 1
Volume (vph)	0	620	45	0	921	94	25	128	19	32	66	19
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Total Lost time (s)		4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Lane Util. Factor		0.91	1.00		0.95		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Frt		1.00	0.85		0.99		1.00	0.98		1.00	0.97	
Fit Protected		1.00	1.00		1.00		0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	
Satd. Flow (prot)		5085	1583		3490		1770	1826		1770	1800	
Fit Permitted		1.00	1.00		1.00		0.70	1.00		0.66	1.00	
Satd. Flow (perm)		5085	1583		3490		1298	1826		1221	1800	
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0,92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Adj. Flow (vph)	.0	674	49	0	1001	102	27	139	21	35	72	21
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	Ű	29	0	19	0	0	13	0	0	13	Ó
Lane Group Flow (vph)	Ö	674	20	0	1084	0	27	147	Ō	35	80	0
Turn Type			Perm	i			Perm			Perm		,
Protected Phases		4			8		1. 1.1.1.1	2			6	
Permitted Phases			4				2	-		6	· · ·	
Actuated Green, G (s)		16.0	16.0	÷	16.0		16.0	16.0		16.0	16.0	
Effective Green, g (s)		16.0	16.0		16.0		16.0	16.0		16.0	16.0	
Actuated g/C Ratio		0.40	0.40		0.40		0.40	0.40		0.40	0.40	
Clearance Time (s)		4.0	4.0		4.0	.,	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Lane Grp Cap (vph)		2034	633		1396		519	730	**	488	720	
v/s Ratio Prot		0.13			c0.31			c0.08			0.04	
v/s Ratio Perm		1991 B.	0.01		5.915		0.02			0.03		
v/c Ratio		0.33	0:03		0.78		0.05	0.20		0.07	0.11	
Uniform Delay, d1		8.3	7.3		10.4		7.4	7.8		7.4	7.5	
Progression Factor		1.00	1.00		1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Incremental Delay, d2		0.4	0.1		4.3	•	0.2	0.6		0.3	0.3	
Delay (s)		8.7	7.4		14.7		7.5	8.5		7.7	7.9	
Level of Service		A	A		B		A	А		A	Α	
Approach Delay (s)		8.6			14.7		4.42	8.3			7.8	
Approach LOS		A			В			A			A	
Intersection Summary	. 1			an di general Santa Basharah			u i ji ka s	ligger Marine and State and State State and State and St	- Antonio La fait antonio			
HCM Average Control Delay		in an	11.7	<u>میں میں میں میں میں میں میں میں میں میں </u>	CMLevel	of Service	<del>Y</del>		B	2.1.1.1.1.1.2.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1	and the second sec	
HCM Volume to Capacity ratio			0.49	1.4	A141. Per 4/64	201.2001.4104			2			
Actuated Cycle Length (s)			40.0	Ċ,	um of lost	time /e)			8.0			•
Intersection Capacity Utilization			49.7%			of Service			A			
Analysis Period (min)			49.7 %			1.0011100						
c Critical Lane Group			10									

HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis Rick Engineering Company

J

Synchro 7 - Report Page 1

21 145

Lane Group	674	49	1103	27	160	35	93	
v/c Ratio	0.33	0.07	0.78	0.05	0.22	0.07	0.13	
Control Delay	8,9	3.4	15.5	7.8	7.9	8.0	6.8	,
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Total Delay	8.9	3.4	15.5	7.8	7.9	8.0	6.8	
Queue Length 50th (ft)	35 54	0	102	3	19	5	9	
Queue Length 95th (ft)	54	12	#172	13	45	16	28	
nternal Link Dist (ft)	420		420		420		420	
Turn Bay Length (ft)		165						
Base Capacity (vph)	2034	663	1415	519	743	489	.732	
Starvation Cap Reductn	0	0	0	.0	0	0	0	
Spillback Cap Reductn	0	0	·0·	0	0	0	0	
Storage Cap Reductn	0	0	<u>0</u> .	Q	0	0	0	
Reduced v/c Ratio	0.33	0.07	0.78	0.05	0.22	0.07	0.13	

ĺ

í

# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

Queues Rick Engineering Company Synchro 7 - Report. Page 1

Phase II - PM Peak Hour 7/10/2013

	٨	->	- <b>`</b>		<b></b>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	1	P	<u></u>		4
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		***	7		<b>ተ</b> ጉ		٦	4		ሻ	1	
Volume (vph)	0	1003	93	0	1245	41	51	80	63	183	402	32
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Total Lost time (s)	•	4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Lane Util. Factor		0.91	1.00		0.95		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Frt		1.00	0.85		1.00		1.00	0.93		1.00	0.99	
Flt Protected		1.00	1.00		1.00		0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	
Satd. Flow (prot)		5085	1583		3522		1770	1740		1770	1842	
Fit Permitted		1.00	1.00		1.00		0.31	1.00		0.66	1.00	
Satd. Flow (perm)		5085	1583		3522		579	1740		1227	1842	
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0:92	0.92
Adj. Flow (vph)	0	1090	101	0	1353	45	55	87	68	199	437	35
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	0	55	0.	5	0	0	28	0	0	6	Ó
Lane Group Flow (vph)	0	1090	46	0.	1393	0	55	127	0	199	466	Ö
Tum Type			Perm				Perm			Perm		- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Protected Phases		4			8			2			6	
Permitted Phases		•	4				2			6		
Actuated Green, G (s)		23.0	23.0		23.0		19.0	19,0		19.0	19.0	
Effective Green, g (s)		23.0	23.0		23.0		19.0	19.0		19.0	19.0	
Actuated g/C Ratio		0.46	0:46		0.46		0.38	0.38		0.38	0.38	
Clearance Time (s)		4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	•
Lane Grp Cap (vph)		2339	728	······································	1620		220	661		466	700	
v/s Ratio Prot		0.21	1.20		c0.40			0.07			c0.25	
v/s Ratio Perm		<b>V.</b>	0.03		007.10		0.10			0:16	*	
V/c Ratio		0.47	0.06		0.86		0.25	0.19		0.43	0.67	
Uniform Delay, d1		9.3	7,5		12.1		10.6	10.4		11.5	12.9	
Progression Factor		1.00	1.00		1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Incremental Delay, d2		0.7	0.2		6.2		2.7	0.6		2.8	5.0	
Delay (s)		9.9	7.7		18.3		13.3	11.0		14.3	17.8	
Level of Service		Â	A		B		B	B		В	B	
Approach Delay (s)		9.8	. <b>O</b> .		18.3		U.	11.6			16.8	
Approach LOS		A			B			B			<u>В</u>	
• •		~			Ų			Ľ,				
Intersection Summary	······	لم و المراجع مراجع مع مع مع					er Nei Se	n ogs si		75 S		<u>, 184</u>
HCM Average Control Delay			14.7	H	CM Level	of Servic	e		B			
HCM Volume to Capacity ratio			0.77									
Actuated Cycle Length (s)			50.0		um of lost				8,0			
Intersection Capacity Utilization	r		72.2%	ĨC	U Level	of Service			С			
Analysis Period (min)			15									
c Critical Lane Group												

A Marine

c Critical Lane Group

ſ

HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis **Rick Engineering Company** 

#### Phase II - PM Peak Hour 7/10/2013

			<b>—</b>	4	4	5	<u> </u>	
Lane Group	EBT	EBR	WBT	NBL	NBT	SBL	SBT	
Lane Group Flow (vph)	1090	101	1398	55	155	199	472	n na i na i na i i na i i i i i i i i i
v/c Ratio	0.47	0.13	0.86	0.25	0.22	0.43	0.67	
Control Delay	10.1	2.7	19.5	14.4	8.7	15.0	18.3	· .
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Total Delay	10.1	2.7	19.5	14.4	8.7	15.0	18,3	
Queue Length 50th (ft)	74	0	176	11	20	41	108	
Queue Length 95th (ft)		18	#308	33	51	87	192	
Internal Link Dist (ft)	103 420		420		420		420	
Turn Bay Length (ft)	,	165						
Base Capacity (vph)	2339	783	1625	220	689	467	706	
Starvation Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<i></i>
Spillback Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Storage Cap Reductn	0	0	Ó	0	Ō	0	0	
Reduced v/c Ratio	0.47	0.13	0.86	0.25	0.22	0.43	0.67	
Intersection Summary		-e. (99-	1. 1. (1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1		4			

1.000

# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

Queues **Rick Engineering Company** 

22.2

N 15

·····	×	<b></b>	<u>``</u>		<b>~</b>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<b>^</b>	p		L.	4
Movement	EBL		ି EBR୍ତ	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		<u> </u>	۴		仲		۴	4		ĥ	Ţ».	
Volume (vph)	.0	652	45	Ô	962	105	25	137	19	32	76	20
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Total Lost time (s)		4.0	4.0	-,, -,	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Lane Util. Factor		0.91	1.00		0.95		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Êrt		1.00	0.85		0.99		1.00	0.98		1.00	0.97	
Fit Protected		1.00	1.00		1.00		0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	
Satd. Flow (prot)		5085	1583		3487		1770	1828		1770	1804	
Fit Permitted		1.00	1.00		1.00		0.69	1.00		0.65	1.00	
Satd. Flow (perm)		5085	1583		3487		1284	1828		1210	1804	
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Adj. Flow (vph)	0	709		Ŏ	1046	114	27	149	21	35	83	22
RTOR Reduction (vph)	Ő	0	29	Ő	20	Ő	Ō	13	0	0	13	
Lane Group Flow (vph)	Ö	709	20	Õ	1140	Ō	27	157	0	35	92	.Ō
Turn Type	<u> </u>	1.00	Perm			· ·	Perm			Perm		
Protected Phases		4	é Sun'		8		i orar	2		i Gim	6	
Permitted Phases		7	-4		0		2	÷.		6	Ū	
Actuated Green, G (s)		16.0	16.0		16.0		16.0	16.0		16.0	16.0	
Effective Green, g (s)		16.0	16.0		16.0		16.0	16.0		16.0	16.0	21
Actuated g/C Ratio		0.40	0.40		0.40		0.40	0.40		0.40	0.40	
Clearance Time (s)		4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Lane Grp Cap (vph)		2034	633		1395		514	731		484	722	
v/s Ratio Prot		0.14	000		c0.33		VIE	c0:09		TO T	0.05	
v/s Ratio Perm		्रुः,(न्	0.01		0.00		0.02	.00.00		0.03	0.00	
v/c Ratio		0.35	0.03		0.82		0.05	0.22		0.07	0.13	
Uniform Delay, d1		8.4	7.3		10.7		7.4	7.9		7.4	7.6	
Progression Factor		1.00	1.00		1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Incremental Delay, d2		0.5	0.1		5.4		0.2	0.7		0.3	0.4	
Delay (s)		8.8	7.4		16.1		7.5	8.6		7.7	7.9	
Level of Service		Â	A		B		A	A		A	A	
Approach Delay (s)		8.7	0		16.1		-	8.4			7.9	
Approach LOS		A			<b>B</b>			A			A	
Intersection Summary		- <b></b>		9. <sup>6</sup>	ang part ting ting ting Change ting ting ting ting ting ting ting ting	an Ter		ee Alise de la companya	a katikati at	Anglekojista	n. Stehnsligh	Lilli din
HCM Average Control Delay	<u>- 199</u> 8	<u> Atuli</u>	12.4	างส.1. พระโรงได้ ไปไ	CM Level	of Service	<u>an di</u> se si Di	, je deska	B.	net of the second s		ALC DE LA CALL
HCM Volume to Capacity ratio			0.52	PŅ	THE FEAG		<b>.</b>		<del>ں</del>			
Actuated Cycle Length (s)			40.0	.Ci	im of lost	time /e)			8.0			
Intersection Capacity Utilization			40.0 51.6%			of Service			0.0 A			
Analysis Period (min)			51.0% 15			C C C VICE			ι <b>n</b>			
and the second			IJ									
c Critical Lane Group								ì				

HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis Rick Engineering Company

×2.

#### Phase III - AM Peak Hour 7/10/2013

······································			<b>—</b>			5		
Lane Group	EBT	EBR	WBT	NBL	NBT	SBL	SBT	
Lane Group Flow (vph)	709	49	1160	27	170	35	105	
v/c Ratio	0.35	0.07	0.82	0.05	0.23	0.07	0.14	
Control Delay	9.0	3.4	17.3	7.8	8.0	8.0	7.0 0.0	
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Total Delay	9.0	3.4	17.3	7.8	8.0	8.0	7.0	
Queue Length 50th (ft)	37	0	110	3	20	5	11	
Queue Length 95th (ft)	57	12	#213	13	48	16	31	
Internal Link Dist (ft)	57 420	21 11	420		420		420	
Turn Bay Length (ft)	1	165	5m .		.44.1.47			
Base Capacity (vph)	2034	663	1415	513	743	484	735	
Starvation Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	Q	
Spillback Cap Reductn	0	-0	0	0	0	.0	0.	
Storage Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Reduced v/c Ratio	0.35	0.07	0.82	0.05	0.23	0.07	0.14	
Intersection Summary			a et l'it.	Sector 12				and the second

# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

Queues **Rick Engineering Company**  Synchro 7 - Report Page 1

Mary

	<u>A</u>	<u> </u>				4		· <b>A</b> :	<i></i>			<u> </u>
						<u> </u>			<u>/*</u>			<b></b>
Movement	EBL		EBR	WBL		WBR		NBT	NBR	SBL		SBR
Lane Configurations		***	7		作		ሻ	<b>A</b>		ሻ	Þ	
Volume (vph)	0	1048	93	.0	1263	52	51	103	63	183	423	63
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Total Lost time (s)		4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Lane Util. Factor		0.91	1.00		0.95		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Frt		1.00	0.85		0.99		1.00	0.94		1.00	0.98	
Fit Protected		1.00	1.00		1.00		0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	
Satd. Flow (prot)		5085	1583		3518		1770	1757		1770	1827	
Fit Permitted		1.00	1.00		1.00		0.25	1.00		0.64	1.00	
Satd. Flow (perm)		5085	1583		3518		465	1757		1199	1827	
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.92	0.92	0,92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Adj. Flow (vph)	Ö	1139	101	0	1373	57	55	112	68	199	460	68
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	Ö	55	Ó	6	0	Ő	24	0	:0	11	.0
Lane Group Flow (vph)	.0	1139	46	0	1424	0	55	156	0	199	517	0
Turn Type			Perm		· · · · · ·		Perm			Perm		
Protected Phases		4	ar <i>412</i> 11		8			2			6	
Permitted Phases			4.				2			6		
Actuated Green, G (s)		23.0	23.0		23.0		19.0	19.0		19.0	19.0	
Effective Green, g (s)		23.0	23.0		23.0		19.0	19.0		19.0	19.0	
Actuated g/C Ratio		0.46	0.46		0.46		0.38	0.38		0.38	0.38	
Clearance Time (s)		4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Lane Grp Cap (vph)		2339	728	111 ×	1618		177	668		456	694	,
v/s Ratio Prot		0.22			c0.40			0.09		••	c0.28	
v/s Ratio Perm			0.03				0.12			0.17		
v/c Ratio		0.49	0.06		0.88		0.31	0.23		0.44	0.75	
Uniform Delay, d1		9.4	7.5		12.2		10.9	10.5		11.5	13.4	
Progression Factor		1.00	1.00		1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Incremental Delay, d2		0.7	0.2		7.2		4.5	0.8		3.0	7:2	
Delay (s)		10.1	7.7		19.5		15.4	11.4		14.5	20.6	
Level of Service		B	A		B		В	B		В	C	
Approach Delay (s)		9.9			19.5			12.3			18.9	
Approach LOS		Á			В			В			B	
Intersection Summary							<b>h</b>	Bugi	an a	2		
HCM Average Control Delay			15.6	Ĥ	CM Level	of Servic	e		В			
HCM Volume to Capacity ratio			0.82	* 3			-					
Actuated Cycle Length (s)			50.0	S	um of lost	time (s)			8.0			
Intersection Capacity Utilization	Į		76.0%		U Level o				D			
Analysis Period (min)	•		15									
c Critical Lane Group												
<ol> <li>Alinaar millio, ai aah.</li> </ol>												

HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis Rick Engineering Company

Synchro 7 - Report Page 1

-----

<u>،</u>		<u>``</u>	<b>~</b>		<b>^</b>	<u> </u>		na <del>ha 1997 - T</del> hank na ya ya la <mark>hiyo na fanala ya mana kana kana ya da</mark> ya manga aliya maja kana na kana kana ka
Lane Group	EBT	EBR	WBT	NBL	ŇBT	SBL	SBT	A CALLER AND A CALL
Lane Group Flow (vph)	1139	101	1430	55	180	199	528	ar i suite r si ny si s
v/c Ratio	0.49	0.13	0.88	0.31	0.26	0.44	0.75	
Control Delay	10.3	2.7	20.9	16.8	9.6	15.3	21.8	
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Total Delay	10.3	2.7	20.9	16.8	9.6	15.3	21.8	
Queue Length 50th (ft)	78	0	183	11	27	41	124	
Queue Length 95th (ft)	108	18	#320	36	61	88	#261	
Internal Link Dist (ft)	420		420		420		420	
Turn Bay Length (ft)	10 <sup>1</sup>	165						
Base Capacity (vph)	2339	783	1624	177	692	456	705 0	
Starvation Cap Reduction	0	0	.0	0	0	0	0	
Spillback Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	.0	
Storage Cap Reductn	Ö	Ö	.0	0	0	0	0	
Reduced v/c Ratio	0.49	0.13	0.88	0.31	0.26	0.44	0.75	

# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.

Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

Queues Rick Engineering Company

······································	۸					<u>د</u>			p	6	Ļ	4
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	∕∵ŴBL:,	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		***	٦		<b>†</b> ₽		ሻ	4Î		٦	1	
Volume (vph)	0	545	46	0	819	124	26	190	19	28	113	24
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Total Lost time (s)		4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0	4,0		4.0	4,0	
Lane Util. Factor		0.91	1.00		0.95		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Frt		1.00	0.85		0.98		1.00	0.99		1.00	0.97	
Fit Protected		1.00	1.00		1.00		0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	
Satd, Flow (prot)		5085	1583		3469		1770	1837		1770	1814	
Fit Permitted		1.00	1.00		1.00		0.66	1.00		0.62	1.00	
Satd. Flow (perm)		5085	1583		3469		1234	1837		1148	1814	
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Adj. Flow (vph)	Ö	592	50	Ő	890	135	28	207	21	-30	123	26
RTOR Reduction (vph)	Ō	0	30	0	30	Ő	Ó	9	0	Ó	16	Ö
Lane Group Flow (vph)	Ő	592	20	Ö	995	0	28	219	0		133	. 0
Turn Type			Perm				Perm			Perm		<del></del>
Protected Phases		4.			8			2			6	
Permitted Phases		•	4		Ŧ		2			6		
Actuated Green, G (s)		16.0	16.0		16.0		16.0	16.0		16.0	16.0	
Effective Green, g (s)		16.0	16.0		16.0		16.0	16.0		16.0	16.0	
Actuated g/C Ratio		0.40	0.40	••	0.40		0.40	0.40		0.40	0.40	
Clearance Time (s)		4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Lane Grp Cap (vph)	·	2034	633		1388		494	735		459	726	
v/s Ratio Prot		0.12			c0.29		,	c0.12			0.07	
v/s Ratio Perm			0.01				0.02			0.03		
v/c Ratio		0.29	0.03		0.72		0.06	0.30		0.07	0.18	
Uniform Delay, d1		8.1	7.3		10.1		7.4	8.2		7.4	7.8	
Progression Factor		1.00	1.00		1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Incremental Delay, d2		0.4	0.1		3.2		0.2	1.0		0.3	0.6	
Delay (s)		8.5	7.4		13.3		7.6	9.2		7.7	8.3	
Level of Service		A	Α		В		А	A		A	Α	
Approach Delay (s)		8.4			13.3			9.0			8.2	
Approach LOS		A			В			A			A	
Intersection Summary			e Kilata	Note di	The second second	an a		۲۰ ۱۰۰۰ ۲۰۰۰		· \	i stalic	
			10.9	<u>ц</u>	CM Loud	of Service	a		B	17 X X Y3 44 54.7	1997 N. 1997 A. 1997	<u>`                                    </u>
HCM Average Control Delay HCM Volume to Capacity ratio			0.51	n'		of activity	<b>7</b>					
			40.0	-Ci	um of lost	timo (c)			8.0			
Actuated Cycle Length (s) Intersection Capacity Utilization			40.0 51.1%			of Service			A.U			
Analysis Period (min)			51.1% 15	-iU	võ, revei (				Δ.			
			CI:									
c Critical Lane Group												

HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis Rick Engineering Company

Synchro 7 - Report Page 1

i,

#### Phase IV - AM Peak Hour 7/10/2013

		~	<b>4</b>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	6	Ļ	
Lane Group	EBT	EBR	WBT	NBL.	NBT	SBL	SBT	
Lane Group Flow (vph)	592	.50	1025	28	228	30	149	
v/c Ratio	0.29	0.08	0.72	0.06	0.31	0.07	0.20	
Control Delay	8.6	3.4	13.2	7.8	9.1	8.0	7.6	
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Total Delay	8.6	0.0 3.4	13.2	7.8	9.1	8.0	7.6	
Queue Length 50th (ft)	30	0	89	4	30	4	7.6 17	
Queue Length 95th (ft)	48	13	142	14	65	14	41	
Internal Link Dist (ft)	420		420		420		420	
Turn Bay Length (ft)		165						
Base Capacity (vph)	2034	663	1417	493	744	459	741	
Starvation Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	Ő	0	Õ	
Spillback Cap Reductn	0	Ŏ	0	0	0	Ő	0	
Storage Cap Reductn	0	.0	0	0	Ö	0	0	
Reduced v/c Ratio	0.29	0.08	0.72	0.06	0.31	0.07	0.20	
Intersection Summary &	· .				a construction	en de		

Queues Rick Engineering Company

В,

\$

Phase IV - PM Peak Hour 7/10/2013

¢

.

