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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study presents the Transportation Impact and Operational Analysis ("TIOA") findings for the proposed Medical Office Building ("MOB") Project (the "Project") at 5940 Soquel Avenue in the County of Santa Cruz ("County"), California. It is proposed that Kaiser Permanente ("Kaiser" or "Proposed Tenant") will occupy the Project if PDP Santa Cruz, LLC (the "Applicant") is successful in obtaining Project entitlements The TIOA covers two key components: (1) a vehicle miles traveled ("VMT") analysis required by the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") that evaluates the amount and distance of automobile travel associated with the Project, and (2) a mobility analysis that evaluates the Project's impacts on automobile delay and traffic congestion, which is not relevant to CEQA, but is relevant to a consideration of the Project's consistency with the County of Santa Cruz's 1994 General Plan and Local Coastal Plan ("General Plan"). Kaiserrelated data and assumptions were used to inform the VMT analysis. ${ }^{1}$ The VMT analysis separately breaks down the traffic impacts associated with the Proposed Tenant's employees that will provide healthcare and support services in the Project and its patients, visitors and non-clinical affiliated members ("Members") traveling to the Project.

## Project Overview

## Project Setting

The Project proposes to construct a new MOB and parking garage that will be located in the southwest quadrant of the intersection of Soquel Avenue \& Mattison Lane, which is approximately $3 / 4$ miles west of the $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue \& Soquel Avenue intersection and $3 / 4$ miles east of the Soquel Drive \& Soquel Avenue intersection. Development of a MOB at the Project site will fill a service gap that the Proposed Tenant currently has in the County, which causes many of its Members to travel out of the County and to the Proposed Tenant's facilities in the City of San Jose Metropolitan Area ("San Jose") for health care. Consequently, the Project is expected to reduce traffic along Highway 17 to/from those San Jose facilities while providing a centrally located MOB that offers a wide range of health services to the residents of the County.

The Project site is currently leased to a variety of light industrial uses including a towing service, an outdoor vehicle storage area, and a concrete subcontractor. If the Project is successful in obtaining its entitlements, then all of the existing structures will be removed prior to construction of the Project.

[^0]
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## Project Description

The Project proposes to construct a MOB, containing approximately 160,000 square feet of gross building floor area, and a parking garage. The parking garage is proposed to contain 730 vehicle parking spaces, 47 of which will be designated as clean air vehicle spaces and equipped with future electric vehicle charging capabilities and 38 motorcycle spaces. Within the parking garage on the first level, 160 bike spaces including 124 racks and 36 lockers are proposed. In addition, the Project will also provide 6 surface vehicle parking spaces adjacent to the parking garage.

The Project also proposes to construct two access points along Soquel Avenue. The main Project driveway will be signalized and will provide full access to the site as shown in the Project site plan. A secondary driveway, east of the main driveway, will provide an access point for pickups and deliveries, as well as quiet ambulatory ingress and egress. The parking garage will not be accessible from the secondary driveway. Thus, it is not anticipated that employees or Members will utilize the secondary driveway. The secondary driveway will be stop-controlled on the northbound approach from the site and will be located along the easterly site boundary.

## Project Operations

The Project's standard business hours will be from 8:30 AM to 5:30 PM Monday through Friday, with two minor exceptions. The first is urgent care, which will comprise approximately 9,600 square feet or 6 percent of the programmed square footage, and is anticipated to operate 24 hours per day, 7 days per week. The second is the post anesthesia care unit, which will compose approximately 4,800 square feet, or 3 percent of the programed square footage, and may operate beyond standard business hours 5 days a week depending on the medical condition of a Member. The Project is planning to provide the following programs and services, which could include, but are not limited to: Obstetrics, Head and Neck Surgery, Surgery, Urology, Endocrinology, Gastroenterology, Hematology/Oncology, Infectious Diseases, Rheumatology, Nephrology, Pulmonology, Sleep Lab, Orthopedics, Podiatry, Pain Medicine, Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Primary Care (Internal Medicine or Family Practice), Dermatology, Allergy, Urgent Care, Chemotherapy Infusion, Audiology, Optometry, Ophthalmology, Imaging, Pharmacy, Laboratories, Sterile Processing, Blood Bank, Recovery, Building Support, Café, Vision Essentials, Administrative Offices, and Conference Spaces.

## Project Mobility Improvements

The Project will provide numerous mobility improvements, including the following:
Main Traffic Driveway Signal: The Project site will be accessed from Soquel Avenue. The Project will construct one main signalized driveway entrance for employees and Members, which will provide access to the patient loading and unloading area, as well as the proposed parking garage. The main driveway will include a protected westbound left-turn pocket and eastbound right-turn pocket into the Project site from Soquel Avenue, as well as northbound left- and rightturn lanes exiting the Project site.
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Soquel Avenue Two-Way Left-Turn Lane Striping Improvements: The Project will implement approximately 3,500 feet of Two-Way Left-Turn Lane ("TWLTL") striping (and restriping) along Soquel Avenue from Paul Minnie Avenue to the existing creek crossing (east of Mattison Lane).

Green Bike Lanes Along Soquel Avenue: The Project will provide approximately 4,200 feet of Class 2 bike lane with green colored striping along Soquel Avenue from Paul Minnie Avenue to just east of Mattison Lane.

Sidewalk Installation Along Soquel Avenue: The Project will construct American with Disabilities Act ("ADA") compliant sidewalks along the north Project frontage (south side of Soquel Avenue), which will extend along the south side of Soquel Avenue and fill an existing gap in the County's sidewalk network.

Soquel Avenue / 40 Avenue \& Gross Road: The Project will install a diagonal diverter extending from the northwest corner to the southeast corner at this intersection. The diverter will prevent cut through traffic on Gross Road through the residential neighborhood, and eliminate the congestion caused by the all-way stop currently existing at the intersection.
$41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue \& Gross Road Overhead Wayfinding Signage: The Project will install overhead signs and roadway markings to improve lane selection and use on the eastbound approach of Gross Road. The lane selection would be for southbound Highway 1 and northbound Highway 1 movements. The Project will also install a physical barrier between the limit line and the diverge of the Highway 1 southbound on-ramp on $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue. This barrier will prevent vehicles from jumping the queue for southbound on-ramp traffic and improve bicycle rider safety in the Class II bike lane at the Highway 1 southbound on-ramp at $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue.

