TO: HONORABLE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

SUBJECT: SEE BELOW
DATE: April 11, 2022

## SUBJECT: CITY ROADMAP - NORTH SAN JOSE STRATEGY: FILE NO. GPT21003, PP21-008, C21-018. AMENDMENT TO THE CITY-INITIATED GENERAL PLAN TEXT AND AMENDMENTS TO THE NORTH SAN JOSE AREA DEVELOPMENT POLICY ("ADP"), TITLE 20 (ZONING ORDINANCE) AND TO CHAPTER 14.29 TITLE 14 (NORTH SAN JOSE TRAFFIC IMPACT FEE)

## RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Commission voted (9-1-1) to recommend that the City Council adopt the following actions with Commissioner Oliverio voting no and Commissioner Torrens absent:
(a) Accept the February 18, 2022 North San José Traffic Impact Fee Plan Update.
(b) Adopt a resolution adopting the Addendum to the Envision San José 2040 General Plan Final Program Environmental Impact Report and Supplemental Environmental Impact Report to the Envision San José General Plan Final Program Environmental Impact Report amending the Envision San José 2040 General Plan and the North San José Area Development Policy (ADP) to:
(1) Remove or modify references to the North San José ADP which will no longer apply to future development in North San José;
(2) Increase the minimum density within the Transit Employment Residential Overlay (TERO) General Plan land use designation from 55 dwelling units per acre to 75 dwelling units per acre and remove the minimum floor area ratio requirement; and
(3) Limit the application of the North San José ADP to projects that received an approved entitlement (general plan amendment and/or zoning amendment) and/or a land use permit from the effective date of the North San José ADP to the effective date of the resolution making such changes, and making the North San José Traffic Impact Fee inapplicable to future North San José development projects.
(c) Adopt a resolution amending the Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan pursuant to Title 18 of the San José Municipal Code to make modifications and clarifying revisions to remove references to the North San José Area Development Policy and amend the
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General Plan to raise the minimum density within the TERO Transit Employment Residential Overlay designation.
(d) Approve an ordinance amending San José Municipal Code Title 20 (Zoning Ordinance) to add Chapter 20.65 "Overlay Districts" including the "TERO Transit Employment Residential Overlay District," and amending the Zoning District Map to include the "TERO Transit Employment Residential Overlay District".
(e) Approve an ordinance amending San José Municipal Code Title 14, Chapter 14.29 (North San José Traffic Impact Fee Requirements) to limit the application of Chapter 14.29 to projects that received an approved entitlement (general plan amendment and/or zoning amendment) and/or a land use permit from the effective date of the ADP to the effective date of the resolution making such changes, and making the North San José Traffic Impact Fee inapplicable to future North San José development project.

## OUTCOME

Should the City Council approve the above actions, the Envision San José 2040 General Plan Land Use/Transportation Diagram and ADP would be amended to limit the applicability of the ADP to projects that received an approved entitlement (general plan amendment and/or zoning amendment) and/or a land use permit from the effective date of the ADP to the effective date of the resolution making such changes, and making the North San José Traffic Impact Fee inapplicable to future North San José development projects. Council approval would establish a new Overlay Chapter in the Zoning Ordinance, a new TERO Overlay Zoning District, and a corresponding amendment to the Zoning District Map.

Should the City Council deny the General Plan Text Amendment and associated actions, the ADP would remain in effect along with the existing North San José Traffic Impact Fee which would remain applicable to both entitled and future development projects.

## BACKGROUND

On March 23, 2022, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on the above-referenced actions. Staff provided an overview of the proposed General Plan Text Amendment, ADP Amendment, and ordinance changes. The item was on the public hearing calendar and one member of the public spoke in support of the item. The speaker supported staff's recommendation given the important recent updates to state law and noted that it encourages greater housing opportunity while reducing vehicle trips by locating much-needed housing near jobs.

Commissioner Oliverio commented that he supports the intent of this item but voted against the motion to recommend that Council approve it because he stated that the minimum density recommended for the TERO sites is too low. He recommended that the minimum required density be raised to 100 dwelling units per acre from the minimum 75 dwelling units per acre
recommended by staff. He believes that new development on the TERO sites can be comfortably achieved by developers at this higher density range. Commissioner Young commented that he strongly supports the proposal to encourage more housing in North San José given the state’s increased requirement for over 62,000 new housing units in San José as part of the upcoming Housing Element process. Commissioner Montanez made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Cantrell, to support staff's recommendation. The Commission voted (9-1-1) to recommend approval of the staff's recommendation with Commissioner Oliverio voting no and Commissioner Torrens absent.

## ANALYSIS

A complete analysis of the proposed General Plan Amendment is included in the attached Planning Commission staff report. Exhibit E of the staff report has been modified as there was an oversight in Table 16 of the North San José Traffic Impact Fee Plan Update (attached). The table has been updated to remove the Charcot overcrossing from the new Phase 1 improvement list.

## CONCLUSION

If the recommended actions are approved, the Envision San José 2040 General Plan Land Use/Transportation Diagram and ADP would be amended and would no longer apply to future projects that are not yet entitled or permitted, and the North San José Traffic Impact Fee would no longer apply to future North San José development projects. Council approval would establish a new Overlay Chapter in the Zoning Ordinance along with a new TERO Overlay Zoning District and a corresponding Zoning Map amendment.

## EVALUATION AND FOLLOW UP

If the proposed General Plan Amendment is approved by the City Council, the amendment to the Envision San José 2040 General Plan Land Use/Transportation Diagram will be effective 30 days after adoption. The proposed ordinances will be effective 30 days after Council adoption at the second reading.

## CLIMATE SMART SAN JOSE

The recommendation in this memorandum has a positive effect on Climate Smart San José energy, water, or mobility goals by increasing residential density proximate to fixed rail facilities and therefore making transportation more accessible.

## PUBLIC OUTREACH

Staff has followed Council Policy 6-30: Public Outreach Policy. Staff held meetings with neighborhood groups and area businesses to discuss the retirement of the ADP. Meetings have included multiple presentations to the San José Developer’s Roundtable. Staff held two virtual community meetings on June 24, 2021, and another on June 28, 2021. A notice of public hearing was also published in the San José Post-Record. Staff posted the hearing notice, staff report, and draft resolution on the Planning Department website. Staff has been available to discuss the proposal with interested members of the public.

## COORDINATION

The preparation of this memorandum has been coordinated with the City Attorney's Office.

## CEQA

An Initial Study/Addendum was prepared and posted to the City’s Active EIRs web page. The Envision San José 2040 General Plan EIR and SEIR can be found on the Completed EIR web page. The Initial Study states that the proposed General Plan Amendment will have a less than significant effect on the environment. No impacts were identified; therefore, no mitigation is required.

/s/<br>Christopher Burton, Secretary<br>Planning Commission

For questions, please contact Michael Brilliot, Deputy Director, at michael.brilliot@sanjoseca.gov.

Attachment: Planning Commission Staff Report
Exhibit E - North San José Traffic Impact Fee Plan Update

## Memorandum

TO: PLANNING COMMISSION
SUBJECT: GPT21-003/PP21-008/C21-018

FROM: Chris Burton
DATE: March 23, 2022

## PROJECT INFORMATION

$\left.\begin{array}{|l|l}\hline \text { Project } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Amendments to the General Plan and North San José Area Development Policy } \\ \text { ("ADP"), addition of Chapter 20.65 to the Zoning Ordinance regarding Overlay } \\ \text { Districts, establishing the Transit Employment Residential Overlay ("TERO") } \\ \text { District, adding the TERO Overlay District to the Zoning District Map, and } \\ \text { amendments to Chapter 14.29 regarding the North San José Traffic Impact Fee. }\end{array} \\ \hline \text { Project Description } & \begin{array}{r}\text { 1. A Resolution amending the Envision San Jose } 2040 \text { General Plan and ADP to: } \\ \text { a. Remove or modify references to the North San José Development ADP; } \\ \text { b. Increase the minimum density within TERO Transit Employment } \\ \text { Residential Overlay General Plan land use designation from } 55 \text { dwelling } \\ \text { units per acre to 75 dwelling units per acre and remove the minimum } \\ \text { floor area ratio requirement; and }\end{array} \\ \text { c. Amend the North San Jose ADP to limit the application of the ADP to } \\ \text { projects that received an approved entitlement (general plan } \\ \text { amendment and/or zoning amendment) and/or a land use permit from } \\ \text { the effective date of the ADP to the effective date of the resolution } \\ \text { making such changes, thus making the North San José Traffic Impact Fee } \\ \text { inapplicable to future North San José development projects; }\end{array}\right\}$

| CEQA | Addendum to the Envision San José 2040 General Plan <br> Final Program Environmental Impact Report (Resolution <br> No. 76041) and Supplemental Environmental Impact <br> Report to the Envision San José General Plan Final <br> Program Environmental Impact Report (Resolution No. 77617) and Addenda <br> thereto. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Project Planner | Joe Sordi, Contract Planner/Project Manager |

## RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council take all of the following actions:

1. Adopt a resolution adopting an Addendum to the Envision San José 2040 General Plan Final Program Environmental Impact Report (Resolution No. 76041) and Supplemental Environmental Impact Report to the Envision San José General Plan Final Program Environmental Impact Report (Resolution No. 77617) and Addenda thereto in conformance with CEQA (GPT21-003, PP21-008 and C21-018);
2. Accept the February 18, 2022 North San Jose Traffic Impact Fee Plan Update;
3. Adopt a resolution amending the Envision San José 2040 General Plan and the ADP to:
a. Remove or modify references to the ADP in the General Plan;
b. Increase the minimum density within the TERO General Plan land use designation from 55 dwelling units per acre to 75 dwelling units per acre and remove the minimum floor area ratio requirement; and
c. Limit the application of the ADP to projects that received an approved entitlement (general plan amendment and/or zoning amendment) and/or a land use permit from the effective date of the ADP to the effective date of this resolution making such changes, making the North San José Traffic Impact Fee inapplicable to future North San José development projects;
4. Approve an ordinance amending Title 20 of the San José Municipal Code (Zoning Ordinance) to add Chapter 20.65 "Overlay Districts" including the "TERO Transit Employment Residential Overlay District," and amending the Zoning District Map to include the "TERO Transit Employment Residential Overlay District;" and
5. Approve an ordinance amending San José Municipal Code Title 14, Chapter 14.29 "North San José Traffic Impact Fee" to limit the application of Chapter 14.29 to projects that received an approved entitlement (general plan amendment and/or zoning amendment) and/or a land use permit from the effective date of the ADP to the effective date of the resolution making such changes, making the North San José Traffic Impact Fee inapplicable to future North San José development projects.

## PROJECT BACKGROUND

## North San José Area Development Policy (2005)

## Basic Structure and Phasing

In 2005, the City adopted the ADP which revised an already-established policy framework to guide the ongoing intensification of mixed-use development and further goals of making North San José an important employment center and innovation district. The Policy as amended to date specifies an amount of new development, including an additional 26.7 million square feet of new office/R\&D development, 32,000 residential units, 2.7 million square feet of retail development, and 1,000 hotel rooms. All of this
development capacity is incorporated into the Envision San José 2040 General Plan. Mitigation measures are specified in the environmental impact report (EIR) for the ADP EIR, which was certified on June 21, 2005 in order to support the ADP. The City also approved a nexus study and adopted a Traffic Impact Fee for the North San José ADP, codified in Chapter 14.29 of the Municipal Code, to partially fund transportation improvements needed to support development under the ADP. The ADP includes a phased development approach that separates development into four roughly equal phases by requiring that infrastructure improvements allocated to each development phase be substantially funded in order to advance to the following phase of development. These four ADP phases are summarized in the table below.

While some minor amendments have been approved in the years since adoption, the ADP phasing program has prevented development from advancing beyond Phase 1. While development applications have been approved in all categories, and all are either at or near their entitlement capacity for Phase 1 (seven million sq. ft. of industrial, 100,00 sq. ft. of commercial, and 7,992 units of residential), not all seven million sq. ft. of the industrial development have received building permits in order to continue to Phase 2. Currently, approximately three million of the seven million sq. ft. of industrial projects have obtained building permits. Additionally, the ADP requires that the construction of $85 \%$ of the infrastructure improvements for each phase must be reasonably assured to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works and all of the improvements from any preceding phase must be constructed before the industrial or residential development of the next phase may be issued building permits. This has become problematic in part because the related traffic impact fees that are due at building permit are often not paid by project until long after project entitlements are approved, so there is not sufficient funding to complete the projects until the fees are paid.

| Phase |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Planning <br> Permit <br> Entitlement <br> for new <br> Industrial <br> Development <br> (maximum <br> square feet | Planning <br> Permit <br> Entitlement <br> for New <br> Commercial <br> Development <br> (minimum <br> square feet | Infrastructure <br> Improvements | Minimum | Maximum | Affordable <br> (BMR) <br> Reservation | Maximum <br> Total <br> Units <br> (MR and <br> BMR) |
| 1 | Up to 7 <br> million | 100,000 | Group 1 <br> Improvements | 0 | 6,400 | 1,600 | 8,000 |
| 2 | Up to 14 <br> million | 200,000 | Group 2 <br> Improvements | 4,000 | 12,800 | 3,200 | 16,000 |
| 3 | Up to 21 <br> million | 300,000 | Group 3 <br> Improvements | 8,000 | 19,200 | 4,800 | 24,000 |
| 4 | Up to 26.7 <br> million | N/A | Group 4 <br> Improvements | 16,000 | 25,600 | 6,400 | 32,000 |

## Transit Employment Residential Overlay

Transit Employment Residential Overlay (TERO) areas (shown shaded in the attached Exhibit A with ADP boundary illustrated in purple) were designated in the ADP to encourage housing production, and this established five key areas comprising 285 acres to support the development of 18,650 residential units. These areas provide more than half the 32,000 housing units envisioned within ADP boundaries.

Approximately 6,900 units of the Phase 1 housing allocations have been built on TERO sites since 2005, with about 156 acres remaining eligible for residential development. The density range of development is 55 dwelling units up to 250 dwelling units per acre. Most of the sites to-date have been developed toward the lower end of the permissible density range resulting in overall fewer units than expected. If the remaining sites are developed at a minimum density of 55 dwelling units per acre, approximately 8,400 additional units could be approved and built within the TERO, resulting in only a total of 15,300 units. This would fall below the goal of 18,650 units. An increase in base density should be considered for this area if the ultimate goal is to be achieved. As a result, staff is recommending that the minimum base density on TERO sites be increased to 75 dwelling units per acre so that approximately 18,350 units could be approved and constructed. Staff is also recommending the removal of the minimum floor area ratio (current FAR range is 2.0 to 12.0 ) in the TERO in order to encourage greater residential density and achieve an appropriate balance between residential and commercial space for mixed-use development.

## Envision San José 2040 General Plan 2011

The City adopted the Envision San José 2040 General Plan in 2011 which identified North San José as a Growth Area and incorporated all of the development capacity in the ADP. The 2011 General Plan also provided new policy direction for transportation improvements, establishing San José as a "walk-and-bikefirst" City.

## SB 743 and Change to VMT Analysis 2013-2020

The adoption of Senate Bill 743 by the state legislature in 2013 changed the CEQA metric for transportation impact analysis from Level of Services (LOS) to Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), marking a fundamental shift in how project transportation impacts are analyzed in California. The LOS impacts of a project were measured by the amount of time additional vehicle traffic from the project would slow vehicle travel times at intersections and road segments. The LOS analysis resulted in mitigation measures aimed at increasing automobile capacity such as widening roads and highways. By supporting auto travel, LOS analysis neither benefited nor enabled sustainable modes of non-vehicle travel such as bike lanes, public transit improvements, and parking pricing, and often led to more automobile trips, thereby further degrading the environment.

