

Mid-City Corridors: Traffic Exposure, Transit Demand and Residential Intensity

Supplemental analysis to the Mid-City Communities Fair Housing Review

Prepared by San Diego Fair Housing Lab

Date September 2026

Contents

0. Front Matter	3
Summary	3
1. Peak segment volumes on the fourteen roadways examined range from 4,400 to 44,400 vehicles a day	4
2. The corridors with the worst congestion are not the ones carrying the most traffic	5
3. Pedestrian injuries concentrate on the corridors receiving the most new capacity	5
3b. Twelve intersections already operate at substandard levels during peak periods	6
3c. Traffic, transit, collisions and proposed intensity at eight locations	6
4. Transit demand and traffic volume vary independently	7
5. The City committed to assessing air and noise pollution alongside this density	9
6. The land use map does not implement the urban design framework	9
7. Three corridor categories	10
8. Recommendations	11
9. What this analysis does not claim	11
Appendix. Sources and methods	12
Sources	14

0. Front Matter

About this document. This is supplemental analysis to the **Mid-City Communities Fair Housing Review**, published with it as part of the San Diego Fair Housing Lab's public comment on the first draft Mid-City Communities Plan Update, September 2026. Figures are the City's own unless stated otherwise.

Relationship to the main review. The Mid-City Communities Fair Housing Review evaluates the first draft Mid-City Communities Plan Update against the fair housing duty the plan invokes. **This document addresses one question that review raises and does not resolve: whether the draft plan's placement of residential intensity corresponds to the measured conditions of the corridors it is placed on.** The review summarises the findings below in its chapter on environmental justice and housing; the full analysis is [here](#).

Why it is kept separate. The transportation argument is substantial enough to eclipse the fair housing one if the two are combined. Holding them apart lets each be read, and disputed, on its own evidence.

Sources. City of San Diego Draft Existing Conditions Mobility Assessment and its appendices; the Draft Ideas Report of August 2025; the Corridor Concept Analysis of February 2026; and Figures 2-1 and 5-1 of the first draft Mid-City Communities Plan. Full sourcing and method in the appendix.

A note on what this is. The analysis establishes that traffic volume and distance from the roadway are recognised exposure considerations, and that the City's own data show enough variation among its designated corridors to warrant a differentiated land use response. **It measures no pollutant concentration, and estimates no health outcome at any location.** Section 9 states the limits directly.

Summary

The draft plan directs new housing to the corridors it designates on its land use map and treats them as a single development category. The City's own traffic data show that they are not one category. Peak segment volumes on the fourteen roadways examined in section 1 range from **4,400 vehicles a day on Chollas Parkway to 44,400 on College Avenue**, a tenfold difference, and transit demand varies independently of it.

The two study areas the plan itself calls transit villages, Marketplace at the Grove and Federal Boulevard at Euclid Avenue, are located where transit demand is lowest, and one of them on the segment carrying the most traffic in Mid-City. The plan's land use map does not deliver the graduated pattern its own urban design framework describes. And in August 2025 the City committed to assessing air and noise pollution alongside the additional density it has now proposed; that assessment does not appear in the draft.

None of this is an argument against growth near transit. It is an argument that the placement of intensity should follow the measured conditions of each corridor rather than a single designation applied to all of them.

The analytical framework is the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's, and the planning recommendation is the California Air Resources Board's. EPA's EJSCREEN methodology treats traffic proximity as average annual daily traffic within a 500-meter radius divided by distance, weighting closer traffic more heavily. CARB's 2017 technical advisory, *Strategies to Reduce Air Pollution Exposure Near High-Volume Roadways*, was written for planners facing precisely this tension: it recognizes that infill development near transit produces substantial public health benefits while people living near high-volume roadways can experience increased exposure to traffic pollution, air toxics and noise.