## Vehicle Miles Traveled (CEQA Analysis)

This chapter documents the Vehicle Miles Traveled ("VMT") analysis completed for the Project. The Project will be part of a network of medical facilities that provide various general and specialized medical services for the Proposed Tenant's Member-based medical system. As such, this analysis considers how the introduction of the Project, including its location and the nature of the services provided, affects the Proposed Tenant's Members' VMT. The Proposed Tenant's service area that was evaluated includes existing facilities which serve Members residing in the County. While most of the Proposed Tenant's existing facilities are located within the County, others are located outside of the County in locations such as Gilroy and San Jose. The facilities outside of the County are used by Members needing specialized services not provided by facilities inside the County. The Project, which will be located within the County along Soquel Avenue, is planned to provide expanded services so that only a small portion of the Proposed Tenant's Members will have to travel to facilities outside of the County. As described herein and shown in Table ES-T1 below, the Project will result in a reduction of at least 20,322 vehicle miles traveled, and thus will have a less than significant impact on transportation.
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Table ES-T1 - Total Vehicle Miles Traveled by Scenario

| Analysis Scenario | Combined <br> Total |
| :---: | :---: |
| Patient + Employee Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) |  |
| A1: Existing No Project | 121,843 |
| A2: Existing Plus Project | $\mathbf{7 7 , 4 2 6}$ |
| Net Reduction in VMT | $-44,416$ |
| A3: 2040 No Project | 121,168 |
| A4: 2040 Plus Project | 75,862 |
| Net Reduction in VMT | $\mathbf{- 4 5 , 3 0 6}$ |
| B1: Cumulative No Project | $\mathbf{9 6 , 1 8 4}$ |
| B2: Cumulative Plus Project | $\mathbf{7 5 , 8 6 2}$ |
| Net Reduction in VMT | $\mathbf{- 2 0 , 3 2 2}$ |

## Definitions

The following definitions are provided for the purpose of having a common understanding of the analysis provided within this section:

Existing Members: Current Members of the Proposed Tenant's healthcare system.
Healthcare Consumer: Consumers of healthcare services in the County, including Members and Other Healthcare Systems' patients.
Members: The Proposed Tenant's patients, visitors and non-clinical affiliated members. Collectively, as the context requires, the term "Members" may refer to Existing Members, Population Growth Members and Transferee Members.

Population Growth Members: Member growth that will occur over time via population growth.

Other Healthcare Systems: Sutter Health and Dignity Health.
Transferee Member: Member growth attributable to patients switching from Other Healthcare Systems to the Proposed Tenant.

## Background

In 2013 and 2018, respectively, CEQA and its implementing guidelines ("CEQA Guidelines") were significantly amended regarding the methods by which lead agencies are to evaluate a project's transportation impacts. As described in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(a):

Generally, vehicle miles travelled is the most appropriate measure of transportation impacts. For the purposes of this section, "vehicle miles traveled" refers to the amount and distance of automobile travel attributable to a project. Other relevant considerations may include the effects of the project on transit and non-motorized travel. Except as provided in subdivision (b)(2) below (regarding roadway capacity), a project's effect on automobile delay shall not constitute a significant environmental impact.
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The CEQA Guidelines have eliminated traffic congestion and automobile delay from the list of issues required to be analyzed as part of a potential project's CEQA analysis and instead clarify that the appropriate criteria for analyzing a potential project's transportation impacts is VMT. This is because California needs to reduce VMT to achieve the State's long-term greenhouse gas ("GHG") reduction climate goals. Half of California's GHG emissions come from the transportation sector; therefore, reducing VMT is an effective climate strategy. ${ }^{2}$ A VMT-focused transportation analysis encourages a reduction in VMT, as opposed to the former approach of evaluating transportation impacts based on level of service ("LOS") impacts, which often leads to roadway improvements that increase roadway capacity and, consequently, can induce more VMT, traffic and GHG emissions. ${ }^{3}$

Effective July 1, 2020, CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3(c) now requires lead agencies to assess transportation impacts based on VMT. On June 16, 2020, the County adopted its own thresholds based on the requirements of CEQA (Public Resources Code section 21099) and the CEQA Guidelines. ${ }^{4}$ As further described below, the threshold of significance, methodology, and analysis provided for in this section are based upon these adopted thresholds and the associated direction from County staff.

## Analyzing MOB VMT

As required by the California State legislature pursuant to SB 743, the California Governor's Office of Planning and Research ("OPR") prepared guidance to facilitate the adoption of VMT thresholds of significance by California jurisdictions. Although the 2018 Guidance ${ }^{5}$ does not specifically discuss MOBs, it does address the approach for analyzing land uses with the attributes of a MOB:

For office projects that feature a customer component, such as a government office that serves the public, a lead agency can analyze the customer VMT component of the project using the methodology for retail development (see below).

Santa Cruz County provided for this VMT analysis approach in its VMT thresholds adopted on June 16, 2020. ${ }^{6}$ Based on County requirements, MOB's are classified under the heading of "All
${ }^{2}$ California Air Resources Board (Nov. 2018) 2018 Progress Report on California's Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act, pp. 4, 5.
${ }^{3}$ Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA (2018), California Governor's Office of Planning and Research, Page 5 [addition of through lanes, including general purpose lanes, HOV lanes, peak period lanes, auxiliary lanes or lanes through grade-separated interchanges would likely lead to measurable and substantial increases in vehicle travel]).
${ }^{4}$ Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Cruz, Resolution No. 146-2020, adopted June 16, 2020.
${ }^{5}$ Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA (2018), California Governor's Office of Planning and Research, Page 5
${ }^{6}$ Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Cruz, Resolution No. 146-2020, adopted June 16, 2020 providing that a project will have a significant transportation impact unless it generates VMT meeting the following thresholds: (i) Residential Projects: 15 percent below Countywide per capita average VMT; (ii) Office and Service Projects: 15 percent below the Countywide per employee average VMT; (iii) Retail Projects: no net increase in the Countywide average VMT; (v) All Other Land Uses: no net increase in VMT. The Project is not a Residential or Retail Project and should not be classified as an "Office and Service Project" either for purposes of analyzing VMT given that an "Office
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other land uses," which provides for a threshold of significance of "no net increase in VMT". Accordingly, the Project will not have a significant transportation impact under CEQA if it results in no net increase in VMT.

The basic concept behind this analysis approach is that MOB's are similar to local retail uses in that they primarily serve pre-existing needs (i.e., they do not generate new trips, instead they meet a demand that would exist with or without the Project). Based on this, it can be presumed that the introduction of a new MOB will result in existing trips being redistributed, potentially resulting in shorter trip lengths when the MOB opens for service and is geographically located inbetween existing healthcare facilities. Given that the relative number of trips is constant, shorter trip lengths result in a VMT reduction. Essentially, a typical doctor visit is assumed to occur regardless of the proximity of the facility, but the proximity of the facility will determine the length of that trip and the resultant impact to the overall transportation system. Subsequently, this characteristic is used in this analysis to calculate the potential net increases or decrease in the overall VMT when the Project is constructed.