While SB 743 was passed in 2013, California Governor's Office of Planning and Research only formally adopted this change to the VMT method of evaluating traffic impacts on July 1, 2020. State law required that all transportation analyses under CEQA change to VMT by July 2020. This not only marks a milestone in that projects that impact state-controlled roadways would become subject to VMT analysis rather than LOS, but also required changes in transportation impact analysis by local government agencies. The City of San José adopted its Transportation Analysis Policy (Council Policy 5-1) in February 2018 in order to comply with SB 743, and since then has, with some exceptions for existing projects, required VMT as the metric for transportation impact analysis.

New development in North San José is required to pay the traffic impact fee (TIF) established in Chapter 14.29 of the Municipal Code. Council Policy 5-1, establishing the City's transportation analysis requirements, requires that only the TIF be paid by all projects that have received land use approvals in North San José and also allows those projects that are consistent with the ADP and the ADP EIR to proceed by paying the TIF. However, applications for projects that may not proceed under the ADP EIR CEQA clearance are required to comply with VMT mitigation measures and also comply with the requirement to pay the TIF as a fee established and supported under the Mitigation Fee Act (Government Code section 66000 et seq.) Staff estimates that the addition of VMT-driven mitigation, in combination with the current TIF fees could result in a doubling of transportation fees paid particularly for post-2018 industrial
and commercial development and may serve as a disincentive for such new development in North San José. As a result, staff proposes to amend both the ADP and the TIF ordinance in Municipal Code Chapter 14.29 to make the TIF inapplicable to development that has not received entitlements and permits prior to the effective date of the proposed changes to the ADP and TIF.

## Mayor and Council Direction 2017-2023

In September 2017, the Mayor's Office issued a memorandum which set a goal of entitling/building 25,000 housing units, including 10,000 affordable units. The Mayor's memo also included staff direction to study ways to modify the phasing constraints in the ADP.

On June 12, 2018, the City Council directed staff to implement a Housing Crisis Workplan that prioritizes implementation and policy actions that facilitate the citywide development of 15,000 market-rate and 10,000 affordable residential units by 2023. Item \#4 on the Workplan is the review and update of the ADP to complete analysis and proposed policy amendments necessary to advance 8,000 housing units from Phase 2 into Phase 1. In response, staff established a Housing Crisis work program and a process of biannual progress reports to the Community and Economic Development Committee to report on progress on implementing this work program. "Retirement" of the ADP to make the remaining housing capacity available for new development was added to this work program.

In February 2018, the City Council adopted Council Policy 5-1, updating the City's Transportation Analysis Policy which now largely uses VMT as a metric for determining transportation impacts under CEQA. However, Council Policy 5-1 includes grandfathering provisions where the TIF remains valid in transportation policy areas such as North San José. Given the change to VMT required by state law, the North San José TIF, which is based upon the evaluation of LOS-related impacts, is no longer relevant to the CEQA analysis of transportation impacts. While the TIF remains valid as a mitigation fee pursuant to the Mitigation Fee Act and is supported by a nexus study, it is no longer desirable for the reasons explained above.

In May 2019, the City Council directed staff to explore options to enable housing development more readily in North San José, and present options that forward the goal of advancing housing with an enhanced amount and incentives for the creation of affordable housing.

## SB 330 in 2019

Within the last few years, the state legislature adopted a significant amount of new housing and housingrelated land use legislation. SB 330 includes several new procedural changes and limitations that impact the City, but of primary concern to North San Jose is a limitation on moratoria or similar restrictions being imposed on housing development, and a prohibition on placing housing unit caps on, or limitations on population or permits issued for, housing development. Specifically, Government Code section 66300(b)(1)(D), in relevant part, appears to invalidate any numeric cap on housing that: (i) limits the number of land use approvals or permits necessary for the approval and construction of housing that will be issued or allocated within all or a portion of the affected city; (ii) acts as a cap on the number of housing units that can be approved or constructed either annually or for some other time period; or (iii) limits the population of the affected city. Because development cannot advance under the North San Jose Area Development Policy until all residential, industrial, and commercial thresholds for advancement beyond Phase 1 have been met (with similar limitations on advancement to subsequent development phases in the Policy), the Policy may have the effect of being considered as a cap on housing approvals and permits.

## SB 1333 in 2019

Senate Bill (SB) 1333 took effect in January 2019 and requires charter cities (like the City of San José) to make consistent their General Plan and Zoning. The City must now rezone areas that are inconsistent with the General Plan. The 2011 General Plan established the TERO Overlay designation consistent with the ADP, but no changes have since been made to the Zoning Ordinance and the Zoning District Map in order to implement this designation and provide consistency between the General Plan and Zoning. The proposed ordinance amending the Zoning Ordinance to add Chapter 20.65 regarding overlay districts, establish the TERO Overlay District, and add the TERO Overlay District to the Zoning Map complies with this requirement of state law.

## Housing Element 2023-2031

The State of California's Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) released in 2020 has determined Bay Area cities and counties are responsible for planning, zoning and approving a combined 441,176 new housing units between 2023 and 2030. This is a substantial increase from the 187,990 housing units that Bay Area cities were tasked with approving between 2015 and 2022. San José's fair share of new housing was determined to be 62,200 units, also a significant increase from 35,080 housing units for the housing element cycle ending in 2022. With only about 8,000 of its 32,000 potential housing units approved todate, North San José is the largest potential planning area for new housing units in the City of San José so staff is recommending effectively eliminating the phasing in the current ADP so that housing can be accommodated.

## Affordable Housing Goal in North San José

The North San José ADP contains a 20\% affordable housing goal for each phase of residential development as shown in the Phasing Plan chart above. However, in the first phase of development, only 432 affordable units were built out of the 1,600 affordable unit allocation (27\%). The City's Inclusionary Housing Ordinance ( IHO ) has a $15 \%$ affordability requirement and has many built-in alternatives for developers in addition to constructing the units. In order to address the above-stated 2019 Council direction and incentivize affordable housing in North San Jose, staff will need to propose intentional measures to achieve the production of affordable housing. This will include efforts to economically integrate North San Jose, which is now a State requirement under the next Housing Element cycle for 2023-2031. Fair housing analysis and fair housing access must inform the locations in which housing is built.

Recommendations on how to achieve affordable housing production in North San José will occur in the second step of the North San Jose policy work which will be integrated into the Housing Element process. Affordable housing measures being considered include the following:

- Identify new North San Jose housing sites in the next Housing Element cycle Site Inventory.
- Identification and possible rezoning of appropriate sites in North San Jose for affordable housing production with emphasis on site proximity to amenities.
- Analysis of the fair housing implications for potential affordable housing sites in North San Jose and confirmation of a positive impact on racial and ethnic segregation as required by the State.
- Study the feasibility of modifications to the IHO to provide flexibility to developers while achieving affordable housing production.

The next cycle of the Housing Element which includes the draft site inventory and a draft of all programs, policies and milestones will be released for public review in mid-year 2022. Staff anticipates completing site selection and rezoning of sites in North San Jose by the end of January 2023. Studying the financial feasibility of other programmatic strategies, such as modifications to the IHO or other programs will take
additional time. Actions that cannot be accomplished prior to certification of the Housing Element in 2023 would be included as part of the work program established for the next Housing Element moving forward, with timeframes established for completion of these additional actions.


#### Abstract

ANALYSIS Staff proposes to amend the ADP by retiring the plan with respect to future development while requiring that currently entitled projects would fulfill their requirements including all mitigation and payment of TIF under the current ADP. As explained on page 3 above, development in North San Jose has not achieved the levels and goals to move from Phase 1 to Phase 2 under the ADP. The amendments to the ADP would effectively eliminate the Phasing Plan, allowing the market to dictate the pace at which development proceeds for all remaining capacity under the General Plan. All new development that has not already been entitled under the ADP would be required to be evaluated on a project-by-project basis under CEQA, including transportation impacts. The proposed changes to the ADP will allow for the submission of applications for development, including the potential industrial, commercial, and residential development envisioned in the General Plan.


## Proposed General Plan Text Amendments

## Revisions to References to the ADP in the General Plan.

The proposed Envision 2040 General Plan Text Amendments are attached as Exhibit B hereto. The text amendments generally eliminate or modify references to the ADP to satisfy closing-out of the ADP with respect to future development in North San José. Entitled but not constructed projects would still be required to pay TIF fees (due prior to issuance of a building permit) in order to mitigate the traffic impacts identified in the ADP.

## Amendment to Raise Minimum Density for TERO Areas

The General Plan TERO designation supports residential development as an alternate use at a minimum average density of 55 units per acre. These sites would continue to be allowed to develop consistent with the underlying designation of Industrial Park. The TERO designation permits development with commercial uses on the first two floors and residential use on upper floors, as well as entirely residential projects. Development within this category is intended to make efficient use of land to provide residential units in support of nearby industrial employment centers. Site specific land use issues and compatibility with adjacent uses are addressed through the development permit process. Land within this overlay area may also be converted for the development of new schools and parks as needed to support residential development. As discussed above, approximately 156 acres remain eligible to develop for residential use in the TERO areas, supporting approximately 15,300 additional dwelling units if developed at the established minimum density of 55 dwelling units per acre. Staff proposes an increase of the required minimum density to 75 dwelling units per acre. At this density, the TERO areas could produce a minimum of 18,350 dwelling units at build-out.

## Amendment to Eliminate Floor Area Ratio Requirement for TERO Sites

Pursuant to the General Plan, commercial use is permitted but not required on TERO sites. There is, however, an established FAR minimum of 2.0 which results in more commercial space than needed to support the residential uses. Commercial spaces are also difficult to finance in housing projects and very challenging for $100 \%$ affordable housing developments. Typical sources of financing for these projects come from local and State programs that often only support the residential uses. A maximum 12.0 FAR is not relevant to a predominantly residential project that has supporting first and second floor commercial uses. It is, therefore, recommended that the FAR range be removed entirely for TERO sites.

## Proposed ADP Amendments

The proposed amendments to the ADP are included in Exhibit B hereto. The text amendments explain that since its adoption in 2005, development within the ADP to-date has not reached the levels to conclude Phase 1 and move forward with the other phases. Moreover, development has not occurred where projected in 2005, so changes to the priority of transportation improvements have been made to adjust for where development has actually occurred and been entitled. The changes to the ADP specify the general location and amount of development to date. Revisions to the proposed transportation improvement program in the ADP is addressed. The proposed amendments clarify that future development that is not subject to the ADP will be required to obtain project-level CEQA clearance, including VMT transportation analysis under CEQA and the City's VMT policy.

New Zoning Ordinance Overlay Chapter 20.65 and Amendment of Zoning Map to add TERO Overlay
Exhibit C includes the proposed Zoning Ordinance amendment adding Chapter 20.65 establishing overlay districts including the TERO District. This includes the new Chapter 20.65 text, with the TERO Overlay District map attached hereto. Senate Bill 1333 requires that zoning be consistent with the applicable general plan. The proposed Zoning Ordinance and Map amendments will make the zoning consistent with the TERO designation in the General Plan.

Staff recommends that the development standards currently in the Zoning Ordinance for the Transit Residential designation be applied to the proposed TERO Overlay, with the exception of minimum density which would be raised to 75 dwelling units per acre consistent with the change to the General Plan amendment recommended above. Staff also recommends there be no floor area ratio applied to development in the TERO Zone for the reasons state above. The standards in the Zoning Ordinance Transit Residential designation conform with the General Plan and this ensures that both documents are consistent as required by SB 1333. The TERO Overlay Zoning District standards are summarized in the table below:

## Proposed TERO District Development Standards

| Category | Standard |
| :--- | :--- |
| Min. Lot Area | 6000 sq. ft. |
| Mixed Use | Allowed, no minimum or maximum floor area <br> ratio (FAR) |
| 100\% Residential DU/AC | 75 -250 DU/AC |
| Maximum Building Height | 270 feet |
| Setback Regulations <br> Front <br> Side <br> Rear | Maximum 10 feet <br> Maximum 10 feet <br> Minimum 10 feet |
| Ground Floor Commercial Spaces | Refer to North San José Urban Design <br> Guidelines and Citywide Design Standards (as <br> applicable) for minimum frontage, height, <br> depth and other requirements for ground- <br> floor commercial spaces. |


| Common and Private Open Space <br> Regulations for 100\% Residential <br> and Mixed Use | Refer to Section 20.55.102 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Lighting | Refer to Section 20.55.103 |
| Parking | For general parking regulations, refer to <br> Chapter 20.90 |
| No unmounted camper or vehicle, other than <br> those vehicles expressly specified and <br> allowed under Title 17 of this Code, shall be <br> kept, stored or parked for a period of time in <br> excess of forty-eight consecutive hours in the <br> front setback area of any lot or parcel <br> containing a residential use. Such parking or <br> storage is limited to <br> paved surfaces |  |

## SJMC Chapter 14.29 Amendments Regarding Application of Traffic Impact Fee

The proposed amendments to Chapter 14.29 of the San José Municipal Code are attached hereto as Exhibit D. The amendments to the TIF ordinance would mirror the proposed changes to the application of the ADP by limiting the application of the TIF to projects that received approved entitlements (general plan amendment and/or zoning amendment) and/or a land use permit from the effective date of the ADP to the effective date of the resolution making such changes to the ADP, thus making the North San José Traffic Impact Fee inapplicable to future North San José development projects. Exhibit E is the North San José Traffic Impact Fee Plan Update (dated February 18, 2022) with an assessment of the transportation projects needed to support already entitled ADP Phase 1 development including development that has occurred in the Policy area to date. The proposed changes would mean that the ADP and the TIF only apply to already entitled development. New development in North San José could only move forward with CEQA clearance and transportation mitigation, among other mitigation measures, on an individual project basis using VMT transportation analysis as required by state law.

## COORDINATION

The preparation of the proposed General Plan and ADP text amendments, ordinances, Traffic Impact Fee Update, CEQA resolution, and this staff report were coordinated with the City Attorney's Office. Additionally, draft versions of the text amendments and ordinances were shared with various City departments including the Department of Transportation, Housing Department, Department of Public Works, Parks Recreation Neighborhood Services, and Office of Economic Development, as well as the Building Division within the Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement. Feedback from various departments was incorporated into the final drafts of these documents.

## CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)

The environmental impacts of the North San José Area Development Policy Amendment were addressed in an Initial Study/Addendum to the Final Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Envision San José 2040 General Plan (Resolution No. 76041) and the Envision San José 2040 General Plan Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (Resolution No. 77617), and Addenda thereto.

The recommended Council actions above relating to the North San José Area Development Policy, and as described in the Initial Study/Addendum, do not create any of the conditions described in Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines that call for the preparation of a subsequent EIR. No new significant impacts would occur, and no previously examined significant effects would be substantially more severe than shown in the Envision San José 2040 General Plan EIR and SEIR. Thus, an Addendum to the adopted EIRs is the appropriate environmental documentation to analyze the potential environmental impact.

The Initial Study/Addendum will be posted to the City’s "Active EIRs" web page. The Envision San José 2040 General Plan EIR and SEIR can be found at the "Completed EIRs" web page.

## PUBLIC OUTREACH

Staff has followed Council Policy 6-30: Public Outreach Policy. The City has held meetings with neighborhood groups and area businesses to discuss the retirement of the ADP. Meetings have included multiple presentations to the San José Developer's Roundtable, and active local neighborhood groups. The City held two virtual community meetings on June 24, 2021 with approximately 30 members of the public in attendance, and another on June 28, 2021 with approximately 35 members of the public in attendance.

A notice for the March 23, 2022 Planning Commission hearing was distributed to all owners and tenants within 1000 feet of the project and posted on the City's website.
Project Manager: Joe Sordi

Approved by: /s/ Michael Brilliot, Deputy Director for Christopher Burton, Planning Director
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## 1. <br> Introduction

This report presents the results of an updated analysis for the Phase 1 intersection and roadway improvements identified in the North San José Area Development Policy (NSJADP). The development levels completed and/or entitled in North San José are close to the current Phase 1 development capacity.