. العن

						<u> </u>	<u> </u>		P			¥
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		<b>†</b> ††	7		<b>A</b> P		۲	1	· · · · ·	ী	1	
Volume (vph)	0	953	94	0	952	80	52	151	63	180	490	140
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Total Lost time (s)		4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Lane Util. Factor		0.91	1.00		0.95		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Ert		1.00	0.85		0.99		1.00	0.96		1.00	0.97	
Fit Protected		1.00	1.00		1.00		0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	
Satd. Flow (prot)		5085 <sup>4</sup>	1583		3498		1770	1781		1770	1801	
Fit Permitted		1.00	1.00		1.00		0.20	1.00		0.61	1.00	
Satd. Flow (perm)		5085	1583		3498		373	1781		1144	1801	
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0:92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Adj. Flow (vph)	0	1036	102	0	1035	87	57	164	68	196	533	152
RTOR Reduction (vph)	Õ	.0	63	Ŏ	14	Ö	0	15	0	0	15	0
Lane Group Flow (vph)	0	1036	39	Ó	1108	Ō	57	217	0	196	670	0
Turn Type			Perm				Perm			Perm		- val
Protected Phases		4	, onn		8			2			6	
Permitted Phases			4		•		2	_		6		
Actuated Green, G (s)		17.0	17.0		17.0		20.0	20.0		20.0	20.0	
Effective Green, g (s)		17.0	17.0		17.0		20.0	20.0		20.0	20.0	
Actuated g/C Ratio		0.38	0.38		0.38		0.44	0.44		0.44	0.44	
Clearance Time (s)		4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Lane Grp Cap (vph)		1921	598		1321		166	792		508	800	
v/s Ratio Prot		0.20			c0.32	·	·	0.12			c0.37	
v/s Ratio Perm			0.02				0.15			0.17		
v/c Ratio		0.54	0.06		0.84		0.34	0.27		0.39	0.84	
Uniform Delay, d1		10.9	8.9		12.8		8.2	7.9		8.4	11.1	
Progression Factor		1.00	1.00		1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Incremental Delay, d2		1.1	0.2		6.5		5.6	0.9		2.2	10.2	
Delay (s)		12.0	9.1		19.3		13.8	8.8		10.6	21.2	
Level of Service		B	A		B		B	A		• <b>B</b>	C	
Approach Delay (s)		11.8			19.3			9.7			18.9	
Approach LOS		В			−B			Á			В	
Intersection Summary		يەر قو مەرقىر	السي ما رواندي زراند المنظي بر			n. Na ser		n La serve		يقبد الأثر	antai generati de s	an a
HCM Average Control Delay			15.9	H	CM Level	of Servic	8		В			
HCM Volume to Capacity ratio			0.84									
Actuated Cycle Length (s)			45.0	SL	im of lost	time (s)			8.0			
Intersection Capacity Utilization	l,		76.5%			f Service			D			
Analysis Period (min)			15									•
c Critical Lane Group												
a second second second												

HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis Rick Engineering Company
#### CVBMP - Current Land Use Plan 3: H Street & Bay Boulevard

#### Phase IV - PM Peak Hour 7/10/2013

······································		~	-	4	4	6		
Lane Group	्रे स्टि <b>टिट</b> ि के	EBR	WBT	NBL	NBT	SBL	SBT	: A <b>takina di tak</b> ingati
Lane Group Flow (vph)	1036	102	1122	57	232	196	685	
v/c Ratio	0.54	0.15	0.84	0.34	0.29	0.39	0.84	
Control Delay	12.2	3.4	20.6	15.4	8.2	11.3	23.4	
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Total Delay	12.2	3.4	20.6	15.4	8.2	11.3	0.0 23.4	
Queue Length 50th (ft)	72	0	129	9	:31	31	138	
Queue Length 95th (ft)	104	21	#235	34	64	70	#316	
Internal Link Dist (ft)	420		420		420		420	
Turn Bay Length (ft)		165						
Base Capacity (vph)	1921	661	1335	166	807	508	815	
Starvation Cap Reductn	0	0	Ö.	Ó	0	0	0	
Spillback Cap Reductn	.0	0	0	.0	0	0	0	
Storage Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Reduced v/c Ratio	0.54	0.15	0.84	0.34	0.29	0.39	0.84	
Intersection Summary	4, 5		ing and the second s	• v ••.	د بر . . بهدی .	, dent - Sol∳ot en	- Andrea Angel - Angel - Ja	

# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

Queues **Rick Engineering Company**  Synchro 7 - Report Page 1

#### RESOLUTION 2013-138

#### RESOLUTION TO ADOPT AN ADDENDUM TO THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE CHULA VISTA BAYFRONT MASTER PLAN AND PORT MASTER PLAN AMENDMENT FOR THE H STREET EXTENSION PROJECT

WHEREAS, the San Diego Unified Port District (District) is a public corporation created by the Legislature in 1962 pursuant to Harbors and Navigation Code Appendix I (Port Act); and

WHEREAS, the District has proposed the H Street Extension Project (Proposed Project) as part of the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan and Port Master Plan Amendment (CVBMP); and

WHEREAS, the Proposed Project proposes the construction of roadway improvements, including paving, sidewalks, a bicycle lane, landscaping, drainage and utilities, that would provide an east-west connection between the City of Chula Vista's urban core and the bayfront by extending the existing H Street westward to Marina Parkway from the existing terminus at the San Diego and Arizona Eastern railroad crossing; and

WHEREAS, the Proposed Project site is located in Planning District 7 (Chula Vista Bayfront) of the District's Port Master Plan and consists of approximately 4.25 acres of land along the northern boundary of the former Goodrich south campus in the City of Chula Vista, California; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Public Resources Code Section 21000, et seq., and its implementing regulations, 14 California Code of Regulations Section 15000, et seq. (CEQA Guidelines), the Board of Port Commissioners (Board) certified a Final Environmental Impact Report for the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan and Port Master Plan Amendment SCH # 2005081077/UPD # 83356-EIR-658 (Final EIR) for the CVBMP, including the Proposed Project, on May 18, 2010, which is on file with the Office of the District Clerk as Document No. 56562; and

WHEREAS, the District has proposed changes and alterations to the original design of the Proposed Project that will substitute a 10-foot-wide center turn lane in place of a 16-foot-wide median, widen the landscaped parkways on both sides of H Street to 9 feet, provide a 12-foot-wide Class I bicycle path along the south side of H Street, modify landscape plantings to provide a consistent street theme, and will maintain all other components and the same footprint as the original design of the Proposed Project; and

WHEREAS, the District has analyzed said changes and alterations as required by CEQA and, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15164, has prepared an Addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan and Port Master Plan Amendment, SCH # 2005081077/UPD # 83356-EIR-658 (Addendum to the Final EIR) because some changes or additions are necessary and none of the conditions described in CEQA Guidelines section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR or a supplemental EIR have occurred; and

WHEREAS, all materials with regard to the Proposed Project were made available to the Board for its review and consideration of the Proposed Project including, but not limited to, the following:

1. The Final EIR, dated May 2010;

2. The Addendum to the Final EIR, dated July 2013;

3. The Staff Report and Agenda Sheet, dated August 13, 2013;

4. All documents and records filed in this proceeding by the District and all interested parties; and

WHEREAS, having reviewed and considered all the materials made available to the Board, including, but not limited to, the Addendum to the Final EIR, the Final EIR, the staff reports and all the evidence in the record of the proceedings with respect to the Proposed Project, the Board took the actions hereinafter set forth.

**NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Board of Port Commissioners of the San Diego Unified Port District, as follows:

1. The Board finds the facts recited above are true and further finds that this Board has jurisdiction to consider, approve and adopt the subject of this Resolution.

2. The Board finds and determines that the applicable provisions of CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines and the District Guidelines have been duly observed in conjunction with said hearing and the considerations of this matter and all of the previous proceedings related thereto.

3. The Board finds and determines, on the basis of the whole record before the Board, that:

- a. Some minor changes or additions to the Final EIR are necessary, but there is no substantial evidence that a new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified effect have occurred because of substantial changes to the Proposed Project or with respect to the circumstances under which the Proposed Project is undertaken;
- b. There is no substantial evidence that new information exists that shows that: (i) the Proposed Project will have one or more significant effects that were not discussed in the Final EIR; (ii) significant effects previously analyzed will be substantially more severe; (iii) mitigation measures or alternatives previously found infeasible are now feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effect of the Proposed Project, but the applicant declines to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives; or (iv) mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the Final EIR would substantially lessen one or more significant effects, but the applicant declines to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives;
- c. The Addendum to the Final EIR is complete and adequate in scope and has been completed in compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines and the District Guidelines for implementation thereof;
- d. Mitigation Measures identified in the Addendum, Final EIR, and MMRP are applicable and no additional mitigation measures or alternatives are required;
- e. The Addendum to the Final EIR was presented to the Board and the Board has fully reviewed and considered the information in Addendum to the Final EIR and the Final EIR prior to approving a resolution Authorizing Issuance of an appealable Coastal Development Permit for the Proposed Project; and
- f. The Addendum to the Final EIR and the Final EIR reflect the District's independent judgment and analysis.

5. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21152 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15094, the Clerk of the Board shall cause a Notice of Determination to be filed with the Clerk of the County of San Diego and the State Office of Planning and Research. Unless the Proposed Project is declared exempt herein and a Certificate of Filing Fee Exemption is on file, the Proposed Project is not operative, vested or final until the filing fees required pursuant to Fish and Game Code Section 711.4 are paid to the Clerk of the County of San Diego.

6. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081.6(a)(2) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(e), the location and custodian of the documents and other materials which constitute the record of proceedings on which this Resolution is based is the Clerk, San Diego Unified Port District, 3165 Pacific Highway, San Diego, California 92101.

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND LEGALITY:

PORT ATTORNEY

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Board of Port Commissioners of the San Diego Unified Port District, this 13th day of August, 2013, by the following vote:

AYES: Castellanos, Merrifield, Moore, Nelson, Smith, Valderrama NAYS: None. EXCUSED: Malcolm. ABSENT: None. ABSTAIN: None.

Ann Y. Moore, Chair Board of Port Commissioners

ATTEST:

Timothy A. Deuel District Clerk

Seal)

Page 5 of 5

## SAN DIEGO UNIFIED PORT DISTRICT

Reference Copy 60864

**DATE:** August 13, 2013

#### SUBJECT: H STREET EXTENSION PROJECT

A) RESOLUTION ADOPTING AN ADDENDUM TO THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE CHULA VISTA BAYFRONT MASTER PLAN AND PORT MASTER PLAN AMENDMENT

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The extension of H Street to the Chula Vista Bayfront (Bayfront) is a critical element to the successful implementation of the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan (CVBMP). The H Street Extension Project (Project) will provide a long-awaited east-west connection between the City of Chula Vista's (City) urban core and the Bayfront. The Project will also serve as a central access and focal point to the Bayfront and will be the first project to help establish the vision for the CVBMP.

Dating back to the 1999 Goodrich Relocation Agreement (Relocation Agreement),<sup>1</sup> the extension of H Street through areas previously blocked by Goodrich operations has been a top priority of the District and the City. The Project has been included in the District's Capital Improvement Program since 2006 and was originally funded out of the South Bay Cities Memorandum of Understanding. Completion of the Project fulfills a District contractual obligation that was established by the Relocation Agreement and the 2010 Second Amendment to Relocation Agreement (Second Amendment)<sup>2</sup>, and is also central to the public infrastructure of the approved CVBMP.

On May 18, 2010, the Board of Port Commissioners (Board) certified the Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) for the CVBMP and Port Mater Plan Amendment.<sup>3</sup> The Final EIR analyzed environmental impacts associated with the redevelopment of land and water along the Chula Vista Bayfront (Bayfront) with a variety of public amenities, a resort conference center, hotel and retail commercial uses, and environmental enhancements. As part of the redevelopment, several existing streets were proposed to be extended and several new streets were proposed to be constructed. In order to accommodate full build-out of the CVBMP, H Street was proposed to be extended and constructed as a 4-lane major street as contemplated and analyzed in the Final EIR. The location of the Project is shown on Attachment A.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Relocation Agreement by and among City of Chula Vista, Redevelopment Agency of the City of Chula Vista, San Diego Unified Port District, and Rohr, Inc., operating as BFGoodrich Aerospace Aerostructures Group, on file in the Office of the District Clerk as Document Number 39466.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Second Amendment to Relocation Agreement, on file in the Office of the District Clerk as Document Number 56072.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Final Environmental Impact Report for the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan and Port Master Plan Amendment (UPD #83356-EIR-658), on file in the Office of the District Clerk as Document Number 56562.

#### Page 2 of 6

Refinements to the Project have occurred since certification of the Final EIR in 2010 that have prompted the need for updated environmental analysis in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). An Addendum to the Final EIR (Attachment B) has been prepared to analyze changes to the Project and to document that none of the conditions in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, triggering preparation of a Subsequent EIR, have occurred. The Addendum is appropriate under CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 and incorporates the updated and refined project into the Final EIR for the Board to consider and adopt.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**:

H Street Extension Project

A) Adopt a resolution adopting an Addendum to the Final EIR for the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan and Port Master Plan Amendment.

#### FISCAL IMPACT:

The Board's adoption of a resolution adopting the Addendum to the CVBMP Final EIR for the Project will have no fiscal impact to the District.

Implementation of the Project analyzed in the Addendum is included in the amended FY 09/13 Capital Improvement Program (Project P0212-1). The total approved Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Budget for this project is \$7.8 million.

#### COMPASS STRATEGIC GOALS:

Adopting the addendum will allow issuance of a Coastal Development Permit that will permit the District to complete the Project. Completion of this Project will enhance and encourage public access to the waterfront, benefiting existing and future businesses. Completion of the Project will serve as an attraction for future developers and businesses, which will ultimately result in increased revenues that will strengthen the District's performance.

This agenda item supports the following Strategic Goals.

- A vibrant waterfront destination where residents and visitors converge.
- $\boxtimes$  A Port that is a safe place to visit, work and play.
- A financially sustainable Port that drives job creation and regional economic vitality.

#### DISCUSSION:

#### Background

Pursuant to the Relocation Agreement and the Second Amendment among the City of Chula Vista, the District, and Goodrich, the District is responsible for the construction of the Project. This Project will improve the roadway, sidewalk, landscape, and

#### Page 3 of 6

associated utilities from Bay Boulevard to Marina Parkway in Chula Vista. The Project will connect the Bayfront to the street grid system in western Chula Vista and will facilitate increased public access to the Bayfront, its parks, and its primary development parcels.

This Project was contemplated and analyzed in the Final EIR prepared for the CVBMP, which was certified by the Board on May 18, 2010. As previously noted, recent refinements to the Project have prompted the need for updated environmental analysis in accordance with CEQA.

Descriptions of the Projects analyzed it the 2010 Final FEIR and the 2013 Addendum to the Final EIR are provided below.

#### H Street Extension Project – 2010 Final EIR

The Project analyzed in the 2010 Final EIR (2010 Project) included the construction of roadway improvements that would provide for an east-west connection between the City of Chula Vista's (City's) urban core and the Bayfront. The 2010 Project proposed to extend westward from the existing H Street right-of-way terminus at the San Diego and Arizona Eastern (SD&AE) railroad crossing to Marina Parkway. Proposed improvements included roadway paving, median, sidewalks, landscaping, drainage and utilities. The 2010 Project was implemented to fulfill the obligations established by the Relocation Agreement and the Second Amendment, and was also found to be consistent with the build-out scenario contemplated under the approved CVBMP.

The 2010 Project included the following design components:

- Divided roadway with a 24-foot-wide travel lane in each direction and a 16-footwide landscaped median;
- 5-foot-wide sidewalks on each side of the roadway, with 7-foot-wide landscaping and swales between the curb and sidewalk;
- Minimum of 3 feet of landscape buffer between the sidewalk and Goodrich property;
- Appropriate roadway transitions at each terminus point to existing roadway improvements, including Marina Parkway between H Street and Sandpiper Way, striping, signal modification, and pedestrian crossing at west side of Bay Boulevard;
- Removal of existing railroad tracks and ties at non-operational crossing;
- Driveway access to adjacent Goodrich property;
- Storm drain systems to accommodate the ultimate build-out of the bayfront pursuant to the CVBMP (i.e., 72-inches or less in diameter capacity);
- Potable water and recycled water system with lines of 8- to 16-inches in diameter;
- Dry utilities, including gas, electric and communications;
- Street lighting;
- Landscape and irrigation system; and

#### Page 4 of 6

 Post-construction storm water mitigation Best Management Practices (BMPs), including Low Impact Development (LID) strategies.

Pursuant to CEQA, a Final EIR was prepared for the CVBMP and certified by the Board on May 18, 2010 (UPD No. 83356-EIR-658; SCH No. 2005081077). As a subsequent action, on November 9, 2010, the Board authorized the issuance of an appealable CDP for the portion of the Project located west of the mean high tide line.

#### Revised H Street Extension Project – 2013 Addendum to Final EIR

The 2010 Project was based on preliminary concepts studied in the CVBMP EIR. For FY 2013, the Board authorized the expenditure of \$500,000 from the CIP budget to advance the pre-design of the Bayfront infrastructure. As part of that effort, the Board authorized the selection of CCI Partners, along with design firm HKS as a subconsultant, at the February 12, 2013, meeting. The primary task of HKS, led by Randy Morton, is to prepare design and development guidelines that will serve as the foundation for establishing a vision for the Bayfront. Initial work conducted under this task identified the opportunity to modify the H Street design to better accommodate pedestrians and bicyclists along the corridor, as well as create a landscape theme that will fit the future vision for the area. As the central access and focal point to the Bayfront, it is important for H Street to appropriately establish and be consistent with the ultimate vision for the CVBMP. The 2010 Project has been redesigned to accomplish this vision.

Similar to the 2010 Project, the Project analyzed in the 2013 Addendum to the Final EIR (2013 Project), coupled with the Final EIR, consists of the construction of roadway improvements that would provide for an east-west connection between the City's urban core and the Bayfront. H Street will continue to be extended westward from the existing H Street right-of-way terminus at the SD&AE railroad crossing to Marina Parkway. The 2013 Project differs from the original Project in the following manner:

- The 16-foot-wide median will be removed, and a 10-foot-wide center turn lane will be added;
- The landscaped parkways on both sides of H Street will be widened to 9 feet wide;
- A 12-foot-wide Class I bicycle path will be provided along the south side of H Street; and
- Landscape plantings will be modified to provide a consistent street tree theme.

All other components of the 2010 Project, including BMPs and LID strategies, will be included in the 2013 Project.

#### Addendum to the Final EIR

As further described below under the Environmental Review section of this agenda sheet, an Addendum to the 2010 Final EIR was prepared to document and analyze

#### Page 5 of 6

changes to the Project. The Addendum incorporates the updated and refined Project into the Final EIR for the Board to consider and adopt.

As proposed, the 2013 Project is substantially similar to the Project that was analyzed in the Final EIR and would be constructed within the same footprint at the 2010 Project. The scope of the 2013 Project, including both construction and operation, is substantially similar to that identified in the 2010 Project; therefore, the 2013 Project will have substantially similar environmental impacts to the 2010 Project.

If the Board adopts the Addendum to the Final EIR, the Board can consider a new appealable Coastal Development Permit for the 2013 Project.

#### Conclusion

Staff recommends that the Board conduct a public hearing and adopt a resolution adopting the Addendum to the CVBMP Final EIR for the H Street Extension Project.

#### Port Attorney's Comments:

The Port Attorney's Office has been involved in this project from the outset and has provided input throughout the preparation of the Addendum to the Final EIR and all accompanying documents. The Port Attorney's Office has also reviewed the issues set forthi in this agenda sheet and the Addendum to the Final EIR for form and legality, and there are no legal concerns present. The Board may analyze the issues presented and take appropriate action.

#### Environmental Review:

In accordance with the CEQA statutes and guidelines, the 2010 Project was analyzed in the Final EIR for the CVBMP (UPD No. 83356-EIR-658; SCH No. 2005081077) (Attachment C). On May 18, 2010, the Board adopted Resolution 2010-78 certifying the Final EIR, adopting the Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations (Findings and SOC), and adopting the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP).

The Addendum to the Final EIR has been prepared to analyze changes from the initial 2010 Project to the 2013 Project and to document that none of the conditions in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, triggering preparation of a Subsequent EIR, have occurred. As detailed in Attachment B, the Addendum is appropriate under CEQA Guidelines Section 15164. The Addendum incorporates the updated and refined project into the Final EIR for the Board to consider and adopt. As further detailed in Attachment B, based on the provisions of State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15164, none of the conditions requiring the preparation of a Subsequent EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a) have occurred. Staff has reviewed the revised Project and has determined (1) the Project as revised is within the scope of the Final EIR and (2) there will not be any new or more severe significant impacts or required mitigation

#### Page 6 of 6

measures not previously identified in the EIR, Findings and SOC, or MMRP previously certified and adopted by the Board.

The analysis included in the Addendum to the Final EIR concludes that the 2013 Project would result in substantially similar effects to those of the 2010 Project because the scope of the 2013 Project, including both construction and operation, is substantially similar to that identified in the 2010 Project. The Addendum to the Final EIR also concludes that analyses and conclusions in the Final EIR remain current and valid; that the 2013 Project would not cause new or substantially more severe significant effects than those identified in the Final EIR, and no new mitigation measures would be required; that no change has occurred with respect to circumstances surrounding the 2013 Project that would cause new or substantially more severe significant environmental effects than identified in the FIR; and that no new information has become available that shows that the project would cause significant environmental effects not already analyzed in the Final EIR. As such, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15164, and based on the information provided in the Addendum to the Final EIR, the analysis for the revised Project has been appropriately addressed in the Final EIR. No further environmental review is required.

If the Board approves any discretionary action to carry out the Project, District staff will file a Notice of Determination pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15075.

#### **Equal Opportunity Program:**

Not applicable.

#### **PREPARED BY**: Lesley Nishihira Manager, Environmental & Land Use Management

Attachment(s): Attachment A: Project Location Map Attachment B: Addendum to the Final EIR for the CVBMP Attachment C: Final EIR for the CVBMP



Google Maps - ©2013 Google

# **Project Location Map**

Attachment B to Agenda Sheet No. 21A

# ATTACHMENT 1 to the FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

# ADDENDUM

to the

## FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

for the

# CHULA VISTA BAYFRONT MASTER PLAN AND PORT MASTER PLAN AMENDMENT

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NUMBER 2005081077 UPD NUMBER 83356-EIR-658

# SAN DIEGO UNIFIED PORT DISTRICT

3165 Pacific Highway

San Diego, California 92101

JULY 2013

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	Introd	l <b>uction</b> Purpose and Background	<b>1</b> 1
		CEQA Framework for Addendum	2
	1.3	Determination	2
2.0	Proje	ct Description	3
	2.1	Location and Setting	3
	2.2	Project Characteristics	3
3.0	Envir	onmental Checklist	5
4.0	Conc	usion3	2
Apper	ndix A	follows page 3	2

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND

This document constitutes an Addendum to the April 2010 Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) originally prepared for the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan and Port Master Plan Amendment (CVBMP), which was certified by the Board of Port Commissions on May 18, 2010, by Resolution No. 2010-78 (Clerk Document Number 56562). The FEIR for the CVBMP analyzed environmental impacts associated with the redevelopment of land and water along the Chula Vista Bayfront with a variety of public amenities, a resort conference center, hotel and retail commercial uses, and environmental enhancements. As part of the redevelopment, several existing streets were proposed to be extended and several new streets were proposed to be constructed. In order to accommodate full build-out of the CVBMP, H Street was proposed to be extended and constructed as a 4-lane major street as contemplated and analyzed in the FEIR.

The purpose of this Addendum is to evaluate whether revisions to the H Street extension component of the CVBMP (hereafter referred to as the original Project) would result in any new or substantially more adverse significant effects or require any new mitigation measures not identified in the FEIR. No other changes are proposed to the original Project.

Similar to the original Project, the revisions to the H Street extension component of the original Project would consist of the construction of roadway improvements that would provide for an east-west connection between the City of Chula Vista's urban core and the Chula Vista bayfront. H Street would continue to be extended westward from the existing H Street right-of-way terminus at the San Diego and Arizona Eastern (SD&AE) railroad crossing to Marina Parkway. The minor revisions to the H Street extension differ from the original Project in the following manner:

- The 16-foot-wide median will be removed, and a 10-foot-wide center turn lane will be added;
- The landscaped parkways on both sides of H Street will be widened to 9 feet wide;
- A 12-foot-wide Class I bicycle path will be provided along the south side of H Street; and
- Landscape plantings will be modified to provide a consistent street tree theme.

All other components of the original Project, including BMPs and LID strategies, would be included in the revisions to the original Project.

This Addendum, together with the FEIR, will be used by the San Diego Unified Port District (District) when considering approval of the minor revisions to the original Project.

