



Monterey County

168 West Alisal Street,
1st Floor
Salinas, CA 93901
831.755.5066

Board Report

Legistar File Number: 16-1205

October 25, 2016

Introduced: 10/17/2016

Version: 1

Current Status: Agenda Ready

Matter Type: General Agenda Item

Conduct a public hearing to consider:

- a. Traffic volumes on Carmel Valley Road for all segments, pursuant to the 2010 General Plan, Carmel Valley area;
- b. A five (5) year interval report;
- c. If additional road segments need to be monitored annually; and
- d. If changes to the unit cap are necessary at this time.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the Board of Supervisors:

- a. Accept the traffic volumes on Carmel Valley Road for all segments, pursuant to the 2010 General Plan, Carmel Valley area;
- b. Accept the five (5) year interval report;
- c. Determine that no additional road segments need to be monitored annually; and
- d. Determine that no changes to the unit cap are necessary at this time.

SUMMARY:

On September 27, 2016 the Board of Supervisors opened the hearing on this item but continued the hearing to October 18, 2016 following a request by the Carmel Valley Association for additional time to review the staff report. Staff subsequently amended some of the attachments to the staff report to clarify the information presented. However, additional clarification to the report required the Board of Supervisors to extend the hearing date to October 25, 2016.

The 2010 General Plan includes policies that require annual monitoring and reporting of traffic volumes and travel times on segments 3,4,5,6,7, and 10 of Carmel Valley Road. If the annual monitoring reveals that traffic volumes are exceeding certain thresholds, the Board of Supervisors must conduct a noticed public hearing.

The required monitoring has been completed and an evaluation report of traffic volumes on Carmel Valley Road and Rio Road has been prepared. No segments exceed the Average Daily Traffic (ADT) thresholds, but two (2) segments exceed Percent Time Spent Following (PTSF) thresholds. Therefore, a public hearing is required pursuant to Policy CV-2.17 of the 2010 General Plan. Notice of the September 27 hearing was published on September 8, 2016, in the *Monterey County Weekly*. Every five (5) years an additional analysis must be performed on all segments of Carmel Valley Road to determine if additional road segments need to be added to the yearly evaluation report. Segments that are currently reported in the yearly evaluation report are not within a twenty percent (20%) margin of the listed threshold. Based on the data, staff recommends making no changes or additions of road segments to the yearly traffic evaluation report.

At five (5) year intervals, the County is also required to examine any factors that might warrant a downward adjustment of the residential unit cap. Staff finds that no change to the unit cap is warranted at this time.

DISCUSSION:

The 2010 General Plan - Carmel Valley Master Plan (CVMP) includes a policy to monitor the circulation of traffic in Carmel Valley. CVMP Policy CV-2.17 requires twice yearly monitoring (in June and October) of peak hour traffic volumes and daily traffic volumes on six (6) roadway segments and an evaluation of traffic flow patterns using two (2) methods - Average Daily Traffic (ADT) and Percent Time Spent Following (PTSF). In addition, every five (5) years an additional analysis must be performed on all segments of Carmel Valley Road to determine if additional road segments need to be added to the yearly evaluation report. Monitoring in 2015 was conducted between June 16 and June 22 and from October 24 through October 30.

In addition, this CVMP Policy requires the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing in the year following data collection if the analysis shows that established thresholds are exceeded. Attachment A is a table displaying the Average Daily Traffic (ADT) volumes for the six (6) segments, and the threshold value from the CVMP. The ADTs do not exceed the threshold or come within 100 ADT of the threshold.

Using these volumes, the Percent Time Spent Following (PTSF) was calculated for segments 3 through 7. Since segment 10 is a four-lane highway, the PTSF methodology does not apply and the LOS is based on Volume. The PTSFs for segments 3 through 7 are shown in Attachment B. The PTSF for segments 6 and 7 exceeds the applicable threshold of LOS D and triggers the need for this public hearing. A summary of all of the segment volumes is in Attachment C. CVMP Policy CV-2.17 d) provides for monitoring and reporting of all segments at five (5) year intervals as follows:

d) At five year intervals the County shall monitor all segments listed in *Policy CV-2.17(a)* and the annual report described in *Policy CV-2.17(b)* shall include a report on all segments. If such periodic monitoring and reporting shows that any segment not previously part of the annual report is within twenty percent (20%) of the listed ADT threshold, that segment shall thereafter be subject to the annual monitoring and reporting.

