Section 4.17
Transportation and Circulation

4.17.1 Overview

This section describes the existing conditions and laws and regulations related to transportation, circulation, and mobility, followed by an analysis of the project's potential to impact these facilities.

The information provided in this section is summarized from the *Alpine Community Park – VMT Analysis* prepared by Chen Ryan Associates in ~~August~~September 2020 (Appendix H) and the *Alpine Park Transportation Impact Study* (TIS) prepared by Chen Ryan Associates in ~~April~~July 2020 (Appendix I). An Addendum to the TIS was prepared by Chen Ryan Associates in July 2026 to respond to the Court's request for an updated analysis related to traffic hazards (Appendix I1). The Addendum is supported by a parking generation analysis, sight distance analysis, traffic safety analysis, and an overview of other safety treatments considered by the County.

4.17.2 Existing Conditions

This section describes the regional and local roadways, public transit systems, and bicycle/pedestrian facilities in the project site vicinity.

4.17.2.1 Existing Transportation Conditions

Regional Facilities

Regional access to the project site is provided by the interstate and ~~s~~State freeway systems, which are both under the California Department of Transportation's (Caltrans') jurisdiction. The following freeways provide access to the vicinity of the project site.

- Interstate (I-) 8 provides regional transit in an east-to-west route that extends from the western coast of San Diego to Casa Grande in central-southern Arizona. I-8 travels through the northern portion of the Alpine Community Plan Area, and through the most densely developed portion of the community. I-8 is approximately one mile north of the project site. ~~Access to/from Alpine from I-8 is provided from the Victoria Park Terrace/Alpine Blvd. interchange to the west and to/from the Willows Rd./Alpine Blvd. Interchange to the east.~~
- State Route (SR-) 79 provides regional access in San Diego and Riverside Counties in a north-to-south route from the I-8 ~~-~~just east of Alpine to Beaumont, in Riverside County. SR-79 is approximately 7.8 miles to the northeast of the project site.

Local Facilities

Roadways

There are two main roadways in the project vicinity, that provide access to the project site.

- South Grade Road creates a ~~circuitous~~ loop around the project site, traveling ~~south~~ from ~~its intersection with Alpine Blvd. in~~ the northwest portion of Alpine to the south, and then back to the north ~~in~~on the eastern portion of the Alpine community~~, connecting again with Alpine Blvd.~~. South Grade Road borders the southern and eastern portions of the project site and provides access to the project site.
- Tavern Road is a main north-to-south roadway that traverses through the community of Alpine and ~~also~~ provides access to the project area. Tavern Road is approximately 0.90 miles to the west of the project site.

Public Transportation Services

Regional public transportation serving the Alpine Community Plan Area includes bus services provided by the San Diego Metropolitan Transit System (MTS). Bus routes 838 and 888 serve Alpine by way of stops along Alpine Boulevard, Tavern Road, and Arnold Way. The closest bus stop is approximately 0.88 miles north of the project site~~, at ??~~.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities

Bicycle facilities are categorized as Class I, II, and III facilities. Class I facilities are off-street, paved bike paths; Class II facilities are bike lanes that are generally identified as a separate lane of a roadway; and Class III facilities are bike routes that are shared with vehicles along a roadway. There are limited bicycle facilities in the project vicinity; Alpine Boulevard has ~~a~~ Class III bike route from its intersection with Tavern Road to its intersection with Honey Hill Ranch Road~~, which is approximately 1/8 mile to the east of South Grade Rd.~~ There are no bike facilities along South Grade Road adjacent to the project site. All County of San Diego roadways (excluding freeways, except where allowed by Caltrans) are open for travel by bicycle, regardless of bikeway treatment.

4.17.3 Applicable Laws and Regulations

4.17.3.1 State

Senate Bill 743

Governor Jerry Brown signed Senate Bill (SB) 743 on September 27, 2013, which mandated a change in the way that public agencies evaluate transportation impacts of projects under CEQA, focusing on vehicle miles traveled (VMT)), rather than level of service (LOS) and other delay-based metrics. SB 743 states that new methodologies under CEQA ~~must be used to evaluate~~are needed for evaluating transportation impacts that are ~~targeted at reducing~~better able to reduce GHG emissions and traffic-related air pollution, promoting the development of a multimodal transportation system, and providing clean, efficient access to destinations. It further intended to balance the need for LOS standards with the ~~s~~State's need to build infill housing and mixed-use commercial developments within walking distance of mass transit facilities and downtowns or town centers. SB 743 allow~~s~~ed for measurements of transportation impacts that ~~can~~could include VMT, VMT per capita, automobile trip generation rates, or automobile trips generated. Accordingly, SB 743 required the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to amend the ~~State~~ CEQA Guidelines to reflect these changes.

~~State~~ CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3

In response to SB 743, the Office of Planning and Research added Section 15064.3 of the ~~State~~ CEQA Guidelines, as part of a comprehensive Guidelines update, adopted by the California Natural Resources Agency in December 2018. Section 15064.3 describes specific considerations for evaluating a project's transportation impacts and identifies VMT as the most appropriate measure to determine the significance of transportation impacts. Section 15064.3 generally states that a project's effect on automobile delay shall not constitute a significant environmental impact under CEQA. The specific criteria for analyzing transportation impacts are provided in Section 15064.3, subdivision (b) of the ~~State~~ CEQA Guidelines. In general, SB 743 indicates that the total VMT that exceeds an applicable threshold of significance may indicate a significant impact.

Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA

In response to SB 743 and the addition of Section 15064.3 to the ~~State~~ CEQA Guidelines, the OPR adopted the *Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA* (Technical Advisory) in December 2018 to provide technical recommendations on methods for assessing VMT, thresholds of significance, and mitigation measures. The recommendations in the Technical Advisory are intended to provide guidance to agencies and the public for assessing VMT-related transportation impacts under CEQA. Details of the recommended thresholds of significance from the Technical Advisory are provided in Section 4.~~17~~14.4.2, below.