### 1.2 CEQA FRAMEWORK FOR ADDENDUM

When a lead agency has already prepared an EIR, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) mandates that "no subsequent or supplemental environmental impact report shall be required by the lead agency or any responsible agency, unless one or more of the following events occurs: (a) substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the environmental impact report; (b) substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is being undertaken which will require major revisions in the environmental impact report; (c) new information, which was not known and could not have been known at the time the environmental impact report was certified as complete, becomes available" (Cal. Pub. Res. Code, §21166). State CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 clarifies that a subsequent EIR or supplemental EIR is only required when "substantial changes" occur to a project or the circumstances surrounding a project, or "new information" about a project implicates "new significant environmental effects" or a "substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects."

When only some changes or additions to a previously certified EIR are necessary and none of the conditions described in Public Resources Code Section 21166 or Section 15162 of the State CEQA Guidelines calling for the preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR are met, CEQA allows the lead agency to prepare and adopt an addendum. (State CEQA Guidelines, §15164(a).)

### 1.3 DETERMINATION

As verified in this Addendum, the analyses and the conclusions in the FEIR remain current and valid. The proposed revisions to the H Street extension component of the original Project would not cause new significant effects not identified in the FEIR nor increase the severity of environmental effect as analyzed in the FEIR, and, hence, no new mitigation measures would be necessary to reduce significant effects (see Section 3.0 Environmental Checklist). No change has occurred with respect to circumstances surrounding the revisions to the original Project that would cause new or substantially more severe significant environmental effects than were identified in the FEIR. In addition, no new information has become available that shows that the revisions to the original Project would cause new or substantially more severe significant environmental effects which have not already been analyzed in the FEIR.

Therefore, no further environmental review is required beyond this Addendum. This Addendum incorporates all of the applicable mitigation measures detailed in the FEIR. With this Addendum, the revisions to the original Project would still be within the framework of the evaluation for the original Project as documented in the FEIR.

# 2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

### 2.1 LOCATION AND SETTING

The original Project is located along the northern boundary of the former Goodrich south campus in Chula Vista, California. The original Project site occupies approximately 4.25 acres. The revisions to the original Project would occur within the same footprint as the original Project.

### 2.2 **PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS**

The original Project included the construction of roadway improvements that would provide for an east-west connection between the City of Chula Vista's urban core and the Chula Vista bayfront. The original Project proposed to extend westward from the existing H Street right-of-way terminus at the San Diego and Arizona Eastern (SD&AE) railroad crossing to Marina Parkway. Proposed improvements associated with the H Street extension included roadway paving, median, sidewalks, landscaping, drainage and utilities. The original Project was implemented to fulfill the obligations established by the 1999 Goodrich Relocation Agreement (Relocation Agreement) and the 2010 Second Amendment to Relocation Agreement (Second Amendment), and was also found to be consistent with the build-out scenario contemplated under the approved CVBMP.

The original Project included the following design features for the H Street extension component:

- Divided roadway with a 24-foot-wide travel lane in each direction and a 16-footwide landscaped median;
- 5-foot-wide sidewalks on each side of the roadway, with 7-foot wide landscaping and swales between the curb and sidewalk;
- Minimum of 3 feet of landscape buffer between the sidewalk and Goodrich property;
- Appropriate roadway transitions at each terminus point to existing roadway improvements, including Marina Parkway between H Street and Sandpiper Way, striping, signal modification, and pedestrian crossing at west side of Bay Boulevard;
- Removal of existing railroad tracks and ties at non-operational crossing;
- Driveway access to adjacent Goodrich property;
- Storm drain systems to accommodate the ultimate build-out of the bayfront analyzed in the CVBMP (i.e., 72-inches or less in diameter capacity);
- Potable water and recycled water system with lines of 8- to 16-inches in diameter;
- Dry utilities, including gas, electric and communications;
- Street lighting;
- Landscape and irrigation system; and

• Post-construction storm water mitigation Best Management Practices (BMPs), including Low Impact Development (LID) strategies.

The revisions to the original Project, which are contemplated in this Addendum, include the following minor changes:

- The 16-foot-wide median will be removed, and a 10-foot-wide center turn lane will be added;
- The landscaped parkways on both sides of H Street will be widened to 9 feet wide;
- A 12-foot-wide Class I bicycle path will be provided along the south side of H Street; and
- Landscape plantings will be modified to provide a consistent street tree theme.

All other components of the original Project, including BMPs and LID strategies, will be included in the revisions to the original Project.

		New		No Substantial Change
I	Aesthetics	Potentially Significant Impact	More Severe Impact	from Previous Analysis
Wo	ould the project:			
a.	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			$\boxtimes$
b.	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings along a scenic highway?			
C.	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			$\boxtimes$
d.	Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?			

## 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

a. – d. The revisions to the original Project would not include the 16-foot-wide landscaped median; thus, west-facing views along H Street, which is identified as a Vista Area and View Corridor in the certified Port Master Plan, would be improved due to the absence of tall trees and other vegetation. No scenic highway is located in the vicinity of the Project site, so the revisions to the original Project would have no effect on scenic highways. Furthermore, the original Project and revisions to the original Project would improve the overall visual quality of the Project area by redeveloping a visually degraded, highly underutilized site. Finally, the revisions to the original Project would not introduce new lighting aside from that previously identified in the original The revisions to the original Project would continue to comply with all Project. applicable aesthetics mitigation measures identified in the FEIR for the CVBMP. Therefore, the impacts originally identified in the FEIR for the CVBMP would remain unchanged with implementation of the revisions to the H Street extension component of the original Project.

Ш.	Agricultural and Forestry Resources	New Potentially Significant Impact	More Severe Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis
res effe Ca Site the an on wh tim effe cor Fo sta Fo can the	determining whether impacts on agricultural sources are significant environmental ects, lead agencies may refer to the lifornia Agricultural Land Evaluation and e Assessment Model (1997) prepared by california Department of Conservation as optional model to use in assessing impacts agriculture and farmland. In determining ether impacts on forest resources, including iberland, are significant environmental ects, lead agencies may refer to information mpiled by the California Department of restry and Fire Protection regarding the ite's inventory of forest land, including the rest and Range Assessment Project and the rest Legacy Assessment Project, and forest rbon measurement methodology provided in a Forest Protocols adopted by the California Resources Board. Would the project:			
a.	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non- agricultural use?			
b.	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or conflict with a Williamson Act contract?			$\boxtimes$
C.	Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?			

d.	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?		$\square$
e.	Involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?		

**a.** – **e.** The revisions to the original Project would have no effect on Farmland or forest land. The revisions to the original Project would be located within an existing developed area absent of Farmland or forest land. The impacts originally identified in the FEIR for the CVBMP would remain unchanged with implementation of the revisions to the H Street extension component of the original Project.

111.	Air Quality	New Potentially Significant Impact	More Severe Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis
est ma ma	nen available, the significance criteria ablished by the applicable air quality inagement or air pollution control district by be relied upon to make the following terminations. Would the project:			
a.	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			$\boxtimes$
b.	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			$\boxtimes$
C.	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is a nonattainment area for an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			
d.	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			$\boxtimes$
e.	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			

**a.** – **e.** The revisions to the original Project would not necessitate additional grading or earthwork as all of the improvements would be completed within the same footprint identified in the original Project as analyzed in the FEIR. No additional construction-related truck trips would be required as the scope of construction is substantially similar to the original Project. Also, the roadway extension would continue to be constructed and operate as a 4-lane major roadway. Because there is no change in roadway capacity, no change in air emissions from vehicular traffic would occur. Finally, the revisions to the original Project would not release additional pollutants or objectionable odors aside from those already identified in the FEIR. The revisions to the original Project would continue to comply with all applicable air quality mitigation measures identified in the FEIR. Therefore, the impacts originally identified in the FEIR for the CVBMP would remain unchanged with implementation of the revisions to the H Street extension component of the original Project.

				No
IV.	Biological Resources	New Potentially Significant Impact	More Severe Impact	Substantial Change from Previous Analysis
Wc	ould the project:			
a.	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			
b.	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			
C.	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			
d.	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?			
e.	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			

f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?			
--	--	--	--

**a.** – **f.** The revisions to the original Project would be completed within the same footprint identified in the original Project as analyzed in the FEIR, and, therefore, would not have any new substantial adverse effect on the following: a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species; any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community; any federally protected wetlands; or the movement of any fish or wildlife species. The revisions to the original Project would continue to comply with all applicable biological resources mitigation measures identified in the FEIR. Therefore, the impacts originally identified in the FEIR for the CVBMP would remain unchanged with implementation of the revisions to the H Street extension component of the original Project.

V.	Cultural Resources	New Potentially Significant Impact	More Severe Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis
Wo	buld the project:			
a.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?			$\square$
b.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?			$\boxtimes$
C.	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			

**a.** – **c.** The revisions to the original Project would not necessitate additional grading or earthwork aside from that already identified for the original Project. In addition, no additional existing structures would be demolished for implementation of the revisions to the original Project. The revisions to the original Project would continue to comply with all applicable cultural resources mitigation measures identified in the FEIR. Therefore, the impacts originally identified in the FEIR for the CVBMP would remain unchanged with implementation of the revisions to the H Street extension component of the original Project.

	<b>Geology and Soils</b> ould the project:	New Potentially Significant Impact	More Severe Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis
a.	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			
	1. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			
	2. Strong seismic ground shaking?			$\boxtimes$
	<ol> <li>Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</li> </ol>			$\boxtimes$
	4. Landslides?			$\boxtimes$
b.	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			$\square$
C.	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project and potentially result in an onsite or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?			
d.	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?			
e.	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems in areas where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?			

f.	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique		$\boxtimes$
	paleontological resource or site or unique		
	geologic feature?		

**a.** – **f.** The revisions to the original Project would be constructed within the same footprint identified in the original Project. The revisions to the original Project do not include the construction of new buildings or other structures aside from those already contemplated in the original Project; thus, no new impacts related to fault rupture, groundshaking, ground failure, landslides, or unstable soils would occur. Additionally, the revisions to the original Project would continue to comply with all applicable geology and soils mitigation measures identified in the FEIR. Therefore, the impacts originally identified in the FEIR for the CVBMP would remain unchanged with implementation of the revisions to the H Street extension component of the original Project.

VII	. Greenhouse Gas Emissions	New Potentially Significant Impact	More Severe Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis
Wo	ould the project:			
a.	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			
b.	Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			

a. - b. The revisions to the original Project would not necessitate additional grading or earthwork as all of the improvements would be completed within the same footprint identified in the original Project as analyzed in the FEIR. No additional constructionrelated truck trips would be required as the scope of construction is substantially similar to the original Project. Also, the roadway extension would continue to be constructed and operate as a 4-lane major roadway and would not increase roadway capacity. Because there would be no change in roadway capacity, no change in greenhouse gas emissions from vehicular traffic would occur. Finally, the revisions to the original Project would provide a Class I bicycle path and sidewalks on either side of the extended H Street, which are intended to encourage non-automobile transportation; these components may have a beneficial effect on greenhouse gas emissions when compared to the original Project. The revisions to the original Project would continue to comply with all applicable greenhouse gas emissions mitigation measures identified in the FEIR. Therefore, the impacts originally identified in the FEIR for the CVBMP would remain unchanged with implementation of the revisions to the H Street extension component of the original Project.

VII	I. Hazards and Hazardous Materials	New Potentially Significant Impact	More Severe Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis
Wo	ould the project:			
a.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			
b.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			
C.	Emit hazardous emissions or involve handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			
d.	Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?			
e.	Be located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, be within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?			
f.	Be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?			
g.	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			$\boxtimes$

Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

**a.** – **h.** The revisions to the original Project would not transport or release additional hazardous materials aside from those already identified in the original Project. The truck haul route would also be identical to that identified in the original Project. The revisions to the original Project would be constructed within the same footprint as the original Project, so new impacts associated with hazardous materials sites, airports, airstrips, or wildland fires would not occur. Also, appropriate emergency access would continue to be included as part of the revisions to the original Project. Finally, the revisions to the original Project would continue to comply with all applicable hazards and hazardous materials mitigation measures identified in the FEIR. Therefore, the impacts originally identified in the FEIR for the CVBMP would remain unchanged with implementation of the revisions to the H Street extension component of the original Project.

IX.	Hydrology and Water Quality	New Potentially Significant Impact	More Severe Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis
Wo	ould the project:			
a.	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			$\boxtimes$
b.	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, resulting in a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			
C.	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation onsite or offsite?			
d.	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding onsite or offsite?			
e.	Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			
f.	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			$\boxtimes$

g.	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?		
h.	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect floodflows?		$\square$
i.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?		
j.	Contribute to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?		$\square$

a. - j. The revisions to the original Project would be constructed within the same footprint as the original Project and would not necessitate additional grading or earthwork than identified by the original Project. Therefore, new impacts related to water quality and groundwater supplies would not occur. The revisions to the original Project would alter the site's existing drainage patterns; however, the revisions would continue to be appropriately designed with relation to stormwater drainages, which would ensure that erosion, siltation, and flooding do not occur. As previously identified, the revisions to the original Project would continue to implement appropriate BMPs and LID strategies, which would further control stormwater runoff. Finally, no new structures would be constructed aside from those identified in the original Project, so no new impacts related to flood hazards, levee or dam failure, or seiche, tsunami, or mudflow would not occur. The revisions to the original Project would continue to comply with all applicable hydrology and water quality mitigation measures identified in the FEIR. Therefore, the impacts originally identified in the FEIR for the CVBMP would remain unchanged with implementation of the revisions to the H Street extension component of the original Project.

X. Land Use and Planning	New Potentially Significant Impact	More Severe Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis
Would the project:			
a. Physically divide an established community?			$\boxtimes$
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, a general plan, specific plan local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?			

**a.** – **c.** The revisions to the original Project would not divide an established community, conflict with an applicable land use plan, or conflict with an applicable habitat conservation plan. The revisions to the original Project would be constructed within the same footprint identified in the original Project, and no established community exists within the limits of the original Project. The revisions to the original Project are also consistent with the certified Port Master Plan. The revisions to the original Project would continue to comply with all applicable land use and planning mitigation measures identified in the FEIR. Therefore, the impacts originally identified in the FEIR for the CVBMP would remain unchanged with implementation of the revisions to the H Street extension component of the original Project.

XI.	Mineral Resources	New Potentially Significant Impact	More Severe Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis	
Wo	Would the project:				
a.	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?			$\boxtimes$	
b.	Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?				

**a.** – **b.** The revisions to the original Project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or state, or a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local plan. The revisions to the original Project would be constructed within the same footprint identified in the original Project, and no mineral resources are known to occur or have been discovered within the limits of the original Project site. Therefore, the impacts originally identified in the FEIR for the CVBMP would remain unchanged with implementation of the revisions to the H Street extension component of the original Project.

XII	. Noise	New Potentially Significant Impact	More Severe Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis
Wo	ould the project:			
a.	Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in a local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?			
b.	Expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			
C.	Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			
d.	Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			
e.	Be located within an airport land use plan area, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			
f.	Be located in the vicinity of a private airstrip and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			

**a.** – **f.** The revisions to the original Project would not require any additional construction aside from that identified for the original Project. In addition, it is anticipated that similar construction methods to those proposed as part of the original Project would be employed as part of the revisions to the original Project; thus, construction noise levels would be similar to those identified in the FEIR. Therefore, no additional noise or vibrations would be generated by the revisions to the original Project. Additionally, the revisions to the original Project would not introduce new land uses that were not already analyzed in the FEIR, so new permanent increase in ambient noise would occur.
Finally, the revisions to the original Project would be constructed within the same footprint as the original Project, so additional impacts associated with airport noise levels would not occur. The revisions to the original Project would continue to comply with all applicable noise mitigation measures identified in the FEIR. Therefore, the impacts originally identified in the FEIR for the CVBMP would remain unchanged with implementation of the revisions to the H Street extension component of the original Project.

XIII	. Population and Housing	New Potentially Significant Impact	More Severe Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis
Wo	uld the project:			
a.	Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			
b.	Displace a substantial number of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			
C.	Displace a substantial number of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			$\boxtimes$

**a.** – **c.** The revisions to the original Project would not induce substantial population growth or displace existing housing or people. The revisions to the original Project do not involve the construction of homes or businesses, and no existing housing units or people occupy the original Project site. The revisions to the original Project would continue to comply with all applicable population and housing mitigation measures identified in the FEIR. Therefore, the impacts originally identified in the FEIR for the CVBMP would remain unchanged with implementation of the revisions to the H Street extension component of the original Project.

XIV. Public Services	New Potentially Significant Impact	More Severe Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis
Would the project:			
a. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or a need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:			
Fire protection?			$\boxtimes$
Police protection?			$\boxtimes$
Schools?			$\boxtimes$
Parks?			$\boxtimes$
Other public facilities?			$\square$

**a.** The revisions to the original Project would not result in additional demand for fire or police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities. Because the revisions to the original Project would not alter the proposed roadway capacity, no additional park users would be accommodated that could cause the need for additional parks aside from those already identified in the FEIR. The revisions to the original Project would continue to comply with all applicable public services mitigation measures identified in the FEIR. Therefore, the impacts originally identified in the FEIR for the CVBMP would remain unchanged with implementation of the revisions to the revisions to the H Street extension component of the original Project.

	7. Recreation	New Potentially Significant Impact	More Severe Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis
a.	Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			
b.	Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			

**a.** – **b.** The revisions to the original Project would not result in an increase in use of existing parks or other recreational facilities. Because the revisions to the original Project would not alter the proposed roadway capacity, no additional park users would be accommodated that could cause the physical deterioration of existing parks. The revisions to the original Project would include a Class I bicycle path; however, all improvements would occur within the same footprint identified for the original Project. Therefore, no additional physical effects on the environment would occur as a result of the revisions. In addition, the Class I bicycle path would provide additional recreational opportunities along the waterfront. The revisions to the original Project would continue to comply with all applicable recreation mitigation measures identified in the FEIR. Therefore, the impacts originally identified in the FEIR for the CVBMP would remain unchanged with implementation of the revisions to the H Street extension component of the original Project.

XV	/l. Transportation/Traffic	New Potentially Significant Impact	More Severe Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis
Wo	ould the project:			
a.	Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation, including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including, but not limited to, intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?			
b.	Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level-of-service standards and travel demand measures or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			
C.	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?			
d.	Substantially increase hazards because of a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			
e.	Result in inadequate emergency access?			$\boxtimes$
f.	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?			

**a.- f.** The revisions to the original Project would not conflict with any plans, policies, or ordinances related to the effectiveness of the circulation system because the roadway

extension would continue to be constructed and operate as a 4-lane major roadway. A traffic memorandum entitled Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan Traffic Analysis Review, California prepared by Rick Engineering in July 2013 (see Appendix A) identified that the revisions to the original Project would continue to service the CVBMP at acceptable level of service (LOS) ratios. The traffic memorandum identified that, since preparation of the FEIR, a few of the land uses within the CVBMP area have changed. However, the traffic memorandum concluded that the current roadway cross sections for H Street are consistent with the CVBMP conceptual plans and comply with all applicable measures identified in the FEIR; thus, no new significant effects on the mitigation roadway network would occur. Finally, the traffic memorandum concluded that the roadway geometry proposed for H Street and Bay Boulevard would operate at an acceptable LOS for peak hour conditions and would accommodate all queued vehicles without spilling onto the railroad tracks. Therefore, the revisions to the original Project would not conflict with an applicable congestion management program. Also, no changes to emergency access are proposed. Finally, no change in air traffic patterns would occur from the revisions to the original Project. Finally, the revisions to the original Project include a Class I bicycle path, which would augment existing bicycle facilities in the area. The revisions to the original Project would continue to comply with all applicable transportation/traffic mitigation measures identified in the FEIR. Therefore, the impacts originally identified in the FEIR for the CVBMP would remain unchanged with implementation of the revisions to the H Street extension component of the original Project.

XV	II. Utilities and Service Systems	New Potentially Significant Impact	More Severe Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis
Wo	ould the project:			
a.	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			$\boxtimes$
b.	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			
C.	Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			
d.	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or would new or expanded entitlements be needed?			
e.	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			
f.	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			$\boxtimes$
g.	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			$\boxtimes$

**a.** – **g.** The revisions to the original Project would not result in additional demand for wastewater treatment, water supplies, or landfill capacity as the revision propose substantially the same features as the original Project. No sanitary sewer facilities would be included as part of the revisions to the original Project. Finally, no additional

landfill capacity would be required as the scope of grading and earthwork is substantially similar to the original Project. In addition, the reduction in landscaping from removal of the landscaped median would result in a small reduction in the overall demand for water. The revisions to the original Project would not include any new stormwater drainage facilities aside from those already identified in the original Project, so no new physical impacts would occur. As previously noted, the revisions would continue to be appropriately designed with relation to stormwater drainages and would continue to implement appropriate BMPs and LID strategies, which would further control stormwater runoff. The revisions to the original Project would continue to comply with all applicable utilities and service systems mitigation measures identified in the FEIR. Therefore, the impacts originally identified in the FEIR for the CVBMP would remain unchanged with implementation of the revisions to the H Street extension component of the original Project.

XV	/III. Mandatory Findings of Significance	New Potentially Significant Impact	More Severe Impact	No Substantial Change from Previous Analysis
a.	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?			
b.	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)			
C.	Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			$\boxtimes$

**a.** – **c.** The revisions to the original Project would not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, reduce biological resources, or eliminate cultural resources because the revisions to the original Project are substantially similar to the original Project and would occur within the same footprint identified in the original Project. The revisions to the original Project would not result in new cumulatively considerable impacts or new environmental impacts on human being because the scope of the Project, including both construction and operation, would also be substantially similar to that identified in the original Project. The revisions to the original Project. The revisions to the original Project, including both construction and operation, would also be substantially similar to that identified in the original Project. The revisions to the original Project would continue to comply with all applicable mitigation measures identified in the FEIR. Therefore, the impacts originally identified in the FEIR for the CVBMP would remain unchanged with implementation of the revisions to the H Street extension component of the original Project.

### **Environmental Determination**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- □ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- □ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions to the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- □ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- □ I find that the proposed project MAY have an impact on the environment that is "potentially significant" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis, as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☑ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the project, nothing further is required.

Signature	Date	
Printed Name	For	

## 4.0 CONCLUSION

On the basis of the evaluation presented in Section 3, the revisions to the original Project would not trigger any of the conditions listed in Section 1.2 of this Addendum, requiring preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR. Thus, this Addendum satisfies the requirements of CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15164. The revisions to the original Project do not introduce new significant environmental effects, substantially increase the severity of previously identified significant environmental effects, or show that mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible.

Overall, the revisions to the Project would result in the substantially similar effects to those of the original Project with similar construction and operations as those originally proposed and would therefore generate substantially comparable effects. The revisions to the original Project would not result in new significant effects or effects that would be substantially more severe than those identified in the FEIR. All applicable mitigation measures from the FEIR would be included as part of the revisions to the original Project.

The analyses and conclusions in the FEIR remain current and valid. The revisions to the original Project would not cause new or substantially more severe significant effects than identified in the FEIR, and thus no new mitigation measures would be required. No change has occurred with respect to circumstances surrounding the revisions to the original Project that would cause new or substantially more severe significant environmental effects than identified in the FEIR, and no new information has become available that shows that the project would cause significant environmental effects not already analyzed in the FEIR.

Therefore, no further environmental review is required beyond this Addendum to the FEIR.

