

DOCKET

11-AFC-1

DATE MAR 29 2012

RECD. APR 02 2012

From: "Casil, Noel" <noel.casil@urs.com>
To: Andrea Koch <AKoch@energy.ca.gov>
Date: 3/29/2012 7:03:12 PM
Subject: RE: Pio Pico Traffic Data Questions

Hi Andrea - It was nice talking to you today.

Please find attached the updated Peak Hour Roadway Table incorporating the peak hour volumes and Levels of Service (LOS) that you requested. Also included are the pertinent calculation sheets.

Please let me know if you have additional questions or need further assistance.

Thanks,
Noel

Noel V. Casil, PE, TE, PTOE
Senior Transportation Engineer
URS Corporation
2020 E. First Street, Suite 400
Santa Ana, CA 92705
Tel: 714.835.6886
Direct: 714.433.7662
Fax: 714.973.4086 (NEW FAX)

-----Original Message-----

From: Andrea Koch [mailto:AKoch@energy.ca.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2012 10:11 AM
To: Casil, Noel
Subject: RE: Pio Pico Traffic Data Questions

Thanks, Noel. Could I get the associated LOS, also? I'm assuming that the LOS for each is similar to what I have for the old data.

Andrea Koch-Eckhardt
Environmental Planner II
916-654-3850
akoch@energy.state.ca.us

CA Energy Commission
Siting, Transmission, and Environmental Protection Division
1516 Ninth Street, MS 40
Sacramento, CA 95814-5504

>>> "Casil, Noel" <noel.casil@urs.com> 3/27/2012 1:37 PM >>>
Hi Andrea - Please find attached the existing peak hour roadway directional volume consistent with Table 5.11-21.

Thanks,
Noel

Noel V. Casil, PE, TE, PTOE

Senior Transportation Engineer
URS Corporation
2020 E. First Street, Suite 400
Santa Ana, CA 92705
Tel: 714.835.6886
Direct: 714.433.7662
Fax: 714.973.4086 (NEW FAX)

-----Original Message-----

From: Andrea Koch [mailto:AKoch@energy.ca.gov]
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2012 1:40 PM
To: Casil, Noel
Subject: RE: Pio Pico Traffic Data Questions

Hi Noel. Any updates on the traffic numbers?

Andrea Koch-Eckhardt
Environmental Planner II
916-654-3850
akoch@energy.state.ca.us

CA Energy Commission
Siting, Transmission, and Environmental Protection Division
1516 Ninth Street, MS 40
Sacramento, CA 95814-5504

>>> "Casil, Noel" <noel.casil@urs.com> 3/21/2012 6:01 PM >>>

Hi Andrea - We can provide the existing peak hour roadway directional volume consistent with Table 5.11-21.

Thanks,
Noel

Noel V. Casil, PE, TE, PTOE
Senior Transportation Engineer
URS Corporation
2020 E. First Street, Suite 400
Santa Ana, CA 92705
Tel: 714.835.6886
Direct: 714.433.7662
Fax: 714.973.4086 (NEW FAX)

-----Original Message-----

From: Andrea Koch [mailto:AKoch@energy.ca.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, March 21, 2012 3:56 PM
To: Casil, Noel
Cc: David Flores; Eric Solorio; MFitzgerald@sierraresearch.com
Subject: RE: Pio Pico Traffic Data Questions

Hi Noel.

Thanks again for your help.

To follow up, I do have an additional request for information. In my report, I include tables comparing existing (current) peak hour volumes to Year 2013 "with project" peak hour volumes. As we discussed, the existing peak hour volumes (provided by Caltrans) aren't consistent with the Year 2013 "with project" peak hour volumes. Could you provide me with the actual existing peak hour volumes that you used in deriving Table 5.11-21?

Thanks again.

Andrea

Andrea Koch-Eckhardt
Environmental Planner II
916-654-3850
akoch@energy.state.ca.us

CA Energy Commission
Siting, Transmission, and Environmental Protection Division
1516 Ninth Street, MS 40
Sacramento, CA 95814-5504

>>> "Casil, Noel" <noel.casil@urs.com> 3/19/2012 5:45 PM >>>
Hi Andrea - Please find below our response to your questions.