1. Peak segment volumes on the fourteen roadways examined range from 4,400 to 44,400 vehicles a day

Existing average daily traffic, from Table 6.7 and Figure 5.3 of the Mobility Assessment. Table 6.7 tabulates 117 segments on 24 study roadways (117 is the count of its rows; the Assessment's own summary sentence says 116). The fourteen below are the eleven on which the plan's Urban Design Framework places a transit village, transit corridor, study area or main street (printed pages 88 to 104: El Cajon Boulevard, University Avenue, Euclid Avenue, Fairmount Avenue, Home Avenue, Federal Boulevard, Adams Avenue, College Avenue, College Grove Drive, 54th Street and Chollas Parkway), and three this analysis discusses on their own evidence: Aldine Drive, whose one segment operates at level of service F on a two-lane collector; 43rd Street, which Figure 5-1 places inside the Mid-City Center village and which holds Mid-City's second-busiest transit location; and Orange Avenue, which runs through the area between El Cajon Boulevard and University Avenue named in the City's August 2025 commitment (section 5). The ten study roadways omitted are collectors and connectors carrying 1,100 to 13,070 vehicles a day (35th, 47th, 52nd and A Streets, Landis Street, Marlborough Avenue, Monroe Avenue, Streamview Drive, Wightman Street and Winona Avenue) on which the plan places none of those roles. The plan draws its corridor designations on Figure 2-1 rather than listing them in its text, so no count of designated corridors is used:

Roadway	Segments	Daily traffic	Peak segment
College Avenue	4	25,200 to 44,400	College Grove Dr to Federal Bl
Euclid Avenue	10	6,300 to 34,400	54th St to SR-94
Home Avenue	4	17,300 to 32,400	
University Avenue	20	11,000 to 29,100	Chollas Pkwy to 58th St
El Cajon Boulevard	8	14,600 to 21,800	
Aldine Drive	1	20,300	
Fairmount Avenue	11	4,700 to 18,900	
54th Street	5	15,400 to 17,200	
Adams Avenue	4	5,800 to 15,800	
College Grove Drive	2	11,300 to 14,000	
Federal Boulevard	2	5,400 to 9,400	
43rd Street	5	5,100 to 7,700	

Roadway	Segments	Daily traffic	Peak segment
Orange Avenue	8	2,400 to 6,800	
Chollas Parkway	1	4,400	

Several corridors vary as much within themselves as they do from one another. Fairmount Avenue runs from 4,700 to 18,900 vehicles per day along its own length, a fourfold difference under a single street name, and Euclid Avenue from 6,300 to 34,400. A designation applied corridor-wide cannot be correct at both ends.

2. The corridors with the worst congestion are not the ones carrying the most traffic

El Cajon Boulevard carries between 14,600 and 21,800 vehicles per day, and none of its eight study segments operates below an acceptable level of service, because it has the lane capacity to absorb them. University Avenue reaches level of service E or F on most of its segments while carrying less traffic, because much of it is a two or three lane collector. One University segment, Highland Avenue to 47th Street, operates at a volume-to-capacity ratio of 2.000 while carrying 16,000 vehicles per day.

Congestion and volume are therefore separate measures in Mid-City, and they rank the corridors differently. Exposure to traffic emissions is a function of how many vehicles pass a location and how far away they are, not of whether those vehicles are queuing. Congestion remains a legitimate concern for livability and for transit reliability, and it is treated as such in section 3. It is not the basis for the siting recommendations in this document.

3. Pedestrian injuries concentrate on the corridors receiving the most new capacity

The Mobility Assessment reports **316 pedestrian-involved collisions resulting in injury between 2018 and 2022**, of which **16 resulted in a fatality**. The corridors with the most pedestrian-involved collisions were **El Cajon Boulevard, University Avenue, and Fairmount Avenue**. Of the 16 fatal collisions, four occurred at intersections along El Cajon Boulevard and four along University Avenue.