4.17.3.2 Regional

San Diego Association of Governments

San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan

SANDAG's *San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan* (Regional Plan) was adopted by the SANDAG Board of Directors on October 9, 2015, to establish a long-range blueprint for the San Diego region's growth and development through the year 2050. The Regional Plan was developed in close partnership with the region's 18 cities and ~~San Diego~~the County ~~government~~, and aims to provide innovative mobility choices and planning to support a sustainable quality of life in a healthy region with a vibrant economy. The Regional Plan integrates ~~both~~ the 2004 Regional Comprehensive Plan ~~and,~~ the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP~~)~~), and the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) into one unified plan. By incorporating the SCS, the Regional Plan is in compliance with SB 375, which identifies how the region will address GHG emissions to meet ~~s~~State-mandated levels and focuses on land use planning and transportation issues in an attempt to develop sustainable growth patterns on a regional level.

State law requires ~~RTPs~~the RTP to be updated every four years. The State ~~of California~~ established climate mandates for regional planning organizations across the ~~s~~State in 2018; so the SANDAG Board of Directors approved a two-year extension to develop the 2021 Regional Plan. ~~A Draft~~The final 2021 Regional Plan is ~~anticipated to be~~ available ~~for~~to the public ~~review in spring 2021.~~

Riding to 2050, the San Diego Regional Bike Plan

Riding to 2050, the San Diego Regional Bike Plan (Regional Bike Plan) was developed to support the 2004 Regional Comprehensive Plan and the 2050 RTP in implementing the regional strategy for

utilizing bicycles as a valid form of everyday travel. The Regional Bike Plan, as a part of the SCS mandated by SB 375, provides for a detailed Regional Bike Network, as well as the programs that are necessary to support it. Implementation of the Regional Bike Plan would help the region meet its goals for reducing GHG emissions and improve mobility.

2018 Regional Transportation Improvement Program

The 2018 Regional Transportation Improvement Program ~~(RTIP)~~ is a multi-billion-dollar 5-year program of major transportation projects funded by federal, ~~s~~State, TransNet local sales tax, and other local and private funding covering fiscal year 2016/2017 to 2020/2021. The program development process, which includes ~~an~~the air quality emissions analysis for all regionally significant projects, requires approval by the Federal Highway Administration ~~(FHWA)~~ and the Federal Transit Administration ~~(FTA).~~. The ~~RTIP~~Regional Transportation Improvement Program is a prioritized program designed to implement the region's overall strategy for providing mobility and improving the efficiency and safety of the transportation system, while reducing transportation-related air pollution in support of efforts to attain federal and ~~s~~State air quality standards for the region. The program also incrementally implements the Regional Plan, which is the long-range transportation plan for the San Diego region (SANDAG 2015).

4.17.3.3 Local

County of San Diego ~~Regulatory Ordinances, Sections 77.201 – 77.220, Transportation Impact Fee~~

~~The Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) program provides funding for mitigation of cumulative impacts and for proportional construction of transportation facilities needed to support traffic generated by new development to meet State law requirements. Per the County Board of Supervisors ordinance, effective December 31, 2012, the County will collect TIF at or before building permit issuance for projects that generate new trips.~~

County of San Diego General Plan Policies

The General Plan includes goals and policies that address transportation and traffic within the Mobility, Land Use, and Safety elements. The~~se~~ goals and policies that are applicable to the project are summarized below.

Mobility Element

Policy M-2.1: Level of Service Criteria. Require development projects to provide associated road improvements necessary to achieve an LOS of "D" or higher on all Mobility Element roads except for those where a failing LOS has been accepted by the County pursuant to the criteria specifically identified in the accompanying text box (Criteria for Accepting a Road Classification with LOS E/F). When development is proposed on roads where a failing LOS has been accepted, require feasible mitigation in the form of road improvements or a fair share contribution to a road improvement program, consistent with the Mobility Element road network.

Policy M-2.2: Access to Mobility Element Designated Roads. Minimize direct access points to Mobility Element roads from driveways and other non-through roads to maintain ~~adequate~~the capacity and improve traffic operations.

Policy M-2.3: Environmentally Sensitive Road Design. Locate and design public and private roads to minimize impacts on significant biological and other environmental and visual resources. Avoid road alignments through floodplains to minimize impacts on floodplain habitats and limit the need for constructing flood control measures. Design new roads to maintain wildlife movement and retrofit existing roads for that purpose. Utilize fencing to reduce roadkill and to direct animals to under crossings.

Policy M-3.1: Public Road Rights-of-Way. Require development ~~projects~~ to dedicate right-of-way for public roads and other transportation routes identified in the Mobility Element roadway network (see Mobility Element Network Appendix), Community Plans, or Road Master Plans. Require the provision of sufficient right-of-way width, as specified in the County Public Road Standards and Community Trails Master Plan, to adequately accommodate all users, including transit riders, pedestrians, bicyclists, and equestrians.

Policy M-3.2: Traffic Impact Mitigation. Require development ~~projects~~ to contribute ~~their~~ "its fair share" toward financing transportation facilities, including mitigating the associated direct and cumulative traffic impacts caused by their project on both the local and regional road networks. Transportation facilities include road networks and related transit, and pedestrian, bicycle and equestrian facilities.

Policy M-3.3: Multiple Ingress and Egress. Require development ~~projects~~ to provide multiple ingress/egress routes in conformance with State law, and local regulations.

Policy M-4.4: Accommodate Emergency Vehicles. Design and construct public and private roads to allow for necessary access for appropriately sized fire apparatus and emergency vehicles while accommodating outgoing vehicles from evacuating residents.

