

## 4.13 TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION

This section of the EIR describes transportation and traffic impacts attributable to implementation of the Draft General Plan. Much of this analysis addresses provisions of the Draft General Plan Circulation Element, which identifies a hierarchy of streets and highways that provides access to new and existing development, while linking the community with surrounding areas of Riverside County and the rest of southern California. Exhibit 3-4 in Chapter 3, “Project Description” illustrates the Roadway Circulation Master Plan for the planning area. Table 3-1 on page 32 of Appendix F presents existing and proposed lane configuration and street classifications for the planning area.

The information in this section of the EIR is based on research and analysis conducted by Urban Crossroads, Inc. in 2006 and 2011. The 2011 *City of Hemet General Plan Circulation Element Update Transportation Study* (Traffic Study), which includes the 2006 *City of Hemet General Plan Circulation Element Update Existing Conditions Assessment* (Existing Conditions Report) as an attachment, is included as Appendix F to this EIR.

### 4.13.1 REGULATORY SETTING

#### FEDERAL PLANS, POLICIES, REGULATIONS, AND LAWS

No federal plans, policies, regulations, or laws directly apply to the traffic and transportation analysis in this EIR.

#### STATE PLANS, POLICIES, REGULATIONS, AND LAWS

The Traffic Study (Appendix F) describes state plans, policies, regulations, and laws beginning on page 3. These include:

- ▶ **Complete Streets Act of 2008 (Assembly Bill [AB] 1358)** – Requires Circulation Elements of general plans to address to identify how the jurisdiction will provide for the routine accommodation of all users of roadways, including motorists, pedestrians, bicyclists, individuals with disabilities, seniors, and users of public transportation.
- ▶ **California Streets and Highways Code: California Bicycle Transportation Act** – The California Streets and Highways Code spells out required components of bicycle plans each jurisdiction must include to be eligible for Caltrans Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA) funds. Local governments seeking these funds must have their plan approved by the regional funding agency. The intent of the California Bicycle Transportation Act is to design and develop a transportation system that achieves the functional commuting needs of the employee, student, business person, and shopper, ensures the physical safety of the bicyclist and bicyclist’s property; and accommodate bicyclists of all ages and skills.
- ▶ **Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32)** – Establishes a comprehensive program of regulatory and market mechanisms to achieve real, quantifiable, cost-effective reductions in greenhouse gasses (GHGs). This legislation calls for a reduction of the state’s greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 and will require the state to cut emissions by approximately 30% over projected levels.
- ▶ **Sustainable Communities Planning Act of 2008 (Senate Bill [SB] 375)** – Requires the ARB to set regional targets for 2020 and 2035 to reduce GHG emissions from passenger vehicles. The targets apply to regions in the state covered by the 18 metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs). The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is the MPO that represents the City of Hemet and other parts of western Riverside County. SB 375 provides emissions-reducing goals regions can plan for, integrates disjointed planning activities, and provides incentives for local governments and developers to follow new, conscientiously planned growth patterns. In September 2010, ARB issued an 8% per capita reduction target to the SCAG

region for 2020 and a conditional target of 13% by 2035, contingent upon further discussion and analysis with ARB. These targets apply to the SCAG region as a whole, and not to individual cities or subregions.

## **REGIONAL AND LOCAL PLANS, POLICIES, REGULATIONS, AND LAWS**

The Traffic Study (Appendix F) describes regional plans, policies, regulations, and laws beginning on page 8. These include:

- ▶ **Regional Transportation Plan** – The SCAG 2008 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is a 25-year plan that provides long-range regional strategies for new construction and improvements to the existing transportation system to enhance the movement of people and goods. The RTP addresses 12 topic areas: transportation finance, air quality conformity, integrated growth forecast and regional land use, highways and arterials, public transit, goods movement, aviation and airport ground access, high-speed regional transport, transportation safety and security, environmental justice, environmental mitigation, and non-motorized transportation.
- ▶ **Riverside County Congestion Management Program** – The Congestion Management Program (CMP) was first introduced in 1991 under Proposition 111 as a state directive for local governments to measure and mitigate the impact of land use decision on streets, highways, and regional roadways. The Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) is responsible for the development and implementation of the CMP in Riverside County. The CMP is required to be updated every two years. Part of this update process requires RCTC to review traffic data to determine if any segments are operating at Level of Service (LOS) “F” conditions. Under the federal metropolitan planning regulations, SCAG is required to certify that the county transportation commissions are meeting federal requirements through their respective CMPs and that they are consistent with the RTP.

### **4.13.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

Existing setting information is based on daily traffic count data from 24-hour intersection approach count data gathered in 2006, with some earlier approach count data from 2004 and 2005 where 2006 data were not available. Operations at 31 intersections were analyzed based on the traffic count data and turning movement volumes, input into the Western Riverside Subarea Applications Traffic Model (WRSATM). WRSATM was developed by disaggregating and refining the Riverside County Integrated Project (RCIP) model which was developed for the County of Riverside.

#### **Level of Service**

The criteria used to evaluate roadway LOS conditions vary based on the type of roadway and whether the traffic flow is considered interrupted or uninterrupted. For signalized intersections, average stopped delay per vehicle for the overall intersection is used to determine LOS. Intersection LOS is defined in terms of average delay for the intersection. Roadway and intersection LOS definitions are provided in Table 4.13-1.