Improvements to the transportation system were split into four phases in the NSJADP - Phase 1 to Phase 4. The four-phase schedule was set up to ensure that, as development proceeds in North San José, they would be implemented concurrently to serve the expected increase in traffic volume, transit riders, and bicycle and pedestrian activities.

A review of traffic conditions between 2005 and 2021 shows that there are significant differences between projected and realized Phase 1 traffic levels. The 2005 NSJADP TIA assumed that the intensity levels in all parcels in North San Jose would grow to their maximum allowable levels at the same rate, but the intensity levels of built Phase 1 development have been disproportionately distributed across the parcels. Therefore, in some locations, improvements that were supposed to serve Phase 1 developments would no longer be needed until later phases since the development levels surrounding those locations did not grow as assumed. Other challenges include the uncertainties surrounding the construction timelines of land-use-entitled developments and transportation improvements.

This updated analysis consists of a review of development in North San José since the adoption of the NSJADP in 2005. Actual completed and entitled development and its associated traffic between 2005 and 2021 is used to update the original traffic forecasts for the same duration. The updated analysis focuses on only those improvements originally identified to provide capacity for the Phase 1 development levels identified in the NSJADP based on the 16 years of actual and entitled NSJ development levels (between 2005 and 2021).

The updated analysis was completed by City of San Jose staff in 2021. Hexagon reviewed and adjusted the City's analysis where necessary for incorporation in this study.

## North San Jose Transportation Improvements

The North San José area plays a vital role in the achievement of San José's economic and fiscal goals. In 2005, the City adopted the North San José Area Development Policy (NSJADP) to guide, along with the Envision San José 2040 General Plan (General Plan), the ongoing intensified mixed-use development in the North San José area as an important employment center and innovation district. The NSJADP provides for a specified amount of new
development, including an additional 26.7 million square feet of new industrial development, 32,000 new residential units, 1.7 million square feet of local-serving retail, 1 million square feet of regional retail, and 1,000 hotel rooms.

In 2005, the North San José Area Development Policy Environmental Impact Report (EIR) identified nine major roadway improvements and 15 intersection improvements to be constructed as part of the Project. Based on the intersection level of service analysis, the NSJADP EIR showed that 74 of the 220 study intersections evaluated were projected to operate at unacceptable levels under Project conditions during either the AM or PM peak hour, or both. Among these 74 intersections, the Project would impact 48 intersections, of which 12 were in North San José, 21 in other areas of San José, and 15 in other jurisdictions. Among the 33 impacts in San José, 12 can be fully mitigated and 10 can be partially mitigated. There were no feasible mitigation measures at the other 11 impacts in San José.

The North San José Deficiency Plan (2005) was also developed to address the projected deficiencies in the level of service of intersections in North San José that are identified as part of the Santa Clara County Congestion Management Program (CMP). Among the 22 CMPdesignated intersections located in North San José, 12 were expected to remain at or degrade to unacceptable levels in the future without improvements. Meeting the CMP level of service standard at 7 of the 12 deficient CMP intersections was determined to be infeasible. The North San José Deficiency Plan established a set of innovative and comprehensive transportation strategies for improving system-wide LOS rather than adhering to strict traffic LOS standards that may contradict other community goals. A list of offsetting improvements, such as transit enhancements and improvements to the bicycle network and pedestrian facilities, that support alternative modes of transportation in North San José were identified.

Based on the North San José Area Development Policy EIR and the North San José Deficiency Plan, the NSJADP identifies nine major roadway improvements, 28 local intersection improvements, and many improvements to transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. Because of the traffic link within North San José among industrial development, residential development, and transportation infrastructure, it is necessary that the construction of new transportation infrastructure proceed concurrently with the planned development. Therefore, the NSJADP included a phasing plan that limits how much industrial, residential and retail development may occur in advance of the construction of the supporting infrastructure improvements. Each of the improvements is tied to one of the four roughly equivalent phases of development (see Table 1) per the phasing plan shown in Table 2 and mapped on Figure 1. The phase in which the improvements would be needed was determined based on peak hour intersection level of service calculations for intersection operational improvements and judgement as to need for major roadway improvements.

In addition, some previously anticipated significant impacts did not occur as predicted, and therefore, some mitigation measures originally planned for Phase 1 would not be needed for implementation until later phases to reduce impacts. On the other hand, some improvements originally planned for later phases would be needed earlier to address impacts. The resulting rephasing of improvements would align transportation improvements to appropriately address current and future Phase 1 entitled development level conditions.

The City of San Jose is considering amending the NSJADP to limit the application of the policy and the associated Traffic Impact Fees (TIF) to only the development projects that have already been entitled and/or have received approved land use permits. If such amendment is adopted, entitled developments projects would continue to be subject to the amended NSJADP and the associated TIF. This anticipated TIF, along with the TIF collected from built development projects to date, would be used to fund the transportation improvements identified in this study
that would appropriately address current development level conditions as well as projects that have not yet been constructed but have received the approval of an entitlement and/or a land uses permit under the Policy to date ${ }^{1}$.

The NSJADP indicated that 12 of the identified intersection improvements and four major roadway improvements would be required to serve Phase 1 development levels. It is these intersection and roadway improvements that are the focus of this updated review.

Table 1
NSJADP Development Levels

| Phase | Development Levels |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 7.0 msf industrial |
|  | Min 100 residential units local retail <br>  <br> 2 |
|  | 7.0 msf industrial |
|  | 8,000 residential units |
|  | Min 100 ksf local retail |
| 3 | 7.0 msf industrial |
|  | 8,000 residential units |
|  | Min 100 ksf local retail |
| 4 | 5.7 msf industrial |
|  | 8,000 residential units |
|  | 1.7 msf local retail |
|  | 26.7 msf industrial |
| Total | 32,000 residential units |
|  | 1.7 msf local retail |

[^0]Table 2
NSJADP Transportation Improvement Phasing Plan

| Type of Improvement | ID | Improvement Name | Phase |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Major Roadway Improvements | 1 | Montague Expressway Widening ${ }^{1}$ | 1 |
|  | II | US-101 and Trimble Road Interchange | 1 |
|  | III | Trimble Road and Montague Expressway Flyover | 1 |
|  | N | I-880 and Charcot Avenue Overcrossing | 2 |
|  | V | Zanker Road Widening | 2 |
|  | VI | McCarthy Boulevard-O'Toole Avenue and Montague Expressway Interchange | 3 |
|  | VII | Zanker Road to Skyport Drive and Fourth Street Connection | 4 |
|  | VIII | US-101 and Mabury Road Interchange | 4 |
|  | IX | North San José Core Area Grid Streets | 1, 2, 3, 4 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Improvements | 6 | Zanker Road and Montague Expressway ${ }^{2,3}$ | - |
|  | 7 | River Oaks Parkway and Montague Expressway ${ }^{2}$ | - |
|  | 8 | Trimble Road and Montague Expressway ${ }^{2,4}$ | - |
|  | 9 | McCarthy Boulevard and Montague Expressway ${ }^{2,5}$ | - |
|  | 38 | North First Street and Skyport Drive ${ }^{6}$ | - |
|  | 10 | Old Oakland Road and Montague Expressway ${ }^{1}$ | 1 |
|  | 12 | North First Street and Trimble Road | 1 |
|  | 27 | North First Street and Charcot Avenue | 1 |
|  | 37 | North First Street and Metro Drive | 1 |
|  | 47 | Bering Drive and Brokaw Road | 1 |
|  | 58 | Trade Zone Boulevard and Montague Expressway ${ }^{1}$ | 1 |
|  | 116 | Thirteenth Street and Hedding Street | 1 |
|  | 117 | King Road and McKee Road | 1 |
|  | 13 | Zanker Road and Trimble Road ${ }^{3}$ | 2 |
|  | 16 | Zanker Road and Brokaw Road ${ }^{3}$ | 2 |
|  | 61 | Oakland Road and US-101 (South) | 2 |
|  | 98 | San Tomas Expressway and Stevens Creek Boulevard | 2 |
|  | 2 | North First Street and SR-237 (South) | 3 |
|  | 24 | Zanker Road and Tasman Drive ${ }^{1}$ | 3 |
|  | 43 | Zanker Road and Charcot Avenue ${ }^{3}$ | 3 |
|  | 45 | Junction Avenue and Charcot Avenue | 3 |
|  | 60 | Oakland Road and US-101 (North) | 3 |
|  | 124 | Capitol Avenue and Cropley Avenue | 3 |
|  | 59 | Lundy Avenue and Berryessa Road | 4 |
|  | 97 | Capitol Expressway and Capitol Avenue ${ }^{1}$ | 4 |
|  | 99 | San Tomas Expressway and Moorpark Avenue | 4 |
|  | 123 | Lundy Avenue and Trade Zone Boulevard | 4 |
|  | 126 | Capitol Avenue and Berryessa Road | 4 |

Table 2 (cont'd)
NSJADP Transportation Improvement Phasing Plan

| Other Roadway Improvements | - | Couplet Conversions | 1, 2, 3, 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements | - | Guadalupe River Trail ${ }^{1}$ | 1, 2, 3, 4 |
|  | - | Coyote Creek Trail | 1, 2, 3, 4 |
|  | - | SR-237 Bike Trail | 1, 2, 3, 4 |
|  | - | Bike and Pedestrian Facilities, including bike lanes, bike racks, pedestrian scale lighting, enhanced crosswalks, and curb ramps, etc. | 1, 2, 3, 4 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Public Transit | - | Specialized passenger shelters and bus/shuttle stop improvements including: curb bulbous depending on location and new locations | 1, 2, 3, 4 |
|  |  | LRT northbound shelters at Orchard, Bonaventura, and Component in the Project area, as well as Tasman (lengthening existing plus southbound shelter) and River Oaks outside the Project area | 1, 2, 3, 4 |
|  | - | Intersection and crosswalk improvements; lane or intersection narrowing, including reducing curve radii and/or curb bulbouts; sidewalks along median from intersections to station platform | 1, 2, 3, 4 |
|  | - | Lighting, furniture, and landscaping at LRT stations, bus stops and key pedestrian locations | 1, 2, 3, 4 |
|  | - | Station platform Improvements | 1, 2, 3, 4 |
|  | - | Other stop and station amenities such as sidewalks or sidewalk widening and lengthening | 1, 2, 3, 4 |
|  | - | Self-cleaning bathrooms | 1, 2, 3, 4 |
|  | - | Real-time information infrastructure (on LRVs and at 17 stations and stops) | 1, 2, 3, 4 |
|  | - | Ducks outs (most important at Tasman station) | 1, 2, 3, 4 |
|  | - | Shuttles between residential, businesses and transit stops/stations | 1, 2, 3, 4 |
|  |  | New bus/shuttle stop locations (noted around Tasman LRT station) including dedication of right-of-way | 1, 2, 3, 4 |
|  |  | Transit traffic signal preemption; bi-directional full priority with ability to cascade calls for green signals for LRT along North First Street | $1,2,3,4$ |
|  |  | LRT operations capital improvements, including trackway improvements, switches, tail/storage/layover tracks, and platform improvements | $1,2,3,4$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| Notes: |  |  |  |
| 1. The improvement is complete. |  |  |  |
| 3. Intersection improvements would be implemented as part of the Zanker Road Widening (Phase 2) improvement. <br> 4. Intersection improvements would be implemented as part of the Trimble Road and Montague Expressway Flyover (Phase 1) |  |  |  |
| 5. Intersection improvements would be implemented as part of the McCarthy Boulevard-O'Toole Avenue and Montague Expressway Interchange (Phase 3) improvement. |  |  |  |
| 6. Intersection improvements would be implemented as part of the Zanker Road to Skyport Drive and Fourth Street Connection (Phase 4) improvement. |  |  |  |

Figure 1

## NSJADP Transportation Improvement Phasing Plan



## Scope of Study

This study is conducted to re-evaluate and update the necessary improvements identified in the NSJADP to adequately mitigate the Phase 1 development levels that have been completed, entitled, and remaining. No changes to the NSJADP land uses are proposed; therefore, it is not the intent of the study to identify new or modify transportation impacts and mitigation. Rather, the study reviews 16 years of built development and traffic growth to update the required improvements to serve Phase 1 of the NSJADP that were previously identified based on 35 years of development and traffic forecasts at the time. Traffic conditions are evaluated for the following scenarios:

## Intersection Analysis

Baseline Conditions: Baseline conditions are the same as the Background conditions studied in the transportation analysis for the NSJADP EIR in 2005. The current pandemic does not provide an opportune time to update the baseline conditions. Instead of updating the baseline to today's traffic levels, the original baseline in 2005 is used to evaluate which transportation improvements would be appropriate to serve Phase 1 development under pre-pandemic traffic patterns. The built development between 2005 and 2021 are reflected in Phase 1 conditions.

Phase 1 Conditions: The existing peak-hour volumes plus near-term future traffic growth associated with entitled Phase 1 development on the near-term future roadway network. The existing volumes reflect completed and entitled Phase 1 development between Year 2005 and 2021, as well as ambient growth in other jurisdictions and other areas of the City during the same period. The near-term future traffic growth represents traffic associated with the remaining Phase 1 development capacity as well as the approved but unconstructed developments outside of North San José. The most notable approved but unconstructed developments outside of North San Jose are phases 1 to 3 of the City Place and the Tasman East Specific Plan, both in the City of Santa Clara. Phase 1 conditions are evaluated relative to Baseline conditions to determine the appropriate necessary intersection improvements.

## Screenline Analysis

Year 2015 conditions: Year 2015 conditions are the base year conditions in the City's travel demand forecasting model for evaluating major roadway improvements. In this scenario, directional traffic crossing the gateway facilities to and from North San José during the AM and PM peak hours and commute periods are compared against the capacity of the gateway facilities to determine how much of gateway capacity is currently utilized. Year 2015 conditions are used to reflect Phase 1 conditions for the screenline analysis since there has been minimal constructed development between 2015 and 2021.

## Study Area

As described earlier in the report, there are no changes to the proposed NSJADP Phase 1 land uses. The purpose of the study is to provide an updated evaluation of only the necessary transportation improvements and mitigation already identified in the NSJADP to support Phase 1 development levels. Therefore, the study focuses on the four major roadway improvements and 12 intersection improvements and mitigation measures that were identified to be required to accommodate Phase 1
development in the 2005 NSJADP EIR. However, all 48 intersections at which impacts were identified in the NSJADP TIA were evaluated to ensure that any potential additional impacts also were captured in the updated analysis. The study facilities are listed below and shown graphically in Figure 2. To allow for easy reference to the NSJADP EIR, the study intersections are given the same study numbers in this report as those used in the NSJADP EIR.