Appendix A



July 18, 2013

Ms. Linda Scott San Diego Unified Port District 3165 Pacific Highway San Diego, California 92112

### SUBJECT: CHULA VISTA BAYFRONT MASTER PLAN TRAFFIC ANALYSIS REVIEW (RICK ENGINEERING COMPANY JOB NUMBER 15939-K)

Dear Ms. Scott:

Rick Engineering Company performed a review of the traffic analyses performed to date for the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan (CVBMP). More specifically, the following traffic analysis were reviewed: *CVBMP Final Environmental Impact Report* (FEIR) (Dudek, April 2010), *CVBMP Traffic Impact Analysis* (Kimley-Horn, March 2008), *CVBMP Pacifica Development Traffic Analysis* (Kimley-Horn, October 2007), and *CVBMP Gaylord Traffic Analysis* (Kimley-Horn, October 2007). The review also compares the existing approved uses for the CVBMP development, with the current land use plan, and assesses the impact to the local roadways in the vicinity of the project. The following summarizes our findings.

### TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS (KIMLEY-HORN) AND FEIR (DUDEK)

The traffic studies were reviewed to verify accuracy and to compare to the current land use plan. The following discrepancies were found with the review:

- Phase I: Both traffic analyses reported the same number of total trips, however, the Dudek study showed a Fire Station (located on Parcel H-17) proposed for this phase (Table 4.2-10), and the Kimley-Horn study did not (Table 4-4). The Fire Station is shown to generate 400 daily trips.
- Phase II: Both traffic analysis reported the same number of total trips, however, the Kimley-Horn study showed a 2-acre Industrial Business Park (located on Parcel H-17) proposed for this phase (Table 4-5), and the Dudek study did not (Table 4.2-11). The Industrial Business Park is shown to generate 400 daily trips.
- Phase III: Both traffic analyses reported the same number of trips, and there are no discrepancies.
- Phase IV: Both traffic analyses reported the same number of trips, and there are no discrepancies.

It should be noted that the discrepancy between Phase I and Phase II regarding the Fire Station and the Industrial Business Park (both located on Parcel H-17) is considered negligible, with no additional impact related to traffic, as both proposed developments are shown to be located on the same parcel and generate the same amount of traffic. Refer to **Attachment 1** for the trip generation tables from the Dudek and Kimley-Horn studies.

Ms. Linda Scott July 18, 2013 Page 2 of 4

### LAND USE

Since the preparation of the FEIR, a few of the land uses within the CVBMP land area have changed. The changes are as follows:

Phase I: S-1 (Sweetwater District) moved from Phase IV to Phase I, and the land use was revised from a 750 room Resort Hotel to a 237 stall RV Park.

H-3 (Harbor District) decreased from a 2,000 room Hotel to a 1,600 room Resort Conference Center. Access for this parcel was previously assumed to be primarily along H Street, with the main entrance and exit on H Street, west of Marina Parkway, and a truck driveway located along H Street, directly opposite Marina Parkway. A secondary driveway for the parcel was assumed on E Street, north of H Street.

- Phase II: H-23 increased from a 500 room Hotel to a 1,250 room Resort Hotel; the 100,000 sf of Cultural use decreased to 25,000 sf; and the 100,000 sf of Retail increased to 175,000 sf. There has not been a focused analysis completed for this parcel, identifying access points.
- Phase III: No change.
- Phase IV: S-1 was removed and assumed to be constructed as a 237 stall RV Park in Phase I.

### **TRIP GENERATION**

The trip generation for the revised land uses was calculated based on trip generation rates in SANDAG's *Brief Guide of Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates for the San Diego Region*, April 2002 (which is the same methodology utilized in the Kimley-Horn and Dudek studies), and compared to the trip generation in the FEIR. The revised trip generation is summarized as follows:

	FEIR	Current Land Use Plan	Difference
Phase I:	30,842 veh/day	28,427 veh/day	2,415 fewer daily trips
Phase II:	25,190 veh/day	34,090 veh/day	8,900 more daily trips
Phase I&II			6,485 more daily trips
Phase III:	8,685 veh/day	8,685 veh/day	no change
Phase I, II, &III			6,485 more daily trips
Phase IV:	14,600 veh/day	8,600 veh/day	6,000 fewer daily trips
Phase I, II, III, & IV	79,317 veh/day	78,317 veh/day	485 more daily trips

Refer to Attachment 2 for summary of the trip generation for each phase of the current land use plan.

Ms. Linda Scott July 18, 2013 Page 3 of 4

### POTENTIAL IMPACTS

The traffic generated by the current land use plan was distributed to the project vicinity for Phase II, Phase III, and Phase IV, and compared to City of Chula Vista General Plan roadway classification capacities, and the Mitigation Measures documented in FEIR Section 4.2.5. No further analysis was prepared for Phase I, as this phase is projected to generate less traffic with the current land use plan.

The total additional traffic generated by the current land use plan (485 daily trips) is not anticipated to have any significant impacts on the roadway network within the vicinity of the project, assuming that the roadway cross sections are constructed as follows:

Segment

H Street, Marina Parkway to Street A H Street, Street A to I-5 Ramps Street C, Marina Parkway to Street A J Street, Marina Parkway to Street A J Street, Street A to Bay Boulevard J Street, Bay Boulevard to I-5 Ramps Marina Parkway, H Street to Street C Marina Parkway, Street C to J Street Street A, H Street to Street C Street A, Street C to J Street Roadway Cross Section

4 Lane Major Street
5 Lane Major Street
2 Lane Class II Collector
4 Lane Major Street
6 Lane Major Street
6 Lane Major Street
3 Lane Class II Collector
3 Lane Class I Collector
4 Lane Class I Collector

The roadway cross sections identified above are consistent with the current Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan, Sweetwater and Harbor Districts, Conceptual Plan – June 19, 2013, the plans for the H Street Extension Project – July 11, 2013, and the Mitigation Measures Section 4.2.5 of the FEIR.

Refer to Attachment 3 for the Phase II, Phase III, and Phase IV mitigation requirements from the FEIR and the current land use plan.

### H STREET AND BAY BOULEVARD INTERSECTION GEOMETRY

The intersection of H Street and Bay Boulevard was analyzed using the Synchro software to determine if the geometry proposed by the current land use plan is adequate for peak hour conditions. Based on the results of the capacity and queuing analysis, for all phases of development, the geometry as proposed is anticipated to operate at an acceptable LOS for peak hour conditions, and accommodate all queued vehicles without spilling across the railroad tracks. The geometry is proposed as follows:

### Intersection of H Street and Bay Boulevard

- o Eastbound: 3 through lanes, 1 right-turn lane
- Westbound: 2 through lanes with a shared right-turn lane
- o Northbound: 1 left-turn lane, 1 shared through/right-turn lane
- o Southbound: 1 left-turn lane, 1 shared through/right-turn lane

Ms. Linda Scott July 18, 2013 Page 4 of 4

Refer to Attachment 4 for the capacity analysis printouts.

### CONCLUSION

The change in land use for the CVBMP is anticipated to result in a minor increase in traffic when compared to the trip generation in the FEIR (485 more daily trips) for full build conditions (all four phases of development). As a result of the net increase in trips, no additional impacts are anticipated to occur, as long as the roadway cross sections described in the Potential Impacts section of this letter are constructed. The roadway cross sections described above correspond with the following plan sets:

- Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan, Sweetwater and Harbor Districts, Conceptual Plan June 19, 2013.
- H Street Extension Project July 11, 2013.

It is recommended that once driveway locations are determined for H-23 that a focused traffic analysis is prepared for this parcel, to determine if any additional impacts will occur at the adjacent intersections and roadways. Additionally, if any access points change for H-3, a revision to the traffic analysis prepared for this parcel should be performed, to determine any impacts to the adjacent intersections and roadways, and to verify that the currently planned cross sections are adequate.

Sincerely,

RICK ENGINEERING COMPANY

Bri R. Spot

Brian R. Stephenson, P.E., T.E., P.T.O.E. Principal Project Manager

Attachments

cc:

Kevin Gibson, Rick Engineering Company

# Attachment 1

Trip Generation from Dudek and Kimley-Horn Studies

Traffic and Circulation

### **TABLE 4.2-10** Summary of Phase I Trip Generation

									A.N	I. Peak H	our	P.N	I. Peak He	our
Phase	Parcel	Land Use	Unit	s <sup>1</sup>	Trip	Ra	te <sup>2</sup>	Daily Trips	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Sweetw	ater District													
1	S-2	Signature Park	18	Ac	50	1	ac	900	59	58	117	41	40	81
Subtota	al							900	59	58	117	41	40	81
Harbor	District													
1	H-3	Hotel	2,000	rm	10	1	rm	20,000	720	480	1,200	960	640	1,600
1	H-13, H-14	Residential	1,500	du	6	1	du	9,000	144	576	720	567	243	810
1	H-8, HP-1	Signature Park	18	ac	50	1	ac	900	59	58	117	41	40	81
1	H-17	Fire Station	2	ac	200	1	ac	400	38	10	48	10	38	48
1	HP-3	Shoreline Promenade	8.4	ac	5	1	ac	42	1	1	2	2	2	3
Subtota	al			_				29,942	924	1,115	2,039	1,570	924	2,494
Total								30,842	983	1,173	2,156	1,611	964	2,575
rm = 1 1The	room; ac = acre; intensity of each	orn and Associates 2008. ; ksf = thousand square feet; du = dwelling unit n land use was provided by the Port of San Diego. s are based on SANDAG's ( <i>Not So</i> ) Brief Guide o		eration	Rates	for th	ne San	Diego Region, Apri	1 2002					

April 2010 Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan

5703-01 4.2-47

4.2

Traffic and Circulation

### **TABLE 4.2-11** Summary of Phase II Trip Generation

se Pa por Distr	arcel	Land Use	11-						A.M	A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		
or Distr	riat		Un	its1	Trip Rate <sup>2</sup>		Rate <sup>2</sup>	Daily Trips	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
	TICL													
H-9	9	Retail/Commercial Recreation	50	ksf	40	1	ksf	2,000	36	24	60	90	90	180
H-1	15	Mixed Use Office	210	ksf	17	1	ksf	3,570	418	46	464	100	400	500
H-1	15	Visitor Hotel	250	rm	8	1	rm	2,000	60	40	100	56	84	140
H-1	15	Retail	120	ksf	40	1	ksf	4,800	86	58	144	216	216	432
H-1	15	General Office	90	ksf	20	1	ksf	1,800	227	25	252	47	187	234
H-2	23	Hotel	500	rm	10	1	rm	5,000	180	120	300	240	160	400
H-2	23	Cultural	100	ksf	16	1	ksf	1,600	22	10	32	80	80	160
H-2	23	Retail	100	ksf	40	1	ksf	4,000	72	48	120	180	180	360
HP	-28	H Street Pier	0.4	ac	50	1	ac	20	1	2	3	1	1	2
total								25,190	1,140	383	1,523	1,020	1,436	2,456
al							10.00	25,190	1,140	383	1,523	1,020	1,436	2,456
HP total	-28				_	1		20 25,190	1 1,140	2 383	3 1,523	1,0	1	1 1 020 1,436

April 2010 Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan

5703-01 4.2-48

4.2

Traffic and Circulation

#### **TABLE 4.2-12** Summary of Phase III Trip Generation A.M. Peak Hour P.M. Peak Hour Phase Land Use Units<sup>1</sup> Trip Rate<sup>2</sup> Parcel Daily Trips In Out Total In Out Total Harbor District H-21 150 ksf 111 Retail 40 / ksf 6,000 108 72 180 270 270 540 Ш HP-23A Industrial Business Park 1.0 50 / ac 50 3 4 7 2 3 5 ac Subtotal 6,050 76 111 187 272 273 545 **Otay District** 0-1/0-2 Industrial Business Park<sup>3</sup> 1,200 115 29 29 144 111 144 115 5 / du 5 / ac 1,180 28 66 5 52 10 0-3 94 78 130 20 RV Park 236 du Ш du OP-1/OP-3 Ш South Park 51 ac 10 10 Subtotal 2,635 148 101 249 117 177 294 Total SOURCE: Kimley-Horn and Associates 2008. 8,685 259 176 435 389 450 S

ksf = thousand square feet

<sup>1</sup>The intensity of each land use was provided by the Port of San Diego. <sup>2</sup>Trip Generation rates are based on SANDAG's (*Not So) Brief Guide of Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates for the San Diego Region*, April 2002.

<sup>3</sup> The size of the industrial business park has not been determined, but trips for its use, which is consistent with the General Plan, have been assumed as shown.

April 2010 Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan 5703-01 4.2-49

4.2

									A.N	I. Peak	Hour	P.N	I. Peak	Hour
Phase	Parcel	Land Use	Uni	ts <sup>1</sup>	T	rip	Rate <sup>2</sup>	Daily Trips	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Sweetw	ater Dist	rict												
IV	S-3	Mixed Use Commercial	120	ksf	17	1	ksf	2,040	239	26	265	57	229	286
IV	S-4	Office	120	ksf	17	1	ksf	2,040	239	26	265	57	229	286
IV	S-1	Resort Hotel	750	rm	8	1	rm	6,000	180	120	300	168	252	420
Subtota	al							10,080	658	172	830	282	710	992
Harbor	District													
IV	H-12	Ferry Terminal/Restaurant	25	ksf	100	1	ksf	2,500	15	10	25	140	60	200
IV	H-18	Office	100	ksf	20	1	ksf	2,000	252	28	280	52	208	260
IV	HP-28	H Street Pier	0.40	ac	50	1	ac	20	1	2	3	1	1	2
Subtota	al							4,520	268	40	308	193	269	462
Total								14,600	926	212	1,138	475	979	1,454

### **TABLE 4.2-13 Summary of Phase IV Trip Generation**

SOURCE: Kimley-Horn and Associates 2008.

ksf = thousand square feet

<sup>1</sup>The intensity of each land use was provided by the Port of San Diego. <sup>2</sup>Trip Generation rates are based on SANDAG's (*Not So*) *Brief Guide of Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates for the San Diego Region*, April 2002.

5703-01 4.2-50 4.2

**TABLE 4.2-14** Total Project Trip Generation Summary P.M. Peak Hour Out A.M. Peak Hour Phase Parcel Land Use Units1 Daily Trips Trip Rate<sup>2</sup> In Total Total Out In Sweetwater District 5,000 900 2,040 2,040 **10,980** 420 81 286 286 1,073 Resort Hotel Signature Park Mixed Use Commercial Office 8 / Rm 50 / Ac 17 / Ksf 17 / Ksf 750 Rm 18.0 Ac 120 Ksf 120 Ksf 168 41 57 252 40 229 229 750 S-1 S-2 S-3 S-4 180 59 239 239 717 120 58 26 300 117 265 265 947 I IV IV Subtotal Harbor District I 230 323 Hotel Signature Park Retal/Commercial Recreation Ferry TerminAlRestaurant Residential Water Use Office Vater Hotel Retail Hotel Cultural Retail Shorefine Promenade Industrial Business Park H Street Pier H-3 H-8/HP-1 H-9 H-12 H-13/H-14 H-15 H-15 H-15 H-15 H-15 H-17 H-18 H-17 H-18 H-23 HP-23 HP-28 HP-28 2,000 Rm 18.0 Ac 50 Ksf 25 Ksf 1,500 Du 210 Ksf 220 Rm 120 Ksf 90 Ksf 100 Ksf 1500 Ksf 100 Ksf 100 Ksf 100 Ksf 100 Ksf 00 Ksf 20,000 900 2,000 2,500 9,000 3,570 2,000 4,800 1,800 1,600 Rm Ac Ksf Du Ksf Rm Ksf Ksf Ksf Ksf Ksf Ksf Ksf Ac Ac Ac Ac 720 480 1,200 960 640 
 10
 /

 50
 /

 40
 /

 100
 /

 6
 /

 17
 /

 8
 /

 40
 /

 20
 /

 200
 /

 200
 /

 10
 /

 10
 /
 81 180 200 810 90 140 567 25 720 464 243 144 576 418 500 140 432 234 48 260 540 400 160 100 144 252 48 280 180 22 400 2,000 6,000 5,000 1,600 4,000 38 252 108 180 300 40 / 5 / 50 / 50 / 50 / 42 Subtotal Otay District 65,706 2,443 1,613 4,055 3,055 2,902 5,957 0-1/0-4 0-3A/0-3B 0P-1A/B 0P-3 115 28 144 94 115 52 144 130 1,200 Industrial Business Park RV Park 29 66 29 78 HI III du 5 du 236 1 and 10 249 5,251 III Subtotal Total 255 2,635 79,317 10 117 3,495 10 177 3,829 20 294 7,324 South Park 51.0 ac 5 ac 5 148 3,308 5 101 1,943

April 2010 Final Environmental Impect Report (EIR) for the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan 5703-01

Traffic and Circulation

		PI		LE 4-4 D PROJECT ERATION SUI	MMARY						
			units	and the second sec	Daily Tript					( Pelk) Out	ALL PROPERTY
	S-2	Signature Park	18:0 ac	ter District 50 / ac	900	59	58	117	41	40	81
and the			for: Sweetwater Dis		900	59	1.000 A	. 117	10	40	
		Top17 Oliver dat of	Harbor	District							
								10.0	1 m m		
	H-3	Hotel	2,000 rm	10 / rm	20,000	720	480	1,200	960	640	1,60
	H-3 H-8/HP-1	Hotel Signature Park	2,000 m 18 ac	10 / rm 50 / ac	20,000 900	720 59	480 _58	1,200 117	960 41	640 40	1,60 81
				and the second sec				10000			
	H-8/HP-1	Signature Park	18 ac	50 / aç	900 9,000 42	59 144 1	58	117	41	40	81
	H-8/HP-1 H-13/H-14	Signature Park Residential 50' Baywalk Subtotat	18 ac 1,500 du	50 / ac 6 / du 5 / ac	900 9,000	59	58 576 1	117 720 2 2,039	41 567	40 243 1 924	81

(1) See Table 4-3 for the SANDAG trip generator category used for each land use description.
 (2) The intensity of each land use was provided by the Port of San Diego
 (3) Trip Generation rates are based on SANDAG's Brief Guide of Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates for the San Diego Region, April 2002

#### TABLE 4-5 PROPOSED PROJECT PHASE II TRIP GENERATION SUMMARY

A PARAT

			Harbo	District	~						
r	H-9	Retail/Commercial Recreation	50 ksf	40 / ksf	2,000	36	24	60	90	90	180
1	H-15	Mixed Use Office	210 ksf	17 / ksf	3,570	418	46	464	100	400	500
I	H-15	Visitor Hotel	250 rm	8 / rm	2,000	60	40	100	56	84	140
1	H-15	Retail	120 ksf	40 / ksf	4,800	86	58	144	216	216	432
I	H-15	General Office	90 ksf	20 / ksf	1,800	227	25	252	47	187	234
1	H-17	Industrial Business Park	2 ac	200 / ac	.400	38	10	48	10	38	48
1	H-23	Hotel	500 m	10 / rm	5,000	1.80	120	300	240	160	400
1	H-23	Cultural	100 ksf	16 / ksf	1,600	22	10	32	80	80	160
1	H-23	Retail	100 ksf	40 / ksf	4,000	72	48	120	180	180	360
I	HP-28	H Street Pier	0.4 ac	50 / ac	20	1	2	3	1	1	2
		Subtotal for:	Harbor District		25,190	1.140			1,020	1,436	2,45
					25.190		207	1,523	1.030	1.436	-

NOTES:

(1) See Table 4-3 for the SANDAG trip generator category used for each land use description.
 (2) The intensity of each land use was provided by the Port of San Diego
 (3) Trip Generation rates are based on SANDAG's Brief Guide of Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates for the San Diego Region, April 2002

K4095451000/TriefficExcelOption 24(SP Trip Genetion)PII Trip Generation

		PHAS		LE 4-6 D PROJECT ERATION SU	MMARY						
					Dáity shi ipi						
			Harbor	District							
ш	H-21	Retail	150 ksf	40 / ksf	6,000	108	72	180	270	270	540
ш	HP-23A	Industrial Business Park	1.0 ac	50 / ac	50	3	4	7	2	3	5
		Sumotal fo	r: Harbor District		6.050	111	76	187	272	273	545
			Otay I	District				N			
ш	0-1/0-2	Industrial Business Park 4			1,200	115	29	144	29	115	144
ш	0-3	RV Park	236 du	5 / du	1,180	28	66	94	78	52	130
ш	OP-1/OP-3	South Park	51 ac	5 / BC	255	5	5	10	10	10	20
		Subtotal fo	r: Otay District		2,635	148	101		117	177	294
				Total:	8.685	259		435	389	450	839
NOT	ES:	in the state of th				11					

NOTES: (1) See Table 4-3 for the SANDAG trip generator category used for each land use description. (2) The intensity of each land use was provided by the Port of San Diego (3) Trip Generation rates are based on SANDAG's Brief Guide of Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates for the San Diego Region, April 2002 (4) The size of the industrial business park has not been determined, but trips for the use, which is consistent with the General Plan, have been assumed as shown. KN0554510000TraffieExcelCeption 2USP Trip Generation

ſī

		PHAS		LE 4-7 D PROJECT VERATION SU	MMARY						
					111日12日111日11日11日11日	ingen anerererterter ter	Discover and the second	ort - Parlander - Con	A CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF	Service and the service of the servi	al a containe
ssenas	2010014.0478-		Sweetwa	ter District	Deally Toplar		CHI	eserolariii	(instactor)	10.000 A	SECON
īV	S-1	Resort Hotel	750 m	8 / m	6,000	180	120	300	168	252	420
IV	S-3	Mixed Use Commercial	120 ksf	17 / ksf	2,040	239	26	265	57	229	286
IV	S-4	Office	120 ksf	17 / ksf	2,040	239	26	265	57	229	286
		Subtoral fo	r: Sweetwater Di	strict	10,080	658	172	\$30	282	710	.992
			Harbo	r District							
rv	H-12	Ferry Terminal/ Restaurant	25 ksf	100 / ksf	2,500	15	10	25	140	60	200
rv	H-18	Office	100 ksf	20. / ksf	2,000	252	28	280	52	208	260
IV	HP-28	H Street Pier	0.40 ac	50 / ac	20	1	2	3	1	1	2
		Subtotat to	r: Harbor Distric	•	4,520	268	-40	308	193	269	462
				Total:		926		1.138	475	979	1.45

(1) See Table 4-3 for the SANDAG trip generator category used for each land use description.
 (2) The intensity of each land use was provided by the Port of San Diego
 (3) Trip Generation rates are based on SANDAG's Brief Guide of Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates for the San Diego Region, April 2002

		TOTAL PI		LE 4-8 ED PROJECT GENERATION	N SUMMA	RY					
				1 militia		<u> </u>	Peden	Liner ye. Que di ana	A CAR	M.Peal -1	lour 100r
*Pha	ie. Hie Karpelstes	- Lang Beel	1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1	ter District	Dany Trip	in a during	14. \$A\$\$	and totals		- AUHTO	有效建設群
rv	S-1	Resort Hotel	750 rm	8 / rm	6,000	180	120	300	168	252	420
1	S-2	Signature Park	18.0 ac	50 / ac	900	59	58	117	41	40	81
rv	S-3	Mixed Use Commercial	120 ksf	17 / ksf	2,040	239	26	265	57	229	286
rv	S-4	Office	120 ksf	17 / ksf	2,040	239	26	265	57	229	286
		Subtotal for	: Sweetwater Di	strict	10.980	717	230	947	323	750	1.07
Thomas	Per management of	[10] A. S. Samuelli, Contract South State (1997) 11 (1997).	Harbo	r District	the second		t obtained	followitere ()		T minth	d level !!
I	H-3	Hotel	2,000 m	10 / m	20,000	720	480	1,200	960	640	1,60
I	H-8/HP-1	Signature Park	18.0 ac	50 / ac	900	59	58	117	41	40	81
π	H-9	Retail/Commercial Recreation	50 ksf	40 / ksf	2,000	36	24	60	90	90	180
IV	H-12	Ferry Terminal/ Restaurant	25 ksf	100 / ksf	2,500	15	10	25	140	60	200
r	H-13/H-14	Residential	1,500 du	6 / du	9,000	144	576	720	567	243	810
Ц	H-15	Mixed Use Office	210 ksf	17 / ksf	3,570	418	46	464	100	400	500
π	H-15	Visitor Hotel	250 rm	8 / m	2,000	60	40	100	56	84	140
п	H-15	Retail	120 ksf	40 / ksf	4,800	86	58	144	216	216	432
п	H-15	General Office	90 ksf	20 / ksf	1,800	227	25	252	47	187	234
п	H-17	Industrial Business Park	2.0 ac	200 / ac	400	38	10	48	10	38	-48
rv	H-18	Office	100 ksf	20 / ksf	2,000	252	28	280	52	208	260
щ	H-21	Retail	150 ksf	40 / ksf	6,000	108	72	180	270	270	540
п	H-23	Hotel	500 m	10 / m	5,000	180	120	300	240	160	400
п	H-23	Cultural	100 ksf	16 / ksf	1,600	22	10	32	80	80	160
П	H-23	Retail	100 ksf	40 / ksf	4,000	72	48.	120	180	180	360
I	HP-03	50' Baywalk	8.4 ac	5 / ac	42	1	1	2	2	1	3
ш	HP-23A	Industrial Business Park	1.0 ac	50 / ac	50	3	4	7	2	3	5
п	HP-28	H Street Pier	0.4 ac	50 / ac	20	1	2	3	1	1	2
v	HP-28	H Street Pier	0.4 ac	50 / ac	20	1	2	3	1	1	2
		Subtotal for:	Harbor Distric	<b>t</b> =	65,702		1,612		5 m m	2,902	
	2		Otay	District							
ш	0-1/0-2	Industrial Business Park <sup>4</sup>			1,200	115	29	144	29	115	144
ш	0-3	RV Park	236 du	5/ du	1,180	28	66	94	78	52.	130
Ш	OP-1/OP-3	South Park	51.0 ac	5 / ac	255	5	5	10	10	10	20
1. 1. (		Subtotal for:	Olay District		2.635	1-(8	101	249	117	177	294
				Total:	79,317	3.308	1.943	5.251	3,495	3,829	7,32-

(2) The intensity of each land use was provided by the Port of San Diego
 (3) Trip Generation rates are based on SANDAG's Brief Guide of Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates for the San Diego Region, April 2002
 (4) The size of the industrial business park has not been determined, but trips for the use, which is consistent with the General Plan, have been assumed as shown.