Figure ES-F1, below, demonstrates the concept described in this section visually and the measure of a "Net Change" in VMT as the metric by which the Project's potential transportation impact is determined.

Figure ES-F1 - Typical Effect of a MOB on VMT


[^1]
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As shown in the above graphic, the introduction of a new MOB often has the effect of redistributing existing patient trips in a manner that reduces average trip lengths, thereby resulting in a VMT reduction (i.e. trip segments that were 3 miles prior to the new MOB are reduced to 1 mile with the addition of the new MOB).

## Scenarios

This TIOA provides two separate and independent analyses of the Project under the threshold of "no net increase in VMT."

The first analysis, identified as "Scenario A," considers the effect of the Project on the Proposed Tenant's Members. This scenario represents the Proposed Tenant's goal of providing nearly all medical services required by its Santa Cruz County Members in the geographical boundaries of the County itself. This will benefit the Proposed Tenant's Members residing in the County by providing improved access to necessary medical services, thereby reducing the percentage of trips that travel to the San Jose area for specialized services. Members that travel outside of the County necessarily add substantial VMT to the existing system. These trips will be reduced with the construction of the Project. Based on the forecasted data provided by the Proposed Tenant, it is estimated that the number of Member trips accessing services outside of the County will be significantly reduced when the Project becomes operational (from 29\% without the Project to 2.4\% with the Project, as shown below).

The second analysis, identified as "Scenario B," provides a more conservative VMT analysis by also considering the potential for Healthcare Consumers from Other Healthcare Systems to become Transferee Members who also receive healthcare services at the Project (in addition to the Proposed Tenant's Existing Members and Population Growth Members).

The two scenarios are described in more detail below.

## Scenario A

Under Scenario A, the following is considered:
A1: Existing No Project: VMT is evaluated under existing conditions (i.e., baseline). Specifically, VMT for Existing Members is determined based on current patterns, where most Members receive care at one of the Proposed Tenant's facilities in the County, but where almost 29-percent of Existing Member trips travel out of the County predominantly to receive specialized services. There are no new employees (because there is no Project) so employee VMT is based on the Proposed Tenant's existing facility locations in and outside of the County.
A2: Existing Plus Project: VMT is evaluated under exiting conditions, but with the addition of the Project. VMT for Members is determined based on the assumption that most Members receive care at the Project or one of the Proposed Tenant's existing facilities in the County. In this scenario, only about 2.4-percent of Members needing specific and highly specialized services that will not be provided at the Project continue to travel out of the County and the remaining Members currently traveling out of the County are redirected to the Project instead. VMT associated with Project employees is also
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included. For purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that the Project is fully occupied and operational.

A3: No Project 2040: 2040 VMT is evaluated based on a Healthcare Consumer distribution that represents forecasted 2040 household locations, which thereby impacts trip lengths (i.e., more density means shorter trip lengths because a higher concentration of people live near services). Members receive care at one of the Proposed Tenant's facilities in the County, but almost 29-percent of Member trips travel out of the County to receive specialized services. There are no new employees (because there is no Project) so employee VMT is based on existing facility locations.

A4: Plus Project 2040: 2040 VMT is evaluated based on a Healthcare Consumer distribution that represents forecasted 2040 household locations and assumes the addition of the Project. VMT for Members is determined based on the assumption that care is received at the Project or one of the Proposed Tenant's existing facilities in the County. In this scenario, most Members receive specialized services at the Project and about 2.4-percent of Members continue to travel out of the County for specific and highly specialized services that will not be provided at the Project. VMT associated with Project employees is also included.

## Scenario A Methodology

Santa Cruz Country Travel Demand Model ("SCC TDM") data and related modeling techniques were used as the principle tool to determine VMT. Travel demand models are broadly considered to be the most accurate of available tools to assess VMT. Based on data provided by the Proposed Tenant about the facilities its Members in the County currently utilize, as well as limitations of the SCC TDM (i.e., it does not include areas outside of the County), a hybrid approach that relied on both the SCC TDM and other spatial analysis techniques was developed to meet the County's VMT analysis requirements. This approach accounted for the unique trip distribution and trip generation characteristics of the Project, as well as for the portion of VMT that would occur outside of the area covered by the SCC TDM.

## Assumptions and Facts - Scenario A

The following assumptions and facts are applicable to the analysis for Scenario A:

1. The trip distribution (i.e., trip length), used for the calculation of VMT and trip generation was developed based on the assumption that all patients travel to the closest facility that provides the medical services they require. Although some individuals may select a less optimal choice based on personal preference, the probability of this would likely be no different under any Scenario A condition (or Scenario B condition). Given this and the fact that there is not a sufficient basis or data to undertake such analysis, the TIOA reflects the assumption that the most optimal medical facility location, based on distance, is always selected by a Healthcare Consumer. It is further assumed that existing facilities of both the Proposed Tenant and Other Healthcare Systems can accommodate the demand for medical services based on this approach to trip distribution.
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2. In order to account for the effect of the Project on Healthcare Consumers, VMT from a variety of sources are considered, including for Members and employees of existing healthcare facilities operated by the Proposed Tenant inside and outside of the County.
3. The facilities selected for this analysis are based on market data ${ }^{7}$ (as further described in Assumption \#8) developed that tracked the number of visits by service required at facilities operated by the Proposed Tenant. This includes six facilities located outside of the County and six facilities, including the Project, located within the County.
4. Based on information provided by the Proposed Tenant, approximately 29percent of current Member trips are estimated to be served by facilities located outside of the County currently, mostly seeking services that the Proposed Tenant currently does not provide within the County. Based on information provided by the Proposed Tenant, when the Project becomes operational, it is assumed that trips to facilities outside of the County will be reduced to about 2.4percent of the total Member trips. These trips would be for highly specialized services that are not expected to be available at the Project, such as pediatric neurology or spine surgery. With the Project, it is assumed that other specialized services required by Members will be provided by the Project.
5. Based on data provided by the Proposed Tenant, it is understood that on average, the Project will employ 300 individuals per day. For the purposes of this VMT analysis, only employee commute trips were accounted for as a part of the VMT analysis. This equates to 600 total Project trips (i.e., 2 times 300 one-way trips), as all employee trips were conservatively assumed to be single occupancy trips for purposes of this analysis.
6. Employee trip generation is based on the proportion of employees ( 300 total) that matches the allocation of Healthcare Consumers to each healthcare facility, regardless of system. The origin of employees is based on the existing Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) data.
7. Other trips, such as deliveries, were assumed to be minor in number and are adequately represented in terms of VMT by Healthcare Consumer and/or employee trips included the analysis (the full trip generation, as used for this analysis, accounts for all Project trips). It is assumed that other elements of the analysis are a reasonable proxy for minor differences in any trip lengths.
8. This TIOA VMT analysis separates Member trips among 28 different services based on market data provided by the Applicant.
[^2]
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9. The Proposed Tenant's membership forecasts for its Santa Cruz County MOBs for 2020 through 2040 were used as the basis for determining what percentage of trips were distributed amongst Members. This data is provided in Appendix S.