## Study Facilities

Major Roadway Improvements
(I) Montague Expressway Widening*
(II) US-101 and Trimble Road Interchange*
(III) Trimble Road and Montague Expressway Flyover*
(IV) I-880 and Charcot Avenue Overcrossing
(V) Zanker Road Widening
(VI) McCarthy Boulevard-O'Toole Avenue and Montague Expressway Interchange
(VII) Zanker Road to Skyport Drive and Fourth Street Connection
(VIII) US-101 and Mabury Road Interchange
(IX) North San José Core Area Grid Streets*

## Project Conditions Intersection Improvements

(2) North First Street and SR-237 (South)
(6) Zanker Road and Montague Expressway*
(7) River Oaks Parkway and Montague Expressway*
(8) Trimble Road and Montague Expressway*
(9) McCarthy Boulevard-O'Toole Avenue and Montague Expressway*
(10) Old Oakland Road and Montague Expressway*
(12) North First Street and Trimble Road*
(13) Zanker Road and Trimble Road
(16) Zanker Road and Brokaw Road
(24) Zanker Road and Tasman Drive
(27) North First Street and Charcot Avenue*
(37) North First Street and Metro Drive*
(43) Zanker Road and Charcot Avenue
(45) Junction Avenue and Charcot Avenue
(47) Bering Avenue and Brokaw Road*

## Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

(6) Zanker Road and Montague Expressway
(7) River Oaks Parkway and Montague Expressway
(10) Old Oakland Road and Montague Expressway
(12) North First Street and Trimble Road
(13) Zanker Road and Trimble Road
(16) Zanker Road and Brokaw Road
(19) Old Oakland Road and Brokaw Road
(22) Lundy Avenue and Murphy Avenue
(24) Zanker Road and Tasman Drive
(27) North First Street and Charcot Avenue
(38) North First Street and Skyport Drive
(43) Zanker Road and Charcot Avenue

Figure 2
Study Facilities

(58) Trade Zone Boulevard and Montague Expressway*
(59) Lundy Avenue and Berryessa Road
(60) Oakland Road and US-101 (North)
(61) Oakland Road and US-101 (South)
(97) Capitol Expressway and Capitol Avenue
(98) San Tomas Expressway and Stevens Creek Boulevard
(99) San Tomas Expressway and Moorpark Avenue
(113) North First Street and Taylor Street
(114) Fourth Street and Hedding Street
(115) Eleventh Street and Taylor Street
(116) Thirteenth Street and Hedding Street*
(117) King Road and McKee Road*
(119) Capitol Avenue and McKee Road
(123) Lundy Avenue and Trade Zone Boulevard
(124) Capitol Avenue and Cropley Avenue
(125) Capitol Avenue and Hostetter Road
(126) Capitol Avenue and Berryessa Road
(130) Almaden Avenue and Grant Street
(143) Tenth Street and Hedding Street
(146) Tenth Street and Julian Street
(154) Tenth Street and Taylor Street

Bold and Asterisk indicates Phase 1 major roadway or intersection improvement.

## Analysis Methodology

## NSJADP EIR

The transportation impact analysis completed in the 2005 NSJADP EIR relied on traffic forecasts developed from the Valley Transportation Agency travel demand forecasting model at the time. The model was used to obtain Project-generated traffic growth and trip assignments on the transportation network. The peak hour vehicular traffic volumes for the Background conditions were obtained by combining the existing turning movement vehicular counts and near-term future traffic associated with entitled development at the time. The peak hour vehicular traffic for the Project conditions were calculated by applying modeled, Project-generated traffic growth to the Background conditions traffic. Intersection level of service under Project conditions were then evaluated against Background conditions to identify adverse traffic effects attributable to the Project on the near-term roadway network and identified transportation improvements to address those effects. The phasing of the nine major roadway improvements were also determined based on judgement of necessity of the improvements and level of service calculations.

## Intersection Improvement Phasing

Since no changes to the adopted NSJADP land uses - as revised through General Plan amendments through 2021 - are proposed, this analysis update is neither about identifying any new transportation impacts nor any changes to the improvements as approved in the 2005 NSJADP EIR. Rather, the analysis update re-evaluates the required improvements to support Phase 1 development levels as completed to date. As such, the updated analysis follows the same approach and methodology as those in the 2005 NSJADP EIR when re-evaluating the phasing of the 12 intersection improvements and mitigation for Phase 1 development.

## Major Roadway Improvement Phasing

In the 2005 NSJADP EIR, the phasing of the nine major roadway improvements was determined based on a qualitative judgement of their need to serve the overall North San José area. These major roadway improvements serve as gateways and/or major arterials to and within North San José and are needed to serve not only each of the development phases in North San José but also the overall citywide long-term growth. The major roadway improvements are included in the Land Use/Transportation Diagram in the General Plan.

To evaluate the need of the major roadway improvements to support Phase 1, a volume-to-capacity analysis is used. The Year 2015 model, which included land use growth and transportation improvements within the Bay Area consistent with the Plan Bay Area projections ${ }^{2}$, is used to estimate peak hour and commute period directional volumes at five sets of gateway facilities (thereafter called "screenlines") in North San José. A screenline is an imaginary line drawn across parallel roadways to evaluate the combined capacity and travel demand crossing the screenline. The screenlines often represent existing physical constrictions on travel at that location. The screenline analysis summarizes the volume and capacity of selected parallel roadways that cross each of the screenlines. Figure 3 presents graphically the five screenlines used in this analysis.

Volume-to-capacity ratio, or V/C, is defined as the mathematical ratio of the volume of traffic on a gateway facility to its capacity. The aggregated V/C for a screenline represents a ratio of the combined volume of traffic on parallel gateway facilities on the screenline to the combined capacity of the gateway facilities. In this analysis, the volume-to-capacity ratios for both the peak hours (7-9 AM and 4-6 PM) and four-hour commute periods (6-10 AM and 3-7 PM) are analyzed. Four-hour commute periods are analyzed because of findings in the NSJADP EIR that the North San Jose development would have adverse long-term impacts on the major roadway facilities serving the area. Traffic associated with future growth in North San José and the surrounding jurisdictions would result in almost all gateway facilities serving North San José to exceed capacity during the peak hours. The nine major roadway improvements would aid in reducing the severity of the long-term impacts in the peak hour but would not be adequate to fully mitigate them unless travel patterns change. Therefore, the four-hour commute periods are a more appropriate representation of a screenline's capacity serving the overall travel needs.

In travel demand modeling, V/C is often used to represent a level of congestion for street segments, similar to the way average control delay is often used to represent a level of congestion for intersections. In this analysis, the volume-to-capacity ratio for gateway facilities and screenlines are defined as the equivalent of levels of service as shown in Table 3 below.

In the intersection level of service analysis, if an intersection is expected to be impacted by the Project by a certain phase of development, improvements to reduce the impact would need to be implemented during that phase. The screenline analysis undertakes a similar approach in evaluating the phasing of each major roadway improvement:

If the volume-to-capacity ratio of a screenline for a four-hour commute or peak-hour periods under Year 2015 Conditions is higher than 0.9 (i.e. LOS E or F), the major roadway improvements would be needed to increase the overall capacity of the screenline.

[^1]Figure 3
Screenline Locations


Table 3
Intersection and Roadway Segment Level of Service Definitions

|  | Intersection |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (Average Control Delay in |  |
| Level of Service |  |  |
| Seconds per Vehicle) ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |

## Significance Criteria

## San José Significant Impact Criteria

The significant impact criteria in the NSJADP EIR that was certified in 2005 are as follows:
A project was said to create a significant adverse impact on the transportation conditions at any intersections located in San José if for either peak hour:

1. The level of service at the intersection degraded from an acceptable LOS D or better under baseline conditions to an unacceptable LOS E or $F$ under project conditions, or
2. The level of service at the intersection was an unacceptable LOS E or $F$ under baseline conditions and the addition of project trips caused both the critical-movement delay at the intersection to increase by four or more seconds and the volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio to increase by 0.01 or more.

An exception to this rule applies when the addition of project traffic reduced the amount of average control delay for critical movements (i.e. the change in average control delay for critical movements was negative). In this case, the threshold of significance was an increase in V/C by 0.01 or more.

A significant impact was said to be fully mitigated when measures were implemented that would restore intersection level of service to baseline conditions or better.

## CMP Significant Impact Criteria

The definition of a significant impact at a CMP intersection was the same as for the City at the time of the NSJADP EIR, except that the CMP standard for acceptable level of service is LOS E or better. A significant impact by CMP standards was said to be fully mitigated when measures were implemented that would restore intersection operations to LOS E or better. Designated CMP intersections located within the City of San José were evaluated against both the City's and CMP standards.

## 2.

Major Roadway Improvements

Nine major roadway improvements in and surrounding the North San José area were planned as part of the NSJADP and were assumed to be operational prior to or at the time of completion of all four development phases. These roadway improvements consist of street widenings, construction of new streets, and major improvements at isolated intersections. This chapter presents an evaluation of the need of the four major roadway improvements that were identified to serve the Phase 1 development levels based on screenline analysis.

## East Screenline

The East screenline is a group of gateway facilities serving eastbound and westbound traffic between North San José and areas east of the Coyote Creek. The screenline runs from SR-237 to the north and Brokaw Road to the south, and accounts for traffic that cross five key parallel gateways, including SR237, Tasman Drive, Montague Expressway, and Brokaw Road. In the General Plan, Montague Expressway between North First Street and Trade Zone Boulevard is programmed to add a HOV lane and serve a total of four lanes in each direction. Widening the section of Montague Expressway between North First Street and I-880 is already complete and reflected in the 2015 analysis. Figure 4 provides a map of the east screenline and its gateway facilities.

Tables 4 and 5 present the volumes crossing the east screenline during the AM and PM 4-hour commute periods and peak hours. The screenline analysis indicates that the CA-237 gateway currently operates at unacceptable levels during the 4 -hour AM commute and AM peak periods, while the Tasman and Brokaw gateways currently have inadequate capacity during the AM peak hour. Table 5 indicates that only eastbound CA-237 currently operates at unacceptable levels during the PM commute period and peak hour.

Two major roadway improvements along the East screenline were identified in the NSJADP to serve the Phase 1 development levels:
(I) Montague Expressway Widening
(III) Trimble Road and Montague Expressway Flyover

## (I) Montague Expressway Widening (Original: Phase 1, Update: Completed)

NSJADP TIA: Project conditions included the widening of Montague Expressway within North San José from six to eight lanes between North First Street and I-880. The improvement was identified to be needed to serve Phase 1 development.

Figure 4

## East Screenline and Gateway Facilities



Table 4
2015 AM Westbound Volumes Crossing East Screenline

| Gateway | Screenline | 6-10 AM |  |  |  | AM Peak Hour |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \# Lanes | 4-Hr. Vol. | 4-Hr. Cap. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { V/C } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ | \# Lanes | $\begin{gathered} \text { Pk-Hr. } \\ \text { Vol. } \end{gathered}$ | Pk-Hr. Cap. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { V/C } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ |
| WB CA-237 | East | 5 | 27,960 | 30,400 | 0.92/E | 5 | 6,990 | 7,600 | 0.92/E |
| WB Tasman | East | 3 | 8,910 | 10,800 | 0.83/D | 3 | 2,970 | 2,700 | 1.10/F |
| WB Montague | East | 4 | 11,550 | 23,200 | 0.50/A | 4 | 3,680 | 5,800 | 0.63/B |
| WB Charcot | East | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| WB Brokaw | East | 3 | 6,350 | 10,800 | 0.59/A | 3 | 3,580 | 2,700 | 1.33/F |
| All Gateways | East | 15 | 54,770 | 75,200 | 0.74/C | 15 | 17,220 | 18,800 | 0.92/E |
| Notes: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 5
2015 PM Eastbound Volumes Crossing East Screenline

| Gateway | Screenline | 3-7 PM |  |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \# Lanes | 4-Hr. <br> Vol. | 4-Hr. <br> Cap. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { V/C } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ | \# Lanes | Pk-Hr. Vol. | Pk-Hr. Cap. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { V/C } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ |
| EB CA-237 | East | 2 | 29,870 | 26,600 | 1.12/F | 2 | 8,130 | 6,650 | 1.22/F |
| EB Tasman | East | 2 | 660 | 10,800 | 0.06/A | 2 | 220 | 2,700 | 0.08/A |
| EB Montague | East | 3 | 13,410 | 23,200 | 0.58/A | 3 | 4,170 | 5,800 | 0.72/C |
| EB Charcot | East | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| EB Brokaw | East | 3 | 4,560 | 10,800 | 0.42/A | 3 | 1,390 | 2,700 | 0.51/A |
| All Gateways | East | 14 | 48,500 | 71,400 | 0.68/B | 14 | 13,910 | 17,850 | 0.78/C |

## Notes:

1. Congested gateways are defined as gateways having volume-to-capacity ratios of LOS E or F.
2. The low eastbound volume on Tasman is resulted from inadequate calibration for the individual traffic assignment on CA-237 and Tasman. However, since the sum of assignments on the two corridors is adequately calibrated, the low eastbound volume on Tasman is acceptable for use in this study.

2021 Update: The widening of Montague Expressway from six to eight lanes between North First Street and I-880 is complete. The improvement is also part of the widening project on Montague Expressway between Lick Mill Boulevard and Trade Zone Boulevard as included in the VTA Measure B Expressway Program (2016), Valley Transportation Plan 2040 (2014), and County Expressway Plan 2040 (2008). As shown in Tables 4 and 5, the roadways that serve as the gateways across the east screenline currently have adequate capacity to serve both the AM and PM 4-hour commute periods. Therefore, further improvement of the east screenline gateways is not necessary to serve Phase 1 traffic conditions.

## (III) Trimble Road and Montague Expressway Flyover (Original: Phase 1, Update: No Improvement)

NSJADP TIA: Project conditions included an improvement of this intersection serving as a major access point into and out of North San José. Left turns from westbound Montague Expressway to southbound Trimble Road, currently served by three lanes, would be replaced by a flyover. With the construction of the flyover, the westbound left-turn movement would be removed from the signal control at the intersection and all the other movements would improve. The improvement was identified to be needed to serve Phase 1 development.

2021 Update: It should be noted that the Trimble Road and Montague Expressway Flyover does not increase the capacity of the westbound Montague Expressway gateway. The improvement will reduce traffic congestion more so at the intersection level than at a roadway network level. The flyover is expected to improve the level of service at the intersection of Trimble Road and Montague Expressway, but would not generate much throughput capacity for Trimble Road or Montague Expressway at the corridor level. As shown in Tables 4 and 5 , the roadways that serve as the gateways across the east screenline currently have adequate capacity to serve both the AM and PM 4-hour commute periods. Therefore, further improvement of the east screenline gateways is not necessary to serve Phase 1 traffic conditions. The City is considering alternative improvements to construction of the flyover along Montague Expressway to improve regional travel. The alternative improvements will focus on improvements that could provide greater benefit to multi-modal travel to and through North San Jose. Improvements could include grade separating the North First Street intersection with Montague Expressway to improve LRT operations. The City will coordinate its efforts with VTA and the County.

In summary, the NSJADP identified two major roadway improvements to increase the total roadway capacity through the east screenline. One of the two major roadway improvements, Montague Widening, has been completed. Based on the updated analysis, this study does not propose to modify the planned implementation of the remaining improvement as part of the Phase 1 development levels. The screenline analysis indicates that the roadways that serve as the gateways across the east screenline currently have inadequate capacity to serve AM peak hour volumes. However, the roadways have adequate capacity to serve both the AM and PM 4-hour commute periods. Therefore, further improvement of the east screenline gateways is not necessary to serve Phase 1 traffic conditions.

## West Screenline

The West screenline is a group of gateway facilities serving northbound/eastbound and southbound/westbound traffic between North San José and areas south of US-101. The screenline runs from Charcot Avenue to the north and Zanker Road to the south, and accounts for traffic crossing five key gateways, including Charcot Avenue, Airport Parkway, North First Street, Zanker Road, and Old Bayshore Highway. Figure 5 provides a map of the screenline and its gateway facilities.

Tables 6 and 7 present the volumes crossing the west screenline during the AM and PM 4-hour commute periods and peak hours. Table 6 indicates that two gateways, CA-87/Charcot and North First Street gateways, currently operate at unacceptable levels during the AM peak hour. Table 7 indicates that all west screenline gateways currently have adequate capacity to serve PM commute period and peak hour traffic.

There were no major roadway improvements along the west screenline identified in the NSJADP EIR to serve the Phase 1 development levels. However, as described below, one improvement is proposed to be implemented with Phase 1 development.
(VII) Zanker Road to Skyport Drive and Fourth Street Connection (Original: Phase 4, Updated: Phase 1)

NSJADP TIA: Project conditions included replacing the intersection of Fourth Street and Matrix Boulevard by a new interchange or overcrossing over US-101 that would provide an extension of Zanker Road to Skyport Drive and Fourth Street. Currently, the US-101 southbound on-ramp at Fourth Street and Matrix Boulevard and the US-101 northbound off-ramp at Zanker Road and Old Bayshore Highway are provided with no bridge connection over US-101. The improvement would connect Zanker Road to Skyport Drive, providing direct access from Zanker Road to southbound US-101 and from northbound US-101 to Skyport Drive and Fourth Street. The improvement was identified to be needed to serve Phase 4 development.