~~**Policy M-11.2: Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities in Development**. Require development projects and town center plans in Villages and Rural Villages to incorporate site design and on-site amenities for alternate modes of transportation, such as comprehensive bicycle and pedestrian networks and facilities. This will include both on-street facilities as well as off-street bikeways to safely serve the full range of intended users. Also designate areas for transit facilities, where appropriate and coordinated with the transit service provider.~~

~~**Policy M-11.4: Pedestrian and Bicycle Network Connectivity**. Require development projects in Villages and Rural Villages to provide comprehensive internal pedestrian and bicycle networks that connect to existing or planned adjacent community and county-wide networks.~~

Land Use Element

Policy LU-5.5: Projects that Impede Non-Motorized Travel. Ensure that development projects and road improvements do not impede bicycle and pedestrian access. Where impacts on existing planned routes would occur, ensure that impacts are mitigated, and acceptable alternative routes are implemented. Examples include large parking areas that cannot be crossed by non-motorized vehicles, and new developments that block "through access" on existing or potential bicycle and pedestrian routes.

Policy LU-6.10: Protection from Hazards. Require that development ~~projects~~ be located and designed to protect property and residents from the risks of natural and man-induced hazards.

Policy LU-9.8: Village Connectivity and Compatibility with Adjoining Areas. Require new development within Villages to include road networks, pedestrian routes, and amenities that create or maintain connectivity; and site, building, and landscape design that is compatible with surrounding areas. (See applicable community plan for possible relevant policies.)

Safety Element

Policy S-3.4: Service Availability. Plan for development where fire and emergency services are available or planned.

Policy S-3.5: Access Roads. Require development ~~projects~~ to provide additional access roads when necessary to provide for safe access of emergency equipment and civilian evacuation concurrently.

Policy S-14.1: Vehicular Access to Development. Require development ~~projects~~ to provide vehicular connections that reduce response times and facilitate access for law enforcement personnel, whenever feasible.

Alpine Community Plan

The *Alpine Community Plan*, amended in December 2016, contains goals, policies and recommendations to maintain an effective circulation system in the community. There are no specific policies or recommendations for ~~development projects~~developments within ~~the~~ Alpine community that are applicable to transportation and circulation.

San Diego County Active Transportation Plan

The San Diego County Active Transportation Plan (ATP) promotes active transportation through pedestrian and bicycle improvements throughout the unincorporated ~~County~~area. The ATP consists of an update to the County's Bicycle Transportation Plan (dated 2008) and the Pedestrian Area Plans (prepared for Alpine, Borrego Springs, Fallbrook Town Center, Lakeside Town Center and Spring Valley) into one combined ATP. The ATP was approved by the County Board of Supervisors on October 31, 2018. The ATP identifies goals, objectives, and actions related to improving safety to reduce auto collisions with cyclists and pedestrians, increasing accessibility and connectivity with an active transportation network, and improving public health by encouraging walking and biking. The plan identifies existing and proposed bikeways, and classifies bikeways into three types of bicycle facilities: bike path, bike lane, and cycle track. *Bike paths* refer to paths that provide for bicycle travel on a paved right-of-way completely separated from any street or highway. A *bike lane* provides a striped and stenciled lane for one-way travel on a street or highway. *Cycle tracks* provide a physically separated bikeway for the exclusive use of bicycles.

County of San Diego Transportation Study Guidelines

The County of San Diego Transportation Study Guidelines (TSG), adopted in January~~September~~ 2026~~2~~ in response to SB 743, provides criteria on how projects should be evaluated for consistency related to the County's transportation goals, policies, and plans, and through procedures established under CEQA (County 2026). The TSG establishes thresholds of significance and the contents and procedures for preparing a Transportation Study for projects in the unincorporated area. The TSG aids in determining appropriate mitigation under CEQA, as well as site-specific improvements to the transportation system to accommodate project traffic.

4.17.4 Project Impact Analysis

4.17.4.1 Methodology

Potential transportation and circulation impacts associated with the project are summarized below based on information contained in Appendix I of ~~this~~the Draft EIR. Methods used to determine impacts are based ~~in part~~ on ~~the County of San Diego Traffic Study Guidelines and in conformance with the State of~~ OPR's *Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA* (Technical Advisory), as well as input from the County of San Diego Department of Public Works~~.~~ (DPW)~~)~~.

Transportation and Circulation During Construction

As discussed in Section 4.14.3.1, SB 743 establishes VMT as the new criteri~~on~~a for determining transportation impacts. Section 15064.3 was added to the ~~State~~ CEQA Guidelines to address SB 743. In relation to construction VMT analyses, ~~State~~ CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 (b)(3) states:

> "Qualitative Analysis. If existing models or methods are not available to estimate the vehicle miles traveled for the particular project being considered, a lead agency may analyze the project's vehicle miles traveled qualitatively. Such a qualitative analysis would evaluate factors such as the availability of transit, proximity to other destinations, etc. For many projects, a qualitative analysis of construction traffic may be appropriate."

For the purposes of ~~determining~~analyzing construction-related VMT impacts of the project, the analysis qualitatively considers the potential change in VMT due to construction, types of construction-related congestion and traffic hazards.

Transportation and Circulation During Operation

The ~~San Diego~~ County Board of Supervisors adopted new guidelines for the County ~~of San Diego Transportation Study Guidelines (~~TSG in January~~September~~ 2026~~2~~. These County ~~TSG) on June 24, 2020.~~ specific thresholds are in accordance and aligned with the industry's best practice and guidance from the OPR to conduct the VMT analysis. The recently adopted County TSG is consistent with ~~the State~~ CEQA Guidelines and utilizes VMT as a metric for evaluating transportation-related impacts. Per the County TSG, all projects within the unincorporated ~~portions of San Diego County~~area are required to ~~use~~go through a screening process to determine the level of transportation analysis that is required. An excerpt of the screening process is provided in Attachment A of Appendix I. The 2026 update to the TSG removed the screening criteria for projects located in infill village areas and small residential and employment projects.

Based on Section 3.3 of the County TSG, when conducting a screening analysis, projects that can be classified within any of the following screening criteria are assumed to have a less than significant VMT impact, due to project's characteristic and/or location and are therefore exempt from additional VMT CEQA analysis:

- *Project located in VMT efficient area*: A VMT efficient area is any area with an average VMT per Resident, VMT per Employee, or VMT per Service Population below the baseline average for the ~~Unincorporated County average.~~San Diego region. Land use projects may qualify for the use of VMT efficient area screening if the project can be reasonably expected to generate a VMT per Resident, per Employee, or per Service Population, respectively, that is similar to the existing land uses in the VMT efficient area.