1) Please see Table 5.11-3 in the Traffic and Transportation section of the AFC. It shows that SR 125 has an existing peak traffic volume of 2,400, and that SR 905 has an existing peak traffic volume of 5,600.

See also the "Supplemental Responses to Data Requests Related to Traffic and Transportation" (submitted August 16, 2011). In this document, Table 5.11-21 provides "Year 2013 No Project Conditions" traffic numbers for SR 125 and SR 905. The link to the document is here:

http://www.energy.ca.gov/sitingcases/piopico/documents/applicant/2011-08-16_Supplemental_Responses_to_Data_Requests_related_to_Traffic_and_Transportation_TN-61889.pdf

I compared these two tables and they seem inconsistent. The "Year 2013 No Project Conditions" peak hour volumes appear to be lower than the existing peak hour volumes given in Table 5.11-3 of the AFC. Why would peak hour volumes be lower in 2013? This seems unlikely.

As described in the August 16, 2011 supplemental response letter, the AFC roadway

segment analysis were conducted in accordance to County of San Diego and City of San Diego requirements, which only require daily roadway segment LOS analysis.

The SR 125 (2,400) and SR 905 (5,600) existing peak traffic volume shown in Table 5.11-3 and as presented in the AFC was intended to describe existing background traffic information only and not for analysis purposes. The daily (Average Daily Traffic) volume was used as the basis of the AFC roadway segment LOS analysis.

[cid:image001.png@01CD05F4.5537ECE0]

Subsequently in August 2011, Kristin Ford requested that we analyze the roadway segment LOS based on peak hour volumes, henceforth we provided the summary of the results in Table 5.11-21.

The apparent difference occur because the roadway volumes shown in Table 5.11-21 were based on the actual peak hour volumes passing through the intersection during the AM and PM analysis hours as compared to the published peak hour traffic counts from Caltrans database which could have been be collected at slightly different location as dictated by their count stations.

The peak hour roadway segment analysis traffic volume were derived by the identifying the approach and departure directional volumes from the intersection data. Thus, the peak hour roadway segment data are also consistent with the peak hour intersection data that was used in the analysis.

2) I didn't see any truck routes identified in the FSA. Do you know the proposed truck routes, and if not, who could I ask about this?

The current truck routes are described in the County of San Diego General Plan Mobility Element (please attached information). Regarding the proposed truck routes, project related truck traffic will generally use Otay Mesa Road, SR-905, SR-125 and all other nearby state highways and freeways which are also truck routes. As highlighted below, County roads will be used to connect to the aforementioned truck routes if there are no direct access to the truck routes.

[cid:image002.png@01CD05F4.5537ECE0]

I hope the above explanation had adequately answered your questions. Please let me know or feel free to call if you have questions.

Thanks,

Noel

Noel V. Casil, PE, TE, PTOE
Senior Transportation Engineer
URS Corporation
2020 E. First Street, Suite 400
Santa Ana, CA 92705
Tel: 714.835.6886
Direct: 714.433.7662
Fax: 714.973.4086 (NEW FAX)

-----Original Message-----

From: Andrea Koch [mailto:AKoch@energy.ca.gov]
Sent: Monday, March 19, 2012 10:59 AM
To: Casil, Noel
Cc: David Flores; Eric Solorio; MFitzgerald@sierraresearch.com
Subject: Pio Pico Traffic Data Questions

Hi Noel.

I've taken over the Pio Pico Traffic and Transportation analysis from Kristin

Ford. I'm hoping you can answer a couple of traffic questions for me as soon as possible (by March 26th). Please let me know if you'll need more time after reviewing the following list.

1) Please see Table 5.11-3 in the Traffic and Transportation section of the AFC. It shows that SR 125 has an existing peak traffic volume of 2,400, and that SR 905 has an existing peak traffic volume of 5,600.

See also the "Supplemental Responses to Data Requests Related to Traffic and Transportation" (submitted August 16, 2011). In this document, Table 5.11-21 provides "Year 2013 No Project Conditions" traffic numbers for SR 125 and SR 905. The link to the document is here:

http://www.energy.ca.gov/sitingcases/piopico/documents/applicant/2011-08-16_Supplemental_Responses_to_Data_Requests_related_to_Traffic_and_Transportation_TN-61889.pdf

I compared these two tables and they seem inconsistent. The "Year 2013 No Project Conditions" peak hour volumes appear to be lower than the existing peak hour volumes given in Table 5.11-3 of the AFC. Why would peak hour volumes be lower in 2013? This seems unlikely.