#### **Existing Performance Standards**

##### ***Riverside County Congestion Management Program***

The Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) Congestion Management Program (CMP) designates certain roadways as CMP facilities. SR 74 and SR 79 are both designated highways on RCTC’s CMP system. SR 74 (Florida Avenue) is exempt from CMP requirements from Sanderson Avenue to Hemet Street because it operated at LOS F when the CMP was initially introduced in 1991. The CMP designates a minimum acceptable LOS of E on CMP facilities. (RCTC 2010)

<b>Table 4.13-1 Intersection Level of Service Definitions</b>			
Level of Service	Signalized Intersection	Unsignalized Intersection	Roadway (Daily)
A	Uncongested operations, all queues clear in a single-signal cycle. Delay $\leq$ 10 sec	Little or no delay. Delay $\leq$ 10 sec/veh	Free flow.
B	Uncongested operations, all queues clear in a single cycle. Delay 10 to 20 sec	Short traffic delays. Delay 10 to 15 sec/veh	Stable flow, presence of other vehicles noticeable.
C	Light congestion, occasional backups on critical approaches. Delay 20 to 35 sec	Average traffic delays. Delay 15 sec/veh to 25 sec/veh	Ability to maneuver and select operating speed affected.
D	Significant congestions of critical approaches but intersection functional. Cars required to wait through more than one cycle during short peaks. No long queues formed. Delay 35 to 55 sec	Long traffic delays. Delay 25 to 35 sec/veh	High density but stable flow, speeds and ability to maneuver restricted.
E	Severe congestion with some long standing queues on critical approaches. Blockage of intersection may occur if traffic signal does not provide for protected turning movements. Traffic queue may block nearby intersection(s) upstream of critical approach (es). Delay 55 to 80 sec	Very long traffic delays, failure, extreme congestion. Delay 35 to 50 sec/veh	At or near capacity, speeds reduced to low but relatively uniform level.
F	Total breakdown, stop-and-go operation. Delay $>$ 80 sec	Intersection blocked by external causes. Delay $>$ 50 sec/veh	Forced flow, breakdown.

Source: 2000 Highway Capacity Manual.

### **City of Hemet**

The City of Hemet has designated a minimum acceptable roadway and intersection LOS of D. Because the City's LOS standard for CMP roadways within the planning area is more stringent than the RCTC standard, analysis in this EIR is based on the City's LOS standard.

### **EXISTING CONDITIONS**

#### **Roadway System**

Existing roadway classifications in the planning area include expressways, arterial highways, major highways, secondary highways, collectors, and local collectors. The circulation system is comprised of State Route 79 (SR 79) as well as Arterial, Major Collector, Minor Collector, and Local streets. Exhibit 4.13-1 illustrates existing roadways and functional classifications in the planning area.

The quality of current roadway traffic conditions in the planning area is summarized below, based on information assembled for the Existing Conditions Report (included in the Traffic Study, Appendix F to the EIR). The description of existing conditions uses information regarding daily traffic volumes on key roadways, and peak-hour traffic volumes at major intersections, along with Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) information.

#### **Roadway and Intersection Level of Service**

Existing peak hour AM intersection volumes are presented on Exhibit 4.13-3, and PM intersection volumes are presented on Exhibit 4.13-4. Existing intersection LOS for the 31 study intersections is presented in Table 4.13-2.

<b>Table 4.13-2 Intersection Analysis Summary for General Plan Buildout Conditions</b>																		
Intersection	Traffic Control <sup>3</sup>	Intersection Approach Lanes <sup>1</sup>												Delay <sup>2</sup> (SECS.)		Level of Service		
		North-Bound			South-Bound			East-Bound			West-Bound							
		L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R	AM	PM	AM	PM	
<b>California Av. (NS) at:</b>																		
• Devonshire Av. (EW)																		
- Existing	AWS	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	8.8	8.6	A	A	
- General Plan Buildout	<b>TS</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	1	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	0.5	1	<b>1.5</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1.5</b>	0.5	32.0	29.9	C	C	
• Florida Av. (EW)																		
- Existing	CSS	0	1!	0	0.5	0.5	1	1	1.5	0.5	1	1.5	0.5	-- <sup>4</sup>	-- <sup>4</sup>	F	F	
- General Plan Buildout	<b>TS</b>	<b>2</b>	1	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	1	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	24.7	50.9	C	D	
<b>Warren Rd. (NS) at:</b>																		
• Esplanade Av. (EW)																		
- Existing	AWS	0	1!	0	0	1!	0	0	1!	0	0	1!	0	20.1	24.9	C	C	
- General Plan Buildout	<b>TS</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b> >	<b>2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	51.3	37.3	D	D	
• Devonshire Av. (EW)																		
- Existing	AWS	0	1!	0	0	1!	0	0	1!	0	0.5	0.5	1	17.6	29.9	C	D	
- General Plan Buildout	<b>TS</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	1	34.7	49.8	C	D	
• Florida Av. (EW)																		
- Existing	TS	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	35.7	37.4	D	D	
- General Plan Buildout	TS	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b> >>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	1	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	1	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	1	41.4	26.8	D	C	
• Simpson Rd. (EW)																		
- Existing	CSS	0.5	0	0.5	0	0	0	0	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	13.7	17.7	B	C	
- General Plan Buildout	<b>TS</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b> >>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	1	0.5	0.5	34.1	42.8	C	D	
• Domenigoni Pw. (EW)																		