- ~~*Project located in infill Village Area:* An infill development is defined by OPR as "…building within unused and underutilized lands within existing development patterns, typically but not exclusively within urban areas." Multiple land use and transportation network variables were identified to create a quantitative definition for "infill development" in the County, including household density, intersection density, and job accessibility. Development in more dense areas with high job accessibility leads to more diversity in land use, demand for transit (bus and trolley) and multimodal infrastructure (walking and biking), and shorter vehicle trips, which reduce GHGs and VMT.~~
- ~~*Small residential and employment projects:* Projects generating less than 110 daily vehicle trips (trips are based on the number of vehicle trips calculated using national ITE trip generation rates with any alternative modes/location-based adjustments are applied) may be presumed to have a less than significant impact absent substantial evidence to the contrary.~~
- *Project located in Transit Accessible Area*: Projects located within a half mile of an existing major transit stop or an existing stop along a high-quality transit corridor may be presumed to have a less than significant impact absent substantial evidence to the contrary. Note that Sprinter stations are considered major transit stops. This presumption may not apply if the project:
    - Has a Floor Area Ratio of less than 0.75.
    - Includes more parking for use by residents, customers, or employees of the project than required by the County.
    - Is inconsistent with SANDAG's most recent Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS).
    - Replaces affordable residential units with a smaller number of moderate- or high-income residential units.
- *Locally serving retail/service projects:* Local serving retail/service projects less than 50,000 square feet may be presumed to have a less than significant impact absent substantial evidence to the contrary. Local serving retail/service generally improves the convenience of shopping close to home and has the effect of reducing vehicle travel.
- *Locally serving public facilities and other uses*: Public facilities that serve the surrounding community or public facilities that are passive use may be presumed to have a less than significant impact absent substantial evidence to the contrary. These do not include facilities or uses that would attract users from outside the vicinity of the use. The following are examples of locally serving facilities and uses:
    - Transit centers
    - Schools
    - Libraries
    - Post offices
    - Park-and-ride lots
    - Local health/medical clinics
    - Law enforcement and fire facilities
    - ~~Local~~Open space preserves, local parks, and trailheads
    - Government offices

- Communication and utility buildings
- Water sanitation buildings
- Waste management buildings

- *Redevelopment projects with greater VMT efficiency*: Redevelopment projects with greater VMT efficiency in which a project replaces existing VMT-generating land uses, the project may be presumed to have a less than significant impact if the total project VMT is less than the existing land use's total VMT, absent substantial evidence to the contrary.
- *Affordable housing*: An affordable housing project may be presumed to have a less than significant impact absent substantial evidence to the contrary if 100% of units are affordable.

Projects that do not meet the screening criteria are required to conduct a VMT analysis using either the County's screening map or the SANDAG Regional Transportation Model to determine whether the project is below the threshold established in the County TSG.

~~The~~Additionally, the TIS (Appendix I) was prepared to identify potential transportation related impacts on roadway segments, intersections, and freeway on-ramps associated with the project. This TIS was performed in accordance with the requirements of the County TSG and in conformance with the enhanced CEQA project review process. LOS is the metric for describing operational conditions within a traffic stream, and the motorist's and/or passengers' perception of operations. A LOS definition generally describes these conditions in terms of such factors as delay, speed, travel time, freedom to maneuver, interruptions in traffic flow, queuing, comfort, and convenience. Table 4.17-1 describes generalized definitions of the various LOS categories (A through F) as applied to roadway operations. LOS D is considered acceptable within the ~~County of San Diego.~~unincorporated area.

Table 4.17-1 Level of Service Definitions

LOS Category	Definition of Operation
A	This LOS represents a completely free-flow condition, where the operation of vehicles is virtually unaffected by the presence of other vehicles and only constrained by the geometric features of the highway and by driver preferences.
B	This LOS represents a relatively free-flow condition, although the presence of other vehicles becomes noticeable. Average travel speeds are the same as in LOS A, but drivers have slightly less freedom to maneuver.
C	At this LOS the influence of traffic density on operations becomes marked. The ability to maneuver within the traffic stream is clearly affected by other vehicles.
D	At this LOS, the ability to maneuver is notably restricted due to traffic congestion, and only minor disruptions can be absorbed without extensive queues forming and the service deteriorating.
E	This LOS represents operations at or near capacity. LOS E is an unstable level, with vehicles operating with minimum spacing for maintaining uniform flow. At LOS E, disruptions cannot be dissipated readily thus causing deterioration down to LOS F.
F	At this LOS, forced or breakdown of traffic flow occurs, although operations appear to be at capacity, queues form behind these breakdowns. Operations within queues are highly unstable, with vehicles experiencing brief periods of movement followed by stoppages.

Roadway segment LOS standards and thresholds provide the basis for analysis of arterial roadway segment performance. The analysis of roadway segment LOS is based on the functional classification of the roadway, the maximum capacity, roadway geometrics, and existing or forecast average daily traffic volumes. Appendix I presents the existing roadway segments and intersections, the roadway segment capacity, and LOS standards utilized to analyze roadways evaluated in the TIS.

4.17.4.2 Thresholds of Significance

Appendix G of the ~~State~~ CEQA Guidelines

The following significance criteria are based on Appendix G of the ~~State~~ CEQA Guidelines and provide the basis for determining the significance of impacts on existing transportation and circulation conditions as a result of the project's implementation. The determination of whether a transportation and circulation impact would be significant is based on the answers to the threshold questions.

Impacts are considered significant if the project would result in any of the following:

1. Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system.
2. Conflict or be inconsistent with ~~State~~ CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b).
3. Substantially increase hazards because of a geometric design feature or incompatible uses.
4. Result in inadequate emergency access.