2021 Update: The improvement is currently in the Project Approval and Environmental Document (PA\&ED) phase. The connection of Zanker Road to Skyport Drive and Fourth Street would provide a much more attractive alternative to motorists that typically use North First Street, particularly during commute hours. Given that the improvement is already in the PA\&ED phase, and that, when implemented, it would become one of the major gateway facilities along the West screenline serving traffic between North San José, Downtown and the Mineta-San José International Airport, it is proposed that the improvement be implemented to serve Phase 1 development.

In summary, the screenline analysis indicates that the roadways that serve as the gateways across the west screenline currently have adequate capacity to serve both the AM and PM 4-hour commute periods. Therefore, further improvement of the west screenline gateways is not necessary to serve Phase 1 traffic conditions. However, the NSJADP EIR identified the Zanker Road to Skyport Drive and Fourth Street Connection to increase the total roadway capacity in Phase 4. Given that the Zanker Road to Skyport Drive and Fourth Street Connection improvement is in the PA\&ED phase, it is suggested that it be implemented to serve Phase 1 development rather than Phase 4 as identified in the original NSJADP EIR.

Figure 5
West Screenline and Gateway Facilities


Table 6
2015 AM Northbound/Eastbound Volumes Crossing West Screenline

|  |  |  |  | AM |  |  | AM Pe | k Hour |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gateway | Screenline | \# Lanes | 4-Hr. Vol. | 4-Hr. Cap. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { V/C } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ | \# Lanes | Pk-Hr. Vol. | Pk-Hr. Cap. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { V/C } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ |
| CA-87/Charcot | West | 2 | 4,770 | 11,200 | 0.43/A | 2 | 2,740 | 2,800 | 0.98/E |
| EB Airport | West | 3 | 1,840 | 10,800 | 0.17/A | 3 | 1,600 | 2,700 | 0.59/A |
| NB North First | West | 2 | 3,730 | 7,200 | 0.52/A | 2 | 1,700 | 1,800 | 0.95/E |
| NB Zanker | West | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| NB Old Bayshore | West | 2 | 1,740 | 7,200 | 0.24/A | 2 | 580 | 1,800 | 0.32/A |
| All Gateways | West | 9 | 12,080 | 36,400 | 0.33/A | 9 | 6,620 | 9,100 | 0.73/C |
| Notes: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Congested gateways are defined as gateways having volume-to-capacity ratios of LOS E or $F$. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 7
2015 PM Southbound/Westbound Volumes Crossing West Screenline

| Gateway | Screenline | 3-7 PM |  |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \# Lanes | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 4-Hr. } \\ & \text { Vol. } \end{aligned}$ | 4-Hr. <br> Cap. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { V/C } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ | \# Lanes | Pk-Hr. Vol. | Pk-Hr. Cap. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { V/C } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ |
| Charcot-CA-87 | West | 2 | 4,750 | 11,200 | 0.42/A | 2 | 1,640 | 2,800 | 0.58/A |
| WB Airport | West | 3 | 1,460 | 10,800 | 0.14/A | 3 | 420 | 2,700 | 0.15/A |
| SB North First | West | 2 | 3,040 | 7,200 | 0.42/A | 2 | 1,010 | 1,800 | 0.56/A |
| SB Zanker | West | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SB Old Bayshore | West | 2 | 2,430 | 7,200 | 0.34/A | 2 | 840 | 1,800 | 0.47/A |
| All Gateways | West | 9 | 11,680 | 36,400 | 0.32/A | 9 | 3,910 | 9,100 | 0.43/A |
| Notes: <br> 1. Congested gateways | as gateways ha | ing volume-to | capacity | os of LOS |  |  |  |  |  |

## Central Screenline

The Central screenline is a group of gateway facilities serving northbound and southbound traffic within the employment core area of North San José. The screenline runs from Orchard Parkway to the west and Junction Avenue to the east, and captures traffic that cross four key parallel gateways, including Orchard Parkway, North First Street, Zanker Road, and Junction Avenue. Figure 6 provides a map of the central screenline and its gateway facilities.

Tables 8 and 9 present the volumes crossing the Central screenline during the AM and PM 4-hour commute periods and peak hours. Table 8 indicates that the North First Street gateway, currently operates at unacceptable levels during the AM peak hour. Table 9 indicates that all central screenline gateways currently have adequate capacity to serve PM commute period and peak hour traffic.

The North San José Core Area Grid Streets were identified in the NSJADP EIR to be implemented as each phase (Phases 1-4) of NSJ development progressed. The North San José Core Area Grid Streets will increase the capacity of the Central screenline.

## (IX) North San José Core Area Grid Streets (Original: Phase: 1-4, Updated: Phase: 1-4)

NSJADP TIA: Project conditions included constructing several new local streets to form a "grid system" of streets to facilitate the efficient circulation of traffic within North San José. The grid streets would serve future development and provide connections to major arterials within North San José. They would generally be two-lane roadways connecting to the major roadways such as Montague Expressway, Trimble Road, North First Street, and Zanker Road. The additional roadways would serve to alleviate connection along the major arterials in the area and would include the following:

- Extend Orchard Parkway between Trimble Road to the north and Atmel Way to the south;
- Extend Component Drive between North First Street to the east and Orchard Parkway to the west;
- Extend Orchard Drive between Montague Expressway to the north and Atmel Way to the south, providing another north-south local street parallel to and in between Orchard Parkway and North First Street;
- Extend Bering Drive between Charcot Avenue to the south and Montague Expressway to the north, providing another north-south local street parallel to and in between North First Street and Zanker Road;
- Extend Orchard Parkway between North First Street to the west to Junction Avenue to the east;
- Add or extend multiple east-west local streets parallel to and in between Montague Expressway, Plumeria Drive, Trimble Road, Charcot Avenue, Brokaw Road, and Skyport Drive.

2021 Update: The extension of Orchard Parkway between Trimble Road to the north and Atmel Way to the south, as well as the extension of Component Drive between North First Street to the east and Orchard Parkway to the west, are complete. The remaining components of the grid street system are not complete. The improvement is also included in the Valley Transportation Plan 2040 (2014).

Figure 6
Central Screenline and Gateway Facilities


Table 8
2015 AM Northbound Volumes Crossing Central Screenline

| Gateway | Screenline | 6-10 AM |  |  |  | AM Peak Hour |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \# Lanes | 4-Hr. <br> Vol. | 4-Hr. Cap. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { V/C } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ | \# Lanes | Pk-Hr. Vol. | Pk-Hr. Cap. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { V/C } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ |
| NB Orchard | Central | 2 | 620 | 4,400 | 0.14/A | 2 | 460 | 1,100 | 0.42/A |
| NB North First | Central | 2 | 4,900 | 7,200 | 0.68/B | 2 | 2,710 | 1,800 | 1.50/F |
| NB Zanker | Central | 2 | 1,500 | 7,200 | 0.21/A | 2 | 610 | 1,800 | 0.34/A |
| NB Junction | Central | 1 | 1,650 | 3,600 | 0.46/A | 1 | 550 | 900 | 0.61/B |
| All Gateways | Central | 7 | 8,670 | 22,400 | 0.39/A | 7 | 4,330 | 5,600 | 0.78/C |
| Notes: <br> 1. Congested gatewa | ed as gateways | ing volume-to | capacity | ios of LOS |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 9
2015 PM Southbound Volumes Crossing Central Screenline

| Gateway | Screenline | 3-7 PM |  |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \# Lanes | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 4-Hr. } \\ & \text { Vol. } \end{aligned}$ | 4-Hr. Cap. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { V/C } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ | \# Lanes | Pk-Hr. Vol. | Pk-Hr. Cap. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { V/C } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ |
| SB Orchard | Central | 2 | 720 | 4,400 | 0.16/A | 2 | 250 | 1,100 | 0.22/A |
| SB North First | Central | 2 | 3,310 | 7,200 | 0.46/A | 2 | 1,120 | 1,800 | 0.62/B |
| SB Zanker | Central | 2 | 90 | 7,200 | 0.01/A | 2 | 30 | 1,800 | 0.02/A |
| SB Junction | Central | 1 | 110 | 3,600 | 0.03/A | 1 | 40 | 900 | 0.04/A |
| All Gateways | Central | 7 | 4,230 | 22,400 | 0.19/A | 7 | 1,440 | 5,600 | 0.26/A |

Notes:

1. Congested gateways are defined as gateways having volume-to-capacity ratios of LOS E or F.

In summary, the screenline analysis indicates that the roadways that serve as the gateways across the central screenline currently have adequate capacity to serve both the AM and PM 4-hour commute periods. Therefore, further improvement of the central screenline gateways is not necessary to serve Phase 1 traffic conditions. The NSJADP EIR identified the North San José Core Area Grid Streets to increase the total roadway capacity as each phase (Phases 1-4) of NSJ development progressed. The extension of Orchard Parkway between Trimble Road to the north and Atmel Way to the south, as well as the extension of Component Drive between North First Street to the east and Orchard Parkway to the west, are complete. The remaining components of the grid street system are not complete and should be completed as planned as part of Phases 1-4.

## North Screenline

The North screenline is a group of gateway facilities serving northbound and southbound traffic between North San José and areas south of the screenline at US-101. The screenline runs from Lawrence Expressway to the west and SR-87 to the east, and accounts for traffic that cross six key parallel gateways, including Lawrence Expressway, Bowers Avenue, San Tomas Expressway, Lafayette Street, De La Cruz Boulevard, and SR-87. Figure 7 provides a map of the screenline and its gateway facilities.

Tables 10 and 11 present the volumes crossing the North screenline during the AM and PM 4-hour commute periods and peak hours. Table 11 indicates that the CA 87 gateway, currently operates at unacceptable levels during the PM peak hour. Table 10 indicates that all north screenline gateways currently have adequate capacity to serve AM commute period and peak hour traffic.

The NSJADP EIR identified one major roadway improvement project, the (II) US-101 and Trimble Road Interchange to serve the Phase 1 development levels.

## (II) US-101 and Trimble Road Interchange (Original: Phase: 1, Updated: Phase 1)

NSJADP TIA: Project conditions included eliminating the southbound loop off-ramp to eastbound Trimble Road, constructing a new southbound diagonal ramp that would serve both eastbound and westbound Trimble Road, and reconstructing the southbound diagonal on-ramp and the southbound and northbound loop on-ramps. The northbound US-101 loop off-ramp to westbound Trimble Road would also be eliminated and replaced by a new northbound diagonal off-ramp that would serve both eastbound and westbound Trimble Road. The northbound diagonal ramp would be fed by a new collector road that would exit US-101 south of SR-87. The improvement was included as part of the Project to be delivered by Phase 1 development.

2021 Update: The elimination and replacement of the northbound US-101 loop off-ramp to westbound Trimble Road with a new northbound diagonal off-ramp serving both eastbound and westbound Trimble Road was completed by VTA. The elimination of the southbound loop off-ramp to eastbound Trimble Road, construction of a new southbound diagonal ramp serving both eastbound and westbound Trimble Road, and reconstruction of the southbound diagonal on-ramp and the southbound and northbound loop on-ramps are not complete.

VTA, in partnership with Caltrans and the City, completed the Project Approval and Environmental Document (PA\&ED) phase for the improvement in March 2016. Currently in the Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS\&E) phase, the US-101 and Trimble Road Interchange improvement would include the following components:

- Reconstruct the existing three-quadrant cloverleaf interchange to a partial cloverleaf interchange;
- Replace the existing De La Cruz Boulevard-Trimble Road overcrossing structure to provide six through lanes and accommodating bike and pedestrian facilities;
- Widen De La Cruz Boulevard between Trimble Road and Central Expressway from four to six lanes;
- Construct a new intersection at the terminus of US-101 southbound off-ramp at De La Cruz Boulevard;
- Reconstruct the intersection of De La Cruz Boulevard and Central Expressway to provide bike lanes and additional through and turn lanes.

Figure 7
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Table 10
2015 AM Northbound Volumes Crossing North Screenline

| Gateway | Screen-line | 6-10 AM |  |  |  | AM Peak Hour |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \# Lanes | 4-Hr. Vol. | 4-Hr. Cap. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { V/C } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ | \# Lanes | $\begin{gathered} \text { Pk-Hr. } \\ \text { Vol. } \end{gathered}$ | Pk-Hr. Cap. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { V/C } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ |
| NB Lawrence | North | 4 | 8,380 | 23,200 | 0.36/A | 4 | 3,220 | 5,800 | 0.56/A |
| NB Bowers | North | 3 | 1,310 | 10,800 | 0.12/A | 3 | 620 | 2,700 | 0.23/A |
| NB San Tomas | North | 4 | 7,250 | 23,200 | 0.31/A | 4 | 4,290 | 5,800 | 0.74/C |
| NB Lafayette | North | 2 | 1,200 | 7,200 | 0.17/A | 2 | 400 | 1,800 | 0.22/A |
| NB De La Cruz | North | 4 | 6,690 | 15,200 | 0.44/A | 4 | 2,230 | 3,800 | 0.59/A |
| NB SR-87 | North | 3 | 16,440 | 22,800 | 0.72/C | 3 | 4,110 | 5,700 | 0.72/C |
| All Gateways | North | 22 | 41,270 | 102,400 | 0.40/A | 22 | 14,870 | 25,600 | 0.58/A |

Notes:

1. Congested links are defined as gateways having volume-to-capacity ratios of LOS E or F.

Table 11
2015 PM Southbound Volumes Crossing North Screenline

| Gateway | Screen-line | 3-7 PM |  |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \# Lanes | 4-Hr. Vol. | 4-Hr. <br> Cap. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { V/C } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ | \# Lanes | Pk-Hr. Vol. | Pk-Hr. Cap. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { V/C } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ |
| SB Lawrence | North | 4 | 9,980 | 23,200 | 0.43/A | 4 | 3,210 | 5,800 | 0.55/A |
| SB Bowers | North | 3 | 2,560 | 10,800 | 0.24/A | 3 | 820 | 2,700 | 0.30/A |
| SB San Tomas | North | 4 | 9,740 | 23,200 | 0.42/A | 4 | 3,200 | 5,800 | 0.55/A |
| SB Lafayette | North | 2 | 970 | 7,200 | 0.14/A | 2 | 330 | 1,800 | 0.18/A |
| SB De La Cruz | North | 4 | 2,530 | 15,200 | 0.17/A | 4 | 800 | 3,800 | 0.21/A |
| SB CA-87 | North | 3 | 20,500 | 22,800 | 0.90/D | 3 | 6,870 | 5,700 | 1.20/F |
| All Gateways | North | 22 | 46,280 | 102,400 | 0.45/A | 22 | 15,230 | 25,600 | 0.59/A |

Notes:

1. Congested links are defined as gateways having volume-to-capacity ratios of LOS E or $F$.

Because the improvement is in the PS\&E phase and construction is forthcoming, it is recommended that the improvement, which is also included in the VTA Measure B Expressway Program (2016) and the Valley Transportation Plan 2040 (2014), would be implemented to serve Phase 1 development.

In summary, the screenline analysis indicates that the roadways that serve as the gateways across the north screenline currently have adequate capacity to serve both the AM and PM 4-hour commute periods. Therefore, further improvement of the north screenline gateways is not necessary to serve Phase 1 traffic conditions. However, the NSJADP EIR identified the improvement of the US-101 and Trimble Road Interchange in Phase 1. Given that the US-101 and Trimble Road Interchange improvement is in the PA\&ED phase and construction is forthcoming, it is suggested that it be implemented to serve Phase 1 development.