**Table 4.13-2  
Intersection Analysis Summary for General Plan Buildout Conditions**

Intersection	Traffic Control <sup>3</sup>	Intersection Approach Lanes <sup>1</sup>												Delay <sup>2</sup>		Level of Service	
		North-Bound			South-Bound			East-Bound			West-Bound			AM	PM	AM	PM
		L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R	AM	PM	AM	PM
- Existing	TS	0	1!	0	0	1!	0	1	2	1	1	2	1	24.1	27.1	C	C
- General Plan Buildout	TS	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1</b>	1	<b>3</b>	1	1	<b>3</b>	1	41.7	52.0	D	D
<b>Cawston Av. (NS) at:</b>																	
Devonshire Av.																	
• (EW)																	
- Existing	AWS	0.5	0.5	1	0	1!	0	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	1	11.0	9.8	B	A
- General Plan Buildout	<b>TS</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	1	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>0.5</b>	23.7	30.3	C	C
Florida Av.																	
• (EW)																	
- Existing	TS	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	0	0	1.5	0.5	17.9	47.8	B	D
- General Plan Buildout	TS	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1</b>	1	<b>2</b>	1	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	32.0	45.7	C	D
<b>Sanderson Av. (NS) at:</b>																	
Esplanade Av.																	
• (EW)																	
- Existing	TS	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	1	23.7	30.5	C	C
- General Plan Buildout	TS	<b>2</b>	<b>1.5</b>	0.5	<b>2</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>0.5</b>	1	<b>1.5</b>	0.5	1	<b>1.5</b>	<b>0.5</b>	37.2	43.0	D	D
Devonshire Av.																	
• (EW)																	
- Existing	TS	1	1.5	0.5	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	27.4	33.0	C	C
- General Plan Buildout	TS	1	1.5	0.5	1	2	1	1	<b>1.5</b>	<b>0.5</b>	1	<b>1.5</b>	<b>0.5</b>	-- <sup>4</sup>	61.1	F	E
- With Additional Through Lanes	TS	1	<b>2.5</b>	0.5	1	<b>3</b>	1	1	<b>2</b>	1	1	<b>2</b>	1	52.1	41.2	D	D
Florida Av.																	
• (EW)																	
- Existing	TS	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	32.2	43.8	C	D

Hemet General Plan FEIR  
 City of Hemet  
 4.13-5  
 Traffic and Transportation  
 AECOM

<b>Table 4.13-2 Intersection Analysis Summary for General Plan Buildout Conditions</b>																		
Intersection	Traffic Control <sup>3</sup>	Intersection Approach Lanes <sup>1</sup>												Delay <sup>2</sup> (SECS.)		Level of Service		
		North-Bound			South-Bound			East-Bound			West-Bound							
		L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R	AM	PM	AM	PM	
- General Plan Buildout	TS	<u>2</u>	1.5	0.5	<u>2</u>	1.5	0.5	<u>2</u>	1.5	0.5	<u>2</u>	1.5	0.5	-- <sup>4</sup>	-- <sup>4</sup>	F	F	
- With Additional Through Lanes	TS	<u>2</u>	<u>2.5</u>	<u>0.5</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2.5</u>	<u>0.5</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2.5</u>	<u>0.5</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2.5</u>	<u>0.5</u>	37.5	42.7	D	D	
<b>Acacia Av.</b>																		
• (EW)																		
- Existing	TS	1	1.5	0.5	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	21.0	21.8	C	C	
- General Plan Buildout	TS	<u>2</u>	1.5	0.5	<u>2</u>	1.5	0.5	1	<u>1.5</u>	<u>0.5</u>	1	<u>1.5</u>	<u>0.5</u>	31.8	53.1	C	D	
<b>Stetson Av.</b>																		
• (EW)																		
- Existing	TS	1	2	1>	1	1.5	0.5	1	1.5	0.5	1	1.5	0.5	18.5	24.7	C	C	
- General Plan Buildout	TS	<u>2</u>	<u>1.5</u>	<u>0.5</u>	<u>2</u>	1.5	0.5	<u>2</u>	<u>2.5</u>	0.5	<u>2</u>	<u>2.5</u>	0.5	36.9	47.4	D	D	
<b>Sanderson Av. (NS) at:</b>																		
Mustang Wy.																		
• (EW)																		
- Existing	TS	1	2	1	1	1.5	1.5	1.5	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	1	28.7	30.5	C	C	
- General Plan Buildout	TS	1	2	1	1	1.5	1.5	1.5	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	1	28.5	31.8	C	C	
<b>Domenigoni Pw. (EW)</b>																		
- Existing	TS	0	0	0	1	0	2>	2	2	0	0	2	1>	16.5	16.2	B	B	
- General Plan Buildout	TS	0	0	0	1	0	2>	2	<u>3</u>	0	0	<u>3</u>	1>	16.0	21.9	B	C	
<b>Lyon Av. (NS) at:</b>																		
Devonshire Av.																		
• (EW)																		
- Existing	AWS	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	1	14.2	32.0	B	D	
- General Plan Buildout	<u>TS</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1.5</u>	<u>0.5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1.5</u>	<u>0.5</u>	<u>1</u>	0.5	<u>0.5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1.5</u>	<u>0.5</u>	23.8	30.5	C	C	

**Table 4.13-2  
Intersection Analysis Summary for General Plan Buildout Conditions**

Intersection	Traffic Control <sup>3</sup>	Intersection Approach Lanes <sup>1</sup>												Delay <sup>2</sup> (SECS.)		Level of Service	
		North-Bound			South-Bound			East-Bound			West-Bound						
		L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R	AM	PM	AM	PM
<b>Florida Av. (EW)</b>																	
- Existing	TS	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1.5	0.5	1	2	1	19.9	22.3	B	C
- General Plan Buildout	TS	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1.5	0.5	1	2	1	25.9	46.0	C	D
<b>Acacia Av. (EW)</b>																	
- Existing	TS	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	16.9	23.0	B	C
- General Plan Buildout	TS	1	<b>1.5</b>	<b>0.5</b>	1	<b>1.5</b>	<b>0.5</b>	1	<b>1.5</b>	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	17.2	22.6	B	C
<b>Stetson Av. (EW)</b>																	
- Existing	TS	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	1.0	1	1.5	0.5	1	1.5	0.5	30.6	31.5	C	C
- General Plan Buildout	TS	1	<b>1.5</b>	<b>0.5</b>	1	<b>1.5</b>	<b>0.5</b>	1	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	1	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	34.5	51.4	C	D
<b>State St. (NS) at:</b>																	
<b>Esplanade Av. (EW)</b>																	
- Existing	TS	1	1.5	0.5	1	1.5	0.5	1	2	1	1	2	1	29.6	32.4	C	C
- General Plan Buildout	TS	1	1.5	0.5	1	1.5	0.5	1	2	1	1	2	1	44.4	51.4	D	D
<b>Devonshire Av. (EW)</b>																	
- Existing	AWS	0.5	1.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	1	20.4	21.5	C	C
- General Plan Buildout	<b>TS</b>	<b>1</b>	1.5	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	0.5	<b>1</b>	0.5	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>0.5</b>	23.6	24.4	C	C
<b>Florida Av. (EW)</b>																	
- Existing	TS	1	1.5	0.5	1	1	1	1	1.5	0.5	1	1.5	0.5	96.5	152.8	F	F
- General Plan Buildout	TS	1	1.5	0.5	1	<b>2</b>	1	1	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	1	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	33.6	43.0	C	D