County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance

~~The San Diego County Board of Supervisors adopted the County TSG on June 24, 2020.~~ The ~~recently adopted 2022~~ County TSG was adopted on January 14~~September 28~~, 202~~62~~, and is consistent with the ~~State~~ CEQA Guidelines and utilizes VMT as a metric for evaluating transportation-related impacts. Per the County TSG, all projects within the unincorporated portions of San Diego County are required to ~~use~~go through a screening process to determine the level of transportation analysis that is required. Under SB 743, CEQA analysis can no longer use road congestion or the amount of time a driver is delayed on the road—commonly measured by LOS—when analyzing transportation impacts. Therefore, instead of using LOS, a project's environmental impacts must be evaluated by the amount and distance people drive to destinations.

4.17.4.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Threshold 1: The project would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system.

County Park ~~and~~, Trails, and Open Space ~~/Preserve~~

Impact Discussion

Construction

The programs, plans, ordinances, and policies addressing the circulation system that are applicable to the project have been described above in Section 4.17.3. The project's potential to conflict with

~~SD~~SB 743 is addressed in the analysis for the next threshold question (Threshold 2) as it relates to ~~State~~ CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b).

Construction may result in temporary partially or completely blocked northbound or southbound travel lanes along South Grade Road and/or Tavern Road due to the use of large construction equipment, construction material deliveries, and construction of the sewer line in the centerline of South Grade Road and Tavern Road. The project also includes the development of a vegetated berm along the eastern and southern boundary of the project site along South Grade Road. The project includes improvements to circulation facilities including a decomposed granite walking path situated between the proposed berm and South Grade Road, the primary ingress/egress driveway on the northeastern side of the project site~~,~~ across from Calle De Compadres (Driveway #1), and the secondary ingress/egress in the southwestern corner of the project site (Driveway #2). Construction of the circulation-related features of the project may encroach into the public right-of-way during portions or the entirety of the construction process. These temporary lane closures or impediments within the roadway could delay or obstruct the movement of traffic along South Grade Road and Tavern Road. However, when construction interrupts the normal function of a roadway, a Traffic Control Permit must be obtained from ~~the~~ County ~~of San Diego Department of Public Works~~DPW. County DPR or its contractors would be responsible for obtaining the Traffic Control Permit which requires the installation and maintenance of appropriate traffic control in accordance with a Traffic Control Plan. The traffic control methods used to maintain safe traffic flow could include barriers, signs, and flags. The implementation of the Traffic Control Plan would ensure continued flow of traffic in the public right-of-way during construction. Otherwise, all construction would occur within the project site, and would not prevent the implementation of circulation programs or plans for the surrounding circulation system, including but not limited to roadway improvements or development of bicycle or pedestrian facilities. As such, the project would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system; impacts would be less than significant.

Operation

Operation of the project would involve active and passive recreational facilities, as well as the associated circulated-related improvements~~, as mentioned above,~~ along South Grade Road, as mentioned above. Operation of the active and passive park would also contribute to additional users of the surrounding circulation system, primarily accessing the project site by car. The project is estimated to draw an average of 500 daily visitors. The potential effect of the daily visitors to regional VMT goals as it relates to SB 743 and ~~State~~ CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b) is discussed ~~under Threshold 2,~~ below. ~~The~~Otherwise, the project would not include any features that would change or prevent the use of local circulation facilities.

~~The~~Furthermore, the TIS ~~prepared~~conducted by Chen Ryan for the project (Appendix I) analyzed the effect of project-generated traffic on the existing transportation facilities. The TIS analysis indicates all of the roadway segments and intersections included in the study area operated at acceptable LOS B. The existing roadway segments plus the project conditions are anticipated to operate at acceptable LOS C or better, and intersections are anticipated to continue to operate at acceptable LOS B or better with the addition of project traffic. The results of the analysis state that the addition of project traffic would not cause a significant impact to the study area roadway segments and intersections when compared to both existing conditions plus the project, as well as future conditions (based on growth projections) plus the project. This indicates the project would not have a detrimental effect on the LOS of project area roadways and intersections, and would be

consistent with the local policies governing target LOS thresholds, including but not limited to, the County of San Diego General Plan. Therefore, operation of the project would not conflict with the implementation of any programs, plans, ordinances, and policies addressing the circulation system. Impacts would be less than significant.

Impact Determination

The project would not conflict with any programs, plans, ordinances, and policies addressing the circulation system. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation is not required.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Impacts would be less than significant.

Threshold 2: The project would not conflict or be inconsistent with ~~State~~ CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b).

County Park, Trails, and Open Space~~/Preserve~~

Impact Discussion

Construction

Construction of the project would provide construction jobs for the region; however, the construction jobs are expected to be filled ~~by current~~with construction personnel from the local labor market, and would not increase the demand ~~for~~on construction personnel such that individuals would be traveling from outside the region to fill the positions. Therefore, project construction jobs would result in redistributing existing vehicle trips around the region and would not induce an increase in VMT. Furthermore, implementation of the Traffic Control Plan pursuant to the Traffic Control Permit~~,~~ in the event of encroachment into the public right-of-way during construction activities~~,~~ would serve to reduce potential impacts on vehicle travel. Therefore, the project would not induce ~~or~~an increase in VMT and would not conflict or be inconsistent with ~~State~~ CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b), and the impact would be less than significant.

Operation

A screening analysis was conducted by Chen Ryan (see Appendix I) for the project using the County TSG screening criteria outlined in Section 4.17.4.1. *Methodology.* Based upon the OPR guidelines and criterion provided therein as well as Attachment A of Appendix I, the project ~~would fall under the local~~ is considered locally serving public facilities and other uses (open space preserves, local parks, and trailheads) category. The County TSG states that local ~~serving~~ public facilities ~~and other uses~~that fall in the public serving category are presumed to have less than significant VMT impact. Therefore, operation of the project would not conflict or be inconsistent with ~~State~~ CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b), and the impact would be less than significant.

Impact Determination

The project would not conflict or be inconsistent with ~~State~~ CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b), and the impact would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation is not required.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Impacts would be less than significant.

Threshold 3: The project <u>would not</u> substantially increase hazards because of a geometric design feature or incompatible uses.