CV 2.17 d) requires that at five (5) year intervals, all segment volumes are analyzed and compared to the ADT thresholds. If a segment is within twenty percent (20%) of the listed ADT threshold, then it shall be added to the list of roads that are evaluated annually. Attachment C shows the current volumes, the threshold volume, and the percent difference. None of the segments that are not currently the subject of the yearly evaluation report are within twenty percent (20%) of the listed threshold. Therefore, no changes or additions to the annual road segment monitoring and reporting are being recommended for the yearly evaluation report.

CV 2.17 e) requires that the County determine if the level of service (LOS) for the road segments is deteriorating quicker than what was reported in the General Plan EIR. The General Plan EIR estimates that road segments 3-10 will degrade to LOS F by 2030 and segments 1, 2,

11 and 13 will degrade to LOS D. Segment 12 was not evaluated in the EIR. Attachment D shows the ADT and LOS for three (3) scenarios that were looked at in the EIR. Attachments E and F compare the 2008 CVMP volumes to the collected 2015 volumes. In most cases, the 2015 volumes are lower than the 2008 volumes. When the volumes have increased, they have not increased at a rate that would indicate that the LOS will not deteriorate quicker than anticipated in the General Plan EIR.

Staff also evaluated projects that have been approved but not built versus the 2015 volumes. These projects include the following: a portion of Quail Lodge, Carmel Valley Ranch, Bernardus Lodge, Santa Lucia Preserve, Tehama, and all of September Ranch. In this scenario, the ADT thresholds would be exceeded for Segments 3-7. Since all of these projects were approved and are considered in the General Plan, the completion of the projects would not deteriorate the LOS quicker than anticipated in the General Plan EIR.

Carmel Valley Master Plan Policy CV-1.6 limits new residential lots and units in Carmel Valley to 190. Of the 190 new residential lots/units, subsection e. of Policy No. CV-1.6 reserves 24 residential units for consideration of the Delfino property (30 acres in Carmel Valley Village consisting of the former Carmel Valley Airport site), resulting in a remaining allotment of 166. At five (5) year intervals, the County shall also examine any other factors that might warrant a downward adjustment to the residential cap. As of August 2016, County records show six (6) new lots/units have been approved since the adoption of the 2010 General Plan. There is a total of 160 residential lots/units available suggesting that no changes to the unit cap are necessary at this time.

CV-1.6 g. requires that new residential subdivisions in Carmel Valley shall be limited to creation of 190 units as a unit cap, where 24 units are reserved for consideration of the Delfino property. At five (5) year intervals, the County shall also examine any other factors that might warrant a downward adjustment to the residential unit cap. Currently there are 160 available units suggesting that no changes to the unit cap are necessary at this time.

Resource Management Agency staff continues to work with the Carmel Valley Road Committee (CVRC) on updating the Carmel Valley Traffic Improvement Program (CVTIP). This program will allow for the partial funding of projects that would address these long term impacts on Carmel Valley Road.

OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT:

This traffic volume analysis was reviewed with the CVRC at their January 21 and February 24, 2016 meetings. During these meetings, committee members expressed the following concerns based on Environmental Impact Reports for the Carmel Canine and Rancho Canada projects: State Highway 1 is operating at LOS F. The Carmel Valley Corridor and CVTIP analysis drafted by Kimley-Horn Associates does not address the ability to evacuate Carmel Valley in the event of an emergency. Further, neither special event traffic, nor the impacts of short term rentals, have been specifically evaluated by this analysis.

At the June 6, 2016 meeting, the Carmel Valley Land Use Advisory Committee discussed both the available units and the CVMP volume data.

FINANCING:

There is no financial impact to the General Fund. Scheduled traffic monitoring activities estimated at \$8,000 for CVMP are funded by the Carmel Valley Traffic Impact Fee Program. Sufficient funds are available in the Road Fund (Fund 002, Unit 8195) to finance this work.

Prepared by: Brenda Villanueva, Assistant Traffic Engineer, (831) 755-8908

Approved by: Benny J. Young, Interim RMA Deputy Director of Public Works and Facilities

Approved by: Carl P. Holm, AICP, RMA Director



Attachments:

Attachment A - Average Daily Traffic Volumes

Attachment B - Percent Time Spent Following

Attachment C - Percent of Threshold

Attachment D - General Plan Volumes

Attachment E - Comparison of 2008 and June 2015 Volumes

Attachment F - Comparison of 2008 and October 2015 Volumes

Attachment G - Approved Project Table

Attachment H - Notice of Public Hearing

Attachment I - Location Map

(Attachments on file with the Clerk of the Board)