<b>Table 4.13-2 Intersection Analysis Summary for General Plan Buildout Conditions</b>																		
Intersection	Traffic Control <sup>3</sup>	Intersection Approach Lanes <sup>1</sup>												Delay <sup>2</sup> (SECS.)		Level of Service		
		North-Bound			South-Bound			East-Bound			West-Bound							
		L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R	AM	PM	AM	PM	
<b>Acacia Av. (EW)</b>																		
- Existing	TS	1	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	1	31.0	39.2	C	D	
- General Plan Buildout	TS	1	<u>2</u>	1	1	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1.5</u>	<u>0.5</u>	<u>1</u>	0.5	<u>0.5</u>	17.1	17.6	B	B	
<b>Stetson Av. (EW)</b>																		
- Existing	TS	1	1.5	0.5	1	1.5	0.5	1	1.5	0.5	1	1.5	0.5	26.5	29.6	C	C	
- General Plan Buildout	TS	1	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u> >	1	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	36.2	40.7	D	D	
<b>Domenigoni Pw. (EW)</b>																		
- Existing	TS	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1>	1	0.5	0.5	28.7	32.9	C	C	
- General Plan Buildout	TS	<u>2</u>	<u>1.5</u>	0.5	<u>2</u>	<u>1.5</u>	<u>0.5</u>	1	<u>2</u>	1>	1	<u>2.5</u>	0.5	40.1	45.5	D	D	
<b>San Jacinto St. (NS) at:</b>																		
<b>Florida Av. (EW)</b>																		
- Existing	TS	1	1.5	0.5	1.5	0.5	1	1	1.5	0.5	1	2	1	42.9	42.2	D	D	
- General Plan Buildout	TS	1	1.5	0.5	<u>1</u>	<u>1.5</u>	<u>0.5</u>	1	1.5	0.5	1	2	1	32.4	42.7	C	D	
<b>Columbia St. (NS) at:</b>																		
<b>Florida Av. (EW)</b>																		
- Existing	TS	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1.5	0.5	1	2	1	9.8	7.4	A	A	
- General Plan Buildout	TS	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1.5	0.5	1	2	1	7.5	9.4	A	A	
<b>Meridian St. (NS) at:</b>																		
<b>Florida Av. (EW)</b>																		
- Existing	TS	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	2	1	1	1.5	0.5	11.1	9.8	B	A	

<b>Table 4.13-2 Intersection Analysis Summary for General Plan Buildout Conditions</b>																	
Intersection	Traffic Control <sup>3</sup>	Intersection Approach Lanes <sup>1</sup>												Delay <sup>2</sup> (SECS.)		Level of Service	
		North-Bound			South-Bound			East-Bound			West-Bound						
		L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R	L	T	R	AM	PM	AM	PM
- General Plan Buildout	TS	<u>1</u>	0.5	<u>0.5</u>	<u>1</u>	0.5	<u>0.5</u>	1	2	1	1	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	11.5	10.6	B	B
<b>Ramona Ex. (NS) at:</b>																	
Florida Av. • (EW)																	
- Existing	TS	0	0	0	2	0	1>	1	2	0	0	2	1	8.9	12.6	A	B
- General Plan Buildout	TS	0	0	0	2	0	1>	1	2	0	0	2	1	15.9	19.8	B	B
Notes: <sup>1</sup> Shared lanes are indicated with decimal values. When a right turn is designated, the lane can either be striped or unstriped. To function as a right turn lane there must be sufficient width for right turning vehicles to travel outside the through lanes. L = Left; T = Through; R = Right; > = Right Turn Overlap Signal Phase (Green Arrow); >> = Free Right Turn 0.5 = shared left-through or shared through-right turn lane; 1! = shared left-through-right turn lane; <u>1</u> = Improvement <sup>2</sup> Delay and level of service calculated using the following analysis software: Traffix, Version 7.5 R1 (2002). Per the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual, overall average intersection delay and level of service are shown for intersections with a traffic signal or all way stop control. For intersections with cross street stop control, the delay and level of service for the worst individual movement (or movements sharing a single lane) are shown. <sup>3</sup> CSS = Cross Street Stop; AWS = All Way Stop; TS = Traffic Signal <sup>4</sup> -- = Delay is greater than 200.0 seconds; Intersection is unstable; Level of Service "F". <sup>5</sup> Volume-to-Capacity Ratio is greater than 1.00; Intersection is unstable; Level of Service "F".																	

Existing data indicate that three intersections operate at a deficient level of service (E or F) during the AM peak hour, and four intersections operate at LOS E or F during the PM peak hour. These intersections include:

- ▶ California and Florida Avenues (AM/PM LOS F)
- ▶ Warren Road at Esplanade Avenue (PM LOS E)
- ▶ Warren Road at Stetson Avenue (AM/PM LOS F)
- ▶ Sanderson and Stetson Avenues (AM/PM LOS F)

## **Railroad Operations**

A heavy rail line extends northeasterly from Winchester to downtown Hemet, where it curves north and runs along Harvard Street, parallel to and east of State Street. Currently, railroad traffic is limited to on-demand freight operations serving industrial and commercial sites throughout Hemet. However, this line is planned to support future Metrolink commuter services. Future improvements involving railroad facilities will require advance coordination with both the BNSF Railway and the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC).