County Park, Trails<u>,</u> and Open Space~~/Preserve~~

Impact Discussion

Construction

The project would involve the construction of two ingress/egress driveways providing access to the parking and staging areas within the park from South Grade Road<u>. as well as a two-way</u>~~an all-way~~ <u>stop at South Grade Road and Calle De Compadres.</u> As part of the standard project approval process, the proposed access improvements would be reviewed by ~~the~~ County ~~of Department of Public Works (~~DPW~~)~~ for safety and sight distance standards. Upon review of the improvements, County DPW would either approve the plans or provide specific recommendations for improving the safety of the proposed ingress/egress. County DPR would comply with all recommendations of County DPW.

As discussed in the analysis for Threshold 1, if encroachment into the public-right-of-way is to occur during construction of certain project elements, including the optional sewer line, or due to the use of large equipment or vehicles, a Traffic Control Plan pursuant to the Traffic Control Permit would be implemented. As part of the Traffic Control Plan, barriers, signs, or flags ~~may be~~<u>maybe</u> used to direct traffic. These traffic control devises would be approved during the review and approval process for the Traffic Control Permit, ensuring that they would be appropriate and safe devi~~c~~<u>s</u>es that would not create a hazard. The optional sewer line in the ~~center-line~~<u>centerline</u> along South Grade Road and Tavern Road would require a Traffic Control Plan during construction. Therefore, construction of the project would not substantially increase hazards because of a geometric design feature or incompatible uses; impacts would be less than significant.

Operation

Upon approval of the transportation improvements by County DPW during construction, the project would not contain any hazards related to geometric design features. Operation of the project would not include any incompatible uses, such as farm equipment that could result in safety hazards related to increased congestion and faster moving vehicles encountering slower moving vehicles along South Grade Road. Work trucks may ~~periodically~~ be utilized at the project site for maintenance

or landscaping; however, these types of vehicles do not represent an incompatible use on a rural roadway such as South Grade Road.

Driveway Safety

The TIS~~TIA~~ completed by Chen Ryan (Appendix I) performed a queuing analysis for the two proposed driveways for access to the project. The primary park entrance (Driveway #1) would be located on the eastern side of the property as a new intersection leg of the South Grade Road and Calle de Compadres intersection, and the second driveway (Driveway #2) would include a new intersection at the southern end of the property. Both driveways would allow full access to the project site. Based on the queuing analysis, the vehicle queues at the project driveways and South Grade Road are expected to fit within the existing storage ~~lanes~~ and would not impede traffic at the driveway or the adjacent roadway system. (Queuing analysis results can be found in Appendix H of Appendix I.) The TIS~~TIA~~ also included a site access evaluation. As part of the evaluation, an all-way stop-controlled intersection warrant analysis was conducted to determine if the peak hour volumes at the intersection of Calle de Compadres (the location of proposed Driveway #1) justified the installation of stop signs at the intersection for all directions of traffic. According to Caltrans' *California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices* (2014), the intersection does not meet the minimum peak hour volumes for an all-way stop-controlled intersection. Additionally, the project driveways are projected to operate at LOS A, indicating free-flowing traffic, during both AM and PM peak hours with the addition of the project-generated traffic.

The Addendum to the TIS (Appendix I1) also performed a sight distance analysis to assess vehicular hazards when entering and exiting the project site. Field observations were conducted in April 2026 to evaluate stopping sight distance and corner sight distance at both project driveways. For context, stopping sight distance is the distance, measured along the travel lane on South Grade Road, that a driver needs to perceive an object or vehicle ahead and bring their own vehicle to a complete stop before reaching it (i.e. *Does a driver traveling on the main road have enough distance to see a vehicle emerging from the driveway and stop before reaching it?*). Corner sight distance is the sight distance available to a driver stopped at the driveway approach, measured in each direction along South Grade Road (i.e. *Does a driver waiting at the driveway have enough visibility along the main road to judge whether it is clear to enter?*).

There are no stopping sight distance deficiencies at any of the four approaches at both driveways. Full stopping sight distance compliance at all four approach directions means that every driver traveling on South Grade Road, regardless of vehicle type, has the sight distance necessary to perceive a vehicle at either driveway approach and bring their vehicle to a complete stop before reaching it. The County's passenger car corner sight distance standard is satisfied at both approach directions of Driveway #1 (northbound and southbound) and at the southwestbound approach of Driveway #2, three of the four approach directions evaluated. At the northeastbound approach of Driveway #2, the available corner sight distance is below the County standard. This condition is attributable to pre-existing vegetation and rock and boulder outcroppings located within the sight triangle on the project site, and is not a condition created or introduced by the project. The exact extent of vegetation obstructions within the sight triangle is dependent on field conditions at any given time. However, corrective measures, including vegetation clearing and removal or grading of the rock/boulder outcroppings shall be completed and verified through the standard site plan review and improvement plan approval process pursuant to the County of San Diego Site Design Standards and Roadway Design Standards, which require that sight distance requirements be satisfied and shown on project plans prior to approval by the County of San Diego Department of

Public Works. Sight distance triangle exhibits identifying the areas within which vegetation clearing and grading are to be maintained clear are provided in the Driveway Sight Distance Evaluation (Attachment C of Appendix I1). Compliance with County standards would be verified and approved before final design approval and issuance of a grading or construction permit to ensure that hazards due to sight distance are prevented for the project.