## Scenario A Analysis

As described above, Scenario A evaluates the effect of the Project on the Proposed Tenant's Members. To determine the impact of the addition of the Project on the total VMT for the Proposed Tenant's Members, the distance traveled by each Member to the facility that provides the service required was determined for both Existing and 2040 Conditions. This distance was then multiplied by the number of trips the Proposed Tenant's Members and employees in Santa Cruz County take in an average day to each of the Proposed Tenant's facilities. This was completed both for Project an No Project conditions.

The number of trips analyzed under Scenario A represents both the estimated current trip generation of existing facilities and the full utilization of the Project facility as determined based on the daily trip generation rate for Clinics (same rate as used in the TIOA) included in the Trip Generation Manual, $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). Based on information provided by the Proposed Tenant it is understood that for the No Project scenario, nearly 29-percent of Member trips include facilities outside of the County, while only 2.4-percent of member trips include facilities outside of the County in the Plus Project scenario. Once the number of daily trips was determined for all facilities, the trips were distributed to the Member and corresponding employee locations throughout the County based on an optimized solution which considers both the availability of a service for a given facility as well as the proximity of that facility to a Member. Member locations are based on the Existing and 2040 population locations provided by the Santa Cruz County Travel Demand Model (SCC TDM), while the employee locations are based on Census employment data. The resultant trips were then multiplied by the distance of the shortest travel time to each facility to determine VMT in the aggregate for each scenario. A more detailed explanation of this methodology is provided in Appendix Z.

## Scenario A Results

The VMT results for Healthcare Consumers under Scenario A are summarized below in Table ES-T2. For both Scenario A. 2 (Existing Plus Project) and Scenario A. 4 (2040 Plus Project conditions), the Project results in a net reduction of more than 44,000 VMT per day. The table includes VMT for both Member and employee trips. The results reflect that with the addition of the Project, there is a reduction in VMT, primarily due to the reduction in trips to facilities outside of the County as compared to the No Project scenarios.
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Table ES-T2 - Total Vehicle Miles Traveled by Scenario

| Analysis A |  | Patient Vehicle Miles <br> Traveled (VMT) | Employee Vehicle Miles <br> Traveled (VMT) | Combined <br> Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Existing | A1: Existing No Project | 97,275 | 24,567 | 121,843 |
|  | A2: Existing Plus Project | 53,300 | 24,126 | 77,426 |
|  | Net Reduction in VMT | $-43,975$ | -441 | $-44,416$ |
| $\mathbf{2} \mathbf{2 0 4 0}$ | A3: 2040 No Project | 96,601 | 24,567 | 121,168 |
|  | A4: 2040 Plus Project | 51,736 | 24,126 | 75,862 |
|  | Net Reduction in VMT | $\mathbf{- 4 4 , 8 6 4}$ | -441 | $-45,306$ |

## SCENARIO B ANALYSIS

As noted above, Scenario B considers a conservative approach to defining the No Project condition. Scenario B is predicated on a set of circumstances where a significant catalyst for growth results from patients of Other Healthcare Systems transferring to the Proposed Tenant's system as new Members once the Project is constructed (i.e., Transferee Members) to receive healthcare services at the Project. Accordingly, in the No Project condition for Scenario B (B1), VMT associated with these Transferee Members is allocated to Other Healthcare Systems in the Project condition for Scenario B (B2), VMT associated with these Transferee Members is allocated to the Project instead because they have become Healthcare Consumers that receive healthcare services at the Project. ${ }^{8}$ Given that a variety of considerations influence the growth of medical networks, including employer/employee selection, cost, and personal preferences, the transfer of patients from Other Healthcare Systems to become Transferee Members of the Proposed Tenant contemplated in this Scenario B represents the most conservative analysis.

B1: Cumulative No Project: 2040 VMT is evaluated based on a Healthcare Consumer distribution that represents forecasted 2040 household locations. In this scenario, Member trips are adjusted to account for Existing Members and Population Growth Members (i.e., new Members projected based on projected population growth). Most Existing Members and Population Growth Members receive care at one of the Proposed Tenant's facilities in the County, but almost 29-percent of Existing Member and Population Growth Member trips travel out of the County to receive medical services, since those specialized services are not offered at existing facilities in the County There are no new employees (because there is no Project) so employee VMT is based on existing facility locations. Under this Scenario B1, Transferee Members remain with the Other Healthcare System in which they are assumed to belong and their VMT contribution is estimated based on their use of that system.

B2: Cumulative Plus Project: Under this condition, Transferee Members have transferred to the Proposed Tenant's membership base and are reflected in the Project's VMT, rather than in VMT attributable to the Other Healthcare Providers. VMT for Existing
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Members and Population Growth Members is determined based on the assumption that care is received at the Project or at one of the Proposed Tenant's facilities in the County. In this scenario, most Members receive specialized services at the Project and very few continue to travel out of the County for specific and highly specialized services that will not be provided at the Project. VMT associated with employees is also included.

## Methodology for Scenario B

The methodology described above for estimating VMT for Scenario A, including with respect to Project trip generation, also applies to the Scenario B analysis. Like Scenario A, the Scenario B analysis is also based on the accommodation of 6,106 Project trips (representing the same number of Members and employees). As such, the Scenario B analysis only considers the circumstances of Transferee Members and Population Growth Members that are forecasted to join the Proposed Tenant's network, as well as Members currently within the Proposed Tenant's network residing within the County. This basis maintains an "apples-to-apples" comparison basis for the two scenarios as required by SB 743. ${ }^{9}$

As discussed further in Chapter 2, this TIOA VMT analysis utilizes a trip generation rate based on the ITE Trip Generation Manual that overstates the VMT of the Project by 37-percent, as compared to traffic counts collected from area MOBs. This overly conservative ITE rate likely results in a substantial decrease (37-percent) for Transferee Members' VMT under Scenario B.2's (Cumulative Plus Project) condition as compared to Scenario B. 1 Cumulative No Project condition. For purposes of providing the most conservative analysis possible as part of this TIOA, however, this likely trip reduction is not considered in this report's VMT analysis, which instead is based on ITE trip generation rates.