2) I didn't see any truck routes identified in the FSA. Do you know the proposed truck routes, and if not, who could I ask about this?

Thanks for your help!

Andrea

Andrea Koch-Eckhardt

Environmental Planner II

916-654-3850

akoch@energy.state.ca.us<mailto:akoch@energy.state.ca.us>

CA Energy Commission

Siting, Transmission, and Environmental Protection Division

1516 Ninth Street, MS 40

Sacramento, CA 95814-5504

This e-mail and any attachments contain URS Corporation confidential information that may be proprietary or privileged. If you receive this message in error or are not the intended recipient, you should not retain, distribute, disclose or use any of this information and you should destroy the e-mail and any attachments or copies.

CC: "Margaret Fitzgerald (MFitzgerald@sierraresearch.com)"
<MFitzgerald@sierraresearch.com>, "Manker, William" <william.manker@urs.com>,
"Amanda Johnson (AJohnson@sierraresearch.com)" <AJohnson@sierraresearch.com>,
"Wu, Jennifer" <jennifer.wu@urs.com>

TABLE 5.11-22
 PIO PICO ENERGY CENTER
 PEAK HOUR ROADWAY SEGMENT ANALYSIS
 CEC INFORMATION REQUEST MARCH 29, 2012

Roadway	Segment	Lane Type	Direction	Existing Conditions				Year 2013 No Project Conditions				Year 2013 Plus Project Construction				Year 2014 No Project Condition				Year 2014 Project Operations			
				AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
				Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS	Volume	LOS
SR 125	North of SR 905	2-Divided Expressway	NB	95	B	439	B	106	B	492	B	107	B	554	B	110	B	510	B	110	B	512	B
			SB	695	B	173	B	779	B	194	B	840	B	194	B	806	B	201	B	808	B	201	B
SR 905	La Media Road and Piper Ranch Road	2-Divided	EB	1435	B	1560	C	1608	C	1747	C	1850	C	1747	C	1664	C	1810	C	1674	C	1810	C
			WB	1019	B	1554	B	1141	B	1740	B	1147	B	1987	B	1183	B	1803	B	1183	B	1813	B
Otay Mesa Road	SR 905 and Sanyo Avenue	1-Undivided	EB	930	D	233	C	1042	D	261	D	1345	D	261	D	1079	D	270	D	1091	D	270	D
			WB	210		840		235		941		242		1256		244		975		244		987	
Otay Mesa Road	Sanyo Avenue and Enrico Fermi Drive	1-Undivided	EB	581	C	125	B	650	C	140	B	953	D	140	D	674	C	145	B	686	C	145	B
			WB	172	B	558	C	192	B	625	C	198		934		199	B	648	C	199	B	660	C
Otay Mesa Road	Enrico Fermi Drive and Alta Road	1-Undivided	EB	523	C	74	B	586	C	83	B	889	C	83	C	607	C	86	B	619	C	86	B
			WB	94	B	407	B	105	B	456	B	112		765		C	109	B	472	B	109	B	484
Alta Road	Otay Mesa Road and Paseo De La Puente	1-Undivided	NB	523	C	74	B	586	C	83	B	889	C	83	C	607	C	86	B	619	C	86	B
			SB	105	B	407	B	105	B	456	B	112		765		C	109	B	472	B	109	B	484

Notes:

- 1 - Roadway segment analysis based from Table 7 - Generalized Peak Hour Directional Volume for Florida's Urbanized Areas based from Highway Capacity Manual.
- 2- Two-lane undivided roadways with volumes exceeding 880 directional volume per lane were out of the tabulated (Table 7) range and were calculated using Highway Capacity Software (HCS) Two-way Two-Lane Highway Segment analysis.
- 3 - Roadway volume on Alta Road north of Otay Mesa Road is the same as Otay Mesa Road between Enrico Fermi Drive and Alta Road.