Upon implementation of the required brush management and vegetation clearing measures, corner sight distance at Driveway #1 would meet the applicable standard, and drivers exiting the park would have sufficient visibility of South Grade Road to safely maneuver the intersection. Additionally, the relatively low side-street and driveway volumes compared to South Grade Road would create substantially differing approach volumes, and all-way stop control under these conditions would impose unnecessary delay on through traffic. Installing all-way stop control at an unwarranted location may also introduce operational and safety concerns, including rear-end collision potential from unexpected deceleration on a high-speed approach, queue spillback into the through traffic stream, and reduced driver compliance over time if the control device is perceived as unnecessary. Based on the availability of adequate stopping sight distance and corner sight distance, side-street stop control is recommended and proposed at both Driveway #1 and Driveway #2. This side street stop control would require exiting park vehicles to stop and yield before entering South Grade Road while allowing through traffic on South Grade Road to remain unimpeded, avoiding the potential operational and safety concerns posed by an all-way stop in these locations. ~~The~~Although ~~the intersection at South Grade Road and Calle de Compadres will operate adequately with~~does not ~~meet the Caltrans minimum peak hour volumes for~~ an "all-way" stop, the County will implement an ~~all-way~~ stop-controlled intersection at Calle de Compadres. ~~as an additional project design feature to improve safety conditions, although not required. The access routes would not substantially increase at the intersections with South Grade Road, or internally on the project site.~~

Geometric Hazards

Regarding potential hazards associated with road geometry, the Addendum to the TIS (Appendix I1) analyzed crash data from the past five years, consistent with the standard analytical window recommended by the FHWA, to assess any existing or potential geometric hazards. In addition to the five-year crash history, a separate review of two historical pedestrian and driver fatalities that occurred in 2016 and 2012, respectively, outside of the standard five-year window, was conducted to provide a conservative analysis and confirm that the conditions associated with the prior incident are not introduced or replicated by the project. A review of the crash types and movement patterns over the past five years indicates that the crashes are consistent with driver behavior (improper turning, driving under the influence of alcohol or drug, and automobile right of way) rather than geometric deficiency. The 2016 incident occurred approximately 145 feet south of the South Grade Road and Calle de Compadres intersection and is classified as a pedestrian violation, with fault assigned to the pedestrian party. The driver of the involved vehicle was found not at fault and was proceeding straight southbound at the time of the collision. The 2012 incident involved a single vehicle whose driver left the roadway and struck a wall and a utility pole; the primary collision factor was improper turning in violation of the California Vehicle Code, and no pedestrian or bicyclist was involved. Consistent with the 2016 collision and the 2021 through 2025 crash history, the 2012 fatality resulted from operator conduct rather than a geometric or design deficiency of South Grade Road. No crashes in the selected dataset were identified as resulting from a geometric feature of the roadway itself. The project does not propose any changes to the existing geometric design of South Grade Road. The project therefore does not introduce a design feature that would create or substantially increase traffic hazards along South Grade Road, and the crash history within

the project vicinity does not indicate a pattern of geometry-related collisions that would be exacerbated by the project.

Pedestrian and Bicyclist Safety

Pedestrians and bicyclists may access the project site without the use of a vehicle, either from the trails to the west of the project site or from surrounding residential areas via South Grade Road. Pedestrian and bicyclist safety at the project driveways was evaluated based on the sight distance findings above, which concluded that the available stopping sight distance on South Grade Road satisfies the standard at all four driveway approach directions. A driver traveling on South Grade Road under normal daytime conditions has sufficient sight distance to perceive a pedestrian or bicyclist near either driveway location and bring the vehicle to a complete stop before reaching the individual. Pedestrians and bicyclists, in turn, have a clear view of oncoming traffic along South Grade Road from the driveway position. This is supported by the corner sight distance findings above for three of the four driveway approach directions, and will be supported at the fourth approach (Driveway #2, northeastbound) upon completion of the vegetation clearing and grading measures identified in this analysis and confirmed through the County's standard site plan review and approval process. The project also proposes a decomposed granite pedestrian path along the west side of South Grade Road, which would provide a separate path of travel for pedestrians outside of the vehicle right of way for pedestrian safety. Additionally, under California Vehicle Code Section 21950(a), the driver of a vehicle is required to yield the right-of-way to a pedestrian crossing the roadway within any marked or unmarked crosswalk at an intersection. Pedestrians crossing South Grade Road at either project driveway are protected by this statutory right-of-way, and drivers exiting either driveway are required to yield to such pedestrians before entering the through travel lane. Thus, no pedestrian or bicycle safety hazards have been identified associated with the project and impacts related to pedestrian and bicycle safety would be less than significant, with no mitigation required.

Finally, the Addendum to the TIS (Appendix I1) includes a parking demand analysis to assess if the project's 240-space parking lot would sufficiently accommodate park visitors. The parking demand analysis uses an existing County Park to assess the parking demand for the project. Of the 76 candidate public parks screened to identify the facility most representative of the proposed project, Hilton Head County Park was selected as the primary analog facility on the basis of full alignment across five screens: park type, catchment setting and population density, amenity mix, fine demographic alignment, and scale and survey configuration. The other 75 parks considered lacked at least one of these five screens (for example, were predominantly passive or hosted primarily league-based sports games and practices instead of the mixed-use day-use pattern of a community park). Two additional East San Diego County parks, Collier County Park and Steele Canyon County park, serve as secondary references for sensitivity comparison of the community park demand. Where the Hilton Head observed rate falls within the range bracketed by the two secondary references after appropriate adjustment for demographic and amenity differences, the central forecast is considered robust. Additionally, because no East County park combines the full amenity-rich community-park program with equestrian access in a single facility, the equestrian-trip component is addressed through a supplementary sensitivity reference utilizing Oakoasis County Preserve (Lakeside) and Dos Picos County Park (Ramona) as data sources for the discrete equestrian-trip contribution, scaled to the proposed Alpine equestrian footprint.

Hilton Head County Park bears to the most resemblance to the project but is in a denser urban setting with a larger surrounding population; as such, retaining the demand rates from the Hilton Head County Park provides a conservative upper bound estimate of traffic volumes for the project. A

2.5 area-based scale factor was applied to account for the difference in active program area between Hilton Head (10 acres) and Alpine (25 acres), proportionally adjusting the observed parking demand to reflect the proposed 240-space lot; this factor is within the range supported by National Recreation and Park Association guidance for transferable trip-rate studies. On non-event days and standard weekday conditions, observed daily parking demand at the comparable park site (Hilton Head County Park) was 17 vehicles in the on-site lot; under these conditions, the proposed project's on-site 240-space parking supply would easily accommodate all park users. On organized sports event days, under conditions of single-sport practice and without simultaneous occurrence of sport activities, observed parking demand at the comparable site reached an average of 72 vehicles for baseball practice and 105 vehicles for multi-use field practice, with maximum observed demands of 119 and 131 vehicles, respectively.

