APPENDIX E

TRAFFIC DATA

APPENDIX E
TRAFFIC DATA

The following traffic data from the Draft Sycamore Landfill Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (Sycamore Landfill, 2008) were used in preparation of the Quail Brush Application for Certification to represent existing conditions data. Tables 10-1, 10-2, and 10-4 of the Sycamore Landfill EIR are reproduced in this appendix for convenience.

TABLE 10–1
SIGNALIZED INTERSECTION OPERATIONS
INTERIM–YEAR 2010

Intersection	Peak Hour	Year 2010 (620 Tickets Permitted)		Year 2010 (1,475 Tickets Proposed)		[c]
		Delay[a] (Seconds)	LOS[b]	Delay (Seconds)	LOS	
Mast Boulevard/SR 52 EB Ramps[d]	AM	19.6	B	23.4	C	3.8
	PM	9.6	A	13.0	B	3.4
Mast Boulevard/ SR 52 WB Ramps[d]	AM	16.7	B	39.5	D	22.8
	PM	15.1	B	16.4	B	1.3
Mast Boulevard/W. Hills Parkway/ Project Driveway[e]	AM	113.1	F	**287.6**	**F**	**174.5**
		With Physical Improvement Mitigation[f]		*99.8*	*F*	–
	PM	30.1	C	**56.7**	**E**	**26.6**
		With Physical Improvement Mitigation[f]		*18.3*	*B*	–
Mast Boulevard/Fanita Parkway	AM	228.6	F	229.5	F	0.9
	PM	56.8	E	57.0	E	0.2
Mast Boulevard/Carlton Hills Boulevard	AM	21.2	C	21.2	C	0.0
	PM	27.7	C	27.7	C	0.0
Mast Boulevard/Cuyamaca Street	AM	50.1	D	51.7	D	1.6
	PM	38.0	D	38.2	D	0.2

Footnotes:

a. Average delay expressed in seconds per vehicle.
b. Level of Service. See table at right for delay thresholds.
c. _ denotes an increase in the Delay.
d. Analysis includes signalization for ramps from near-term scenario.
e. Analysis includes dual eastbound left-turn lane mitigation from near-term scenario.
f. Physical Improvements Mitigation the provision of the following lane configurations: eastbound/westbound=two lefts, two thrus, shared thru-right (protected phasing) and southbound=two rights, one thru and one left (protected phasing).

SIGNALIZED

DELAY/LOS THRESHOLDS

Delay	LOS
0.0 < 10.0	A
10.1 to 20.0	B
20.1 to 35.0	C
35.1 to 55.0	D
55.1 to 80.0	E
> 80.1	F

General Notes:

1. BOLD—represents a significant impact
2. ITALICS—LOS/Delay with Physical Improvements mitigation.

Table 10–2 shows the Year 2010 street segment operations with both the permitted 620-ticket and proposed 1,475-ticket projects. This table shows that with the proposed project and the existing circulation system, all street segments are calculated to continue to operate at LOS C or better with the exception of Mast Boulevard from SR 52 to the West Hills Parkway/Project Driveway intersection, which is calculated to operate at LOS E. No significant cumulative impacts are calculated.

TABLE 10–2
STREET SEGMENT OPERATIONS
INTERIM–YEAR 2010

Street Segment	Existing Capacity (LOS E) [a]	Year 2010 (620 Tickets Permitted)			Year 2010 (1,475 Tickets Proposed)			Δ [e]
		ADT [b]	V/C [c]	LOS [d]	ADT	V/C	LOS	
Mast Boulevard								
SR 52 to West Hills Parkway/ Project Driveway	40,000	33,820	0.85	D	**39,615**	**0.99**	**E**	**0.14**
		With Physical Improvement Mitigation[f]				*0.66*	*C*	--
West Hills Parkway/ Project Driveway to Fanita Parkway	40,000	28,830	0.72	C	29,015	0.73	C	0.01
Fanita Parkway to Carlton Hills Boulevard	40,000	19,430	0.49	B	19,615	0.49	B	0.00
Carlton Hills Boulevard to Cuyamaca Street	40,000	28,730	0.72	C	28,915	0.72	C	0.00
East of Cuyamaca Street	40,000	19,145	0.48	B	19,205	0.48	B	0.00

Footnotes:
a. Capacities based on City of Santee, City of San Diego Roadway Capacity Tables (See Appendix H).
b. Average Daily Traffic
c. Volume to Capacity ratio
d. Level of Service
e. _ denotes an increase in the Volume to Capacity ratio
f. Physical Improvements Mitigation includes widening to a 6-lane roadway with a capacity of 60,000 ADT.

General Notes:
1. BOLD—represents a significant impact.
2. ITALICS—LOS/Delay with Physical Improvements mitigation.

Table 10–4 shows the Year 2010 peak hour freeway mainline operations for SR 52 east and west of Mast Boulevard with both the permitted 620-ticket and proposed 1,475-ticket projects. Again, no capacity-enhancing improvements have been assumed for SR 52, such as the Managed Lanes or Auxiliary Lanes project. This table shows that with the proposed project, three peak conditions on SR 52 are calculated to continue to operate at LOS F(3). The project's contributions in V/C to these conditions exceed the allowable 0.01, and are considered significant cumulative project impacts. *Physical improvement mitigation measures are discussed in Section 13.0 in this report.*

TABLE 10–4
MAINLINE OPERATIONS SUMMARY
INTERIM—YEAR 2010

Freeway and Segment	Peak Hour	Direction/ Capacity[a]		Year 2010 (620 Tickets Permitted)			Year 2010 (1,475 Tickets Proposed)			_[e]
				PHV[b]	V/C[c]	LOS[d]	PHV	V/C	LOS	
SR 52										
West of Mast Boulevard	AM	WB[f]	6,600	9,975	1.511	F(3)	**10,289**	**1.559**	**F(3)**	**0.048**
				With Physical Improvement Mitigation[g]			*Requires Additional Freeway Lane*			
	PM	WB	6,600	2,366	0.359	B	2,505	0.380	B	0.021
	AM	EB	4,400	2,109	0.479	B	2,404	0.546	B	0.067
	PM	EB	4,400	8,929	2.029	F(3)	**9,055**	**2.058**	**F(3)**	**0.029**
				With Physical Improvement Mitigation[g]			*Requires Additional Freeway Lane*			
East of Mast Boulevard	AM	WB	4,400	6,880	1.564	F(3)	**6,935**	**1.576**	**F(3)**	**0.012**
				With Physical Improvement Mitigation[g]			*Requires Additional Freeway Lane*			
	PM	WB	4,400	1,607	0.365	B	1,631	0.371	B	0.006
	AM	EB	4,400	1,375	0.313	B	1,434	0.326	B	0.013
	PM	EB	4,400	6,223	1.414	F(2)	6,249	1.420	F(2)	0.006

Footnotes:

a. Capacity based on 2,200 vehicles/hour/lane.
b. PHV = Peak Hour Volumes
c. V/C = Volume/ Capacity
d. LOS = Level of Service
e. _ = Denotes an increase in the V/C.
f. EB = Eastbound, etc.
g. Physical Improvements Mitigation requires an additional freeway lane to increase capacity, such as the Managed Lanes projects.

General Notes:

1. BOLD—represents a significant impact.
2. ITALICS—LOS/Delay with TDM/ Physical Improvements mitigation.
3. See Section 13.0 for discussion on cumulative project impact freeway mitigation.
4. Existing freeway configuration is assumed.