## Assumptions and Facts - Scenario B

The assumptions and facts that are specific to Scenario B are provided below:

1. All of the Assumptions and Facts applicable to Scenario A also apply to Scenario $B$ and are incorporated herein by reference, except Assumptions Number 2 (VMT sources) and 9 (membership forecasts) provided in Scenario A are modified as provided below.
2. In order to account for the effect of the Project on Healthcare Consumers, VMT from a variety sources are considered, including those for Existing Members, Population Growth Members, Transferee Members and healthcare facilities in the County. This is a modification for Scenario A, Assumption No. 2 in that it evaluates VMT impacts associated with Other Healthcare Systems based on market data
[^4]
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provided by Pivotal Analytics ${ }^{10}$ for Cumulative No Project and Cumulative plus Project conditions.
3. The Proposed Tenant's Membership forecasts for its in-County MOBs for 2020 through 2040 was used as the basis for determining what percentage of trips were distributed across each of the three sources of Members (i.e., Existing Members, Population Growth Members or Transferee Members). These data are provided in Appendix T. This is a modification for Scenario A, Assumption No. 9 modified for Scenario B in order to provide for the consideration of Existing Members, Population Growth Members and Transferee Members.
4. The Proposed Tenant's Member growth under Scenario B. 2 cumulative conditions (Population Growth Members) is based on the population growth percentage between 2019 and 2040, as provided for in the SCC TDM. Appendix S contains a detailed breakdown of these values.
5. Transferee Members that are Healthcare Consumers of Other Healthcare Systems under the Cumulative No Project condition have 33 facilities to choose from, 18 for 15 for Dignity Health ("Healthcare System A") and Sutter Health ("Healthcare System B").

## Scenario B Analysis

Generally, Scenario B follows the same analytical techniques outlined under the Scenario A analysis above. The primary differences between the two scenario analyses is the analysis of the prior trip patterns of Transferee Members under the Cumulative No Project condition (when they are participants in Other Healthcare Systems) versus their trip patterns under the Cumulative Plus Project condition (after they become Members that receive health care at the Project).

The number of Existing Members in 2020 and the Proposed Tenant's projected membership in 2040 for Santa Cruz County, as provided by the Proposed Tenant, was used as the basis for distributing Members across each of the three member sources: Existing Members, Population Growth Members, and Transferee Members. As shown in Appendix S, the 2020 Membership is estimated to be 35,071 , while the 2040 Membership is projected to be 87,729 , for a 20 -year growth of 52,658 Members. The SCC TDM was used as the basis to determine the population growth over the same period. It was determined that the population would grow by approximately 12.5 percent. As with Scenario A, the SCC TDM population distribution is the basis for the determination of Healthcare Consumer origins.

To determine Population Growth Members, the 2020 membership was multiplied by the population growth percentage for the County, resulting in a Membership growth of 4,394. The remaining growth of 48,264 is assumed to be the result of Transferee Members. As a result, the Cumulative Plus Project conditions assume that Membership is made up of 40-percent Existing Members, 5-percent Population Growth Members, and 55-percent Transferee Members, as
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shown in Appendix T. Under the Scenario B. 1 Cumulative No Project conditions, the 55-percent of Transferee Member are analyzed as participants in Other Healthcare Systems.

As with Scenario A, the Applicant-provided market data were the basis of identifying the distribution of Member visits by service type and by facility for Scenario B1 and Scenario B2. Similarly, the data shows that almost 29-percent of Existing Members and Population Growth Members would travel outside the County for specialized services under the Scenario B. 1 Cumulative No Project Condition and almost 2.4-percent of total Member trips would continue to travel outside the County under the Scenario B. 2 Cumulative Plus Project condition for the purposes of obtaining highly specialized services that are not expected to be provided by the Project.

VMT for the Scenario B. 1 Cumulative No Project and the Scenario B. 2 Cumulative Plus Project condition was calculated in the same manner as Scenario A (see Appendix Z for more details). The primary difference being that the Cumulative No Project condition considers the VMT of Transferee Members as it relates to Other Healthcare Systems. Employees were also handled consistently with Scenario A.

## Scenario B Results

The VMT results for Healthcare Consumers under Scenario B are summarized in Table ES-T3. For Scenario B. 2 (Cumulative Plus Project) conditions, the Project results in a net reduction of more than 20,000 VMT per day. The table includes the effect of Transferee Members leaving Other Healthcare Providers to become new Proposed Tenant Members receiving care at the Project instead. VMT was calculated for both Member trips and employee trips. The results reflect that with the addition of the Project in the Scenario B. 2 (Cumulative Plus Project) condition, there is a reduction in VMT primarily due to trips outside the County being significantly reduced as compared to the B. 1 (Cumulative No Project scenario).

Table ES-T3 - Total Vehicle Miles Traveled

| Analysis B | Combined <br> Total |
| :---: | :---: |
| Patient Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) |  |
| B1: Cumulative No Project |  |
| B2: Cumulative Plus Project | $\mathbf{7 0 , 9 0 6}$ |
| Net Reduction in VMT |  |
| Employee Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) |  |
| B1: Cumulative No Project | $\mathbf{2 5 , 2 7 9}$ |
| B2: Cumulative Plus Project | $\mathbf{2 4 , 1 2 6}$ |
| Net Reduction in VMT |  |
| Patient + Employee Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) |  |
| B1: Cumulative No Project | $\mathbf{- 1 , 1 5 2}$ |
| B2: Cumulative Plus Project |  |
| Net Reduction in VMT |  |
| $\mathbf{y y y}$ | $\mathbf{7 5}, 862$ |
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With the addition of the Project, the Healthcare Consumers allocated to Healthcare System $A$ and Healthcare System $B$ become Transferee Members and their trips are diverted from the Other Healthcare Systems to the Project. VMT associated with Healthcare Consumers that currently are, and that after construction of the Project will continue to be patients of the Healthcare System A or Healthcare System B are not reflected in this Table.

## Conclusion

Conclusion: As shown in Table ES-T4 below, under all conditions for the Scenario A and Scenario B analyses, the Project results in a net VMT reduction. In Scenario A, which focuses on VMT associated with Members who receive services at the Proposed Tenant's existing facilities should the Project not be constructed, the Project results in reduction of 44,416 VMT in the Scenario A. 2 (Existing Plus Project) condition and a reduction of 35,306 VMT in the Scenario A. 4 (2040 Plus Project) condition as shown in Table ES-T2. In Scenario B, which provides a more conservative analysis that considers the VMT associated with Existing, Population Growth and Transferee Members, the Project results in a reduction of 20,322 VMT in the Scenario B. 2 (Cumulative Plus Project) condition as shown in Table ES-T3. In both Scenario A and Scenario B, this ultimate reduction in VMT with the Project is primarily due to the reduction in the number of trips outside the County for specialized services since the majority of those services will be provided by the Project.