To prevent parking demand from exceeding supply on the project site under concurrent multi-event conditions, where combined maximum demand could approach approximately 250 vehicles, the parking demand analysis recommends on-site measures be implemented to address organized sports programming and scheduling. The live-on volunteer, maintenance staff, and park ranger would implement and maintain the following scheduling requirements for all organized sports activities at the park to ensure the project's parking lot does not become overburdened:

- Only one sport or user group shall occupy each park field/court at any given time; overlapping or simultaneous sports activities or practices are prohibited.
- Sports Programming staff will monitor the site between consecutive sessions to confirm no vehicular spillover onto the public right-of-way. If spillover is observed more than two times in any given season, a minimum one-hour buffer shall be implemented between consecutive sessions to allow full vehicle turnover before the next group arrives. For example, if a session ends at 1:00 PM, the next session may not begin until 2:00 PM. This one-hour buffer shall increase to two hours if additional spillover continues to be observed.
- Sports Programming staff shall be responsible for scheduling all organized activities in strict accordance with these requirements.
- Parks Programming staff and the on-site volunteer shall monitor scheduling compliance on an ongoing basis to ensure these requirements are met at all times.
- Vehicular spillover onto the public right-of-way, including South Grade Road, shall be prevented through enforcement of this scheduling protocol.

Following project opening, County staff and park rangers would monitor on-site and nearby on-street parking conditions for a minimum of one year of operation. If field observations demonstrate that actual parking demand associated with organized sports practices is consistently and materially lower than the levels estimated herein, modification of the parking management program may be considered in coordination with County DPW.

With the incorporation of the sports programming features identified above, the project's parking lot would adequately accommodate park visitors, and pedestrians accessing the park by vehicle could park and walk entirely within the project site, with no need to walk along South Grade Road. Even without these features, should park visitors choose to access the site via walking or bicycling, the project's proposed pedestrian path along the west side of South Grade Road would prevent

pedestrians from walking within the roadway, and a driver traveling on South Grade Road under normal daytime conditions has sufficient sight distance to perceive a pedestrian or bicyclist near either driveway location and bring the vehicle to a complete stop before reaching the individual. Thus, no safety impacts to pedestrians or bicyclists would occur. Because impacts related to pedestrian safety would be less than significant, no mitigation is required.

In conclusion,~~Therefore,~~ the project would not substantially increase hazards because of a geometric design feature or incompatible uses. The project would not create hazardous conditions for pedestrians or bicyclists in the project vicinity.~~;~~ I~~i~~mpacts would be less than significant.

Impact Determination

The project would not substantially increase hazards because of a geometric design feature or incompatible uses. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation is not required.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Impacts would be less than significant.

Threshold 4: The project would not result in inadequate emergency access.

County Park, Trails, and Open Space~~/Preserve~~

Impact Discussion

Construction

Construction equipment for the project would include tractors, excavators, backhoes, water truck, drill rig, bobcat, forklift, rollers, a rubber tire loader, wheel tractor scrapers, an air compressor, a generator set, a crane, and a concrete truck. Construction staging activities would occur adjacent the project site. Construction may result in temporary partially or completely blocked travel lanes along South Grade Road due to large construction equipment in the public right-of-way, construction material deliveries, or construction activities associated with the project features that are adjacent to South Grade Road. These temporary lane closures or impediments within the roadway could delay or obstruct the movement of emergency vehicles along South Grade Road. However, when construction interrupts the normal function of a roadway, a Traffic Control Permit must be obtained from ~~the~~ County ~~of San Diego Department of Public Works.~~DPW. County DPR or its contractors would be responsible for obtaining the Traffic Control Permit which requires the installation and maintenance of appropriate traffic control in accordance with a Traffic Control Plan. The traffic control methods used to maintain safe traffic flow could include barriers, signs, and flags. The implementation of the Traffic Control Plan would ensure safe passage of emergency vehicles in the public right-of-way, and adequate access to the project site by emergency vehicles. Additionally, construction activities onsite would not prevent emergency vehicles from reaching the project site. Impacts would be less than significant.

Operation

As part of standard project approval, the County Fire ~~Services~~Protection District (FPD) staff (i.e., County Fire Marshall) will review the project design to ensure the project site is accessible for emergency vehicles, and onsite utilities are sufficient for emergency response. Therefore, the project would comply with the County Fire Marshall review and approval. County DPR is preparing a Site Evacuation Plan as part of the project operational procedures that ~~will outline~~outlines the evacuation routes to be used by visitors and staff within the Alpine Park site in the event of an onsite or offsite emergency situation. The Site Evacuation Plan only addresses evacuation within the boundaries of the project site. Once visitors leave the park, evacuation ~~procedures~~ would be under the jurisdiction of Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization ~~(EOS), the~~, Alpine ~~Fire Department (AFD),~~FPD, and other jurisdictional agencies, depending on the ~~nature of the~~ emergency situation (i.e.~~g.~~, California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection or County ~~Fire Authority~~FPD may be involved in wildfire emergency situations). During project operation, County DPR would work with ~~AFD~~Alpine FPD and ~~OES~~the Office of Emergency Services to coordinate emergency access and evacuation procedures~~,~~ as necessary. Therefore, operation of the project would not result in inadequate emergency access. Impacts would be less than significant. The Alpine Community Park Fire Evacuation Analysis prepared for the project is included as Appendix K of the Recirculated Draft EIR. This analysis assessed the time required for evacuation from the project site under several scenarios (e.g., a wind-driven fire that results in a required evacuation, affecting the project site and surrounding community). County FPD and Alpine FPD reviewed the evacuation analysis and conclusions derived in the~~this~~ Final EIR.

Impact Determination

The project would not result in inadequate emergency access. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation is not required.

Level of Significance After Mitigation

Impacts would be less than significant.

4.17.5 Summary of Significant Impacts

There would be no significant impacts associated with transportation and circulation.