On bicycle conditions, the assessment finds that all the major corridors in Mid-City are level of traffic stress 3 or 4 in their entirety, including El Cajon Boulevard, Fairmount Avenue, College Avenue, Euclid Avenue, Federal Boulevard, 54th Street and College Grove Drive, with University Avenue primarily level 4. It concludes that there are currently no low-stress routes spanning the community in either direction.

Transit operates in the same conditions. The assessment notes that transit in Mid-City “operates along the same roadway segments as passenger vehicles and is therefore influenced by the same congestion,” naming Adams Avenue, El Cajon Boulevard, Euclid Avenue, Fairmount Avenue, Home Avenue, University Avenue and Wightman Street, and observing that this affects “areas with some of the highest transit passenger activity.”

3b. Twelve intersections already operate at substandard levels during peak periods

Daily volume is the measure relevant to exposure and is the basis for the siting recommendations in this document. Peak-hour performance describes something different and worth stating separately: how the corridor functions at the times most residents experience it.

Table 6.9 of the Mobility Assessment identifies twelve study intersections operating at level of service E or F in the AM or PM peak. Those on the corridors carrying the most new capacity:

Intersection	AM delay	AM	PM delay	PM
College Avenue & University Avenue	96.2 sec	F	142.7 sec	F
Home Avenue & Fairmount Avenue	112.4 sec	F	76.6 sec	E
Euclid Avenue & University Avenue	56.6 sec	E	56.4 sec	E
Fairmount Avenue & El Cajon Boulevard	56.0 sec	E	31.4 sec	C
Fairmount Avenue & Aldine Drive	13.2 sec	B	118.7 sec	F
54th Street & Chollas Parkway	26.2 sec	D	36.2 sec	E

The remaining six are freeway ramp intersections on I-805, I-15 and University Avenue, the worst being I-805 northbound ramps at University Avenue at 129.2 and 151.9 seconds of delay.

College Avenue at University Avenue fails in both peaks, and it lies on a corridor the plan treats as suitable for its highest intensities. **Fairmount Avenue at University Avenue does not appear among the substandard intersections**, despite being the busiest transit location in Mid-City. The place with the strongest transit demand is not the place with the worst peak congestion.

3c. Traffic, transit, collisions and proposed intensity at eight locations

The eight locations below were selected using the City's own criteria rather than by which best supported a conclusion: identified level of service E or F, inclusion among the most frequent collision locations, high daily traffic volume, major transit activity, or designation as a transit village.

Location	Daily traffic	Transit b+a	Collisions 2018-22	AM peak	PM peak	Proposed role
Fairmount Ave & University Ave	15,900	3,458	15	42.1 D	40.7 D	Corridor, beside Mid-City Center community village
College Ave & University Ave	25,200	1,425	not top eight	96.2 F	142.7 F	Transit corridor
54th St & University Ave	21,600	1,345	16	24.7 C	31.8 C	Transit corridor
El Cajon Blvd & Fairmount Ave	9,400	623	29, highest in Mid-City	56.0 E	31.4 C	Transit corridor
College Ave & College Grove Dr	44,400	429	12	40.4 D	37.7 D	Transit village
Euclid Ave & Federal Blvd	29,400	366	not top eight	24.0 C	24.7 C	Transit village
Home Ave & Fairmount Ave	32,400	281	18	112.4 F	76.6 E	Study area 11
Euclid Ave & University Ave	20,300	none recorded	not top eight	56.6 E	56.4 E	Transit corridor

Read across the rows rather than down the columns, the four measures do not agree with one another at any location, and the plan's assignment of role does not track any of them consistently.

At College Avenue and University Avenue the Assessment gives two segment volumes: 25,200 on College Avenue between El Cajon Boulevard and University Avenue, and 22,100 on University Avenue between 60th Street and College Avenue. Both tables in this analysis use the College Avenue figure.