## South Screenline

The South screenline is a group of gateway facilities serving westbound and eastbound traffic between the east side of US-101 and the west side. The screenline runs from Oakland Road to the north and Alum Rock Avenue to the south, and accounts for traffic that cross five key parallel gateways, including Oakland Road, Berryessa Street, Mabury Road, McKee Road, and Alum Rock Avenue. Figure 8 provides a map of the screenline and its gateway facilities.

Tables 12 and 13 present the volumes crossing the South screenline during the AM and PM 4-hour commute periods and peak hours. The screenline analysis indicates that the McKee gateway currently operates at unacceptable levels during the AM commute period and both the AM and PM peak hours. The screenline analysis indicates that the remaining west screenline gateways currently have adequate capacity to serve commute period and peak hour traffic.

There were no major roadway improvements along the South screenline identified in the NSJADP EIR to serve the Phase 1 development levels. In summary, the screenline analysis indicates that the roadways that serve as the gateways across the south screenline currently have adequate capacity to serve both the AM and PM 4-hour commute periods. Therefore, further improvement of the south screenline gateways is not necessary to serve Phase 1 traffic conditions.

Figure 8
South Screenline and Gateway Facilities


Table 12
2015 AM Westbound/Eastbound Volumes Crossing South Screenline

| Gateway | Screen-line | 6-10 AM |  |  |  | AM Peak Hour |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \# Lanes | 4-Hr. Vol. | 4-Hr. Cap. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { V/C } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ | \# Lanes | Pk-Hr. Vol. | Pk-Hr. Cap. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { V/C } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ |
| Westbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WB Alum Rock | South | 2 | 2,100 | 7,200 | 0.29/A | 2 | 1,580 | 1,800 | 0.88/D |
| WB McKee | South | 2 | 6,660 | 7,200 | 0.93/E | 2 | 2,110 | 1,800 | 1.17/F |
| WB Mabury | South | 1 | 980 | 3,600 | 0.27/A | 1 | 750 | 900 | 0.84/D |
| WB Berryessa | South | 2 | 3,570 | 7,200 | 0.50/A | 2 | 640 | 1,800 | 0.35/A |
| SB Oakland | South | 3 | 1,210 | 10,800 | 0.11/A | 3 | 390 | 2,700 | 0.15/A |
| All Gateways | South | 10 | 14,520 | 36,000 | 0.40/A | 10 | 5,470 | 9,000 | 0.61/B |
| Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EB Alum Rock | South | 2 | 900 | 7,200 | 0.12/A | 2 | 420 | 1,800 | 0.24/A |
| EB McKee | South | 2 | 2,960 | 7,200 | 0.41/A | 2 | 1,410 | 1,800 | 0.78/C |
| EB Mabury | South | 1 | 490 | 3,600 | 0.14/A | 1 | 220 | 900 | 0.25/A |
| EB Berryessa | South | 3 | 900 | 10,800 | 0.08/A | 3 | 500 | 2,700 | 0.19/A |
| NB Oakland | South | 3 | 2,840 | 10,800 | 0.26/A | 3 | 1,040 | 2,700 | 0.39/A |
| All Gateways | South | 11 | 8,090 | 39,600 | 0.20/A | 11 | 3,590 | 9,900 | 0.36/A |
| Notes: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 13
2015 PM Westbound/Eastbound Volumes Crossing South Screenline

| Gateway | Screen-line | 3-7 PM |  |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \# Lanes | 4-Hr. Vol. | 4-Hr. Cap. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { V/C } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ | \# Lanes | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pk-Hr. } \\ & \text { Vol. } \end{aligned}$ | Pk-Hr. Cap. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { V/C } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ |
| Westbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| WB Alum Rock | South | 2 | 1,140 | 7,200 | 0.16/A | 2 | 350 | 1,800 | 0.19/A |
| WB McKee | South | 2 | 4,750 | 7,200 | 0.66/B | 2 | 1,490 | 1,800 | 0.83/D |
| WB Mabury | South | 1 | 740 | 3,600 | 0.21/A | 1 | 230 | 900 | 0.26/A |
| WB Berryessa | South | 2 | 1,710 | 7,200 | 0.24/A | 2 | 510 | 1,800 | 0.29/A |
| SB Oakland | South | 3 | 3,850 | 10,800 | 0.36/A | 3 | 1,300 | 2,700 | 0.48/A |
| All Gateways | South | 10 | 12,190 | 36,000 | 0.34/A | 10 | 3,880 | 9,000 | 0.43/A |
| Eastbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EB Alum Rock | South | 2 | 2,100 | 7,200 | 0.29/A | 2 | 680 | 1,800 | 0.38/A |
| EB McKee | South | 2 | 5,060 | 7,200 | 0.70/C | 2 | 1,630 | 1,800 | 0.91/E |
| EB Mabury | South | 1 | 980 | 3,600 | 0.27/A | 1 | 310 | 900 | 0.35/A |
| EB Berryessa | South | 3 | 3,070 | 10,800 | 0.28/A | 3 | 1,000 | 2,700 | 0.37/A |
| NB Oakland | South | 3 | 1,700 | 10,800 | 0.16/A | 3 | 530 | 2,700 | 0.20/A |
| All Gateways | South | 11 | 12,910 | 39,600 | 0.33/A | 11 | 4,150 | 9,900 | 0.42/A |

[^2]
## 4. <br> Phase 1 Intersection Impacts and Mitigation

As described previously, a total of nine major roadway improvements and 15 intersection improvements were assumed as part of the of the NSJADP development. Based on the NSJADP EIR, Phase 1 development would impact 12 intersections, of which 10 were in North San José and two in other areas of San José. This chapter provides an update of peak hour intersection level of service conditions for the purpose of ensuring that transportation improvements adequately address current and future Phase 1 development level conditions.

The results of the updated intersection level of service is discussed below. Table 14 provides updated intersection levels of service for all intersections that were identified to be impacted by buildout of all four phases of NSJADP development.

## (6) Zanker Road and Montague Expressway (Original: Phase 1 \& 2, Updated: Complete)

NSJADP TIA: Intersection Improvements: Phase 1 conditions included the widening of Montague Expressway from six to eight lanes between North First Street and I-880. The additions of second northbound and southbound left-turn lanes on Zanker Road were identified to be required to serve Phase 2 development in the NSJADP EIR.

2021 Update: Intersection Improvements: The widening of Montague Expressway from six to eight lanes between North First Street and I-880 is complete.

The additions of second northbound and southbound left-turn lanes on Zanker Road were identified to be required to serve Phase 2 development in the NSJADP EIR and are not complete. The improvement would be implemented as part of the Zanker Road Widening improvements planned as part of Phase 2 development. The Zanker Road Widening improvement is also included in the Valley Transportation Plan 2040 (2014). Therefore, the Phase 1 improvement for this intersection is complete.
(7) River Oaks Parkway and Montague Expressway (Original: Phase 1, Updated: Complete)

NSJADP TIA: Intersection Improvements: Phase 1 conditions included the widening of Montague Expressway from six to eight lanes between North First Street and I-880.

2021 Update: Intersection Improvements: Improvement at this intersection per the NSJADP consisted only of the Montague Expressway Widening which has been completed.

Table 14
Intersection Level of Service Summary

|  |  | Peak <br> Hour | Baseline |  | 2005 NSJADP EIR |  |  |  | 2018 Analysis Update |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Phase 1 |  |  | Phase 1 Mitigated |  | Phase 1 |  | Phase 1 Mitigated |  |
|  |  | Avg. <br> Delay | LOS | Avg. <br> Delay | LOS | Avg. <br> Delay | LOS | Avg. <br> Delay | LOS | Avg. <br> Delay | LOS |
| North San Jose Intersections |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 237/FIRST (S) * |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AM } \\ & \text { PM } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 81.3 \\ & 59.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & F \\ & E \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24.7 \\ & 29.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C} \\ & \mathrm{C} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 45.1 \\ & 40.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & D \\ & D \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| 6 | MONTAGUE/ZANKER * |  | AM | 54.0 | D | 82.1 | F | 48.3 | D | $67.2$ | E | 63.0 | $\begin{aligned} & E \\ & F \end{aligned}$ |
| 7 | MONTAGUE/RIVER OAKS | AM | 45.3 | D | 72.9 | E | 56.2 | E | 32.9 | C |  |  |
|  |  | PM | 54.9 | D | 68.9 | E | 62.7 | E | 35.5 | D |  |  |
| 8 | MONTAGUE/TRIMBLE * | AM | 25.1 | C | 24.3 | C | 27.6 | C | 67.7 | E |  |  |
|  |  | PM | 140.6 | F | 109.5 | F | 43.0 | D | 50.8 | D |  |  |
| 9 | MONTAGUE/O'TOOLE * | AM | 86.7 | F | 82.1 | F |  |  | 87.9 | F |  |  |
|  |  | PM | 470.2 | F | 175.3 | F |  |  | 160.9 | F |  |  |
| 10 | MONTAGUE/OAKLAND * | AM | 85.0 | F | 103.0 | F | 101.1 | F | 107.0 | F |  |  |
|  |  | PM | 101.7 | F | 128.2 | F | 123.6 | F | 85.5 | F |  |  |
| 12 | FIRST/TRIMBLE * | AM | 76.7 | E | 51.6 | D | 47.1 | D | 46.4 | D |  |  |
|  |  | PM | 80.0 | E | 55.8 | E | 51.6 | D | 42.8 | D |  |  |
| 13 | TRIMBLE/ZANKER * | AM | 44.7 | D | 41.0 | D |  |  | 39.4 | D |  |  |
|  |  | PM | 122.6 | F | 114.4 | F |  |  | 42.4 | D |  |  |
| 16 | BROKAW/ZANKER * | AM | 54.3 | D | 68.4 | E |  |  | 44.6 | D |  |  |
|  |  | PM | 58.4 | E | 68.2 | E |  |  | 44.3 | D |  |  |
| 19 | BROKAW/OAKLAND * | AM | 59.0 | E | 58.3 | E |  |  | 46.9 | D |  |  |
|  |  | PM | 47.9 | D | 47.3 | D |  |  | 51.8 | D |  |  |
| 22 | LUNDY/MURPHY * | AM | 46.6 | D | 46.1 | D |  |  | 40.3 | D |  |  |
|  |  | PM | 43.1 | D | 47.8 | D |  |  | 44.7 | D |  |  |
| Other North San Jose Intersections |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24 | TASMAN/ZANKER | AM | 38.0 | D | 38.0 | D |  |  | 35.8 | D |  |  |
|  |  | PM | 54.7 | D | 44.5 | D |  |  | 34.8 | C |  |  |
| 27 | CHARCOT/FIRST | AM | 103.8 | F | 71.9 | E | 40.4 | D | 51.5 | D |  |  |
|  |  | PM | 48.4 | D | 40.4 | D | 35.7 | D | 41.9 | D |  |  |
| 37 | FIRST/METRO | AM | 12.9 | B | 13.7 | B | 13.6 | B | 12.1 | B |  |  |
|  |  | PM | 23.4 | C | 25.3 | C | 20.4 | C | 19.3 | B |  |  |
| 38 | FIRST/SKYPORT | AM | 20.9 | C | 35.8 | D |  |  | 26.6 | C |  |  |
|  |  | PM | 26.9 | C | 22.8 | C |  |  | 40.1 | D |  |  |
| 43 | CHARCOT/ZANKER | AM | 34.7 | C | 33.0 | C |  |  | 42.5 | D |  |  |
|  |  | PM | 31.9 | C | 37.6 | D |  |  | 43.6 | D |  |  |
| 45 | CHARCOT/JUNCTION | AM | 21.5 | C | 22.7 | C |  |  | 34.1 | C | 28.8 | C |
|  |  | PM | 25.1 | C | 34.7 | C |  |  | 58.9 | E | 32.2 | C |
| 47 | BERING/BROKAW | AM | 18.7 | B | 30.2 | C | 27.0 | C | 26.9 | C |  |  |
|  |  | PM | 24.3 | C | 28.9 | C | 30.3 | C | 31.0 | C |  |  |
| Other San Jose CMP Intersections |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 58 | TRADE ZONE/MONTAGUE * | AM | 52.3 | D | 81.8 | F | 46.1 | D | 61.7 | E |  |  |
|  |  | PM | 79.9 | E | 109.0 | F | 53.0 | D | 70.3 | E |  |  |
| 59 | LUNDY/BERRYESSA* | AM | 53.3 | D | 48.5 | D |  |  | 43.6 | D |  |  |
|  |  | PM | 44.3 | D | 47.2 | D |  |  | 47.7 | D |  |  |
| 60 | OAKLAND/US-101 (N) * | AM | 35.5 | D | 41.0 | D |  |  | 85.5 | F | 84.7 | F |
|  |  | PM | 18.8 | B | 19.6 | B |  |  | 54.6 | D | 54.4 | D |
| 61 | OAKLAND/US-101 (S) * | AM | 25.9 | C | 24.6 | C |  |  | 29.9 | C | 29.9 | C |
|  |  | PM | 38.0 | D | 45.9 | D |  |  | 85.7 | F | 85.6 | F |
| 97 | CAPITOL/CAPITOL * | AM | 31.3 | C | 34.4 | C |  |  | 42.7 | D |  |  |
|  |  | PM | 101.4 | F | 86.3 | F |  |  | 49.9 | D |  |  |

Table 14 (Cont'd)
Intersection Level of Service Summary

|  |  | Peak <br> Hour | Baseline |  | 2005 NSJADP EIR |  |  |  | 2018 Analysis Update |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Phase 1 |  |  | Phase 1 <br> Mitigated |  | Phase 1 |  | Phase 1 Mitigated |  |
|  |  | Avg. <br> Delay | LOS | Avg. <br> Delay | LOS | Avg. <br> Delay | LOS | Avg. <br> Delay | LOS | Avg. <br> Delay | LOS |
| 98 | SAN TOMAS/STEVENS CREEK * |  | AM <br> PM | $\begin{aligned} & 56.6 \\ & 82.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & E \\ & \mathbf{F} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 55.3 \\ & 83.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & E \\ & \mathbf{F} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 78.2 \\ & 71.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & E \\ & E \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 57.5 \\ & 56.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & E \\ & E \end{aligned}$ |
| 99 | SAN TOMAS/MOORPARK * |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AM } \\ & \text { PM } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 67.8 \\ 125.4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{E} \\ & \mathrm{~F} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 67.2 \\ 125.5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & E \\ & F \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 82.5 \\ & 55.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & F \\ & E \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 60.1 \\ & 46.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{E} \\ & \mathrm{D} \end{aligned}$ |
| Other San Jose Intersections |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 113 | FIRST/TAYLOR (Protected) | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{AM} \\ & \mathrm{PM} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 114 | FOURTH/HEDDING (Protected) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AM } \\ & \text { PM } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | - | - | - | - |  |  |  |  |
| 115 | ELEVENTH/TAYLOR (Protected) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AM } \\ & \text { PM } \end{aligned}$ | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 116 | THIRTEENTH/HEDDING | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AM } \\ & \text { PM } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 57.9 \\ & 42.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{E} \\ & \mathrm{D} \end{aligned}$ | 62.6 | E | $\begin{aligned} & 48.9 \\ & 38.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{D} \\ & \mathrm{D} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 54.3 \\ & 52.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{D} \\ & \mathrm{D} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| 117 | KING/MCKEE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AM } \\ & \text { PM } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 51.8 \\ & 47.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{D} \\ & \mathrm{D} \end{aligned}$ | 56.6 | $\frac{E}{D}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 41.9 \\ & 38.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & D \\ & D \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 77.9 \\ & 78.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{E} \\ & \mathrm{~F} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 44.0 \\ & 41.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & D \\ & D \end{aligned}$ |
| 119 | CAPITOL/MCKEE (Protected) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AM } \\ & \text { PM } \end{aligned}$ | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 123 | LUNDY/TRADE ZONE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AM } \\ & \text { PM } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40.9 \\ & 39.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & D \\ & D \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 43.8 \\ & 40.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{D} \\ & \mathrm{D} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 32.1 \\ & 42.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { C } \\ & \text { D } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| 124 | CAPITOL/CROPLEY | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AM } \\ & \text { PM } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33.6 \\ & 57.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C} \\ & \mathrm{E} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33.8 \\ & 58.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C} \\ & \mathrm{E} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 39.1 \\ & 54.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{D} \\ & \mathrm{D} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| 125 | CAPITOL/HOSTETTER (Protected) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AM } \\ & \text { PM } \end{aligned}$ | - |  |  |  |  |  | - | - | - |  |
| 126 | CAPITOL/BERRYESSA | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AM } \\ & \text { PM } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 46.4 \\ & 46.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{D} \\ & \mathrm{D} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 46.9 \\ & 48.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{D} \\ & \mathrm{D} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 48.8 \\ & 55.7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{D} \\ & \mathrm{E} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 48.7 \\ & 53.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{D} \\ & \mathrm{D} \end{aligned}$ |
| 130 | ALMADEN/GRANT (Protected) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AM } \\ & \text { PM } \end{aligned}$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 143 | TENTH/HEDDING (Protected) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AM } \\ & \text { PM } \end{aligned}$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 146 | TENTH/JULIAN (Protected) | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{AM} \\ & \mathrm{PM} \end{aligned}$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| 154 | TENTH/TAYLOR (Protected) | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{AM} \\ & \mathrm{PM} \end{aligned}$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
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## (8) Trimble Road and Montague Expressway (Original: Phase 1, Updated: Complete)

NSJADP TIA: Intersection Improvements: Phase 1 conditions included the widening of Montague Expressway from six to eight lanes between North First Street and I-880, providing four lanes in each direction. In addition, the construction of a flyover connecting from westbound Montague Expressway to southbound Trimble Road, thereby providing a free westbound left-turn movement and removing the movement from the intersection's signal control also was included in Phase 1 conditions.