Table ES-T4 - Total Vehicle Miles Traveled

| Analysis Scenario | Combined <br> Total |
| :---: | :---: |
| Patient + Employee Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) |  |
| A1: Existing No Project | $\mathbf{1 2 1 , 8 4 3}$ |
| A2: Existing Plus Project | $\mathbf{7 7 , 4 2 6}$ |
| Net Reduction in VMT | $\mathbf{- 4 4 , 4 1 6}$ |
| A3: 2040 No Project | $\mathbf{1 2 1 , 1 6 8}$ |
| A4: 2040 Plus Project | 75,862 |
| Net Reduction in VMT | $\mathbf{- 4 5 , 3 0 6}$ |
| B1: Cumulative No Project | $\mathbf{9 6 , 1 8 4}$ |
| B2: Cumulative Plus Project | $\mathbf{7 5 , 8 6 2}$ |
| Net Reduction in VMT | $\mathbf{- 2 0 , 3 2 2}$ |

Based on the results of this TIOA analysis, the Project would not result in a net increase in VMT and, accordingly, would not have a significant transportation impact under CEQA.

## Transportation Demand Management (Non-CEQA Analysis)

Transportation Demand Management ("TDM") measures are programs that can be implemented to reduce single occupancy vehicle ("SOV") travel to and from homes or places of work by offering travelers mode choice options. TDM options are intended to reduce roadway congestion and provide more choices for how to travel, both of which will assist in promoting business, providing
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access to opportunity, and improving the quality of life across the state. The County recognizes the value of TDM measures in its General Plan ${ }^{11}$ and Trip Reduction Ordinance. ${ }^{12}$

The Project has no significant transportation impacts under CEQA (as assessed by VMT), and therefore is not legally required to provide or incorporate TDM measures to mitigate such impacts. Nonetheless, the Project will voluntarily implement TDM measures to reduce reliance on SOVs and to assist in achieving state and local GHG reduction commitments, preserving the environment, improving health and safety, and reducing congestion on local streets and highways. The trip generation assumptions used in this TIOA to analyze the Project's impacts on County roadways were not discounted to account for the implementation of TDM.

The Project proposes a targeted TDM strategy focusing on separate measures for employees and Members, as summarized below.

## Employee-Focused TDM Measures

The Project proposes to provide the following TDM benefits to employees:

- Bike Share Program
- Commute Management Platform and Rideshare Support
- Emergency Ride Home Program
- TDM Coordinator
- Safe, Well-Lit, and Accessible Pedestrian/Bicycle Facilities along Soquel Avenue

Based on the information identified in Table, it is anticipated that the TDM measures would reduce employee trip generation by approximately 15.5 percent.

## Member-Focused TDM Measures

The Project will also provide the following TDM measures intended to benefit Members:

- Virtual Care Strategy
- Safe, Well-Lit, and Accessible Pedestrian/Bicycle Facilities along Soquel Avenue

Based on information identified in Table ES-T5, it is anticipated that these TDM measures would reduce Member trip generation by approximately 20.5 percent.

It should be noted that since the Project proposes to implement and fund the TDM improvements described above, it is anticipated that trip generation estimates provided in this TIOA and used in the operational LOS analyses are very conservative because it does not incorporate the anticipated TDM measures in the overall analysis. In fact, with implementation of the TDM measures, it is anticipated that the Project will generate fewer trips than as analyzed in this TIOA, roughly on the order of 1,165 daily trips. This estimate is based on 300 employees working at the Project making trips during the AM and PM peak hours. The remainder of the daily 6,106 trips are made by Members and project support services (i.e., deliveries, pickups and drop-offs) of which
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$5 \%$ of the project support service trips are excluded from the TDM trip calculations shown below in Table ES-T5.

Table ES-T5 - TDM Trip Calculations

| TDM Trip Calculations | Daily trips | AM trips | PM trips | \% TDM | Daily trips | AM trips | PM trips |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | TDM Trips |  |  |
| Project Trip Generation | 6106 | 590 | 525 |  |  |  |  |
| Employee Trips | 600 | 300 | 300 | 15.50\% | 93 | 47 | 47 |
| Member and Project Support Service Trips | 5506 | 290 | 225 |  |  |  |  |
| Project Support Service Trip Reduction (5\%) | -275 | -15 | -11 |  |  |  |  |
| Net Member Trips | 5231 | 275 | 214 | 20.50\% | 1072 | 56 | 44 |
| Total TDM Trips |  |  |  |  | 1165 | 103 | 91 |

Moreover, trip generation rates used in this TIOA are based on ITE assumptions as discussed with County staff. As further described in CHAPTER 2. VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED on Page 8 of this report, traffic data was collected at comparable facilities at the County's request (Appendix Q).

The traffic counts collected indicate that ITE assumptions overstate actual trip generation by between 23 percent and 52 percent. Based on implementation of TDM and the potential overestimation of trips utilizing ITE assumptions, it is likely that operational deficiencies to the local transportation will be substantially less than what is published in this TIOA.
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Table ES-T6 - TDM Measure Summary

| TDM Measure | Description | TDM Type | Estimated Trip Reduction (\%) | Trip Reduction Source |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Employees Only |  |  |  |  |
| Bike Share Program | Bicycle share programs provide convenient rental bicycles to users. This allows urban residents and visitors to bicycle without needing to purchase, store and maintain a bike. | Incentive | 4\% | Quantifying Greenhouse Gas <br> Mitigation Measures, <br> California Air Pollution <br> Control Officers Association, August 2010. |
| Commute <br> Management <br> Platform (Ride <br> Amigos or similar <br> service) and <br> Rideshare Support | Increases vehicle occupancy by providing rideshare matching services, designating preferred parking for ride-share participants, designing adequate passenger loading/unloading and waiting areas for ride-share vehicles, and providing a website or message board to connect riders and coordinate rides. | Incentive | 2.5\% | This service is already available to employees in the County and would only be a continuation/extension to employees at the Project. |
| Emergency Ride Home Program (ERH) | Provides an occasional subsidized ride to commuters who use alternative modes and eliminates a common constraint to the use of alternative modes. Guaranteed ride home for people if they need to go home in the middle of the day due to an emergency or stay late and need a ride at a time when transit service is not available. ERH programs may use taxies, company vehicles or rental cars. | Incentive | 3\% | Guaranteed Ride Home <br> Programs: A Study of Program Characteristics, Utilization, and Cost by William B. Menczer (Federal Transit Administration); Guaranteed Ride Home Program Evaluation 2013 by Alameda CTC. |
| On-site TDM <br> Program Coordinator and TDM marketing materials | A TDM coordinator to monitor overall program progress, marketing and public outreach to promote awareness of TDM program. | Infrastructure | 4\% | Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures, California Air Pollution Control Officers Association, August 2010. |
| Safe, well-lit, and accessible pedestrian/bicycle facilities | Enhance the route for employees walking or bicycling to transit (typically off-site). Implements pedestrian network improvements throughout and around the Project site that encourages people to walk. | Infrastructure | 2\% | Quantifying Greenhouse Gas <br> Mitigation Measures, <br> California Air Pollution <br> Control Officers Association, August 2010. |
| Estimated Total Trip Reduction for Employees Only |  |  |  | 15.5\% |
| Members Only |  |  |  |  |
| Virtual Care Strategy | Resources to allow Members to access healthcare services or communicate with healthcare staff through online or off-site programs. | Infrastructure | 20\% | Based on the Proposed Tenant's ongoing program results. See Appendix W. |
| Safe, well-lit, and accessible pedestrian/bicycle facilities | Enhance the route for Members walking or bicycling to transit (typically off-site). Implements pedestrian network improvements throughout and around the Project site that encourages people to walk. | Infrastructure | 0.5\% | Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures, California Air Pollution Control Officers Association, August 2010. |
| Estimated Total Trip Reduction for Members Only |  |  |  | 20.5\% |
| Notes: <br> 1. An Incentive is a measure that would entice a candidate employee or patient to make a mode shift choice and reduce their SOV trips. <br> 2. Infrastructure type is a physical feature that makes it more enticing for an employee or patient to make a mode choice from SOV to an alternative mode. <br> 3. TDM reduction percentages are consistent with the County's most recent VMT reduction strategies. The County TDM Policy is Attached in Appendix Z. |  |  |  |  |
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## Pedestrian, Bicycle and Transit Mobility (Non-CEQA Analysis)