Fairmount Avenue at University Avenue carries the most transit activity in Mid-City, on the second lowest traffic volume in this table, at acceptable peak delay. On every measure it is the strongest candidate for concentrated residential intensity, and it is designated corridor rather than village.

College Avenue at College Grove Drive carries the highest traffic volume in the plan area, 429 daily boardings and alightings, and twelve collisions, and it is designated a transit village.

El Cajon Boulevard at Fairmount Avenue is the most frequent automobile collision location in Mid-City at 29 collisions, on a comparatively modest 9,400 vehicles per day, which indicates a design condition rather than a volume condition.

Euclid Avenue at University Avenue operates at level of service E in both peaks and has no transit stop recorded in Table 4.1.

4. Transit demand and traffic volume vary independently

Table 4.1 of the Mobility Assessment records boardings and alightings at 273 transit stops, which combine to 166 distinct locations and 27,083 daily boardings and alightings across the study area. Setting transit demand against traffic volume at the same locations tests the plan's own rationale directly.

The ratio below is daily boardings and alightings per 1,000 vehicles. A high ratio indicates a location whose activity comes from transit; a low ratio indicates a location where the traffic is passing through.

Location	Daily boardings + alightings	Daily traffic	Ratio
Fairmount Ave & University Ave	3,458	15,900	217.5
43rd St & El Cajon Blvd	1,653	19,500	84.8
54th St & El Cajon Blvd	1,266	15,400	82.2
El Cajon Blvd & Fairmount Ave	623	9,400	66.3
54th St & University Ave	1,345	21,600	62.3
College Ave & University Ave	1,425	25,200	56.5
El Cajon Blvd & Winona Ave	828	17,500	47.3
College Ave & El Cajon Blvd	1,222	27,289	44.8
I-15 Transit Plaza & University Ave	1,012	25,100	40.3
35th St & El Cajon Blvd	554	21,800	25.4
Euclid Ave & Federal Blvd	366	29,400	12.4
58th St & University Ave	330	29,100	11.3
College Ave & College Grove Dr	429	44,400	9.7

The ratio spans twenty-two fold. Corridor designation alone does not indicate where transit demand is concentrated.

The two study areas the plan calls transit villages are sited where transit demand is lowest

Study area 4, Marketplace at the Grove, is College Avenue at College Grove Drive: **429 daily boardings and alightings against 44,400 vehicles per day**, the lowest ratio among the thirteen locations tabulated above. Study area 5, Federal Boulevard at Euclid Avenue, is the second lowest, at 366 against 29,400.

The plan groups five study areas under the heading Transit Villages at printed pages 88 and 89, and its text calls only these two a “transit village”. Mid-City Center and Mid-City West are each a “community village” and Chollas Triangle is a “study area”, so the count of villages used here is two, the plan’s own. The plan justifies the Federal and Euclid village by bus rapid transit and “the potential for a future transit station as part of the planned Trolley Purple Line” (printed page 89), and Mid-City Center in the same words (printed page 88). The Mobility chapter says only that the Purple Line is planned with two stations in Mid-City (printed page 123). No timing or funding is stated for either station, and the figures in this section describe present conditions.

Study area 1, Mid-City Center, is sited correctly and this should be said plainly. The plan places it along Fairmount Avenue, El Cajon Boulevard and University Avenue (printed page 88), and on Figure 5-1 its Transit Villages fill runs along 43rd Street from El Cajon Boulevard to University Avenue. The busiest and second busiest transit locations in Mid-City, Fairmount Avenue at University Avenue and 43rd Street at El Cajon Boulevard, sit beside and inside it, together carrying **5,111 daily boardings and alightings**, nineteen percent of all transit activity in the study area.

Both Marketplace at the Grove and Federal at Euclid are large sites in consolidated ownership, and siting a village at either one for its redevelopment potential is sound planning. The plan describes them as transit villages, however, and the transit data do not support that description. **The distinction**

determines the appropriate design response. A village justified by transit access belongs at its densest close to the street. A village justified by site availability, on a roadway carrying 44,400 vehicles per day with little transit ridership, is the strongest candidate in Mid-City for setting residential intensity back from the roadway edge.