# Attachment 2

Summary of Current Land Use Plan Trip Generation

			1	T Frip Gene	able 1 ration - I	Phase I							
Phase	Parcel	Land Use	Uni	ts	Trip R	ate	Daily Trips	AN	Peak Hour	r	PN	1 Peak Hour	r
Sweetwater Distri	ict							In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
l.	5-2	Signature Park	18	ac	50	ac	900	59	58	117	41	40	81
I	S-1	RV Park	237	stalls	5	stall	1,185	28	67	95	78	52	130
Subtotal							2,085	87	125	212	119	92	211
Harbor District													
I	H-3	Resort Conference Center	1,600	rm	10	rm	16,000	576	384	960	768	512	1,280
1	H-13, H-14	Residential	1,500	du	6	du	9,000	144	576	720	567	243	810
1	H-8, HP-1	Signature Park	18	ac	50	ac	900	59	58	117	41	40	81
1	H-17	Fire Station	2	ac	200	ac	400	38	10	48	10	38	48
1	HP-3	Shoreline Promenade	8	ac	5	ac	42	1	1	2	2	2	. 4
Subtotal							26,342	818	1,029	1,847	1,388	835	2,223
Total			1		1		28,427	905	1,154	2,059	1,507	927	2,434

Note: H-3 decreased from 2,000 rooms to 1,600 rooms. S-1 moved from Phase IV to Phase I, and land use revised to RV Park.

			т		Table 2 ration - P	hase l	I						
Phase	Parcel	Land Use	Unit	s	Trip R	ate	Daily Trips	AMI	Peak Hour		PM	Peak Hour	
Harbor District													
11	H-9	Retail/Commercial Recreation	50	ksf	40	ksf	2,000	36	24	60	90	90	180
11	H-15	Mixed Use Office	210	ksf	17	ksf	3,570	418	46	464	100	400	500
П	H-15	Visitor Hotel	250	rm	8	rm	2,000	60	40	100	56	84	140
11	H-15	Retail	120	ksf	40	ksf	4,800	86	58	144	216	216	432
11	H-15	General Office	90	ksf	20	ksf	1,800	227	25	252	47	187	234
0	H-23	Resort Hotel	1,250	rm	10	rm	12,500	450	300	750	600	400	1,000
11	H-23	Cultural	25	ksf	16	ksf	400	6	2	8	20	20	40
U	H-23	Retail	175	ksf	40	ksf	7,000	126	84	210	315	315	630
II	HP-28	H Street Pier	0.4	ac	50	ac	20	1	2	3	1	1	2
Subtotal							34,090	1,410	581	1,991	1,445	1,713	3,158
Total							34,090	1,410	581	1,991	1,445	1,713	3,158

Note: H-23 increased from 500 rooms to 1,250 rooms.

			Т		Table 3 ration - P	hase I	Ц						
Phase	Parcel	Land Use	Unit	s	Trip R	ate	Daily Trips	AM	Peak Hour		PM F	eak Hour	
Harbor District													
111	H-21	Retail	150	ksf	40	ksf	6,000	108	72	180	270	270	540
111	HP-23A	Industrial Business Park	1.0	ac	50	ac	50	3	4	7	2	3	5
Subtotal							6,050	111	76	187	272	273	545
Otay District													
	0-1/0-2	Industrial Business Park					1,200	115	29	144	29	115	144
111	O-3	RV Park	236	du	5	du	1,180	28	66	94	78	52	130
111	OP-1/OP-3	South Park	51	ac	5	ac	255	5	5	10	10	10	20
Subtotal							2,635	148	100	248	117	177	294
Total	1						8,685	259	176	435	389	450	839

			т		able 4 ration - P	hase IV	V						
Phase	Parcel	Land Use	Unit	s	Trip R	ate	Daily Trips	AN	Peak Hou	r l	PM	Peak Hour	r
Sweetwater Distri	ct							In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
IV	S-3	Mixed Use Commercial	120	ksf	17	ksf	2,040	239	26	265	57	229	286
IV	S-4	Office	120	ksf	17	ksf	2,040	239	26	265	57	229	286
Subtotal							4,080	478	52	530	114	458	572
Harbor District													
IV	H-12	Ferry Terminal/Restaurant	25	ksf	100	ksf	2,500	15	10	25	140	60	200
IV	H-18	Office	100	ksf	20	ksf	2,000	252	28	280	52	208	260
IV	HP-28	H Street Pier	0.4	ac	50	ас	20	1	2	3	1	1	5
Subtotal							4,520	268	40	308	193	269	462
Total							8,600	746	92	838	307	727	1,034

Note: S-1 moved from Phase IV to Phase I, and land use revised to RV Park.

			Tr	ip Gener	able 5 ation - Al	l Phase	25						
Phase	Parcel	Land Use	Uni	ts	Trip Rate Dail		Daily Trips	AN	1 Peak Hou	r	PN	1 Peak Hour	r
Sweetwater Distri	ict							In	Out	Total	in	Out	Total
1	S-2	Signature Park	18	ac	50	ac	900	59	58	117	41	40	81
1	S-1	RV Park	237	stalls	5	stall	1,185	28	67	95	78	52	130
IV	S-3	Mixed Use Commercial	120	ksf	17	ksf	2,040	239	26	265	57	229	286
IV	S-4	Office	120	ksf	17	ksf	2,040	239	26	265	57	229	286
Subtotal							6,165	565	177	742	233	550	783
Harbor District													_
1	H-3	Resort Conference Center	1,600	rm	10	rm	16,000	576	384	960	768	512	1,280
1	H-13, H-14	Residential	1,500	du	6	du	9,000	144	576	720	567	243	810
1	H-8, HP-1	Signature Park	18	ac	50	ac	900	59	58	117	41	40	81
1	H-17	Fire Station	2	ac	200	ac	400	38	10	48	10	38	48
1	HP-3	Shoreline Promenade	8	ac	5	ac	42	1	1	2	2	2	4
н	H-9	Retail/Commercial Recreation	50	ksf	40	ksf	2,000	36	24	60	90	90	180
П	H-15	Mixed Use Office	210	ksf	17	ksf	3,570	418	46	464	100	400	500
11	H-15	Visitor Hotel	250	rm	8	rm	2,000	60	40	100	56	84	140
11	H-15	Retail	120	ksf	40	ksf	4,800	86	58	144	216	216	432
11	H-15	General Office	90	ksf	20	ksf	1,800	227	25	252	47	187	234
11	H-23	Resort Hotel	1,250	rm	10	rm	12,500	450	300	750	600	400	1,000
11	H-23	Cultural	25	ksf	16	ksf	400	6	2	8	20	20	40
0	H-23	Retail	175	ksf	40	ksf	7,000	126	84	210	315	315	630
11	HP-28	H Street Pier	0.4	ac	50	ac	20	1	2	3	1	1	2
ш	H-21	Retail	150	ksf	40	ksf	6,000	108	72	180	270	270	540
ш	HP-23A	Industrial Business Park	1.0	ac	50	ac	50	3	4	7	2	3	5
IV	H-12	Ferry Terminal/Restaurant	25	ksf	100	ksf	2,500	15	10	25	140	60	200
IV	H-18	Office	100	ksf	20	ksf	2,000	252	28	280	52	208	260
IV	HP-28	H Street Pier	0.4	ac	50	ac	20	1	2	3	1	1	2
Subtotal							71,002	2,607	1,726	4,333	3,298	3,090	6,388
Otay District								-/		.,		0,000	
111	0-1/0-2	Industrial Business Park		1	1		1,200	115	29	144	29	115	144
10	0-3	RV Park	236	du	5	du	1,180	28	66	94	78	52	130
111		South Park	51	ac	5	ac	255	5	5	10	10	10	20
Subtotal							2,635	148	100	248	117	177	294
Total							79,802	3,320	2,003	5,323	3,648	3,817	7,465

	Tabl						
Tri	p Generatio	n Compa	rison				
Phase	Daily Trips	AN	I Peak Hou	r	PIV	I Peak Hou	r
Trips from Revised DEIR, May 2008 (Dudek)		In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
1	30,842	983	1,173	2,156	1,611	964	2,575
11	25,190	1,140	383	1,523	1,020	1,436	2,456
III	8,685	259	176	435	389	450	839
IV	14,600	926	212	1,138	475	979	1,454
Total	79,317	3,308	1,944	5,252	3,495	3,829	7,324
Trips based on Current Land Use Plan							
1	28,427	905	1,154	2,059	1,507	927	2,434
11	34,090	1,410	581	1,991	1,445	1,713	3,158
III.	8,685	259	176	435	389	450	839
IV	8,600	746	92	838	307	727	1,034
Total	79,802	3,320	2,003	5,323	3,648	3,817	7,465
Difference in Trips between Revised DEIR and Currer	nt Land Use Plan	L.					
I	(2,415)	(78)	(19)	(97)	(104)	(37)	(141)
п	8,900	270	198	468	425	277	702
III	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
IV	(6,000)	(180)	(120)	(300)	(168)	(252)	(420)
Total Difference in Trips	485	12	59	71	153	(12)	141

# Attachment 3

Mitigation Requirements from DEIR

### Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan



K-1095451000\Traffic\Excel/Option 2\{O2 RS.xism]ADT Fig NCVProposed Project - Phase II Trip Distribution


K:\095451000\Traffic\ExcetOption 2\(02 R\$.xtem)ADT Fig NC\Proposed Project - Phase II Roadway Segment Trip Assignment

Assignment



5-83

Proposed Project - Phase II Plus Project Conditions ADT Volumes

K:(095451000/TrafficiExcel/Option 2/O2 R8.dum)ADT Fig NC/Proposed Project - Phase II Plus Project Conditions ADT Volumes



5-139

Proposed Project - Phase III Conditions Redistributed ADT Traffic Volumes

K:1095451000\Treffic\ExcetOption 2(O2 RS.dsm]ADT Fig NE\Proposed Project - Phase III Conditions Redistributed ADT Traffic Volumea



K:1095451000/Tratile/Excel/Option 21/02 R5.xlam]ADT Fig NF/Proposed Project - Phase IV Trip Distribution



5-164

K:095451000/Traffic/Excel/Option 2402 RS.dam)ADT Fig NP/Proposed Project - Phase M Readway Segment Trip Assignment

Proposed Project - Phase IV Roadway Segment Trip Assignment



Kimtey-Hom and Associates, Inc.

5-174

FIGURE 5-64 Proposed Project - Phase IV Plus Project Conditions ADT Volumes

K1095451000\TrafficlExcelOption 2\(O2 RS.dsm)ADT Fig NFIProposed Project - Phase IV Plus Project Conditions ADT Volumes

Capacity (v/c) ratios were calculated for each roadway segment. It should be noted that the capacity of a roadway is equal to the maximum LOS E pursuant to the Chula Vista General Plan (2005). *Table 4.2-1* summarizes the capacities and LOS for each Circulation Element and Urban Core Circulation Element roadway.

Facility		Acceptable		Leve	l of Service	(LOS)	
Class <sup>a</sup>	Lanes	LOS	A (.6)	B (.7)	C (.8)	D (.9)	E (1.0)
Circulation Element Ro	adways						
Expressway	7/8	С	52,500	61,300	70,000	78,800	87,500
Prime	6	С	37,500	43,800	50,000	56,300	62,500
Major Street	6	С	30,000	35,000	40,000	45,000	50,000
	5	С	26,250	30,650	35,000	39,400	43,750
	4	С	22,500	26,300	30,000	33,800	37,500
Class I Collector	4	С	16,500	19,300	22,000	24,800	27,500
Class II Collector	2	С	9,000	10,500	12,000	13,500	15,000
Class III Collector	2	С	5,600	6,600	7,500	8,400	9,400
Urban Core Circulation	Element R	oadways					
Gateway Street	6	D	40,800	47,600	54,400	61,200	68,000
	4	D	28,800	33,600	38,400	43,200	48,000
Urban Arterial	4	D	25,200	29,400	33,600	37,800	42,000
Commercial Blvd.	4	D	22,500	26,250	30,000	33,750	37,500
Downtown Promenade	4	D	22,500	26,250	30,000	33,750	37,500
	2	D	9,600	11,200	12,800	14,400	16,000

# TABLE 4.2-1 Roadway Segment Capacity and Level of Service

Note: Shaded cells correspond to the acceptable traffic volumes for each roadway.

<sup>a</sup> The adopted Circulation Element roadways are considered to be Class I Collector Streets and above, and the Urban Core Circulation Element roadways are considered to be six-lane Gateway Streets and below.

Street classifications, discussed in more detail below and identified for specific roadway segments in the study area as shown in *Figure 4.2-2*, are based on standards provided in the 2005 Chula Vista General Plan.

To determine LOS, traffic counts were conducted during peak commute periods. Existing A.M. (7:00 A.M. to 9:00 A.M.) and P.M. (4:00 P.M. to 6:00 P.M.) peak-hour turning movement counts were conducted by Southland Car Counters, Turning Point Traffic Service, and Traffic Data Service Southwest. These intersection counts were taken during several different times of the day in 2004 and 2005. Traffic volumes along segments of F Street, J Street, and Bay Boulevard were collected by Field Data Services in 2006. The remaining roadway segment traffic volumes were provided by the City of Chula Vista and Traffic Data Services Southwest (which collected data on two segments of Broadway). In addition, Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. conducted supplemental roadway counts for older count locations. Existing freeway volumes (2004) were

**Traffic and Circulation** 

		Acceptable	Phas Base		Phas Basel Plus Pr	ine	Project	Project Trips		Scotian 4.2.5 Mittyshan Measures
Roadway Segment	Roadway Classification	Volume	ADT	LOS	ADT	LOS	ADT	(Percent)	IMPACT?	measures
E Street		0.000			0.011					_
H Street to Gaylord-RCC Dwy	2 Lanes Class III Collector	7,500	6,034	В	6,041	В	6	0	NO	-
West of Bay Blvd	2 Lanes Class III Collector	7,500	2,294	A	2,612	A	318	12	NO	_
Bay Boulevard to I-5 Ramps	4 Lanes Major Street	30,000	15,834	A	17,567	A	1,192	7	NO	
I-5 Ramps to Woodlawn Avenue	4 Lanes Gateway Street	43,200	28,355	A	29,818	В	1,193	4	NO	
Woodlawn Avenue to Broadway	4 Lanes Gateway Street	43,200	27,988	A	28,744	A	756	3	NO	
Broadway to 3rd Avenue	4 Lanes Urban Arterial	37,800	19,468	A	19,972	A	504	3	NO	
Lagoon St/ F Street										
Bay Boulevard to Broadway	4 Lanes Downtown Promenade	33,750	5,746	A	6,099	A	353	6	NO	
Broadway to 4th Avenue	2 Lanes Downtown Promenade	14,400	11,202	C	11,515	C	313	3	NO	
4th Avenue to 3rd Avenue	4 Lanes Downtown Promenade	33,750	10,755	A	11,007	A	252	2	NO	
H Street				1	15,867					
West of Marina Parkway	3 Lanes Class II Collector	17,000	15,028	C	15,672	C /	644	4	NO	
Marina Parkway to Street A	4 Lanes Major Street	30,000	14,263	A	18,106	A 🗹	4,104	23	NO	i and i a
Street A to I-5 Ramps	4 Lanes Major Street	30,000	29,621	CHZ	40,005	F 🖌	9,574	24	DIRECT	S Long Myor
I-5 Ramps to Broadway	4 Lanes Gateway Street	43,200	35,402	C	40,325	D	4,922	12	NO	
Broadway to 3rd Avenue	4 Lanes Urban Arterial	37,800	28,755	В	31,113	C	2,357	8	NO	
J Street					20902	·				
Marina Parkway to Street A	4 Lanes Major Street	30,000	15,784	A	19,540	A 🖌	5,311	27	NO	
Street A to Bay Boulevard	4 Lanes Major Street	30,000	18,998	A	31,404	NG	13,216	42	DIRECT	6 Low Mijor
Bay Boulevard to I-5 Ramps	4 Lanes Major Street	30,000	24,675	В	33,657	D	9,116	27	DIRECT	to have major
I-5 Ramps to Broadway	4 Lanes Major Street	30,000	19,198	A	21,881	A	2,683	12	NO	
L Street										
Bay Boulevard to Industrial Way	4 Lanes Gateway Street	43,200	17,329	A	19,345	A	2,015	10	NO	
Industrial Way to Broadway	4 Lanes Gateway Street	43,200	21,874	A	23,809	A	1,934	8	NO	1

**TABLE 4.2-21** Phase II Conditions Roadway Segment Level of Service Summary

April 2010 Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan

5703-01 4.2-103

4.2

4.2

Traffic and Circulation

IMPACT?

NO

Project

Trips

(Percent)

52

#### Phase II Phase II Baseline Acceptable Baseline **Plus Project** Project **Roadway Classification** Volume LOS ADT ADT ADT LOS 19,320 7 991 9.089 3 Lanes Class III Collector 17,000 A A 4,722 9,991 12,039 A

**TABLE 4.2-21 (Cont.)** 

3 Lane Class II Collector Street C to J Street 17,000 AB 5,981 50 NO **Bay Boulevard** 13,595 9.984 10,104 В NO E Street to F Street 2 Lanes Class II Collector 12,000 B 1 120 4,318 4,608 A NO F Street to H Street 2 Lanes Class III Collector 7,500 A 12 559 5,451 5,479 H Street to J Street 2 Lanes Class III Collector 7.500 A A 13 NO 702 J Street to L Street 2 Lanes Class II Collector 12,00 6,696 A 10,918 С 4,221 39 NO L Street to I-5 Ramps1 2 Lanes Class II Collector 12,000 4,403 A 5,159 A 756 15 NO 5,159 NO South of I-5 Ramps 2 Lanes Class III Collector 7,500 4,403 A A 756 15 Broadway C Street to E Street 4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard 33,750 26,304 С 26,325 С 20 0 NO E Street to H Street 4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard 33,750 26,312 С 26,816 С 504 2 NO H Street to K Street 4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard 33,750 30,316 D 30,840 D 524 2 NO 26,878 C 27,130 С NO 1 K Street to L Street 4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard 33,750 252 С 3 South of L Street 4 Lanes Major Street 27,512 С 28,228 NO 30,000 715 Street A \$ 724 7,297 2 Lanes Class III Collector H Street to Street C SE 75 NO (a) 7,500 -5,470 . 4 Loc Class I 2 Lanes Class III Collector 5.246 12,630 64 DIRECT Street C to J Street 7,500 A F/ 8,104 Collector Street C 14,705 2,085 A-74 NO 2 Lanes Class III Collector 7,500 Marina Parkway to Street A (a) 1,544

2,474

SOURCE: Kimley-Horn and Associates 2008.

**Roadway Segment** 

Marina Parkway

H Street to Street C

ADT = Average Daily Trips; LOS = Level of Service

Bold values indicate roadway segments operating at LOS E or F. Bold and shaded values indicate project significant impact. \*Roads will be built to given classification with Phase I of the Proposed Project as required to provide site frontage.