## **Truck Routes**

Regional truck routes follow SR 74, SR 79, and Domenigoni Parkway. Within the planning area, SR 74 and SR 79 follow Florida Avenue, San Jacinto Avenue north of Florida Avenue, and Winchester Road. Pursuant to Hemet Municipal Code Section 78-61, designated truck routes in the City include:

- ▶ Florida Avenue;
- ▶ Warren Road;
- ▶ Sanderson Avenue;
- ▶ State Street and San Jacinto Street north of Florida Avenue;
- ▶ Menlo Avenue between Sanderson Avenue and San Jacinto Street;
- ▶ Stetson Avenue between Sanderson Avenue and State Street; and
- ▶ Domenigoni Parkway.

## **Pedestrian Facilities**

The existing pedestrian network consists of street sidewalks, paseos in larger scale developments or along portions of Florida and Sanderson Avenues, and regional trails that may be shared with bicyclists or equestrians. Sidewalks are required in new developments except where rural street standards are applied. Some existing developed portions of Hemet located outside the core central area were developed either as rural areas or as large lot subdivisions and thus do not have sidewalks.

## **Bicycle Facilities**

Hemet's current bike trail system includes Class 1 bike paths, Class 2 bike lanes, and Class 3 bike routes. In the older, central portion of the City, designated bike routes are constrained by street widths that typically do not accommodate designated lanes. This is particularly true on collector streets where the typical widths allow either on-street parking, designated bike lanes, or medians. However, much of the central portion of the City has sidewalks, and the grid system offers flexibility for bicycle riders to use side streets. Newer portions of the City typically have a larger grid system that may or may not include sidewalks or bike paths, although some more recently developed areas include mixed-use pathways.

## **Transit Facilities**

Riverside Transit Authority (RTA) operates public transit the planning area. RTA bus lines 32, 33, and 42 provide local access to the planning area and neighboring San Jacinto, as shown in Exhibit 4.13-5. RTA routes currently

use the Hemet Valley Mall located near the intersection of Florida Avenue and Kirby Street as a hub for all routes serving Hemet and San Jacinto and for routes connecting to regional destinations.

Several paratransit options are provided for senior citizens who are not able to drive, or would rather not drive. RTA's Dial-A-Ride program provides general Senior/Disabled service and Priority Service for persons certified under the Americans with Disabilities Act. Care-A-Van service is also provided within the City for low-income seniors and disabled travelers. Hemet Valley Medical Center offers patient transportation to and from the hospital.

## **Airports**

The Hemet-Ryan Airport serves users of smaller general aviation aircraft and the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection's fire fighting aircraft. The airport also provides air freight service. The Hemet-Ryan Airport is owned and operated by Riverside County.

### **4.13.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

#### **ANALYSIS METHODS**

The analysis of impacts is based on the likely consequences of adoption and implementation of the Draft General Plan, including: future land uses consistent with the Land Use Diagram, supporting roadways on the Circulation Master Plan, infrastructure and public services to support future uses, and implementation of Draft General Plan policies and programs.

The analysis presented in this section describes the quality of traffic movement on roadways in the planning area under current conditions and post-2030 with implementation of the Draft General Plan (as shown on Table 3-1 in Chapter 3, "Project Description.") The analysis of post-2030 conditions with implementation of the Draft General Plan also incorporates proposed roadway improvements described in Table 3-3 in Chapter 3, "Project Description." Interchanges are analyzed according to the method prescribed in the Transportation Research Board's *2000 Highway Capacity Manual*, for both un-signalized and signalized intersections.

The impact analysis presented in this section is based on analysis provided in the Traffic Study (Urban Crossroads 2011), which is attached to this EIR as Appendix F. The Traffic Study was completed using the Riverside County Transportation Analysis Model (RivTAM). First, future land use estimates from the Draft General Plan were converted into socio-economic data. Then, information describing the future roadway network depicted on the Circulation Master Plan were used to assign trip routes and determine LOS. RivTAM incorporates additional inputs regarding residential and non-residential activity throughout the region, enabling more sophisticated analysis of travel behavior. For example, household size, vehicle ownership, and income all affect the likelihood that modes of transport other than the automobile will be utilized to satisfy the daily transportation needs of a household.

Many highway network changes were necessary to convert the regional RivTAM model to a more detailed City of Hemet-focused version of RivTAM. Each roadway included on the Circulation Master Plan was explicitly modeled, resulting in more detailed travel demand forecasts. The final network of modeled roadways, including the number of lanes and segment distances, is included in Appendix 2.1 to the Traffic Study, which is included as Appendix F to this EIR).

Table 4.13-3 presents socio-economic data used in the Traffic Study, which are consistent with and/or derived from the General Plan Land Use Element and Table 3-1 in Section 3.0, "Project Description."

Based on the data presented in Table 4.13-3, 623,990 existing (2006) daily trips were estimated, and 1,430,620 daily trips were estimated for the Draft General Plan, which includes numerous trip reduction measures.

**Table 4.13-3  
Socio-Economic Data for Travel Demand Modeling Existing Conditions and Draft General Plan**

Variable	Existing Conditions (2006)	Draft General Plan (Post-2030)	Difference	Percent Difference
<b>Residential Units (households)</b>	47,793	68,948	21,155	44%
<b>Population</b>	95,384	163,753	68,369	72%
<b>Employment</b>	25,190	96,260	71,070	282%
<b>Commercial Square Footage (1,000s)</b>	6,857	20,269	13,412	196%
<b>Office Square Footage (1,000s)</b>	1,026	6,662	5,636	549%
<b>Industrial Square Footage (1,000s)</b>	3,898	27,690	23,792	610%

Note: Employment data includes only the area within the 2006 City limits for existing conditions.  
Source: Urban Crossroads, 2011.