5. The City committed to assessing air and noise pollution alongside this density

The Draft Ideas Report of August 2025 carries the following note beneath its land use concept maps, repeated across the concepts:

“Additional density will be studied between El Cajon Blvd and University Ave and along the SR-15 rapid bus corridor while assessing considerations related to fair housing, **air and noise pollution**, and feasibility testing.”

The August 2026 draft plan applies that additional density. Its Chapter 4, Sustainability, Equity, Resilience and Conservation, addresses roadway air pollution in three places, and its Chapter 5, Urban Design, in one more. Policy 4.10 encourages new residential buildings within 500 feet of a freeway to incorporate building features that reduce the effects of air pollution (printed page 78), and Chapter 5’s Design Adjacent to Freeways guidance at printed page 85 describes a layered buffering strategy within 500 feet of a freeway; both are specific to freeways. Policy 4.11 supports strategies to mitigate air pollution sources from on-road transportation near sensitive receptors (printed page 78); it carries no freeway qualifier, and it is a statement of support with no standard behind it. The chapter’s Air Pollution passage at printed pages 61 and 62 observes that Mid-City communities “are closely situated to high-traffic corridors”, adds one sentence linking freeway pollution to the community’s asthma burden, and goes no further. For the arterial corridors that receive the plan’s new residential intensity, the draft therefore contains no analysis of exposure by residents living beside the roadway, no ventilation or filtration standard, and no health risk assessment.

The geography named in that commitment, between El Cajon Boulevard and University Avenue and along the SR-15 corridor, is the same area identified in section 6 below as receiving uniform medium-density designations across whole blocks.

6. The land use map does not implement the urban design framework

Figure 5-1, the Urban Design Framework, at printed page 83 of the draft plan, sets out a node and transition structure, and its legend defines the categories. **Transit Villages:** “A mix of uses concentrating commercial, office and the highest density around transit.” **Transit Corridors:** “A mix of uses and density oriented along main transit corridors.” **Transit Neighborhoods:** “Lower-scale buildings and missing-middle housing types that provide a transition from transit corridors and transit villages.” The body text at printed page 82 defines the same categories in other words, and for Transit

Neighborhoods reads: “A mix of neighborhood-friendly housing types and markets that provide a transition from transit villages, corridors, and main streets.” Both are the plan’s own definitions; the legend is the one printed on the figure itself.

Figure 2-1, Planned Land Uses, at printed page 13 with its designation legend from page 16, applies designations that do not follow that structure in three respects.

The highest designation is applied linearly rather than at nodes. Community Commercial at up to 218 dwelling units per acre (the legend range is 0 to 218) runs as a near-continuous ribbon along the full length of El Cajon Boulevard and University Avenue, while Figure 5-1 identifies only a small number of transit villages.

Intensity does not decline with distance from the roadway. Across Normal Heights south of Adams Avenue and through western City Heights, Residential Medium-3 at 56 to 73 units per acre and Medium-4 at 74 to 109 units per acre are applied across whole blocks in a substantially uniform field.

The two figures describe the same ground differently. Much of that Medium-3 and Medium-4 area falls within what Figure 5-1 labels Transit Neighborhoods, the category the figure’s legend defines as lower-scale, missing-middle housing. Densities of 56 to 109 units per acre are neither.

The transition fails in two different ways in two halves of the plan area

Parcel-level review of the City’s interactive land use map confirms the pattern and shows that it takes opposite forms east and west.

In western Mid-City the transition is absent because the medium-density field is continuous.

Between El Cajon Boulevard and University Avenue, across Normal Heights and City Heights, Residential Medium-3 and Medium-4 are applied to whole blocks running several streets deep, with Community Commercial frontage on the arterials and Urban Village designations at intervals. A parcel three blocks from El Cajon Boulevard carries broadly what a parcel facing it carries.