April 2010 Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan 5703-01 4.2-104

# Z Lan Class II

Collector

measures

Section 4.2.5

Mitzatia

Traffic and Circulation

Setta 4.2.5

Mitydia

masures

#### **TABLE 4.2-27** Phase III Conditions With Extension of E Street Roadway Segment Level of Service Summary Phase III **Plus Project** Phase III Project Acceptable Baseline Mitigated Project Trips IMPACT? **Roadway Segment Roadway Classification** Volume ADT LOS ADT LOS ADT (Percent) E Street 2 Lanes Class III Collector 6,050 В 4,800 0 NO H Street to Dwy 7,500 A 0 West of Bay Blvd 2 Lanes Class III Collector 7,500 2,970 A 7,872 D 2 0 CUMULATIVE 17,570 19,230 Bay Boulevard to I-5 Ramps 4 Lanes Major Street 30,000 A А 182 1 NO В В 29,820 29,433 NO I-5 Ramps to Woodlawn Avenue 4 Lanes Gateway Street 43,200 261 1 28,750 A 29,011 В NO Woodlawn Avenue to Broadway 4 Lanes Gateway Street 43,200 261 1 Broadway to 3rd Avenue 19,980 20,154 NO 4 Lanes Urban Arterial 37,800 A A 174 1 Lagoon St/ F Street Bay Boulevard to Broadway 4 Lanes Downtown Promenade 33,750 6,100 A 6,577 A 387 6 NO С C 2 Lanes Downtown Promenade 14,400 11,520 11,787 2 NO Broadway to 4th Avenue 267 11,470 11,557 1 NO 4th Avenue to 3rd Avenue 4 Lanes Downtown Promenade 33,750 A A 87 H Street 11,568 16,120 С 11,373 NO 3 Lanes Class II Collector 17,000 A -4 West of Marina Parkway 458 Marina Parkway to Street A 4 Lanes Major Street 30,000 18,450 AIST 14,269 A 14 0 NO Street A to I-5 Ramps 5 Lanes Major Street 39,200 40,010 D 35580 33,116 8 772 2 NO I-5 Ramps to Broadway 4 Lanes Gateway Street 43,200 42,470 D 42,844 D 752 2 NO C C NO Broadway to 3rd Avenue 4 Lanes Urban Arterial 37,800 31,120 31,509 389 1 J Street 24,460 4 Lanes Major Street 30,000 19,540 A B / 5,635 23 NO Marina Parkway to Street A Street A to Bay Boulevard 31,410 B 39,7.8 36,346 6 Lanes Major Street 40,000 C 4,880 13 NO 33,660 С 9 NO Bay Boulevard to I-5 Ramps 6 Lanes Major Street 40,000 В 37,653 3,408 21,940 22,635 В 3 NO A I-5 Ramps to Broadway 4 Lanes Major Street 30,000 695 L Street 4 Lanes Gateway Street 43,200 19.350 A 20.0454 A 3 NO Bay Boulevard to Industrial Way 695 23,810 24,265 2 NO 43,200 A A Industrial Way to Broadway 4 Lanes Gateway Street 455

April 2010 Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan 5703-01

4.2

4.2

### **Traffic and Circulation**

# TABLE 4.2-27 (Cont.)

		Acceptable	Phase Base		Phase Plus Pro Mitiga	oject	Project	Project Trips		Section 4.25 maggdim masangs
Roadway Segment	Roadway Classification	Volume	ADT	LOS	ADT	LOS	ADT	(Percent)	IMPACT?	masing
Marina Parkway					10,700					
H Street to Street C	3 Lanes Class II Collector	17,000	9,090	A	9,468	Α <	652	7	NO	
Street C to J Street	3 Lane Class II Collector	17,000	12,040	A	13,098	В 🖌	946	7	NO	1
Bay Boulevard					14,654					1
E Street to F Street	2 Lanes Class II Collector	12,000	11,610	C	11,472	C	0	0	NO	7
F Street to H Street	2 Lanes Class III Collector	7,500	4,980	A	5,120	A	441	8	NO	
H Street to J Street	2 Lanes Class III Collector	7,500	5,630	В	7,061	C	439	6	NO	
J Street to L Street	2 Lanes Class II Collector	12,000	10,970	C	11,302	C	1.033	9	NO	1
L Street to I-5 Ramps1	2 Lanes Class II Collector	12,000	5,310	A	5,780	A	524	9	NO	1
South of I-5 Ramps	2 Lanes Class III Collector	7,500	5,310	A	5,571	A	261	5	NO	-
Broadway								11		-
C Street to E Street	4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard	33,750	26,330	C	26,390	C	60	0	NO	1
E Street to H Street	4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard	33,750	26,820	C	26,994	C	174	1	NO	-
H Street to K Street	4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard	33,750	31,090	D	31,324	D	234	1	NO	1
K Street to L Street	4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard	33,750	27,130	C	27,217	C	87	0	NO	7
South of L Street	4 Lanes Major Street	30,000	28,230	C	28,371	C	141	0	NO	
Street A					11,931					
H Street to Street C	2 Lanes Class III Collector	7,500	7,300	C	10,504	F /	938	9	DIRECT	4 Love Cless I
Street C to J Street	4 Lanes Class I Collector	22,000	12,630	A	16,468	AB	1,690	10	NO	Collector
J Street to Street B (a)	2 Lanes Class III Collector	7,500		. '	3,838	A	2,813	73	NO	
Street B										
Street A to Bay Boulevard (a)	2 Lanes Class III Collector	7,500		-	1,746	A	722	41	NO	
Street C		······································						a		
Marina Parkway to Street A	2 Lanes Class III Collector	7,500	2,090	A	2,065	A -	3	0	NO	
SOURCE: Kimley-Horn and Associates ADT = Average Daily Trips: LOS = Level					2,454					

SOURCE: Kimiey-Horn and Associates 2008. ADT = Average Daily Trips; LOS = Level of Service Bold values indicate roadway segments operating at LOS E or F. Bold and shaded values indicate project significant impact. \* Roads will be built to given classification with Phase I of the project as required to provide site frontage.

April 2010 Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan

5703-01 4.2-168

Traffic and Circulation

4.2.5

		Acceptable	Phase Basel		Phase IV B Plus Pro		Project	Project Trips		
Roadway Segment	Roadway Classification	Volume	ADT	LOS	ADT	LOS	ADT	(Percent)	IMPACT?	
E Street										
H Street to Gaylere RCC										
Driveway	2 Lanes Class III Collector	7,500	4,810	Α	5,809	B	1,008	17	NO	
Geylard RCC Driveway to F										
Street	2 Lanes Class II Collector	12,000	6,700	A	9,089	B	2,136	24	NO	
F Street to Bay Boulevard	2 Lanes Class II Collector	12,000	8,790	A	16,279	F	7,705	47	DIRECT	
Bay Boulevard to I-5 Ramps	4 Lanes Major Street	30,000	19,230	A	26,289	B	6,950	26	NO	
I-5 Ramps to Woodlawn Avenue	4 Lanes Gateway Street	43,200	29,440	В	33,608	C	4,168	12	NO	
Woodlawn Avenue to Broadway	4 Lanes Gateway Street	43,200	29,010	В	32,472	В	3,462	11	NO	
Broadway to 3rd Avenue	4 Lanes Urban Arterial	37,800	20,150	A	23,063	A	2,913	13	NO	
Lagoon St/ F Street										
E Street to Bay Boulevard (a)	2 Lanes Class III Collector	7,500	-		2,630	A	2,413	92	NO	
Bay Boulevard to Broadway	4 Lanes Downtown Promenade	33,750	6,580	A	8,325	A	1,744	21	NO	
Broadway to 4th Avenue	2 Lanes Downtown Promenade	14,400	11,790	C	12,275	C	484	4	NO	
4th Avenue to 3rd Avenue	4 Lanes Downtown Promenade	33,750	12,750	A	12,997	A	247	2	NO	
H Street	•				12,235					
West of Marina Parkway	3 Lanes Class II Collector	17,000	11,380	A	12,520	A -	1,140	9	NO	
Marina Parkway to Street A	4 Lanes Major Street	30,000	15,170	AN	11 15,961	Α -	791	5	NO	
Street A to I-5 Ramps	5 Lanes Major Street	39,200	33,120	B 344	2 34,588	C -	1,467	4	NO	
I-5 Ramps to Broadway	4 Lanes Gateway Street	43,200	48,420	F	49,203	F	783	2	DIRECT	
Broadway to 3rd Avenue	4 Lanes Urban Arterial	37,800	31,510	C	32,063	C	553	2	NO	
J Street					27,291					
Marina Parkway to Street A	4 Lanes Major Street	30,000	24,460	B	26,949	C -	2,488	9	NO	
Street A to Bay Boulevard	6 Lanes Major Street	40,000	36,340	C 44 (	39 38,567	8D	2,226 13	6 83	NO	Cunal
Bay Boulevard to I-5 Ramps	6 Lanes Major Street	40,000	37,650	C	38,913	C	1,262	3	NO	
I-5 Ramps to Broadway	4 Lanes Major Street	30,000	22,770	В	23,131	B	361	2	NO	
L Street						·	104100 IS-			
Bay Boulevard to Industrial Way	4 Lanes Gateway Street	43,200	20,040	A	20,402	A	362	2	NO	
Industrial Way to Broadway	4 Lanes Gateway Street	43,200	24,270	A	24,531	A	261	1	NO	
Marina Parkway					11.548					
H Street to Street C	3 Lanes Class II Collector	17,000	9,470	A	10,856	A (	1.386	13	NO	

# **TABLE 4.2-30**

# Phase IV Conditions Roadway Segment Level of Service Summary

April 2010 Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan

5703-01 4.2-183

4.2

4.2

#### **Traffic and Circulation**

#### TABLE 4.2-30 (Cont.)

		Acceptable	Phase		Phase IV B Plus Pro		Project	Project Trips	
Roadway Segment	Roadway Classification	Volume	ADT	LOS	ADT	LOS	ADT	(Percent)	IMPACT?
Street C to J Street	3 Lane Class II Collector	17,000	13,100	B	14,050	"B°C	949	7	NO
Bay Boulevard					15,126				
E Street to F Street	2 Lanes Class II Collector	12,000	11,470	C	12,676	D	1,206	10	DIRECT
F Street to H Street	2 Lanes Class III Collector	7,500	6,680	C	7,116	C	436	6	NO
H Street to J Street	2 Lanes Class III Collector	7,500	7,410	A	7,787	D	377	5	CUMULATIVE
J Street to L Street	2 Lanes Class II Collector	12,000	11,440	C	12,173	D	733	6	CUMULATIVE
L Street to I-5 Ramps <sup>1</sup>	2 Lanes Class II Collector	12,000	6,170	A	6,347	A	176	3	NO
South of I-5 Ramps	2 Lanes Class III Collector	7,500	5,910	В	6,087	B	176	3	NO
Broadway									
C Street to E Street	4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard	33,750	26,390	C	27,020	C	630	2	NO
E Street to H Street	4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard	33,750	26,990	C	27,585	C	594	2	NO
H Street to K Street	4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard	33,750	31,960	D	32,076	D	116	0	NO
K Street to L Street	4 Lanes Commercial Boulevard	33,750	27,220	C	27,266	C	45	0	NO
South of L Street	4 Lanes Major Street	30,000	28,370	C	28,456	C	85	0	NO
Street A					18,455				
H Street to Street C	4 Lanes Class I Collector	22,000	10,510	A	11,388	A *	878	8	NO
Street C to J Street	4 Lanes Class I Collector	22,000	16,470	A II	27612,741	B 🐐	1,271	7	NO
J Street to Street B	2 Lanes Class III Collector	7,500	3,840	A	4,091	A	250	6	NO
Street B									
Street A to Bay Boulevard	2 Lanes Class III Collector	7,500	1,750	A	1,876	A	125	7	NO
Street C									
Marina Parkway to Street A	2 Lanes Class III Collector	7,500	2,060	A	2,482	A -	422	17	NO
SOURCE: Kimley-Horn and Asso					2,691				

SOURCE: Kimley-Horn and Associates 2008. ADT = Average Daily Trips; LOS = Level of Service Bold values indicate roadway segments operating at LOS E or F. Bold and shaded values indicate project significant impact.

April 2010 Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan 5703-01 4.2-184

# 4.2.5 Mitigation Measures

Developers of any parcel located within the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan shall reimburse the Port, City, and/or other developers the pro-rata cost of the installation of public transportation improvements, as obligated and required by the Port and/or City based on the nexus established in the technical studies and this Draft EIR.

# a. Phase I Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures shall be required to be implemented by the developer to reduce impacts to a level less than significant:

- **4.2-1** Prior to the issuance of any certificates of occupancy for any development on H-3 in Phase I, the Port or Port tenant, as appropriate, shall:
  - Construct H Street west of Marina Parkway as a 2-lane Class III Collector
  - Construct E Street as a 2-lane Class III Collector along Parcel H-3. This would provide a connection to Lagoon Drive via Marina Parkway.
  - Construct a traffic signal at H Street and Gaylord-<u>RCC</u> Truck Driveway.

Prior to the issuance of building permits for any development on H-13 or H-14 in Phase I, the applicant shall:

- Rebuild <u>that portion of Marina Parkway fronting H-13 and H-14</u> between E <u>StreetSandpiper Way</u> and J Street as a 3-lane Class II Collector with excess ROW used for pedestrian facilities, or secure such construction to the satisfaction to the <u>City engineer. Frontage improvements for the remaining segments of Marina</u> <u>Parkway J Street and Sandpiper Way will be constructed in conjunction with the</u> <u>development of the adjacent parcels to these frontages in subsequent phases.</u>
- Construct Street A north of J Street would be constructed as a 2-lane Class III Collector-, or secure such construction to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

This mitigation would reduce **Significant Impact 4.2-1** to below a level of significance.

**4.2-2** Prior to the issuance of any certificates of occupancy for any development on H-3 in Phase I, the Port or Port tenant, as appropriate, shall construct H Street from I-5 to Marina Parkway as a four-lane Major Street. This mitigation is provided in lieu of widening of F Street due to environmental constraints associated with the widening of F Street in the vicinity of the F&G Street Marsh. At the completion of the H Street Extension, the Port or Port tenant, as appropriate, shall also restrict access along the segment of Lagoon Drive/F Street (between Parcel H-3 and the BF Goodrich access on F Street) to emergency vehicle access only. This mitigation would reduce **Significant Impacts 4.2-2, 4.2-4, 4.2-6, 4.2-7, and 4.2-11** to below a level of significance.

**4.2-3** Prior to the issuance of any certificates of occupancy for any development on H-3 in Phase I, the Port or Port tenant, as appropriate, shall widen H Street west of Marina Parkway from a two-lane Class III Collector to a three-lane Class II Collector. This mitigation would reduce **Significant Impact 4.2-3** to below a level of significance.

- 4.2-4 Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development on H-3 and building permits for any development on H-13 or H-14 in Phase I, the Port, Port tenant, or applicant, as appropriate, shall widen Bay Boulevard between E Street and F Street from a two-lane Class III Collector to a two-lane Class II Collector, or secure such widening to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. The additional roadway capacity would facilitate the flow of project traffic. This mitigation would reduce Significant Impact 4.2-5 to below a level of significance.
- 4.2-5 Prior to the issuance of building permits for any development on H-13 or H-14 in Phase I, the applicant shall construct a traffic signal at the intersection of J Street and Bay Boulevard, or secure such construction to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. The traffic signal shall be constructed and operate to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. This mitigation would reduce Significant **Impacts 4.2-8** and **4.2-14** to below a level of significance.
- 4.2-6 Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development on H-3 or building permits for any development on H-13 or H-14 in Phase I, the Port, Port tenant, or applicant, as appropriate, shall construct a traffic signal at the intersection of L Street and Bay Boulevard, or secure such construction to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. The traffic signal shall be constructed and operate to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. This mitigation would reduce Significant Impacts 4.2-9 and 4.2-15 to below a level of significance.
- 4.2-7 Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for development on H-3 or building permits for any development on H-13 or H-14 in Phase I, the Port, Port tenant, or applicant, as appropriate, shall construct a traffic signal at the intersection of I-5 southbound ramps and Bay Boulevard, or secure such construction to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. The traffic signal shall be constructed and operate to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. This mitigation would reduce Significant Impacts 4.2-10 and 4.2-16 to below a level of significance.

4.2-8 The following mitigation measure would reduce, but not eliminate project impacts on Interstate 5, as identified in Significant Impacts 4.2-12, 4.2-17, 4.2-18, 4.2-29, 4.2-30, 4.2-35 through 4.2-37, and 4.2-46 through 4.2-50.

The Port and the City shall participate in a multi-jurisdictional effort conducted by Caltrans and SANDAG to assist in developing a detailed I-5 corridor level study that will identify transportation improvements along with funding, including federal, state, regional, and local funding sources and phasing that would reduce congestion management with Caltrans standards on the I-5 south corridor from the SR-54 interchange to the Otay River (the "I-5 South Corridor") (hereinafter, the "Plan"). Local funding sources identified in the Plan shall include fair share contributions related to private and/or public development based on the nexus established in this Draft EIR as well as other mechanisms. The Plan required by this mitigation shall include the following:

- a) The responsible entities (the Entities) included in this effort will include, but may not be limited to, the City, other cities along I-5, the Port, SANDAG, and Caltrans. Other entities will be included upon the concurrence of the foregoing Entities.
- b) The Plan will identify physical and operational improvements to I-5 adjacent to the project area, relevant arterial roads and transit facilities (the Improvements), that are focused on regional impacts and specific transportation impacts from the project, and will also identify the fair share responsibilities of each Entity for the construction and financing for each Improvement. The Plan will include an implementation element that includes each Entity's responsibilities and commitment to mitigate the impacts created by all phases of the Proposed Project.
- c) The Plan will set forth a timeline and other agreed upon relevant criteria for implementation of each Improvement.
- d) The Plan will identify the total estimated design and construction cost for each Improvement and the responsibility of each Entity for both implementation and funding of such costs.
- e) The Plan will include the parameters for any agreed upon fair-share funding to be implemented, that would require private and/or public developers to contribute to the costs, in a manner that will comply with applicable law.
- f) In developing the Plan, the Entities shall also consider ways in which the Improvements can be coordinated with existing local and regional transportation and facilities financing plans and programs, in order to avoid duplication of effort and expenditure; however, the existence of such other plans and programs shall

not relieve the Entities of their collective obligation to develop and implement the Plan as set forth in this mitigation measure. Nothing in the Plan shall be construed as relieving any Entity (or any other entity) from its independent responsibility (if any) for the implementation of any transportation improvement.

- g) The Port shall seek adoption of the Plan before the Port Board of Commissioners and the City shall seek adoption of the Plan before the City Council upon the completion of the multi-jurisdictional effort to develop the Plan. The Port and the City shall report, to their respective governing bodies regarding the progress made to develop the Plan within 6 months of the first meeting of the entities. Thereafter, the Port and the City shall report at least annually regarding the progress of the Plan, for a period of not less than 5 years, which may be extended at the request of the City Council and/or Board of Commissioners.
- h) The Plan shall also expressly include each Entity's pledge that it will cooperate with each other in implementing the Plan.
- Prior to issuance of certificates of occupancy or building permits for any development of individual projects within the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan, the Port and the City shall require project applicants to make their fair share contribution toward mitigation of cumulative freeway impacts within the City's portion of the I-5 South Corridor by participating in the City's Western Traffic Development Impact Fee or equivalent funding program.

The failure or refusal of any Entity other than the Port or the City to cooperate in the implementation of this mitigation measure shall not constitute failure of the Port or the City to implement this mitigation measure; however, the Port and the City shall each use its best efforts to obtain the cooperation of all responsible Entities to fully participate, in order to achieve the goals of the mitigation measure.

- **4.2-9** Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development on H-3 in Phase I, the Port or Port tenant, as appropriate, shall construct a westbound through lane along H Street/Gaylord-RCC Driveway, which would result in widening H Street west of Marina Parkway to a three-lane Class II Collector. This mitigation would reduce Significant Impact 4.2-13 to below a level of significance.
- 4.2-10 The following mitigation measure would reduce, but not eliminate impacts at intersections of E Street and H Street associated with trolley delays, as identified in Significant Impact 4.2-19. Prior to issuance of certificates of occupancy for parcel H-3 or building permits for any development within the City, the Port and the City shall require project applicants to make their fair share contribution toward mitigation of intersection impacts at H Street and E Street within the City's jurisdiction by

participating in the City's Western Traffic Development Impact Fee or equivalent funding program.

The failure or refusal of any Entity other than the Port or the City to cooperate in the implementation of this mitigation measure shall not constitute failure of the Port or the City to implement this mitigation measure; however, the Port and the City shall each use its best efforts to obtain the cooperation of all responsible Entities to fully participate, in order to achieve the goals of mitigation measure.

However, because implementation of the physical improvements needed to reduce the significant impacts to the affected intersections will require funding from other sources in addition to the WTDIF, such as local, state and federal funds, and such funding is not certain or under the control of the Port or the City, the Port and the City cannot assure the necessary improvements will be constructed as needed or that they will be constructed within any known time schedule. Accordingly, the Proposed Project's impacts to the E Street and H Street intersections affected by an at-grade trolley crossing are considered significant and unmitigated.

# b. Phase II Mitigation Measures

- 4.2-11 Prior to the issuance of any certificates of occupancy for any development on H-23 in Phase I, the Port or Port tenant, as appropriate, shall construct Street A between H Street to Street C as a two-lane Class III Collector, and shall construct Street C between Marina Parkway and Street A as a two-lane Class II Collector. -> Class III Collector. Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce Significant Impact 4.2-20 to below a level of significance.
- 4.2-12 Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development in Phase II, the Port, Port tenant, or applicant, as appropriate, shall widen H Street between Street A and I-5 Ramps to a five-lane Major Street, or secure such construction to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. The additional roadway capacity would facilitate the flow of project traffic. This mitigation would reduce **Significant Impact 4.2-21** to below a level of significance.
- 4.2-13 Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development in Phase II, the Port, Port tenant, or applicant, as appropriate, shall widen J Street between Street A to -7 4 loc of I-5 Ramps to a six-lane Major Street, or secure such construction to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. The additional roadway capacity would facilitate the flow of project traffic. This mitigation would reduce Significant Impact 4.2-22 to below a level of significance.

- 4.2-14 Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development in Phase II, the Port, Port tenant, or applicant, as appropriate, shall widen Street A between Street C and J Street to a four-lane Class I Collector, or secure such construction to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. The additional roadway capacity would facilitate the flow of project traffic. This mitigation would reduce **Significant Impact 4.2-23** to below a level of significance.
- 4.2-15 Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development in Phase II, the Port, Port tenant, or applicant, as appropriate, shall construct a traffic signal and add an exclusive left-turn lane at each approach at the intersection of H Street and Gaylord-RCC Driveway, or secure such construction to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. The traffic signal and left-turn lanes shall be built to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. This mitigation would reduce Significant Impact 4.2-24 to below a level of significance.
- **4.2-16** Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development in Phase II, the Port, Port tenant, or applicant, as appropriate, shall construct a westbound and eastbound through lane along J Street at the intersection of J Street and Bay Boulevard, or secure such construction to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. The lanes shall be constructed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. This mitigation would reduce **Significant Impact 4.2-25** to below a level of significance.
- 4.2-17 Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development in Phase II, the Port, Port tenant, or applicant, as appropriate, shall construct a traffic signal at the intersection of H Street and Street A, or secure such construction to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. The traffic signal shall be constructed and operate to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. This mitigation would reduce Significant Impact 4.2-26 to below a level of significance.
- 4.2-18 Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development in Phase II of the development, the developer shall construct a traffic signal at the intersection of J Street and Marina Parkway. The traffic signal shall be constructed and operate to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. This mitigation would reduce Significant Impact 4.2-27 to below a level of significance.
- **4.2-19** Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development in Phase II, the Port, Port tenant, or applicant, as appropriate, shall construct a traffic signal at the intersection of J Street and Street A and add an exclusive westbound right-turn lane along J Street and an exclusive southbound right-turn lane along Street A, or secure such construction to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. The traffic signal and turning lanes shall operate and be constructed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

This mitigation would reduce **Significant Impact 4.2-28** to below a level of significance.