Note that this intersection was not identified to be impacted by Phase 1 conditions in the 2005 EIR. The above-described major roadway improvements were included as part of the NSJADP project.

2021 Update: Intersection Improvements: The widening of Montague Expressway from six to eight lanes between North First Street and I-880 is complete.

The construction of a flyover connecting from westbound Montague Expressway to southbound Trimble Road was identified to be included as part of the NSJADP project. The improvement is also included in the VTA Measure B Expressway Program (2016), Valley Transportation Plan 2040 (2014), and County Expressway Plan 2040 (2008). However, the screenline analysis indicates that the flyover is not required to serve Phase 1 traffic conditions. It should be noted that the Trimble Road and Montague Expressway Flyover improvement will reduce traffic congestion at the intersection level, however it would not generate much throughput capacity for Trimble Road or Montague Expressway at the corridor level. Therefore, the City is considering alternative improvements to construction of the flyover along Montague Expressway to improve regional travel. The alternative improvements will focus on improvements that could provide greater benefit to multi-modal travel to and through North San Jose. Improvements could include grade separating the North First Street intersection with Montague Expressway to improve LRT operations. The City will coordinate its efforts with VTA and the County. Therefore, the Phase 1 improvement for this intersection is complete.

## (9) McCarthy Boulevard and Montague Expressway (Original: Phase 1 \& 3, Updated: Complete)

NSJADP TIA: Intersection Improvements: Phase 1 conditions included the widening of Montague Expressway from six to eight lanes between North First Street and I-880, providing four lanes in each direction. Note that this intersection was not identified to be impacted by Phase 1 conditions in the 2005 EIR. The above-described major roadway improvement was included as part of the NSJADP project.

Phase 3 conditions include the construction of a "square-loop" interchange to replace the at-grade intersection.

2021 Update: Intersection Improvements: The widening of Montague Expressway from six to eight lanes between North First Street and I-880 is complete. The NSJADP EIR indicated that the intersection was projected to operate at LOS F conditions with the Montague Expressway Widening. There were no other improvements identified to serve Phase 1 development in the NSJADP EIR.

The construction of a "square-loop" interchange to replace the at-grade intersection was identified to be needed to serve Phase 3 development and is not complete. The improvement is included in the VTA Measure B Expressway Program (2016), Valley

Transportation Plan 2040 (2014), and County Expressway Plan 2040 (2008) (Tier 1B improvement). However, the "square-loop" interchange is not required to support Phase 1 development based on the screenline analysis. Therefore, the Phase 1 improvement for this intersection is complete.
(10) Old Oakland Road and Montague Expressway (Original: Phase 1, Updated: Complete)

NSJADP TIA: Intersection Improvements: Phase 1 conditions included the addition of a second southbound left-turn lane on Old Oakland Road.

2021 Update: Intersection Improvements: The addition of a second southbound left-turn lane on Old Oakland Road is complete. The intersection was projected to continue to operate at LOS F conditions with the identified improvement in the NSJADP EIR. There are no further feasible improvements that can be implemented.
(12) North First Street and Trimble Road (Original: Phase 1, Updated: No Improvements)

NSJADP TIA: Intersection Improvements: Phase 1 conditions included adding a second eastbound left-turn lane and an exclusive westbound right-turn lane on Trimble Road. The improvement may require acquisition of a minimal amount of right-of-way.

2021 Update: The updated analysis indicates that this intersection will operate at acceptable levels under Phase 1 conditions. Therefore, the improvements described above are not required to support Phase 1 development based on the updated analysis.
(24) Zanker Road and Tasman Drive (Original: Phase 3, Updated: Complete)

NSJADP TIA: Intersection Improvements: The addition of second eastbound and westbound leftturn lanes on Tasman Drive were identified as needed to support Phase 3 development levels.

2021 Update: Intersection Improvements: The additions of second eastbound and westbound leftturn lanes on Tasman Drive are complete.
(27) North First Street and Charcot Avenue (Original: Phase 1, Updated: No Improvements)

NSJADP TIA: Intersection Improvements: Phase 1 conditions included adding exclusive eastbound and westbound right-turn lanes on Charcot Avenue and a second southbound left-turn lane on North First Street. The improvement may require the acquisition of right-of-way due to the LRT lane running within the median along North First Street.

2021 Update: The updated analysis indicates that this intersection will operate at acceptable levels under Phase 1 conditions. Therefore, the improvements described above are not required to support Phase 1 development based on the updated analysis.
(37) North First Street and Metro Drive (Original: Phase 1, Updated: No Improvements)

NSJADP TIA: Intersection Improvements: Phase 1 conditions included adding a second eastbound left-turn lane on Metro Drive at this City intersection in North San José.

2021 Update: The updated analysis indicates that this intersection will operate at acceptable levels under Phase 1 conditions. Therefore, the improvements described above are not required to support Phase 1 development based on the updated analysis.

## (45) Junction Avenue and Charcot Avenue (Original: Phase 3, Updated Phase 1)

NSJADP TIA: Intersection Improvements: This intersection was projected to operate at acceptable levels and no improvements were identified to serve the Phase 1 development.

2021 Update: Intersection Improvements: The NSJADP identified the additions of second eastbound and westbound left-turn lanes on Charcot Avenue and the widening of Charcot Avenue and Junction Avenue from two to four lanes to serve Phase 3 development. The updated level of service analysis shows that the improvement would be needed to support Phase 1 development.
(47) Bering Drive and Brokaw Road (Original: Phase 1, Updated: No Improvements)

NSJADP TIA: Intersection Improvements: Phase 1 conditions included adding a second northbound left-turn lane and an exclusive southbound left-turn lane on Bering Drive. The improvement would require signal modifications and the acquisition of a minimum amount of right-of-way.
2021 Update: The updated analysis indicates that this intersection will operate at acceptable levels under Phase 1 conditions. Therefore, the improvements described above are not required to support Phase 1 development based on the updated analysis.
(58) Trade Zone Boulevard and Montague Expressway (Original: Phase 1, Updated: Complete)

NSJADP TIA: Intersection Improvements: Phase 1 conditions included adding second northbound and southbound left-turn lanes on Trade Zone Boulevard and an eastbound free rightturn lane on Montague Expressway.

2021 Update: Intersection Improvements: The additions of second northbound and southbound leftturn lanes on Trade Zone Boulevard and an eastbound free right-turn lane on Montague Expressway are complete. The impact is therefore determined to be less than significant with completion of the identified NSJADP improvements.
(60) Oakland Road and US-101 (North) (Original: Phase 3, Updated: Not Phase 1)

NSJADP TIA: Intersection Improvements: This intersection was projected to operate at acceptable levels and no improvements were identified to serve the Phase 1 development.

2021 Update: Intersection Improvements: The addition of a second southbound right-turn lane on Oakland Road, as well as the reconstruction of the US-101 and Oakland Road interchange overpass, are not complete. The NSJADP would contribute fair share towards the City's US-101/Oakland/Mabury Transportation Development Policy, which establishes a traffic impact fee program to fund the improvement while allowing for the intersection to temporarily exceed the City's LOS standards until the improvement is constructed. The impact is determined to be less-than-significant with payment of the TIF.

The improvement also is being evaluated as part of the Project Approval and Environmental Document (PA\&ED) stage for the US-101 and Mabury Road interchange improvement. It is more appropriate to align the phasing of the US-101 and Oakland Road improvements with the major regional improvement at US-101 and Mabury Road. Therefore, the improvement will not be completed as part of Phase 1.

## (61) Oakland Road and US-101 (South) (Original: Phase 3, Updated: Not Phase 1)

NSJADP TIA: Intersection Improvements: This intersection was projected to operate at acceptable levels and no improvements were identified to serve the Phase 1 development.

2021 Update: Intersection Improvements: The reconstruction of the interchange to include six lanes on the overpass is not complete. The NSJADP would contribute fair share towards the City's US-101/Oakland/Mabury Transportation Development Policy, which establishes a traffic impact fee program to fund the improvement while allowing for the intersection to temporarily exceed the City's LOS standards until the improvement is constructed. The impact is determined to be less-than-significant with payment of the TIF.

The improvement also is being evaluated as part of the PA\&ED phase for the US-101 and Mabury Road interchange improvement, and it is more appropriate to align the phasing of the US-101 and Oakland Road improvements with the major regional improvement at US-101 and Mabury Road. Therefore, the improvement will not be completed as part of Phase 1.
(97) Capitol Expressway and Capitol Avenue (Original: Phase: 4, Update: Complete)

NSJADT TIA: Intersection Improvements: The addition of an exclusive eastbound left-turn lane on Capitol Avenue was identified as needed to support Phase 4 development levels.

2021 Update: The addition of an exclusive eastbound left-turn lane on Capitol Avenue is complete.
(98) San Tomas Expressway and Stevens Creek Boulevard (Original: Phase 2, Updated: Phase 1)

NSJADP TIA: Intersection Improvements: This intersection was projected to operate at LOS F conditions under Phase 1 conditions. However, no improvements were identified to serve the Phase 1 development.

2021 Update: Intersection Improvements: The NSJADP EIR identified the widening of San Tomas Expressway from six to eight lanes, providing four through lanes in both northbound and southbound approaches at the intersection to support Phase 2 development. The NSJADP will contribute a fair share towards the County's implementation of this improvement as part of the following countywide plans and programs:

- VTA Measure B Expressway Program (2016) - widening San Tomas Expressway between Stevens Creek Boulevard and Homestead Road, including extending San Tomas Aquino Spur Trail along the west side of the expressway and sidewalks consistent with pedestrian route plan
- VTA Measure B Expressway Program (2016) - widening San Tomas Expressway between Campbell Avenue and Stevens Creek Boulevard from six to eight lanes
- Valley Transportation Plan 2040 (2014) - widening San Tomas Expressway between Williams Road and El Camino Real from six to eight lanes
- County Expressway Plan 2040 (2008) - widening San Tomas Expressway between Williams Road and El Camino Real from six to eight lanes (Tier 1A improvement).

The updated analysis indicates that the improvement would be needed to support Phase 1 development.
(99) San Tomas Expressway and Moorpark Avenue (Original: Phase 4, Updated: Phase 1)

NSJADP TIA: This intersection was projected to operate at LOS F conditions under Phase 1 conditions. However, no improvements were identified to serve the Phase 1 development.
2021 Update: Intersection Improvements: The NSJADP EIR identified the addition of a second southbound left-turn lane on San Tomas Expressway to support Phase 2 development. Additional improvements to mitigate the Project impact would be the widening of San Tomas Expressway from six to eight lanes, providing four through lanes in both northbound and southbound approaches at the intersection. The NSJADP will contribute a fair share towards the County's implementation of this improvement as part of the following countywide plans and programs:

- VTA Measure B Expressway Program (2016) - widening San Tomas Expressway between Campbell Avenue and Stevens Creek Boulevard from six to eight lanes
- Valley Transportation Plan 2040 (2014) - widening San Tomas Expressway between Williams Road and El Camino Real from six to eight lanes County Expressway Plan 2040 (2008) - widening San Tomas Expressway between Williams Road and El Camino Real from six to eight lanes (Tier 1A improvement)

The updated analysis indicates that the improvement would be needed to serve Phase 1 development.
(116) Thirteenth Street and Hedding Street (Original: Phase 1, Updated: No Improvement)

NSJADP TIA: Intersection Improvements: The necessary improvement to mitigate the Phase 1 impact included adding second eastbound and westbound left-turn lanes on Hedding Street. The improvement would require the acquisition of right-of-way. The improvement would fully mitigate the Phase 1.
2021 Update: The updated analysis indicates that this intersection will operate at acceptable levels under Phase 1 conditions. Therefore, the improvements described above are not required to support Phase 1 development based on the updated analysis.
(117) King Road and McKee Road (Original: Phase 1, Updated: Phase 1)

NSJADP TIA: Intersection Improvements: The necessary improvements to mitigate the Phase 1 impact would include adding second eastbound and westbound left-turn lanes on McKee Road, and an exclusive southbound right-turn lane on King Road. The improvements would require the acquisition of right-of-way.

2021 Update: Intersection Improvements: The addition of a second eastbound left-turn lane on McKee Road is complete. The updated analysis indicates that the additions of a second westbound left-turn lane on McKee Road and an exclusive southbound right-turn lane on King Road are required to support Phase 1 development.
(126) Capitol Avenue and Berryessa Road (Original: Phase 4, Updated: Phase 1)

NSJADP TIA: Intersection Improvements: This intersection was projected to operate at acceptable levels and no improvements were identified to serve the Phase 1 development.

2021 Update: Intersection Improvements: The NSJADP identified the addition of a second westbound left-turn lane on Berryessa Road as being required to support Phase 4 development. The updated analysis indicates that the improvement would be needed to support Phase 1 development.

## 5.

## Conclusions

This study was completed to re-evaluate and update the necessary improvements identified in the NSJADP to adequately mitigate the Phase 1 development levels that have been completed and/or entitled to date. No changes to the NSJADP land uses are proposed; therefore, it was not the intent of the study to identify new or modify transportation impacts and mitigation that were identified in the NSJADP TIA. Rather, the study reviewed 16 years of built development and traffic growth to update the required improvements to serve Phase 1 of the NSJADP that were previously identified based on 35 years of development and traffic forecasts at the time.

## Major Roadway Improvements

The original NSJADP TIA indicated that four major roadway improvements were required to serve the Phase 1 development. The screenline analysis indicated that three of the four major roadway improvements continue to be required to support Phase 1 development levels:
(I) Montague Expressway Widening (Complete)
(II) US-101 and Trimble Road Interchange
(IX) North San José Core Area Grid Streets

In addition, based on the screenline analysis and changes to funding opportunities and progression of environmental review, the following additional major roadway improvement is now proposed to be completed to support Phase 1 development:
(VII) Zanker Road to Skyport Drive and Fourth Street Connection: Given that the improvement is in the PA\&ED phase, it is suggested that it be implemented to serve Phase 1 development rather than Phase 4 as identified in the original NSJADP EIR.