In eastern Mid-City the transition is absent because there is nothing between the corridor and the single-family blocks. Along University Avenue near College Avenue and 60th Street, Community Commercial at up to 109 dwelling units per acre forms a narrow linear band abutting Residential Low-2 at 5 to 9 units per acre directly, with no intermediate designation on either side.

The same absence of a graduated pattern therefore produces uniform intensity in one half of the plan area and an abrupt edge in the other. **Neither is the transition Figure 5-1 describes.**

The draft does not publish residential capacity by community planning area, making it difficult to evaluate whether the proposed distribution of growth is proportionate among the four communities.

7. Three corridor categories

Proposed as a framework for differentiated treatment, ordered by peak segment volume.

Category A. Concentrate intensity at nodes and step it back from the roadway edge. College Avenue (44,400), Euclid Avenue (34,400), Home Avenue (32,400), University Avenue (29,100).

Category B. Differentiate by segment rather than corridor-wide. El Cajon Boulevard (14,600 to 21,800), Fairmount Avenue (4,700 to 18,900), Adams Avenue and Aldine Drive (5,800 to 20,300), 54th Street (15,400 to 17,200).

Category C. Roadway exposure is not the governing consideration. Chollas Parkway (4,400), Orange Avenue (2,400 to 6,800), 43rd Street (5,100 to 7,700), Federal Boulevard (5,400 to 9,400), College Grove Drive (11,300 to 14,000).

Category C matters as much as Category A. An analysis that makes the same claim about every corridor is properly read as a general objection to density. Naming the corridors where the concern does not apply is what makes it credible on the corridors where it does.

8. Recommendations

1. **Complete the air and noise assessment the City has already committed to**, for the geography named in the August 2025 Ideas Report, before the highest-density designations are finalized.
2. **Differentiate residential intensity by measured roadway volume**, using Table 6.7, rather than applying one transit-corridor treatment across a tenfold range of conditions, and calibrate the gradient to volume rather than to a fixed number of parcels.
3. **Concentrate the highest designations where transit demand is measured to be strongest**, using Table 4.1, and reconsider or re-justify the villages at College Avenue and College Grove Drive and at Federal Boulevard and Euclid Avenue.
4. **Establish a depth gradient behind the highest-volume segments**, with the highest medium designations facing the corridor and lower designations behind.
5. **Use the roadway edge on Category A corridors for active commercial and mixed-use frontage** rather than continuous residential frontage.
6. **Require filtration, protected air intakes and ventilation measures** for residential buildings within identified near-roadway zones, consistent with the California Air Resources Board's 2017 technical advisory, *Strategies to Reduce Air Pollution Exposure Near High-Volume Roadways*.
7. **Reconcile Figure 2-1 with Figure 5-1**, or restate the Transit Neighborhoods definition to match the designations applied.
8. **Address the corridor conditions alongside the intensity decision**, given that Mid-City's 316 pedestrian injury collisions concentrate on the corridors receiving the most capacity and no low-stress bicycle route spanning the community.

9. What this analysis does not claim

No quantified exposure level or health risk category is asserted. This analysis establishes that traffic volume and distance from the roadway are recognized exposure considerations, and that the City's own data show sufficient variation among its designated corridors to warrant a differentiated land use response. It does not measure concentrations or estimate health outcomes at any location.

Level of service is not used as the basis for any recommendation. Level of service measures a roadway's performance against its own capacity, not the volume of traffic passing a given address. Because University Avenue is largely a two or three lane collector, it registers poor levels of service at volumes lower than those El Cajon Boulevard carries comfortably on more lanes. An argument built on level of service would therefore exempt El Cajon Boulevard, which carries more traffic than University Avenue on most segments and ties it for the most fatal pedestrian collisions in Mid-City, four each. Congestion is a real concern and is reported in section 3; it is not the measure that governs exposure.