# d. Phase III Mitigation Measures

- **4.2-20** Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development in Phase III, the Port, Port tenants, or applicant, as appropriate shall construct the segment of Street A that would continue south from J Street, connecting to the proposed Street B in the Otay District, as a two-lane Class III Collector. In addition, prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development in Phase III, the Port, Port tenants, as appropriate shall construct the segment of Street B that would connect to the proposed Street A, bridge over the Telegraph Canyon Creek Channel, and continue south to Bay Boulevard, as a 2-lane Class III Collector. This mitigation would reduce **Significant Impact 4.2-31** to below a level of significance.
- 4.2-21 Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development in Phase III, the Port, Port tenants, or applicant, as appropriate, shall widen Street A between H -> 2 lac Class Street and Street C to a four-lane Class I Collector, or secure such construction to the III Collector satisfaction of the City Engineer. The additional roadway capacity would facilitate the flow of project traffic. This mitigation would reduce **Significant Impact 4.2-32** to below a level of significance.
- **4.2-22** Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development in Phase III, the Port, Port tenants, or applicant, as appropriate, shall construct an exclusive eastbound right-turn lane along J Street at the intersection of J Street and Bay Boulevard, or secure such construction to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. The turning lane shall be built to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. This mitigation would reduce **Significant Impact 4.2-33** to below a level of significance.
- **4.2-23** Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development in Phase III, the Port, Port tenants, or applicant, as appropriate, shall construct an exclusive westbound right-turn lane along J Street at the intersection of J Street and I-5 NB Ramps, or secure such construction to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. The turning lane shall be built to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. This mitigation would reduce **Significant Impact 4.2-34** to below a level of significance.
- 4.2-24 Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development in Phase III, the Port, Port tenants, or applicant, as appropriate, shall construct E Street from the Gaylord-RCC Driveway to Bay Boulevard as a two-lane Class III Collector. This mitigation would reduce Significant Impact 4.2-38 to below a level of significance.

# e. Phase IV Mitigation Measures

- 4.2-25 Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development in Phase IV, the Port, Port tenant, or applicant, as appropriate, shall construct a new F Street segment between the proposed terminus of the existing F Street and the proposed E Street extension, ending at the SP-3 Chula Vista Nature Center parking lot, as a two-lane Class III collector street, which shall also contain a Class II bike lane on both sides of the street. This mitigation would reduce Significant Impact 4.2-39 to below a level of significance
- 4.2-26 Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development in Phase IV, the Port, Port tenant, or applicant, as appropriate, shall widen E Street between F Street and Bay Boulevard to a four-lane Class I Collector, or secure such construction to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. The additional roadway capacity would facilitate the flow of project traffic. Also, the widening of this segment of E Street would facilitate the flow of project traffic on Bay Boulevard between E Street to F Street. This mitigation would reduce Significant Impacts 4.2-40 and 4.2-41 to below a level of significance.
- 4.2-27 Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development in Phase IV, the Port, Port tenant, or applicant, as appropriate, shall widen H Street between I-5 Ramps and Broadway to a 6-lane Gateway Street. The additional roadway capacity would facilitate the flow of project traffic. This mitigation would reduce Significant Impact 4.2-42 to below a level of significance. The off-site traffic improvements described in this mitigation measure for direct traffic impacts would create secondary traffic impacts. Improvements associated with these secondary impacts would be required as a result of cumulative and growth-related traffic overall, of which the Proposed Project would be a component. The Western Chula Vista TDIF identifies these improvements in a cumulative context and attributes fair share contributions according to the impact. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be responsible for a fair share contribution and would not be solely responsible for implementation of necessary secondary impact improvements.
- **4.2-28** Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development in Phase IV, the Port, Port tenant, or applicant, as appropriate, shall construct an eastbound through lane and an exclusive eastbound right-turn lane along E Street at the intersection of E Street and Bay Boulevard, or secure such construction to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. The lanes shall be constructed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. This mitigation would reduce **Significant Impact 4.2-43** to below a level of significance.

- **4.2-29** Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development in Phase IV, the Port, Port tenant, or applicant, as appropriate, shall construct an exclusive southbound right-turn lane along Bay Boulevard at the intersection of J Street and Bay Boulevard, or secure such construction to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. The lane shall be constructed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. This mitigation would reduce **Significant Impact 4.2-44** to below a level of significance.
- **4.2-30** Prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy for any development in Phase IV, the Port, Port tenant, or applicant, as appropriate, shall construct a dual southbound left-turn lane along Street A, or secure such construction to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. The lane shall be constructed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. This mitigation would reduce **Significant Impact 4.2-45** to below a level of significance.

# 4.2.6 Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.2-8 would not reduce **Significant Impacts 4.2-12**, **4.2-17**, **4.2-18**, **4.2-29**, **4.2-30**, **4.2-35** through **4.2-37**, and **4.2-46** through **4.2-49**, concerning project related impacts along I-5, to below a level of significance because implementation of the physical improvements needed to reduce significant impacts to the affected freeway segments is within the jurisdiction and control of Caltrans and not the Port or the City. The Port and the City cannot assure the necessary improvements will be constructed as needed. Accordingly, the Proposed Project's impacts to freeway segments are considered significant and unmitigated.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.2-10 would not reduce **Significant Impact 4.2-19**, concerning project related impacts on H Street and E Street intersections due to trolley delay, to below a level of significance, because implementation of the physical improvements needed to reduce significant impacts are within the jurisdiction and control of other entities and not the Port or City. The Port and the City cannot assure the necessary improvements will be constructed as needed. Accordingly, the Proposed Project's impacts to E Street and H Street intersections affected by the trolley crossings are considered significant and unmitigated

The implementation of the Mitigation Measures 4.2-1 though 4.2-7, 4,2-9, and 4.2-11 through 30 would reduce the remaining direct project related impacts to below a level of significance.

# Attachment 4

**Capacity Analysis Printouts** 



K:\TPTO\095451000\\Traffic\Figures\Option 2\Geometry\P1 mit geo (13-24).al

And a second sec	Bay	front Master P	Cymerce and a second				
2 [3] [3] [3]	13	s 35./45 ⇔ 427./546 ⊕ 59./98 H St	e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e	15 58 / 28 58 / 28 57 / 58 57 / 58	- Q arotogo	98 15 MB On Ramp	s 392 / 591 ∞ 708 / 801 H St
279 / 389 87 / 141 ъ		160 / 181 <i>e</i> 58 / 25 ~	347 1434 0	Ø 8 357 / 538 ↔ 73 / 192 ↔ 15	1.5 8B On Ramp	192 / 313 2 647 / 760 유 등 다 망망 또	133 / 142 & 514 / 573 &
2 193 / 165 41 / 30 5 133 / 108	9	⊚ 102/98 ⇔ 809/1034 ⊉ 104/63 ₩ St		19 58 12 / 142 08 / 678 54 / 343 H 51 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 1	€	<ul> <li>93 / 221</li> <li>949 / 590</li> <li>102 / 192</li> <li>4th Ava</li> </ul>	© 115 / 168 ⇔ 609 / 784 ⊉ 89 / 137 H St
131 / 92 Ø 1082 / 1005 ⇒ 78 / 60 S		52 / 107 & 14 / 29 ÷ 49 / 40 %	ERE I EDE -	211 / 61 / 589 / 749 + 589 / 749 / 749 + 589 / 749 + 589 / 749 / 749 + 589 / 749 / 749 + 589 / 749 + 589 / 749 / 749 + 589 / 749 / 749 + 589 / 749 / 749 + 589 / 749 / 749 + 589 / 749 / 749 + 589 / 749 / 7	38 / 201 ø 41 / 104 ÷ 46 / 242 §	128 / 162 ∅ 552 / 780 ⇔ 102 / 211 §	184 / 157 2 447 / 448 c 80 / 91 o
6 58 / 162 6 313 / 537 6 102 / 184	2465	o, 136 /147 ⇔ 643 / 644 ⊮ 230 / 247 H St	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	23 23 24 27 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28 28	분 문 양 문 양 순 2 149 / 281 J St	24 du un	s 367 / 312 ⇔ 423 / 484 J 8t
93 / 147 ø 411 / 726 ⇔ 168 / 210 ⊚	Ř.	135 / 197 o 492 / 487 o 83 / 189 o	107:1330	Ø 362 / 473 ↔ 144 / 251 ↔ %	15 SB On Ramp	222 / 248 후 382 / 691 유 등 명 및 약 관	331/239 a 211/0 - 518/291 o



5-42



FIGURE 5-17.1 Proposed Project - Phase I Conditions Redistributed Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes(cont.)

NOT TO SCALE

1005481000/7emmet/Canal/Option 2002-TA Films singlOP P1 Mit Figure 13-84



10:095451000(Traffic/Excel/Option 2)(02 RS.xism]ADT Fig NC/Proposed Project - Phase II Trip Distribution



KITPTO/095451000/ITraffic/Figures/Option 2\Geometry/P2WP geo (13-24).al

13	31	Dwy			14	32	66 / 402 32 / 183	PA		610 610 714 714 714		16 dury	
	a 22/31	Gaylord Dwy	000	36 / 46 428 / 547 179 / 254 H St		s 19/32	¢ 68/	Bay Blvd	© 94/41 ⇔ 846/1123 921/1245 H St	5 410/610 e 3/0 e 464/714 l6 88 0rt- Ramp	ei 547/656 ∂ 520/596 HSt	16 dury uo giv s-i	s 392 / 591 e 932 / 1003 H.St
280 / 390 130 / 164	¢	Marina Pkwy	170/229 0	95 / 201 s	62 555 45	2 / 914 5 / 93	0		25 /51 a 128 /80 a 19 /63 a	495/963 ନ ତିର୍ଣ୍ଣ 93/237 ବ୍ଲାଞ୍ଚେମ ବ୍ୟୁ		254 / 461 ⊗ 726 / 1039 ↔ 55 a װ װ װ װ װ װ װ	162 / 194 ø 514 / 573 ø
×	e 41/30 e 133/108	Woodiawn Ave	\$ \$ \$	102 / 96 1033 / 1236 104 / 63 H St	18	a 120 / 216	c 441/894 c 89/228	Broadway	s: 112/142 c= 531/796 e 154/343 H St	<ul> <li>140/153</li> <li>26/148</li> <li>153/167</li> <li>153/167</li> </ul>	s 207 / 77 ⇔ 693 / 890 ∞ 55 / 244 H St	0 84/1222 0 94/1222 0 102/192 0 102/192	© 115 / 168 ⇔ 678 / 843 ø 89 / 137 H St
131 / 92 1161 / 1285 78 / 60	ల స ఉ క		52 / 107 0 14 / 29 🖒	24. 1994.	611	2 / 273 / 762 5 / 301		Broadway	159 / 326 & 1022 / 747 ↔ 105 / 221 &	223./107 0 613/835 ⇔ 48/187 ъ	44 / 211 a 41 / 104 a 46 / 242 a	129 / 163	184 / 157 <i>o</i> 447 / 448 <del>o</del> 80 / 91 o
51 / 181 1 / 181 1 / 181	e 102 / 184	3rd Ave	\$	136 / 147 679 / 675 230 / 247 H St	22		e 32/202 e 48/210	Bay Blvd	⊗ 292 / 120 ⇔ 730 / 825 ⊉ 363 / 183 JSt	\$ 506 / 411 \$ 232 / 417 \$ \$88 Off- Ramp	⇔ 878/681 ຂ 149/261 J≌t	24 during uo si vo	v, 367/312 ⇔ 558/590 J≋t
101 / 175 425 / 770 172 / 225	\$ \$ \$		148 / 207 a	83 / 189 9	557	/ 17 / 954 / 371			306 / 385 % 66 / 65 % 33 / 189 %	477 / 931 ↔ 월 183 / 418 ∿ 5 88 21		295 / 542 Ø 425 / 856 Ø 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 9 8 8 8 9 8 8 8 9 8 9 9 9 9 9	474/336 o 211/0 o 518/291 o





Kimley-Hom and Associates, Inc.

5-80

FIGURE 5-30.1 Proposed Project - Phase II Plus Project Conditions Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes(cont.)

1000XTmRolEnotOpton 2(02-YA Plin.shu)3P P2 Pigure 13-24



K1095451000/Traffic/ExceNOption 21/02 R8.stem]ADT Fig ND/Proposed Project - Phase III Trip Distribution



K:\TPTO\095451000\Traffic\Figures\Option 2\Geometry\P3WP mit geo (13-24).ai

[3]	131	Dwy			14	20 / 63 78 / 423	32 / 183 ay Blvd		duran 3 / 754 12 / 881 3 / 754 512 / 881 12 / 88		16 dura	0
	0 22/31	Gaylord Dwy	9 9 9	36 / 46 414 / 528 180 / 255 H St			e 32 / 18 Bay Blvd	s 105 / 52 ⇔ 889 / 1141 ¶UZ / 1213 H St	a 411/661 c 3/0 c 489/754 15 sts oft- Ramp	⇔ 578/683 ⊭. 550/631 ⊮ St	16 de la constanta de la const	rs 412 /626 ⇔ 1022 /1019 HSt
272 / 378 122 / 112		Marine, Plowy	101 / 237 0	96 / 202 S	653 584 45	1957 193	1 <b>8</b> \$	25 / 51 0 137 / 103 4 18 / 63 0	521 / 1073 ↔ 5 94 / 258 ☆ 8 8 5 92 258		266 / 472 # 781 / 1073 # 50 # 80 #	163 / 200 8 544 / 603 6
	e 55/50 e 163/133	Woodlawn Ave	5 5 5 1	112 / 143 1093 / 1252 154 / 103 H St	18	5 121 /217 5 481 /874	e 94 / 243 Broadwisy	s, 112 / 147 e, 549 / 827 g/ 159 / 358 H St	61 63 147 / 169 641 Ave 641 Ave	s 217 / 82 ⇔ 705 / 902 ⊉ 70 / 284 H St	8 99/232 9 7232 9 7232 9 1/197 4th Ave	s, 120 / 188 ⇔ 735 / 865 ⊮ 99 / 152 H St
166 / 92 1176 / 131 103 / 85	0 9 ⇔ 0		62/177 a 24/49 e		279 664 121		e a o Broadway	152/321 a 1112/812 a 115/241 a	229 / 116 Ø 622 / 850 ⇔ 74 / 228 ₪	65 / 267 0 46 / 134 5 71 / 302 5	134 / 168	189 / 162 <i>o</i> 462 / 463 eo 85 / 96 o
	e 323/557 e 107/189	3rd Ave	8 Q Q	141 / 152 722 / 663 240 / 257 Н St	22	5 15/38 5 32/202	e 48 / 210 Bay Bivd	o, 305 / 120 ⇔ 835 / 979 ⊘ 398 / 203 J St	561 / 491 5 561 / 491 6 242 / 432 15 58 Off- Ramp	ся 990./755 2/154/271 J St	24 durra uo gini s-i	s, 382/322 ⇔ 625/623 JSt
105 / 180 446 / 805 175 / 228	\$ \$ 2		151 / 210 a 512 / 507 a		36 626 268	1131	5 13 13	337 / 433 e 84 / 66 e 33 / 194 s	530 / 1062 ⇔ 2 212 / 467 ⊗ 6 89		333 / 635	530 / 380 0 211 / 0 0 538 / 301 0







KY

89461000/TrafficiEncel/Option 2402-TA Filmuster/BP PR Figure 13-24

5–116

FIGURE 5-43.1 Proposed Project - Phase III Plus Project Conditions Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes(cont.)



K:1095451000(Traffic)Excel/Option 2(O2 R5.xkm)ADT Fig NF/Proposed Project - Phase IV Trip Distribution



K:\TPTO\095451000\Traffic\Figures\Option 2\Geometry\P4WP geo (13-24).ai

13	100	S				14	a	2.9	-		15		07					16			de	1	
	e 23/32	Gaylord Dwy	000	37 / 318 / 233 / H St	405		5 24/140	e 113/450 e 28/180	Bay Blvd	to 124 / 80 to 764 / 847 €19 / 15 H St	2		c 236 / 498c 3 / 0	≤ 554 / 858	1-5 SB Off- Ramp	¢ 2	699 / 746 628 / 722 H St				l-5 NB On Ramp	\$ Q	464 / 717 1283 / 104 H St
203 / 286 85 / 91	ವೆ ಇ	Marina Pkny	68 / 165 .0	97 / 239 😒			1867 194	\$3 ¢ 0	5K	26/52 /5 190/151 19/63 9		425 / 82 /		2 G	L5 SB On Ramp				155 / 33 899 / 11	9 38 ;	LS.NB Off Ramp	160 / 184 0	622 / 681 %
s 445 / 309	241/198 241/198	Woodlawn Ave	8 0 0	138 / 2 1277 / 1 284 / 2 H St	1281	18	a 134/224		Broadway	s, 112 / 160 ⇔ 600 / 882 ¢ 172 / 397 H st	19		<ul> <li>√ 153 / 171</li> <li>⇔ 62 / 238</li> </ul>		5th Ave	2 4 2	243 / 95 736 / 914 109 / 368 H st		s 104 / 248	20	1.0.5	8 D C	133 / 240 883 -/ 903 125 / 191 H St
257 / 92 1191 / 1385 168 / 150	000		88 / 359 a			776	/ 399 / 965 / 308	5 A 2	Broadway	163 / 334 <i>o</i> 1346 / 981 <i>o</i> 141 / 293 o		230 / 629 / 140 /	877	0 0 0		123 / 412 0	59/212 🗢 136/458 🖕		142 / 17 718 / 90 126 / 25	7 .	¢		\$ 205/109 \$ 601/86
- 91 / 187	2 120 / 202	3rd Ave	\$ \$	154 / 1 823 / 6 266 / 2 H St	588	22	18/61		Bay Bivd	<ul> <li>a 339 / 121</li> <li>⇔ 853 / 1018</li> <li>∞ 485 / 252</li> <li>J St</li> </ul>	23	1	s 526 / 483	e 268/471	1.5 SB Off- Ramp	£ &	1166 / 799 167 / 297 J St	24	I		I-S NB On Ramp	\$	421 / 348 766 / 641 J St
106 / 185 488 / 879 179 / 243	3 A 2		167 / 216 0 564 / 559 0				/ 87 / 1149 / 508	5 0 A		391 / 463 a 80 / 78 ⇔ 29 / 204 ⇔		505 / 247 /		එ දා	L5 88 On Ramp				303 / 60 518 / 93	5 8		0	590/327 %



5-171



Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. FIGURE 5-63.1 Proposed Project - Phase IV Plus Project Conditions Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes(cont.)

(Co56451000)TealleQuestOption 2000-TA Files.sterJOP P4 Figure 13-24

# CVBMP - Current Land Use Plan 3: H Street & Bay Boulevard

	1	->	>	1	-	A.	-	1	p	1	+	1
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		***	7		♠ኈ		ň	ĵ.		ň	(î)	
Volume (vph)	0	340	36	0	472	88	21	142	67	32	65	10
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Total Lost time (s)		4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Lane Util. Factor		0.91	1.00		0.95		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Frt		1.00	0.85		0.98		1.00	0.95		1.00	0.98	
Flt Protected		1.00	1.00		1.00		0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	
Satd. Flow (prot)		5085	1583		3456		1770	1773		1770	1825	
Flt Permitted		1.00	1.00		1.00		0.70	1.00		0.62	1.00	
Satd. Flow (perm)		5085	1583		3456		1311	1773		1149	1825	
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Adj. Flow (vph)	0	370	39	0	513	96	23	154	73	35	71	11
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	0	23	0	38	0	0	43	0	0	7	0
Lane Group Flow (vph)	0	370	16	0	571	0	23	184	0	35	75	0
Turn Type			Perm				Perm			Perm		
Protected Phases		4			8			2			6	
Permitted Phases			4				2			6		
Actuated Green, G (s)		16.0	16.0		16.0		16.0	16.0		16.0	16.0	
Effective Green, g (s)		16.0	16.0		16.0		16.0	16.0		16.0	16.0	
Actuated g/C Ratio		0.40	0.40		0.40		0.40	0.40		0.40	0.40	
Clearance Time (s)		4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Lane Grp Cap (vph)		2034	633		1382		524	709		460	730	
v/s Ratio Prot		0.07			c0.17			c0.10			0.04	
v/s Ratio Perm			0.01				0.02			0.03		
v/c Ratio		0.18	0.02		0.41		0.04	0.26		0.08	0.10	
Uniform Delay, d1		7.8	7.3		8.6		7.3	8.0		7.4	7.5	
Progression Factor		1.00	1.00		1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Incremental Delay, d2		0.2	0.1		0.9		0.2	0.9		0.3	0.3	
Delay (s)		8.0	7.3		9.5		7.5	8.9		7.7	7.8	
Level of Service		A	A		А		A	А		А	A	
Approach Delay (s)		7.9			9.5			8.8			7.8	
Approach LOS		A			A			А			A	
Intersection Summary	10	all all	See. 1	Sec. 4	Sec. 1				14.2	1.15	1-152	
HCM Average Control Delay			8.8	HC	CM Level	of Service	Э		A			
HCM Volume to Capacity ratio			0.34									
Actuated Cycle Length (s)			40.0		im of lost				8.0			
Intersection Capacity Utilization			40.7%	IC	U Level o	f Service			A			
Analysis Period (min)			15									
c Critical Lane Group												

# CVBMP - Current Land Use Plan 3: H Street & Bay Boulevard

		>	-	*	1	1	Į					
Lane Group	EBT	EBR	WBT	NBL	NBT	SBL	SBT					
Lane Group Flow (vph)	370	39	609	23	227	35	82					
v/c Ratio	0.18	0.06	0.43	0.04	0.30	0.08	0.11					
Control Delay	8.1	3.6	8.9	7.7	7.0	8.0	7.3					
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0					
Total Delay	8.1	3.6	8.9	7.7	7.0	8.0	7.3					
Queue Length 50th (ft)	18	0	42	3	21	5	9					
Queue Length 95th (ft)	31	11	72	12	54	16	27					
Internal Link Dist (ft)	420		420		420		420					
Turn Bay Length (ft)		165										
Base Capacity (vph)	2034	657	1420	524	752	460	737					
Starvation Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
Spillback Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
Storage Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
Reduced v/c Ratio	0.18	0.06	0.43	0.04	0.30	0.08	0.11					
Intersection Summary	-	10.3										
	1	->	>	1	-	A	-	1	p	1	Ļ	1
-----------------------------------	------	----------	-------	------	------------	------------	------	------	------	------	-------	------
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		<u> </u>	7		个孙		ň	ĵ>		ň	e î	
Volume (vph)	0	420	71	0	624	28	41	76	73	183	408	17
	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Total Lost time (s)		4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Lane Util. Factor		0.91	1.00		0.95		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Frt		1.00	0.85		0.99		1.00	0.93		1.00	0.99	
Flt Protected		1.00	1.00		1.00		0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	
Satd. Flow (prot)		5085	1583		3517		1770	1726		1770	1852	
Flt Permitted		1.00	1.00		1.00		0.37	1.00		0.65	1.00	
Satd. Flow (perm)		5085	1583		3517		680	1726		1219	1852	
	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Adj. Flow (vph)	0	457	77	0	678	30	45	83	79	199	443	18
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	0	46	0	8	0	0	47	0	0	4	0
Lane Group Flow (vph)	0	457	31	0	700	0	45	115	0	199	457	0
Turn Type			Perm				Perm			Perm		
Protected Phases		4			8			2			6	
Permitted Phases			4				2			6		
Actuated Green, G (s)		16.0	16.0		16.0		16.0	16.0		16.0	16.0	
Effective Green, g (s)		16.0	16.0		16.0		16.0	16.0		16.0	16.0	
Actuated g/C Ratio		0.40	0.40		0.40		0.40	0.40		0.40	0.40	
Clearance Time (s)		4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Lane Grp Cap (vph)		2034	633		1407		272	690		488	741	
v/s Ratio Prot		0.09			c0.20			0.07			c0.25	
v/s Ratio Perm			0.02				0.07			0.16		
v/c Ratio		0.22	0.05		0.50		0.17	0.17		0.41	0.62	
Uniform Delay, d1		7.9	7.3		9.0		7.7	7.7		8.6	9.6	
Progression Factor		1.00	1.00		1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Incremental Delay, d2		0.3	0.1		1.3		1.3	0.5		2.5	3.8	
Delay (s)		8.2	7.5		10.2		9.0	8.2		11.1	13.4	
Level of Service		A	A		В		A	A		В	В	
Approach Delay (s)		8.1			10.2			8.4			12.7	
Approach LOS		A			В			A			В	
Intersection Summary												
HCM Average Control Delay			10.3	HC	CM Level	of Service	Э		В			
HCM Volume to Capacity ratio			0.56									
Actuated Cycle Length (s)			40.0	Su	im of lost	time (s)			8.0			
Intersection Capacity Utilization			54.0%	IC	U Level o	f Service			A			
Analysis Period (min)			15									
c Critical Lane Group												