## Intersection Improvements

Besides the major roadway improvements, the original NSJADP TIA also indicated that 12 intersection improvements would be required to serve Phase 1 development levels. It is these intersections and roadway improvements that were the focus of this updated review.

The updated analysis indicated that improvements at 6 of the 12 intersections originally identified to be required to support Phase 1 development, along with 2 other intersections originally identified to support later phases of development, are complete. Five (5) of the 12 intersections originally identified
to support Phase 1 development are now not required. Conversely, the updated analysis also indicated that Phase 1 development levels will require improvement at four (4) other intersections that were originally identified in the NSJADP TIA to support later phases of development.

In summary, based on the updated analysis, there are a total of 11 updated Phase 1 intersection improvements, listed below:
(6) Zanker Road and Montague Expressway (Complete)
(7) River Oaks Parkway and Montague Expressway (Complete)
(8) Trimble Road and Montague Expressway (Complete)
(9) McCarthy Boulevard and Montague Expressway (Complete)
(10) Old Oakland Road and Montague Expressway (Complete)
(45) Junction Avenue and Charcot Avenue
(58) Trade Zone Boulevard and Montague Expressway (Complete)
(98) San Tomas Expressway and Stevens Creek Boulevard
(99) San Tomas Expressway and Moorpark Avenue
(117) King Road and McKee Road
(126) Capitol Avenue and Berryessa Road

Figure 9 provides the location of each of the original and new Phase 1 major roadway improvements and intersection improvements, along with those that are already completed.

Table 15 provides a side-by-side comparison analysis and improvement summary for those intersections that were identified to be impacted in either the 2005 NSJADP TIA and this updated analysis.

Table 16 compares the original phasing plan and the updated Phase 1 plan.

Figure 9
Phase 1 Intersection Improvement Locations


Table 15
Intersection Improvement Comparison Summary

|  |  |  | 2005 NSJADP EIR |  |  |  |  | 2021 Analysis Update |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Study Numb | Intersection | Peak Hour | Phas <br> Avg. <br> Delay | Los | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Phas } \\ & \text { Mitiga } \\ & \hline \text { Avg. } \\ & \text { Delay } \end{aligned}$ | 1 ted LOS | Improvements/Mitigations | Phas <br> Avg. <br> Delay | $\frac{e 1}{\text { Los }}$ |  | Avg. <br> Delay LOS | Improvements/Mitigations |
| 6 | MONTAGUE/ZANKER * | AM | 82.1 | F | 48.3 | D | Widening of Montague to 8 lanes | 67.2 | E | 63.0 | E | Widening of Montague to 8 lanes is complete. |
|  |  | PM | 115.3 | F | 67.9 | E |  | 72.1 | E | 59.1 | E |  |
| 7 | MONTAGUE/RIVER OAKS | AM | 72.9 | E | $\begin{aligned} & 56.2 \\ & 62.7 \end{aligned}$ | E | Widening of Montague to 8 lanes | 32.9 | C |  |  | Widening of Montague to 8 lanes between North First Street and $1-880$ is complete. No improvement would be required for Phase 1. |
|  |  | PM | 68.9 | E |  |  |  | 35.5 | D |  |  |  |
| 8 | MONTAGUE/TRIMBLE * | AM | 24.3 | C | $\begin{aligned} & 27.6 \\ & 43.0 \end{aligned}$ | C | Widening of Montague to 8 lanes and construction of a flyover to serve WBL | 67.7 | E |  |  | Widening of Montague to 8 lanes between North First Street and $1-880$ is complete. |
|  |  | PM | 109.5 | F |  |  |  | 50.8 | D |  |  |  |
| 9 | MONTAGUE/O'TOOLE * | AM | 82.1 | F |  |  | Widening of Montague to 8 lanes | 87.9 | F |  |  | Widening of Montague to 8 lanes between North First Street and $1-880$ is complete. |
|  |  | PM | 175.3 | F |  |  |  | 160.9 | F |  |  |  |
| 10 | MONTAGUE/OAKLAND * | AM | 103.0 | F | $\begin{aligned} & 101.1 \\ & 123.6 \end{aligned}$ |  | Addition of $\mathrm{n}^{\text {nd }} \mathrm{SBL}$ | 107.0 | F |  |  | Addition of $2^{\text {nd }}$ SBL is complete. No additional mitigation was proposed for Phase 1. |
|  |  | PM | 128.2 | F |  |  |  | 85.5 | F |  |  |  |
| 12 | FIRST/TRIMBLE * | AM | 51.6 | D | $\begin{aligned} & 47.1 \\ & 51.6 \end{aligned}$ | D | Addition of $2^{\text {nd }}$ EBL and exclusive WBR | 46.4 | D |  |  | No improvement required for Phase 1. |
|  |  | PM | 55.8 | E |  |  |  | 42.8 | D |  |  |  |
| 27 | CHARCOT/FIRST | AM | 71.9 | E | $\begin{aligned} & 40.4 \\ & 35.7 \end{aligned}$ | D | Addition of exclusive WBR \& EBR and $2^{\text {nd }}$ SBL | 51.5 | D |  |  | No improvement is required for Phase 1. |
|  |  | PM | 40.4 | D |  |  |  | 41.9 | D |  |  |  |
| 37 | FIRST/METRO | AM | 13.7 | B | $\begin{aligned} & 13.6 \\ & 20.4 \end{aligned}$ | C | Addition of 2 ${ }^{\text {nd }} \mathrm{EBL}$ | 12.1 | B |  |  | No improvement required for Phase 1. |
|  |  | PM | 25.3 | C |  |  |  | 19.3 | B |  |  |  |
| 45 | CHARCOT/JUNCTION | AM | 22.7 | C |  |  | No improvement required for Phase 1. | 34.1 | C | 28.8 | C | Addition of $2^{\text {nd }}$ EBL \& WBL and widening of both Charcot and Junction to 4 lanes (Original Phase 3 Imbrovement) |
|  |  | PM | 34.7 | C |  |  | 58.9 | E | 32.2 | C |  |
| 47 | BERING/BROKAW | AM | 30.2 | C | 27.30. |  |  | Addition of $2^{\text {nd }}$ NBL and separate SBL | 26.9 | C |  |  | No improvement required for Phase 1. |
|  |  | PM | 28.9 | C |  |  | 31.0 |  | C |  |  |  |  |
| 58 | TRADE ZONE/MONTAGUE ' | AM | 81.8 | $F$ | $\begin{aligned} & 46.1 \\ & 53.0 \end{aligned}$ | D | Addition of $2^{\text {nd }}$ NBL \& SBL and free EBR | $\begin{aligned} & 61.7 \\ & 70.3 \end{aligned}$ | E |  |  | Addition of $2^{\text {nd }}$ NBL \& SBL and free EBR is complete. No additional mitigation was proposed for Phase 1 . |  |
|  |  | PM | 109.0 | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60 | OAKLAND/US-101 (N) * | AM | 41.0 | D |  |  | No improvement required for Phase 1. | 85.5 | F | 84.7 | F | US 101/Oakland/Mabury TIF (Original Phase 3 Improvement) |  |
|  |  | PM | 19.6 | B |  |  | 54.6 | D | 54.4 | D |  |  |
| 61 | OAKLAND/US-101 (S) * | AM | 24.6 | C |  |  |  | No improvement required for Phase 1. | 29.9 | C | 29.9 | C | US 101/Oakland/Mabury TIF (Original Phase 2 Improvement) |
|  |  | PM | 45.9 | D |  |  | 85.7 |  | F | 85.6 | F |  |  |
| 98 | SAN TOMAS/STEVENS CRE | AM | 55.3 | E |  |  | No improvement required for Phase 1. | 78.2 | E | 57.5 | E | Widening of San Tomas to 8 lanes (Original Phase 2 Improvement) |  |
|  |  | PM | 83.9 | F |  |  | 71.2 | E | 56.6 | E |  |  |

Table 15 (Cont'd) Intersection Improvement Comparison Summary

|  |  | 2005 NSJADP EIR |  |  | 2021 Analysis Update |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Study NumbeIIntersection | Peak Hour | Phase 1 <br> Avg. <br> Delay LOS | Phase 1 <br> Mitigated <br> Avg. <br> Delay LOS | Improvements/Mitigations | Phase 1 <br> Avg. <br> Delay LOS | Phase 1 <br> Mitigated <br> Avg. <br> Delay LOS | Improvements/Mitigations |
| 99 SAN TOMAS/MOORPARK * | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{AM} \\ & \mathrm{PM} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{cc} 67.2 & E \\ 125.5 & F \end{array}$ |  | No improvement required for Phase 1. | $\begin{array}{ll} \hline 82.5 & F \\ 55.9 & E \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 60.1 & E \\ 46.1 & D \end{array}$ | Widening of San Tomas to 8 lanes and addition of $2^{\text {nd }}$ SBL (Original Phase 4 Improvement) |
| 116 THIRTEENTH/HEDDING | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AM } \\ & \text { PM } \end{aligned}$ | 62.6 E <br> 42.8 D | $\begin{array}{ll} 48.9 & \mathrm{D} \\ 38.6 & \mathrm{D} \end{array}$ | Addition of $2^{\text {nd }}$ EBL and WBL | $\begin{array}{ll} 54.3 & \text { D } \\ 52.1 & \text { D } \end{array}$ |  | No improvement required for Phase 1. |
| 117 KING/MCKEE | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{AM} \\ & \mathrm{PM} \end{aligned}$ | 56.6 E <br> 51.9 D | $\begin{array}{ll} 41.9 & D \\ 38.9 & D \end{array}$ | Addition of $2^{\text {nd }} E B L \& W B L$ and separate SBR | $\begin{array}{ll} 77.9 & E \\ 78.4 & E \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 44.0 & D \\ 41.7 & D \end{array}$ | Addition of $2^{\text {nd }} \mathrm{EBL}$ is complete. Addition of $2^{\text {nd }}$ WBL and separate SBR would be required for Phase 1. |
| 126 CAPITOL/BERRYESSA | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{AM} \\ & \mathrm{PM} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 46.9 & D \\ 48.0 & D \end{array}$ |  | No improvement required for Phase 1. | $\begin{array}{ll} 48.8 & D \\ 55.7 & E \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 48.7 & \mathrm{D} \\ 53.6 & \mathrm{D} \end{array}$ | Addition of $2^{\text {nd }}$ WBL (Original Phase 4 Improvement) |

## Notes:

* Denotes CMP Intersections

Entries denoted in bold indicate conditions that exceed the applicable level of service standard
Entries denoted in bold and boxed indicate significant impact.
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Table 16
Updated Phase 1 Improvement Phasing

| Type of Improvement | ID | Improvement Name | Phase | Updated Phase 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Major Roadway Improvements | I | Montague Expressway Widening ${ }^{1}$ | 1 | 1 |
|  | II | US-101 and Trimble Road Interchange | 1 | 1 |
|  | III | Trimble Road and Montague Expressway Flyover | 1 | Alt. Imp. ${ }^{5}$ |
|  | IV | 1-880 and Charcot Avenue Overcrossing | 2 |  |
|  | V | Zanker Road Widening | 2 |  |
|  | VI | McCarthy Boulevard-O'Toole Avenue and Montague Expressway Interchange | 3 |  |
|  | VII | Zanker Road to Skyport Drive and Fourth Street Connection | 4 | 1 |
|  | VIII | US-101 and Mabury Road Interchange | 4 |  |
|  | IX | North San José Core Area Grid Streets | 1, 2, 3, 4 | 1, 2, 3, 4 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Improvements | 6 | Zanker Road and Montague Expressway ${ }^{1,3}$ | 1 | 1 |
|  | 7 | River Oaks Parkway and Montague Expressway ${ }^{1}$ | 1 | 1 |
|  | 8 | Trimble Road and Montague Expressway ${ }^{1}$ | 1 | 1 |
|  | 9 | McCarthy Boulevard and Montague Expressway ${ }^{1}$ | 1 | 1 |
|  | 38 | North First Street and Skyport Drive ${ }^{4}$ | 4 |  |
|  | 10 | Old Oakland Road and Montague Expressway ${ }^{1}$ | 1 | 1 |
|  | 12 | North First Street and Trimble Road | 1 | Not Req. ${ }^{6}$ |
|  | 27 | North First Street and Charcot Avenue | 1 | Not Req. ${ }^{6}$ |
|  | 37 | North First Street and Metro Drive | 1 | Not Req. ${ }^{6}$ |
|  | 47 | Bering Drive and Brokaw Road | 1 | Not Req. ${ }^{6}$ |
|  | 58 | Trade Zone Boulevard and Montague Expressway ${ }^{1}$ | 1 | 1 |
|  | 116 | Thirteenth Street and Hedding Street | 1 | Not Req. ${ }^{6}$ |
|  | 117 | King Road and McKee Road | 1 | 1 |
|  | 13 | Zanker Road and Trimble Road ${ }^{3}$ | 2 |  |
|  | 16 | Zanker Road and Brokaw Road ${ }^{3}$ | 2 |  |
|  | 61 | Oakland Road and US-101 (South) | 2 |  |
|  | 98 | San Tomas Expressway and Stevens Creek Boulevard | 2 | 1 |
|  | 2 | North First Street and SR-237 (South) | 3 |  |
|  | 24 | Zanker Road and Tasman Drive ${ }^{1}$ | 3 |  |
|  | 43 | Zanker Road and Charcot Avenue ${ }^{3}$ | 3 |  |
|  | 45 | Junction Avenue and Charcot Avenue | 3 | 1 |
|  | 60 | Oakland Road and US-101 (North) | 3 |  |
|  | 124 | Capitol Avenue and Cropley Avenue | 3 |  |
|  | 59 | Lundy Avenue and Berryessa Road | 4 |  |
|  | 97 | Capitol Expressway and Capitol Avenue ${ }^{1}$ | 4 |  |
|  | 99 | San Tomas Expressway and Moorpark Avenue | 4 | 1 |
|  | 123 | Lundy Avenue and Trade Zone Boulevard | 4 |  |
|  | 126 | Capitol Avenue and Berryessa Road | 4 | 1 |
| Notes: <br> 1. The improvement is complete. <br> 2. Intersection improvements would be implemented as part of the Montague Expressway Widening (Phase 1) improvement. <br> 3. Intersection improvements would be implemented as part of the Zanker Road Widening (Phase 2) improvement. <br> 4. Intersection improvements would be implemented as part of the Zanker Road to Skyport Drive and Fourth Street Connection (Phase 4) improvement. <br> 5. City is considering alternative improvements to construction of the flyover along Montague Expressway to improve regional travel. <br> 6. The updated analysis indicates that this intersection will operate at acceptable levels under Phase 1 conditions and is not required. |  |  |  |  |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ If property owners do not develop their properties in accordance with land use permits approved under the current NSJADP, development will not occur as anticipated and the impacts to transportation attributable to that development will not occur. However, all applications for land use entitlements and permits that are approved after the amended NSJADP takes effect will be required to complete appropriate environmental analysis pursuant to CEQA, including but not limited to transportation analysis using the City's Transportation Analysis Policy (Council Policy 5-1), adopted in February 2018.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ To be consistent with the Plan Bay Area projections on the overall regional population and job growth, the difference in population and job growth in San José between the General Plan and the Plan Bay Area projections is subtracted from/added to the non-Santa Clara County areas.

[^2]:    Notes:

    1. Congested links are defined as gateways having volume-to-capacity ratios of LOS E or F.
[^3]:    Notes:

    * Denotes CMP Intersections

    Level of service analysis was not performed for intersections that are designated to be Protected Intersections under the NSJADP.
    Entries denoted in bold indicate conditions that exceed the applicable level of service standard.
    Entries denoted in bold and boxed indicate significant impact.