The ridership ranking in section 4 is derived, not quoted, and the City's own document is internally inconsistent on this point. The Mobility Assessment states the matter twice and differently. Its transit chapter lists five locations as having "the highest ridership volumes": Fairmount Avenue and University Avenue, Euclid Avenue and University Avenue, 54th Street and University Avenue, College Avenue and University Avenue, and Fairmount Avenue and El Cajon Boulevard. Its Section 4 narrative instead names two, Fairmount Avenue and University Avenue with 3,458 daily boardings and alightings, and El Cajon Boulevard and 43rd Street with 1,653.

Aggregating Table 4.1 supports the second passage and not the first. By that table, El Cajon Boulevard and 43rd Street is the second busiest location in Mid-City and does not appear in the list of five. Fairmount Avenue and El Cajon Boulevard, which does appear, carries 623, well below both. **And Euclid Avenue and University Avenue, also on the list of five, has no transit stop recorded in Table 4.1 at all.**

This matters beyond bookkeeping. The list of five is the passage a reader is most likely to rely on for where transit demand is concentrated, and it omits the location where the plan has placed its Mid-City Center community village. The ranking used in section 4 is assembled from Table 4.1's stop-level rows, combining all directions and routes serving one intersection, and is described that way throughout.

Land use map readings describe pattern, not parcels. The observations in section 6 are taken from the published Figures 2-1 and 5-1 at the resolution at which they were released. Parcel-level questions should be confirmed against the City's interactive land use map.

Appendix. Sources and methods

How the different measures are used

The analysis draws on three kinds of traffic evidence and uses each for one purpose only.

Daily traffic volume is the primary evidence for the near-roadway exposure argument. The question is the relationship between the volume of traffic on a roadway and the proximity of housing to it, and the 24-hour volume is the appropriate measure of that. All corridor comparisons and the Category A, B and C assignments rest on it.

Peak-hour turning movements are contextual evidence about corridor functioning. They describe the concentration and directionality of activity at particular intersections. They are not required to establish the exposure gradient and are not used to do so.

Level of service and delay are the City's own operational analysis. Those are derived analytical measures, and this report cites the City's published results rather than attempting to reproduce the underlying model.

Keeping these separate matters because congestion and exposure are different conditions that rank the corridors differently, as section 2 sets out.

Traffic volumes. Table 6.7, Existing Roadway Level of Service of Study Segments, and Figure 5.3, Daily Traffic Volumes for Study Roadway Segments, in the Draft Existing Conditions Mobility Assessment (CR Associates, 2024). Table 6.7 carries 117 study segment records on 24 roadways, spanning 1,100 to 44,400 vehicles per day; **the table in section 1 carries the 85 segments on the fourteen roadways selected by the rule stated there**, and every volume in this analysis is drawn from those rows. Values were cross-checked against Figure 5.3 and against the existing-conditions diagrams in the Corridor Concept Analysis, which reproduce the same figures independently, giving three levels of source agreement: the underlying counts in Appendix C, the summary in Table 6.7 and Figure 5.3, and the corridor diagrams.

Transit demand. Table 4.1, Average Daily Boardings and Alightings by Transit Stop (2023), source MTS, in the same assessment, pages 66 through 73. Two hundred seventy-three stop records were combined into 166 locations by aggregating all directions and routes serving the same intersection. The two busiest locations so derived reproduce the figures stated in the assessment's own narrative.

Collision data. Table 6.3, Most Frequent Automobile Collision Locations, and sections 2 and 3 of the same assessment, all covering 2018 through 2022, source TIMS (2024).

Peak-hour intersection performance. Table 6.9, Existing Peak Hour Study Intersection Analysis. Eighty-three intersections were recovered; the twelve identified in the assessment's narrative as operating at level of service E or F each reconcile to the table, including which peak they fail in. **One further intersection, 33rd Street and Orange Avenue, records 216.0 seconds of AM delay at level of service F in the table and does not appear in the narrative list of twelve.** That discrepancy has not been resolved and the figure is not relied on here.