### Intersection Levels of Service

Peak-hour intersection traffic volumes were identified for key intersections in the planning area. Table 4.13-4 identifies resulting peak-hour LOS forecasts for key intersections in the planning area. Because implementation of the Draft General Plan includes both proposed land uses and the proposed circulation system, the analysis of future-year conditions assumes that roadway configurations will be those illustrated on the Circulation Master Plan.

### DRAFT GENERAL PLAN POLICIES AND PROGRAMS

Implementation of Draft General Plan policies and programs listed below would reduce traffic and transportation impacts.

#### Policies

- ▶ **C-1.3 Traffic Flow.** Maintain Level of Service (LOS) C or better for roadway segment operations, and LOS D or better for peak-hour intersection movements. Portions of Florida Avenue and Sanderson Avenue may operate at or below LOS D on a case-by-case basis.
- ▶ **C-1.6 Roadway Capacity.** Identify roadways that cannot be widened to their full master-planned width because existing development or other physical constraints prohibit acquisition of full right-of-way and consider parking restrictions, access management, roadway restriping, and intersection improvements as potential methods of increasing roadway capacity.
- ▶ **C-1.15 New Development.** Approval of new development projects shall:
  - require that all roadways within a new development be constructed to the ultimate right-of-way and that master-planned roadways next to the project site be, at a minimum, constructed to their master planned half-width plus 10 feet, or greater if necessary to maintain adequate traffic flow;
  - require new developments to meet roadway and intersection performance standards and/or contribute their fair share toward improvements pursuant to a traffic impact analysis;

- require new developments within designated commercial corridors to acquire or grant reciprocal access and parking agreements to facilitate movement with adjacent commercial uses without affecting the adjacent roadway;
  - require dedication and improvement of adequate right-of-way along new roadways to minimize impacts of proposed development projects on the City’s circulation system;.
  - limit lot development to reverse frontage and/or side-one lots on all arterials.
- ▶ **C-1.17 Traffic Analyses.** Evaluate development proposals for potential impacts on the transportation and infrastructure system based on traffic analyses that follow the protocols established by the City. The traffic analysis should evaluate the need for both ultimate and interim improvements resulting from the development proposal.
  - ▶ **C-1.18 Future Roadways.** Future roadways and intersections must meet roadway classification design specifications and performance criteria.
  - ▶ **C-1.19 Street Standard Compliance.** Require compliance with established street standards for public, private, and rural streets, including traffic calming facilities, where appropriate.
  - ▶ **C-3.4 Emergency and Service Vehicle Right-of-Way.** Establish and implement street standards that maintain an acceptable right-of-way to accommodate emergency, utility, maintenance, and service vehicles.
  - ▶ **C-4.15 Transit-oriented Development Design Features.** Require new development to incorporate transit-oriented design features and attractive, accessible, and appropriate transit, bicycle, and pedestrian amenities to promote and support public transit and alternate modes of transportation, including but not limited to:
    - requiring bus turnouts and shaded bus stops where appropriate;
    - requiring all new transit stops be equipped with bicycle racks and/or bicycle lockers;
    - encouraging senior citizen and affordable family housing projects to provide transportation services; and requiring new public facilities to incorporate transit facilities
  - ▶ **C-5.3 Bike-Friendly Development.** Require the provision of designated bikeways, bicycle racks, lockers, and other bicycle amenities at public parks and buildings, commercial or industrial buildings, shopping centers, and other activity centers as part of discretionary plans for development projects.
  - ▶ **C-5.4 Roadway Sharing.** Evaluate the needs of bicycle traffic in the planning, design, construction, and operation of all new roadway projects including the provision of sufficient paved surface width to enable bicycle traffic to share the road with motor vehicles.
  - ▶ **C-5.5 Regional Bikeway Interconnectivity.** Require that existing and proposed bikeways within the City connect with those in neighboring jurisdictions and the Riverside County Trails and Bikeway System Master Plan, whenever practicable.
  - ▶ **C-6.1 Railway-Pedestrian Safety.** Limit pedestrian access onto the railway line from street crossings and require that discretionary development projects consider and include vandal-resistant fencing or barriers to limit pedestrian access to the extent feasible.
  - ▶ **PS-7.4 Emergency Access.** Require adequate access for emergency vehicles, including adequate street widths, vertical clearance on new streets, and multiple points of access.

## Programs

- ▶ **C-P-10: Railway Issues.** Monitor changes in railway usage. Evaluate railroad street crossing features if freight demand substantially increases within the developed portions of the City, or when Metrolink service is provided.
- ▶ **C-P-11: Development Review.** Prepare and publish guidelines for the preparation of traffic impact analyses. For projects that increase volume to capacity by .01 or more on affected intersections or roadway segments experiencing unacceptable level of service conditions without the proposed project, traffic impact analyses must propose binding mitigation strategies to be incorporated within the project. Traffic impact analyses must also consider impacts related to traffic increases at rail crossings and propose binding mitigation strategies.
- ▶ **PS-P-18: Emergency Plans and Procedures.** Regularly evaluate the City's emergency preparedness plans and procedures to provide for adequate police, fire, and protection services in event of an emergency. Ensure compliance with the requirements and provisions of the State Emergency Management System. Conduct exercises to perfect and test emergency preparedness procedures.

### 4.13.4 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Based on Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, an impact on traffic and transportation would be considered significant if the proposed project would:

- ▶ 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;
- ▶ conflict with an applicable Congestion Management Program;
- ▶ 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;
- ▶ substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment);
- ▶ result in inadequate emergency access; or
- ▶ conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

In addition, this section evaluates the potential for increased traffic volumes and pedestrian traffic across railroad rights-of way. An impact related to rail crossings would be considered significant if the project would create a substantial hazard to the public due to the potential for conflict between trains and vehicles or pedestrians.