	->	>	-	*	Ť	1	Ļ	
Lane Group	EBT	EBR	WBT	NBL	NBT	SBL	SBT	
Lane Group Flow (vph)	457	77	708	45	162	199	461	1
v/c Ratio	0.22	0.11	0.50	0.17	0.22	0.41	0.62	
Control Delay	8.3	3.1	10.4	9.7	5.5	11.8	13.9	
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Total Delay	8.3	3.1	10.4	9.7	5.5	11.8	13.9	
Queue Length 50th (ft)	23	0	56	6	11	30	75	
Queue Length 95th (ft)	38	16	91	21	36	68	144	
Internal Link Dist (ft)	420		420		420		420	
Turn Bay Length (ft)		165						
Base Capacity (vph)	2034	679	1415	272	738	487	744	
Starvation Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Spillback Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Storage Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Reduced v/c Ratio	0.22	0.11	0.50	0.17	0.22	0.41	0.62	
Intersection Summary				3.6.6	1000	de seis		

	٠	-	>	1	-	A.	4	1	p	1	↓	1
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		***	7		♠₽		ሻ	Þ		ሻ	P	
Volume (vph)	0	620	45	0	921	94	25	128	19	32	66	19
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Total Lost time (s)		4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Lane Util. Factor		0.91	1.00		0.95		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Frt		1.00	0.85		0.99		1.00	0.98		1.00	0.97	
Flt Protected		1.00	1.00		1.00		0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	
Satd. Flow (prot)		5085	1583		3490		1770	1826		1770	1800	
Flt Permitted		1.00	1.00		1.00		0.70	1.00		0.66	1.00	
Satd. Flow (perm)		5085	1583		3490		1298	1826		1221	1800	
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Adj. Flow (vph)	0	674	49	0	1001	102	27	139	21	35	72	21
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	0	29	0	19	0	0	13	0	0	13	0
Lane Group Flow (vph)	0	674	20	0	1084	0	27	147	0	35	80	0
Turn Type			Perm		144 a 1745 - 16	200	Perm			Perm		
Protected Phases		4	10.000		8		1.000000	2			6	
Permitted Phases		50	4		123		2			6	575	
Actuated Green, G (s)		16.0	16.0		16.0		16.0	16.0		16.0	16.0	
Effective Green, g (s)		16.0	16.0		16.0		16.0	16.0		16.0	16.0	
Actuated g/C Ratio		0.40	0.40		0.40		0.40	0.40		0.40	0.40	
Clearance Time (s)		4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Lane Grp Cap (vph)		2034	633		1396		519	730		488	720	
v/s Ratio Prot		0.13			c0.31		5-51 (B. 075).	c0.08			0.04	
v/s Ratio Perm			0.01				0.02			0.03		
v/c Ratio		0.33	0.03		0.78		0.05	0.20		0.07	0.11	
Uniform Delay, d1		8.3	7.3		10.4		7.4	7.8		7.4	7.5	
Progression Factor		1.00	1.00		1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Incremental Delay, d2		0.4	0.1		4.3		0.2	0.6		0.3	0.3	
Delay (s)		8.7	7.4		14.7		7.5	8.5		7.7	7.9	
Level of Service		A	A		В		A	A		A	А	
Approach Delay (s)		8.6			14.7			8.3			7.8	
Approach LOS		А			В			А			A	
Intersection Summary	n ing								1.11	la de la		
HCM Average Control Delay			11.7	H	CM Level	of Servic	е		В			
HCM Volume to Capacity ratio			0.49									×.
Actuated Cycle Length (s)			40.0	Su	um of lost	time (s)			8.0			
Intersection Capacity Utilization	l .		49.7%	IC	U Level c	f Service			A			
Analysis Period (min)			15									

c Critical Lane Group

	->	>	-	1	.1	1	+	
Lane Group	EBT	EBR	WBT	NBL	NBT	SBL	SBT	
Lane Group Flow (vph)	674	49	1103	27	160	35	93	
v/c Ratio	0.33	0.07	0.78	0.05	0.22	0.07	0.13	
Control Delay	8.9	3.4	15.5	7.8	7.9	8.0	6.8	
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Total Delay	8.9	3.4	15.5	7.8	7.9	8.0	6.8	
Queue Length 50th (ft)	35	0	102	3	19	5	9	
Queue Length 95th (ft)	54	12	#172	13	45	16	28	
Internal Link Dist (ft)	420		420		420		420	
Turn Bay Length (ft)		165						
Base Capacity (vph)	2034	663	1415	519	743	489	732	
Starvation Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Spillback Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Storage Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Reduced v/c Ratio	0.33	0.07	0.78	0.05	0.22	0.07	0.13	
Intersection Summary		44.02		14				

95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

	٨		Y	1	-	A	1	1	p	1	ł	1
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		***	7		作序		ή	ĥ		ň	ĥ	
Volume (vph)	0	1003	93	0	1245	41	51	80	63	183	402	32
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Total Lost time (s)		4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Lane Util. Factor		0.91	1.00		0.95		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Frt		1.00	0.85		1.00		1.00	0.93		1.00	0.99	
Flt Protected		1.00	1.00		1.00		0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	
Satd. Flow (prot)		5085	1583		3522		1770	1740		1770	1842	
Flt Permitted		1.00	1.00		1.00		0.31	1.00		0.66	1.00	
Satd. Flow (perm)		5085	1583		3522		579	1740		1227	1842	
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Adj. Flow (vph)	0	1090	101	0	1353	45	55	87	68	199	437	35
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	0	55	0	5	0	0	28	0	0	6	0
Lane Group Flow (vph)	0	1090	46	0	1393	0	55	127	0	199	466	0
Turn Type			Perm				Perm			Perm		
Protected Phases		4			8			2			6	
Permitted Phases			4				2			6		
Actuated Green, G (s)		23.0	23.0		23.0		19.0	19.0		19.0	19.0	
Effective Green, g (s)		23.0	23.0		23.0		19.0	19.0		19.0	19.0	
Actuated g/C Ratio		0.46	0.46		0.46		0.38	0.38		0.38	0.38	
Clearance Time (s)		4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Lane Grp Cap (vph)		2339	728		1620		220	661		466	700	
v/s Ratio Prot		0.21			c0.40			0.07			c0.25	
v/s Ratio Perm			0.03				0.10			0.16		
v/c Ratio		0.47	0.06		0.86		0.25	0.19		0.43	0.67	
Uniform Delay, d1		9.3	7.5		12.1		10.6	10.4		11.5	12.9	
Progression Factor		1.00	1.00		1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Incremental Delay, d2		0.7	0.2		6.2		2.7	0.6		2.8	5.0	
Delay (s)		9.9	7.7		18.3		13.3	11.0		14.3	17.8	
Level of Service		A	A		В		В	В		В	В	
Approach Delay (s)		9.8			18.3			11.6			16.8	
Approach LOS		А			В			В			В	
Intersection Summary						1.11			-		22.5	
HCM Average Control Delay			14.7	H	CM Level	of Service	Э		В			
HCM Volume to Capacity ratio			0.77									
Actuated Cycle Length (s)			50.0		im of lost				8.0			
Intersection Capacity Utilization			72.2%	IC	U Level a	f Service			С			
Analysis Period (min)			15									
c Critical Lane Group												

	$\rightarrow$	>	-	*	1	1	+	
Lane Group	EBT	EBR	WBT	NBL	NBT	SBL	SBT	
Lane Group Flow (vph)	1090	101	1398	55	155	199	472	
v/c Ratio	0.47	0.13	0.86	0.25	0.22	0.43	0.67	
Control Delay	10.1	2.7	19.5	14.4	8.7	15.0	18.3	
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Total Delay	10.1	2.7	19.5	14.4	8.7	15.0	18.3	
Queue Length 50th (ft)	74	0	176	11	20	41	108	
Queue Length 95th (ft)	103	18	#308	33	51	87	192	
Internal Link Dist (ft)	420		420		420		420	
Turn Bay Length (ft)		165						
Base Capacity (vph)	2339	783	1625	220	689	467	706	
Starvation Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Spillback Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Storage Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Reduced v/c Ratio	0.47	0.13	0.86	0.25	0.22	0.43	0.67	
Intersection Summary								

95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.
Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

	≯	->	$\mathbf{i}$	1	-	A.	-	1	p	1	.↓	1
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		ተተተ	Ĩ		个孙		ή	ĥ		ሻ	٩Ĵ	
Volume (vph)	0	652	45	0	962	105	25	137	19	32	76	20
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Total Lost time (s)		4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Lane Util. Factor		0.91	1.00		0.95		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Frt		1.00	0.85		0.99		1.00	0.98		1.00	0.97	
Flt Protected		1.00	1.00		1.00		0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	
Satd. Flow (prot)		5085	1583		3487		1770	1828		1770	1804	
Flt Permitted		1.00	1.00		1.00		0.69	1.00		0.65	1.00	
Satd. Flow (perm)		5085	1583		3487		1284	1828		1210	1804	
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Adj. Flow (vph)	0	709	49	0	1046	114	27	149	21	35	83	22
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	0	29	0	20	0	0	13	0	0	13	0
Lane Group Flow (vph)	0	709	20	0	1140	0	27	157	0	35	92	0
Turn Type			Perm				Perm			Perm		
Protected Phases		4			8			2			6	
Permitted Phases			4				2			6		
Actuated Green, G (s)		16.0	16.0		16.0		16.0	16.0		16.0	16.0	
Effective Green, g (s)		16.0	16.0		16.0		16.0	16.0		16.0	16.0	
Actuated g/C Ratio		0.40	0.40	10	0.40		0.40	0.40		0.40	0.40	
Clearance Time (s)		4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Lane Grp Cap (vph)		2034	633		1395		514	731		484	722	
v/s Ratio Prot		0.14			c0.33			c0.09			0.05	
v/s Ratio Perm			0.01				0.02			0.03		
v/c Ratio		0.35	0.03		0.82		0.05	0.22		0.07	0.13	
Uniform Delay, d1		8.4	7.3		10.7		7.4	7.9		7.4	7.6	
Progression Factor		1.00	1.00		1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Incremental Delay, d2		0.5	0.1		5.4		0.2	0.7		0.3	0.4	
Delay (s)		8.8	7.4		16.1		7.5	8.6		7.7	7.9	
Level of Service		A	A		В		A	A		A	A	
Approach Delay (s)		8.7			16.1			8.4			7.9	
Approach LOS		A			В			A			A	
Intersection Summary		1.00	Sec. 11			2.02			2.02	1.3		11 L
HCM Average Control Delay			12.4	H	CM Level	of Service	Э		В			
HCM Volume to Capacity ratio			0.52									
Actuated Cycle Length (s)			40.0		um of lost				8.0			
Intersection Capacity Utilization			51.6%	IC	U Level o	of Service			А			
Analysis Period (min)			15									
c Critical Lane Group												

		~	-	*	1	1	4	
Lane Group	EBT	EBR	WBT	NBL	NBT	SBL	SBT	
Lane Group Flow (vph)	709	49	1160	27	170	35	105	
v/c Ratio	0.35	0.07	0.82	0.05	0.23	0.07	0.14	
Control Delay	9.0	3.4	17.3	7.8	8.0	8.0	7.0	
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Total Delay	9.0	3.4	17.3	7.8	8.0	8.0	7.0	
Queue Length 50th (ft)	37	0	110	3	20	5	11	
Queue Length 95th (ft)	57	12	#213	13	48	16	31	
Internal Link Dist (ft)	420		420		420		420	
Turn Bay Length (ft)		165						
Base Capacity (vph)	2034	663	1415	513	743	484	735	
Starvation Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Spillback Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Storage Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Reduced v/c Ratio	0.35	0.07	0.82	0.05	0.23	0.07	0.14	
Intersection Summary		100.00	2 Minut					

# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

	٨		>	1	-	A.	*	1	p	1	¥	1
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		<u> </u>	7		个孙		ሻ	P		ሻ	4Î	
Volume (vph)	0	1048	93	0	1263	52	51	103	63	183	423	63
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Total Lost time (s)		4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Lane Util. Factor		0.91	1.00		0.95		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Frt		1.00	0.85		0.99		1.00	0.94		1.00	0.98	
Flt Protected		1.00	1.00		1.00		0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	
Satd. Flow (prot)		5085	1583		3518		1770	1757		1770	1827	
Flt Permitted		1.00	1.00		1.00		0.25	1.00		0.64	1.00	
Satd. Flow (perm)		5085	1583		3518		465	1757		1199	1827	
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Adj. Flow (vph)	0	1139	101	0	1373	57	55	112	68	199	460	68
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	0	55	0	6	0	0	24	0	0	11	0
Lane Group Flow (vph)	0	1139	46	0	1424	0	55	156	0	199	517	0
Turn Type			Perm				Perm			Perm		
Protected Phases		4			8			2			6	
Permitted Phases			4				2			6		
Actuated Green, G (s)		23.0	23.0		23.0		19.0	19.0		19.0	19.0	
Effective Green, g (s)		23.0	23.0		23.0		19.0	19.0		19.0	19.0	
Actuated g/C Ratio		0.46	0.46		0.46		0.38	0.38		0.38	0.38	
Clearance Time (s)		4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Lane Grp Cap (vph)		2339	728		1618		177	668		456	694	
v/s Ratio Prot		0.22			c0.40			0.09			c0.28	
v/s Ratio Perm			0.03				0.12			0.17		
v/c Ratio		0.49	0.06		0.88		0.31	0.23		0.44	0.75	
Uniform Delay, d1		9.4	7.5		12.2		10.9	10.5		11.5	13.4	
Progression Factor		1.00	1.00		1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Incremental Delay, d2		0.7	0.2		7.2		4.5	0.8		3.0	7.2	
Delay (s)		10.1	7.7		19.5		15.4	11.4		14.5	20.6	
Level of Service		В	A		В		В	В		В	С	
Approach Delay (s)		9.9			19.5			12.3			18.9	
Approach LOS		A			В			В			В	
Intersection Summary												
HCM Average Control Delay			15.6	H	CM Level	of Service	Э		В			
HCM Volume to Capacity ratio			0.82						_			
Actuated Cycle Length (s)			50.0	St	um of lost	time (s)			8.0			
Intersection Capacity Utilization			76.0%		U Level o				D			
Analysis Period (min)			15			10000			19 <del>99</del> 9			
c Critical Lane Group			10120									

		~	-	4	1	1	Ļ	
Lane Group	EBT	EBR	WBT	NBL	NBT	SBL	SBT	
Lane Group Flow (vph)	1139	101	1430	55	180	199	528	
v/c Ratio	0.49	0.13	0.88	0.31	0.26	0.44	0.75	
Control Delay	10.3	2.7	20.9	16.8	9.6	15.3	21.8	
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Total Delay	10.3	2.7	20.9	16.8	9.6	15.3	21.8	
Queue Length 50th (ft)	78	0	183	11	27	41	124	
Queue Length 95th (ft)	108	18	#320	36	61	88	#261	
Internal Link Dist (ft)	420		420		420		420	
Turn Bay Length (ft)		165						
Base Capacity (vph)	2339	783	1624	177	692	456	705	
Starvation Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Spillback Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Storage Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Reduced v/c Ratio	0.49	0.13	0.88	0.31	0.26	0.44	0.75	
Intersection Summary								

# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.

	۶		>	1	-	*	*	1	p	1	Ļ	1
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		<u> </u>	71		<b>1</b>		ň	ĥ		Ϋ	ĥ	
Volume (vph)	0	545	46	0	819	124	26	190	19	28	113	24
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Total Lost time (s)		4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Lane Util. Factor		0.91	1.00		0.95		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Frt		1.00	0.85		0.98		1.00	0.99		1.00	0.97	
Flt Protected		1.00	1.00		1.00		0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	
Satd. Flow (prot)		5085	1583		3469		1770	1837		1770	1814	
Flt Permitted		1.00	1.00		1.00		0.66	1.00		0.62	1.00	
Satd. Flow (perm)		5085	1583		3469		1234	1837		1148	1814	
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Adj. Flow (vph)	0	592	50	0	890	135	28	207	21	30	123	26
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	0	30	0	30	0	0	9	0	0	16	0
Lane Group Flow (vph)	0	592	20	0	995	0	28	219	0	30	133	0
Turn Type			Perm				Perm			Perm		
Protected Phases		4	5. (57.55)		8		100/05/11/10	2		1.15.15.11.1.1	6	
Permitted Phases			4				2			6	0.00	
Actuated Green, G (s)		16.0	16.0		16.0		16.0	16.0		16.0	16.0	
Effective Green, g (s)		16.0	16.0		16.0		16.0	16.0		16.0	16.0	
Actuated g/C Ratio		0.40	0.40		0.40		0.40	0.40		0.40	0.40	
Clearance Time (s)		4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Lane Grp Cap (vph)		2034	633		1388		494	735		459	726	
v/s Ratio Prot		0.12			c0.29			c0.12			0.07	
v/s Ratio Perm			0.01				0.02			0.03		
v/c Ratio		0.29	0.03		0.72		0.06	0.30		0.07	0.18	
Uniform Delay, d1		8.1	7.3		10.1		7.4	8.2		7.4	7.8	
Progression Factor		1.00	1.00		1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Incremental Delay, d2		0.4	0.1		3.2		0.2	1.0		0.3	0.6	
Delay (s)		8.5	7.4		13.3		7.6	9.2		7.7	8.3	
Level of Service		A	A		В		А	A		А	А	
Approach Delay (s)		8.4			13.3			9.0			8.2	
Approach LOS		A			В			А			А	
Intersection Summary		1	in the	4.5.2								
HCM Average Control Delay HCM Volume to Capacity ratio			10.9 0.51	HC	CM Level	of Service	Э		В			
Actuated Cycle Length (s)			40.0	SL	im of lost	time (s)			8.0			
Intersection Capacity Utilization Analysis Period (min)			51.1% 15		U Level o				A			

c Critical Lane Group

#### Phase IV - AM Peak Hour 7/10/2013

		V	-	1	1	1	ł	
Lane Group	EBT	EBR	WBT	NBL	NBT	SBL	SBT	
Lane Group Flow (vph)	592	50	1025	28	228	30	149	
v/c Ratio	0.29	0.08	0.72	0.06	0.31	0.07	0.20	
Control Delay	8.6	3.4	13.2	7.8	9.1	8.0	7.6	
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Total Delay	8.6	3.4	13.2	7.8	9.1	8.0	7.6	
Queue Length 50th (ft)	30	0	89	4	30	4	17	
Queue Length 95th (ft)	48	13	142	14	65	14	41	
Internal Link Dist (ft)	420		420		420		420	
Turn Bay Length (ft)		165						
Base Capacity (vph)	2034	663	1417	493	744	459	741	
Starvation Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Spillback Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Storage Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Reduced v/c Ratio	0.29	0.08	0.72	0.06	0.31	0.07	0.20	
Intersection Summary								

	≯		V	1	-	A.	-	1	1	1	¥	1
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		<u> </u>	7		<b>ተ</b> ጮ		ሻ	ef (		٢	Þ	
Volume (vph)	0	953	94	0	952	80	52	151	63	180	490	140
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Total Lost time (s)		4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Lane Util. Factor		0.91	1.00		0.95		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Frt		1.00	0.85		0.99		1.00	0.96		1.00	0.97	
Flt Protected		1.00	1.00		1.00		0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	
Satd. Flow (prot)		5085	1583		3498		1770	1781		1770	1801	
Flt Permitted		1.00	1.00		1.00		0.20	1.00		0.61	1.00	
Satd. Flow (perm)		5085	1583		3498		373	1781		1144	1801	
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Adj. Flow (vph)	0	1036	102	0	1035	87	57	164	68	196	533	152
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	0	63	0	14	0	0	15	0	0	15	0
Lane Group Flow (vph)	0	1036	39	0	1108	0	57	217	0	196	670	0
Turn Type			Perm				Perm			Perm		
Protected Phases		4			8			2			6	
Permitted Phases			4				2			6		
Actuated Green, G (s)		17.0	17.0		17.0		20.0	20.0		20.0	20.0	
Effective Green, g (s)		17.0	17.0		17.0		20.0	20.0		20.0	20.0	
Actuated g/C Ratio		0.38	0.38		0.38		0.44	0.44		0.44	0.44	
Clearance Time (s)		4.0	4.0		4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Lane Grp Cap (vph)		1921	598		1321		166	792		508	800	
v/s Ratio Prot		0.20			c0.32			0.12			c0.37	
v/s Ratio Perm			0.02				0.15			0.17		
v/c Ratio		0.54	0.06		0.84		0.34	0.27		0.39	0.84	
Uniform Delay, d1		10.9	8.9		12.8		8.2	7.9		8.4	11.1	
Progression Factor		1.00	1.00		1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Incremental Delay, d2		1.1	0.2		6.5		5.6	0.9		2.2	10.2	
Delay (s)		12.0	9.1		19.3		13.8	8.8		10.6	21.2	
Level of Service		В	A		В		В	А		В	С	
Approach Delay (s)		11.8			19.3			9.7			18.9	
Approach LOS		В			В			А			В	
Intersection Summary			and the					19.3		1	1.1.1.1	1
HCM Average Control Delay			15.9	HC	CM Level	of Service	Э		В			
HCM Volume to Capacity ratio			0.84									
Actuated Cycle Length (s)			45.0		im of lost				8.0			
Intersection Capacity Utilization	1		76.5%	IC	U Level o	f Service			D			
Analysis Period (min)			15									*
c Critical Lane Group												

	->	>	-	-	1	1	¥		
Lane Group	EBT	EBR	WBT	NBL	NBT	SBL	SBT		
Lane Group Flow (vph)	1036	102	1122	57	232	196	685		
v/c Ratio	0.54	0.15	0.84	0.34	0.29	0.39	0.84		
Control Delay	12.2	3.4	20.6	15.4	8.2	11.3	23.4		
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
Total Delay	12.2	3.4	20.6	15.4	8.2	11.3	23.4		
Queue Length 50th (ft)	72	0	129	9	31	31	138		
Queue Length 95th (ft)	104	21	#235	34	64	70	#316		
Internal Link Dist (ft)	420		420		420		420		
Turn Bay Length (ft)		165							
Base Capacity (vph)	1921	661	1335	166	807	508	815		
Starvation Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Spillback Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Storage Cap Reductn	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Reduced v/c Ratio	0.54	0.15	0.84	0.34	0.29	0.39	0.84		
Intersection Summary								A CONTRACTOR OF A CONTRACT	*

 Intersection Summary
# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. CD of Final EIR for the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan and Port Master Plan Amendment (UPD # 83356-EIR-658; SCH# 2005081077)

Note: The Final EIR is also available online at <u>http://www.portofsandiego.org/chula-vista-bayfront-master-plan/environmental-impact-report/cat\_view/225-real-estate-projects/227-chula-vista-bayfront-masterplan/519-environmental-impact-reports/504-final-environmental-impact-reporteir.html</u>