Land use designations. Figure 2-1, Planned Land Uses, and Figure 5-1, Urban Design Framework, Draft Mid-City Communities Plan, August 2026.

The air and noise commitment. Draft Ideas Report, August 2025, note beneath the land use concept maps.

Corridor design vocabulary. The Corridor Concept Analysis is organized by named segment and specifies roadway elements including median type, travel lanes, bike route, on-street parking, sidewalk width, and sidewalk treatments with tree grate or landscape buffers. Recommendation 5 uses that vocabulary rather than proposing a new standard.

How the counts were taken. Per Appendix A of the Mobility Assessment: "Ground truth roadway segment counts were collected using tubes during a typical weekday over a 24-hour period. Intersection turning movement counts were collected using video counters" during a typical weekday, "during the morning peak period (7:00 AM to 9:00 AM) and evening peak period (4:00 PM to 6:00 PM)." Counts were "staggered over several weeks" owing to weather, street sweeping and construction, and "all existing traffic counts were conducted between March and April 2024, by Counts Unlimited, Inc. and Elite Traffic Dynamics, LLC."

Count-date note. Appendix A states that existing traffic counts were conducted between March and April 2024. Appendix C contains 32 dated records from September 5, 2024, as well as historical City counts from 2015 through 2023. The September records were verified as genuine intersection turning-movement counts rather than extraction errors. They do not affect the roadway-segment ranges reported from Table 6.7.

What “existing conditions” means here. Of 282 dated records in Appendix C, 236 carry a single date, Wednesday, March 13, 2024. That concentration does not invalidate any figure, and it is worth knowing whenever peak-period observations are discussed: the peak-hour picture in this record is largely one Wednesday in March. A claim about an individual segment or intersection should cite the count sheet rather than the summary table.

The literature review, and what it does not contain. Appendix B reviews the City’s adopted plans and policies. It contains no discussion of near-roadway pollution exposure, no reference to sensitive receptors, and no mention of particulate matter, diesel emissions or asthma. Its air quality references run the other direction, toward emissions reduction: the Climate Action Plan’s Measure 3.4, “Reduce Traffic Congestion to Improve Air Quality,” and a Green Streets discussion of walking and cycling “helping to reduce air pollution” and “contributing to improved public health.”

It does record one relevant acknowledgment. Summarising the adopted Mid-City community plans, Appendix B notes that “the construction of SR-15 has presented problems to address, such as noise, visual impact, and traffic circulation.” The City’s own adopted plans therefore recognize that a high-volume facility imposes burdens on the neighborhoods beside it. That acknowledgment concerns noise and visual impact rather than air quality, and it concerns a freeway rather than the arterials this analysis addresses, but it establishes that corridor burden on adjacent residents is not a novel consideration in Mid-City planning.

Not used. The Corridor Concept Analysis contains no discussion of air quality or exposure; its buffer references are to sidewalk landscaping.

Sources

- Draft Existing Conditions Mobility Assessment, City of San Diego, CR Associates (2024), and its appendices.
- Draft Mid-City Communities Plan, August 2026, 159 pages. Figure 2-1, Planned Land Uses, at printed page 13 with its designation legend from page 16; Figure 5-1, Urban Design Framework, at printed page 83, with the legend definitions quoted in section 6. Printed page numbers run four behind the PDF page numbers. Also the City’s interactive land use map for the plan’s first draft.
- Draft Ideas Report, August 2025.
- Corridor Concept Analysis, February 2026.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, EJSCREEN technical documentation, traffic proximity indicator.
- California Air Resources Board, *Strategies to Reduce Air Pollution Exposure Near High-Volume Roadways*, Technical Advisory, April 2017. https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2017-10/rd_technical_advisory_final.pdf