The applicable measure of the effectiveness of the City's circulation system is LOS. The City's LOS standard for intersections and roadway segments is LOS D. The analysis in this EIR is based on intersection LOS, because the LOS for roadway segments typically depends on the quality of traffic flow at the intersections along the roadway. Roadway link analysis is affected by such factors as intersections (spacing, configuration and control features), degree of access control, roadway grades, design geometrics (horizontal and vertical alignment standards), sight distance, vehicle mix (truck and bus traffic) and pedestrian and bicycle traffic.

Because the City's standard LOS requirement is LOS D, compared to a less stringent standard of LOS E for roadways that are part of the CMP, this section does not include a separate analysis of CMP facilities

## IMPACT ANALYSIS

IMPACT 4.13-1 Peak Hour Intersection Level of Service. *Implementation of the Draft General Plan would result in two intersections operating at unacceptable LOS E or LOS F in 2030. This impact would be significant.*

Future land uses consistent with the Draft General Plan, along with other regional growth and implementation of the Circulation Master Plan would result in additional daily trips throughout the planning area. In 2006, 623,990 daily trips were estimated for the planning area, compared to 1,430,620 daily trips in 2030 under the Draft General Plan, which includes numerous trip reduction measures. Table 3.14-2 identifies LOS at key intersections throughout the planning area in 2030. With implementation of the Draft General Plan in 2030, 26 of the 28 study intersections would operate at an acceptable LOS of D or higher. Thus, there would be a **less-than-significant** impact at these intersections, and no conflict with performance measures for the circulation system.

Two intersections would operate at unacceptable LOS E or LOS F, representing a **significant** impact and a potential conflict with the City's performance measures for the circulation system. These intersections are described below.

### Sanderson Avenue at Devonshire Avenue

The intersection of Sanderson Avenue at Devonshire Avenue would operate at LOS E during the morning peak hour, and LOS F during the afternoon peak hour. To operate at an acceptable LOS D, all four intersection approaches would require an additional lane (Table 3.14-4 presents the intersection improvements which are proposed as part of the Draft General Plan, as well as the greater intersection improvements that would be required to provide for LOS D). Right-of-way constraints and existing buildings would make widening the intersection approaches to accommodate future traffic volumes infeasible; furthermore, unacceptable LOS at this intersection is largely a result of volumes above capacity at the intersection of Sanderson and Florida Avenues, approximately 900 feet to the south.

### Sanderson Avenue at Florida Avenue

The intersection of Sanderson Avenue at Florida Avenue would operate at LOS F during both morning and afternoon peak hours. To operate at an acceptable LOS D, all four intersection approaches would require an additional lane (Table 3.14-4 presents the intersection improvements which are proposed as part of the Draft General Plan, as well as the greater intersection improvements that would be required to provide for LOS D). As with the Devonshire Avenue intersection, right-of-way constraints and existing buildings would make widening the intersection approaches to accommodate future traffic volumes infeasible. The City has historically made exceptions to its LOS standard at the intersection of Sanderson Avenue and Florida Avenue. Furthermore, Florida Avenue is part of the CMP, and the portion of Florida Avenue from Sanderson Avenue to Hemet Street is exempt from CMP LOS requirements because of its LOS F operating conditions in 1991.

As early as 1992, when the EIR for the last comprehensive General Plan update was prepared, it was recognized that certain segments and intersections would exceed LOS "D" --- the voter approved LOS standard under Measure C. These segments include portions of Florida Avenue, Stetson Avenue, and Sanderson Avenue. Consequently, the City Council approved a Statement of Overriding Considerations for circulation for the 1992 EIR. Measure C incorporated these problematic roads in the measure language with the result that while most intersections within the City need to comply with the "D" level of service, portions of Florida, Sanderson and Stetson do not need to comply. The traffic study prepared for the Draft General Plan shows LOS of E and F at the same areas along Florida Avenue and Sanderson Avenue (but an improvement to acceptable service levels for Stetson Avenue). Specifically, the Florida/Sanderson intersection and the Sanderson/Devonshire intersection

would both exceed a “D” LOS at buildout of the Draft General Plan. As in 1992, the primary reasons for exceeding LOS “D” are as follows (wording taken verbatim from 1992 EIR page D-57):

- ▶ Traffic lights along Florida Avenue are very closely spaced
- ▶ Left turns into commercial driveways fronting Florida impede through traffic
- ▶ Florida Avenue serves as both a primary route through the City as well as its main commercial street
- ▶ In some areas, right-of-way is not available to widen streets where needed

The last point made, pertaining to right-of-way, is critical to understand. Usually, traffic flows can be accommodated by properly sizing intersections and the number of lanes. This is the normal situation for new development occurring on vacant land. However, over the years businesses have been built along Florida Avenue which limits roadway widening. Widening can only occur if those businesses are acquired through imminent domain and demolished to allow roadway construction. In developing the Draft General Plan, which actually reduces traffic impacts compared to the 1992 General Plan, the City continues to accept LOS higher than level “D” for Florida and Sanderson for the same reasons as those considered in 1992 outlined above and especially for the fact that the City believes that the costs of imminent domain and demolition of existing business exceeds the benefits of slightly better capacity.

## Conclusion

Numerous Draft General Plan policies direct how the City will fund, build, and operate the Circulation Master Plan. Policy C-1.6 requires consideration of restriping, access restrictions, or removal of parking where buildout of the Circulation Master Plan is constrained. Policy C-1.17 requires traffic analysis that considers both interim and buildout conditions for projects under the Draft General Plan. Policy C-1.3 requires projects to meet the City’s LOS standard, and Policy C-1.15 requires that projects implementing the Draft General Plan construct improvements as identified in the Draft General Plan and provide fair-share funding to mitigate traffic impacts. Program C-P-11 requires binding mitigation measures for projects that would violate Draft General Plan LOS standards and cause a significant intersection LOS impact or increase the volume to capacity ratio of an intersection with a deficient LOS by more than 0.01.