## Pedestrian Mobility

No sidewalk currently exists along the Project site frontage along Soquel Avenue. The Project will construct ADA-compliant sidewalks and ramps along its frontage on the south side of Soquel Avenue, which will extend west and east beyond its frontage and connect to existing sidewalk facilities along Soquel Avenue. These improvements will fill a critical gap in the County's pedestrian facility network and will improve pedestrian connectivity along Soquel Avenue. Additionally, internal pedestrian connections will link the Project's entrance with the parking areas, as well as the Soquel Avenue frontage. Lighting will be installed to enhance the safety and usability of new pedestrian paths of travel. Therefore, with construction of the Project and sidewalk improvements, employees and Members choosing to walk to the site would not be adversely affected based on pedestrian mobility, accessibility, or safety.

These improvements will further pedestrian travel policies set forth in the General Plan, including those that: require adequate lighting for pedestrian movement; require dedication and construction of walkways for through pedestrian traffic and internal pedestrian circulation in new development; provide for pedestrian movement in the design of parking areas; and incorporate ADA standards in the design of new projects. (General Plan, Policies 3.10.1-3.10.10.)

## Bicycle Mobility

The Project will provide approximately 4,200 feet of Class 2 bike lane along Soquel Avenue from Paul Minnie Avenue to just east of Mattison Lane, as illustrated in concept drawings included in
Appendix I. These proposed improvements would improve safety and fill critical gaps in the County's bicycle network, as well as provide bicycle access to the Project site via Soquel Avenue. Striping for the bike lane will be colored green, which is expected to reduce collisions by 19 percent, according to a study on Safety Performance Functions for Bicycle Crashes in New Zealand and Australia (2011), further described in the Bicycle Mobility section of this TIOA on page 36. This results in a reduction of approximately two bike collisions out of every 10 bike collisions. Restriping the improved Class 2 bike lanes is a safety improvement per NCHRP.

These bicycle mobility improvements further General Plan policies addressing the bikeway system and bikeway safety by furthering the bikeway network's integration with other modes of transportation, including transit stations and other activity centers, and designing and constructing bikeways in accordance with County, Caltrans and state standards. (General Plan, Policies 3.8.13.8.4, 3.9.1-3.9.3.)

The Project will support bike share initiatives within the County once a bike rental service is implemented.

## Transit Mobility

METRO currently does not have plans or funding to construct a bus stop and run a transit route along Soquel Avenue near the Project site. A $1 / 4$-mile walk (around 5 minutes) to a bus stop is typically considered the maximum acceptable distance for average transit riders, as documented in the USDOT Federal Highway Administration's "Course on Bicycle and Pedestrian
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Transportation" Coursebook ${ }^{13}$. The closest bus stops are approximately 1 mile walking distance, which is approximately a 20 minute walk or a 7 minute bike ride according to Google Maps. These bus stops are located at the intersections of $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/Soquel Drive, $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/Capitola Road, and at the Transit Center at the Capitola Mall. METRO buses are equipped with bike racks.

Transit service directly to the Project site will be available for disabled persons via the METRO operated ParaCruz service according to personal communication with METRO ParaCruz on $8 / 11 / 2020$. Santa Cruz METRO ParaCruz is a shared-ride service, providing door-to-door public transportation for people who have a temporary or permanent physical, cognitive, or psychiatric disability that prevents them from making some or all of their trips on METRO's fixed route bus system. Lift Line, a program operated by Community Bridges, also provides free door-to-door rides to qualifying seniors and people with disabilities needing transportation to medical appointments throughout the County, and this service is expected to be available to qualified Members utilizing the Project.

## Summary of Findings

The Project's on-site and off-site improvements will improve pedestrian and bicycle mobility, and the roadway improvements that will be constructed as part of the Project will improve transit mobility. Therefore, the Project will not adversely affect local pedestrian, bicycle, and/or transit facilities and will implement several General Plan goals relative to pedestrian and bicycle mobility.

## Parking Supply and Demand Evaluation (Non-CEQA Analysis)

The Project will construct a five-level parking garage, which will include a total of 730 vehicle parking stalls (including 619 standard spaces, 67 ADA spaces and 47 clean air vehicle spaces (including three ADA spaces). 38 motorcycle spaces will be provided in the parking garage as well. A total of 160 bike spaces will also be provided, consisting of 36 bike locker spaces and 124 bike rack spaces. In addition, the Project will also provide 6 surface vehicle parking spaces adjacent to the parking garage. The Project is providing a total of 736 parking spaces (garage + surface), which is 24 spaces more than the minimum Code required parking. Table ES-T7 summarizes the Project's proposed parking supply.

| Table ES-T7 - Parking Spaces Provided by the Project |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use <br> Description | Type | Rate | No. of Units | Spaces <br> Provided by <br> the Project |
| Medical <br> Office | Vehicle Parking | 1 space per 217.4 square <br> feet of gross floor area | 160,000 | 736 |
|  | Bike Parking | 1 space per 1,000 square <br> seet of gross floor area |  | 160 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
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Section 13.10.552 of the County's Code requires one vehicle parking space per 225 square feet of gross floor area. The Code also requires one bike parking space per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area.