No additional feasible mitigation measures beyond Draft General Plan policies and programs are available to reduce the intersection LOS impact at Sanderson Avenue at Devonshire and Florida Avenues. These impacts would remain **significant and unavoidable**.

IMPACT 4.13-2 Air Traffic Patterns. *Implementation of the Draft General Plan would not affect air traffic patterns, and compliance with existing airport land use regulations would result in a less-than-significant impact.*

The Hemet-Ryan airport is located within the planning area. Please refer to Section 4.8, “Hazards and Hazardous Materials” for a discussion regarding consistency of the Draft General Plan with the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for the airport. Implementation of the Draft General Plan, including requirements for Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) review as described in Impact 4.8-4 in Section 4.8, “Hazards and Hazardous Materials,” would not result in construction of new buildings or improvements that would affect air traffic patterns related to the airport. Furthermore, Riverside County ALUC review (as described in Impact 4.8-4) would ensure that future land uses consistent with the Draft General Plan would not be permitted to exceed height limitations associated with the ALUCP. This impact would be **less than significant**.

IMPACT 4.13-3 Design Hazards. *Implementation of the Draft General Plan would include construction of new roadways consistent with the City’s existing safety standards. This impact would be less than significant.*

Future land uses consistent with the Draft General Plan, along with regional growth and implementation of the Circulation Master Plan would result in additional daily trips throughout the planning area. New roadways and

roadway improvements would be constructed to implement the Draft General Plan. Implementation of policies C-1.18 and C-1.19 would require that new and improved roadways comply with existing City roadway standards that ensure no hazards would result. This impact would be **less than significant**.

IMPACT 4.13-4 Emergency Access. *Future land uses consistent with the Draft General Plan would result in additional congestion at intersections throughout the planning area, which may affect emergency access. However, implementation of Draft General Plan policies and programs would result in a less-than-significant impact.*

Future land uses consistent with the Draft General Plan would result in impacts to intersection LOS as shown in Table 3.14-4. These increased levels of congestion at intersections have the potential to impede emergency access.

Draft General Plan policies and programs are designed to ensure provision of adequate emergency services. Policy C-3.4 and PS-7.4 require that adequate street widths and clearance be provided to allow passage of emergency vehicles. Program PS-18 requires regular evaluation of the City’s emergency preparedness plans and procedures.

Implementation of Draft General Plan policies and programs, along with implementation of the City’s existing Community Emergency Response Team (CERT) and Emergency Operation Plan (both described in greater detail in Section 4.8, “Hazards and Hazardous Materials”) would reduce this impact to a **less-than-significant** level by requiring regular evaluation and modification of the City’s emergency procedures to meet changing conditions, including emergency access.

IMPACT 4.13-5 Non-Motorized Transportation and Transit. *Implementation of the Draft General Plan would increase the use of alternative transportation modes, including pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and neighborhood electric vehicle (NEV) trips and provide for additional non-motorized transportation and transit facilities. This impact would be less than significant.*

Future land uses in the planning area consistent with the Draft General Plan would provide for development of commercial, residential, industrial, and mixed-use projects. The Draft General Plan emphasizes mixing land uses to reduce distances between people and their destinations, and to allow more trips to be made without a single-occupant vehicle. As described in Section 4.7, “Greenhouse Gas Emissions,” Draft General Plan policies and programs would reduce both the number and length of automobile trips within mixed-use areas, provide better pedestrian facilities and connectivity, implement a neighborhood electric vehicle (NEV) network, provide for bike lanes, and increase transit accessibility in the planning area.

Draft General Plan policies direct a variety of activities to maintain the City’s non-motorized transportation and transit system. Policies C-5.3, C-5.4, and C-5.5 would require provision and dedication of bikeways and bike lanes in conjunction with development permits, as well as provision of facilities at commercial and office facilities to support bicycle commuting. Policy C-4.15 requires provision of facilities for NEVs, bicycles, and transit in new development. Implementation of these Draft General Plan policies and programs would result in a **less-than-significant** impact related to alternative transportation.

IMPACT 4.13-6 Rail Hazards. *Future land uses consistent with the Draft General Plan would increase the volumes of both vehicular and pedestrian traffic crossing the BNSF rail right-of-way. However, implementation of Draft General Plan policies and programs and compliance with existing regulations would result in a less-than-significant impact.*

Future land uses consistent with the Draft General Plan would result in an increase in the amount of residential, commercial, industrial, and mixed-use development in the planning area, and increase both vehicle and pedestrian/bicycle traffic volumes. This increased traffic would include increases in the number of vehicles and

pedestrians crossing the BNSF rail line in the planning area. The BNSF rail line currently operates on-demand freight service. However, future use of this line could increase in frequency, including the addition of Metrolink passenger trains.

Draft General Plan policies and programs direct a variety of activities to reduce potential conflicts between rail and pedestrians and vehicles. Policy C-6.1 would require physical access barriers to keep pedestrians off of the rail line, and Program C-P-10 would require evaluation of street crossing features if freight demand increases or Metrolink service is developed. Program C-P-11 requires traffic impact analyses to consider safety hazards related to increased traffic at rail crossings. Furthermore, CPUC would review the design of the Metrolink system extension prior to the start of service on the system expansion, and has authority under the public utility code (Section 1202) to determine and prescribe the manner in which any roadway crosses a railroad. Therefore, implementation of Draft General Plan policies and programs and compliance with existing CPUC regulations would result in a **less-than-significant** impact.