The Project will construct approximately 160,000 square feet of medical office uses. Therefore, based on Table ES-T8, the County Code requires the Project to provide at least 712 vehicle parking spaces, and 160 bike parking spaces.

| Table ES-T8 - County MOB Parking Requirements |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use <br> Description | Type | Rate | No. of Units | Spaces <br> Required |
| Medical <br> Office | Vehicle Parking | 1 space per 225 square <br> feet of gross floor area | 160,000 <br> square feet | 712 |
|  | Bike Parking | 1 space per 1,000 square <br> feet of gross floor area | 160 |  |

In addition to the above general parking requirements, the County's Code requires that for a project proposing between 501 and 1,000 parking spaces, two percent of the total spaces be ADA accessible. However, because the Project is a medical office, the County Planning department is requiring the Project to provide the following ADA parking requirements based on the Applicant's Development Review Group meeting conducted on November 8, 2018 (Table ES-T9 below):

- Approximately 3\% of the parking spaces that serve the Project's employees shall be ADA accessible per California Building Code 11B-208
- Approximately $11 \%$ of the parking spaces that serve the Project's Members and visitors shall be ADA accessible per California Building Code 11B-208.2.1

| Table ES-T9 - County Required ADA Accessible Parking |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Functional <br> Program Summary | Building Area <br> (Square Feet) | \% of <br> building | Total <br> New <br> Parking <br> Spaces | California Building Code <br> ADA Space <br> Requirement <br> (Project ADA Space <br> Requirement) | Accessible <br> Parking <br> Requirement |
| TOTAL Employees | 48,405 | $30 \%$ | 223 | $11 \mathrm{~B}-208(3 \%)$ | 7 |
| TOTAL Members/Visitors | 111,595 | $70 \%$ | 513 | $11 \mathrm{~B}-208.2 .1(11 \%)$ | 56 |
| Project TOTAL | 160,000 | $100 \%$ | 736 |  | 63 |

As shown in Table ES-T10 below, the Project is providing four more ADA parking spaces than required by the County Planning Department to accommodate for future flexibility in Potential Tenant's programming requirements.
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| Table ES-T10 - <br> Project ADA Accessible Parking |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Project ADA Parking Space Summary |  |
| County Required ADA Accessible Spaces | 63 |
| Project Proposed ADA Accessible Spaces | 67 |
| Additional ADA Accessible Spaces Above <br> County Requirement | +4 |

## Local Mobility Analysis (Non-CEQA Analysis)

The County's General Plan Circulation Element requires development projects to analyze level of service ("LOS") impacts in order to assess roadway capacity. The information from an LOS analysis can be used to identify operating deficiencies on the roadway network, determine the effects of a project and potential improvements to offset such effects, and to more accurately update and apply the County's impact fee program. This LOS analysis is not a CEQA analysis, which provides specifically that "automobile delay, as described solely by level of service or similar measures of vehicular capacity or traffic congestion shall not be considered a significant impact on the environment." (Public Resources Code, §21099(b)(2); see also CEQA Guidelines, §15064.3(a) ["a project's effect on automobile delay shall not constitute a significant environmental impact."]) CEQA no longer focuses on LOS-based analyses because such analyses tend to result in mitigation measures calling for new or expanded roadways, which leads to more VMT and GHG emissions in contravention of the purposes of SB 743 (2013) and the State's climate change laws, including AB 32 (2006), requiring a reduction in state GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, and SB 32 (2016), requiring at least a 40 percent reduction in GHG emissions from 1990 levels by 2030. Accordingly, the local mobility analysis is provided at the request of the County for informational purposes only and not for purposes of evaluating the Project's transportation impacts under CEQA.

## Level of Service

LOS is a qualitative measure used to describe operational conditions. LOS ranges from A (best), which represents minimal delay, to $F$ (worst), which represents heavy delay and a facility that is operating at or near its functional capacity. LOS analyses model whether deficient operations along the local transportation network would occur as a result of a proposed project. Thus, a detailed operational (i.e., LOS and other traffic operational measures) analysis was conducted as part of this TIOA to determine whether an acceptable LOS would be maintained with the addition of the Project. Potential improvements were identified where deficient/unacceptable LOS would likely occur within the County due to the Project.

Although not required by the General Plan, for informational purposes only, this report considers LOS standards of the County and other agencies having jurisdiction over roadways and
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intersections located outside the County that will be impacted by the Project. Applicable LOS standards are set forth below.

## (a) Santa Cruz County

Project-related deficiencies at study intersections occur:

- If the intersection operates at an acceptable LOS (i.e., LOS A, B, C, or D) without the Project during the weekday peak hour and degrades to an unacceptable LOS (i.e. LOS E or F) with the Project during the weekday peak hour; or
- If the intersection operates at an unacceptable LOS (i.e., LOS E or F) without the Project during the weekday peak hour, and the volume to capacity ("v/c") ratio of the sum of all critical movements at the intersection increases by 1 percent or more with the Project.
(b) City of Santa Cruz

An intersection maintained by City of Santa Cruz operates at an acceptable level of service if it maintains a LOS D or better at signalized intersections. (City of Santa Cruz 2030 General Plan, Chapter 5, Mobility Element, p.55, Goal M.3.1.3, M3.1.4.)
(c) City of Capitola

An intersection maintained by City of City of Capitola operates at an acceptable level of service if it maintains a LOS C, with the exception of the Village Area, Bay Avenue, and $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue (for which there is no LOS standard).

## (d) California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)

Caltrans no longer requires a LOS analysis for CEQA purposes due to the enactment of SB 743. However, for informational purposes only, a LOS-based analysis of Caltrans facilities is provided using the previously applied LOS standards for Caltrans and the County:

Project-related deficiencies at study intersections occur when the addition of Project traffic:

- Cause operations to deteriorate from an acceptable level (LOS C or better) to an unacceptable level (LOS D or worse); or
- Causes the existing measure of effectiveness (average delay) to deteriorate at a Stateoperated intersection operating at LOS D or worse.

In addition, volume to capacity ratios ("v/c ratios") were also considered in this study's freeway analysis because the study freeway network is considerably oversaturated during the peak periods (with and without the Project) and roadway density measures of effectiveness do not provide accurate representations of congestion conditions for oversaturated facilities. The v/c ratios reflect the actual volume demand, which is higher than what is observed in one peak hour (the peak period occurs over several hours), versus the roadway capacity.
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## Study Intersections and Freeway Segments

The study intersections identified below in Table ES-T11 were selected for LOS analysis based on Project trip generation, estimated trip distribution, and guidance from County staff. The Project trip distribution was developed based on current traffic patterns in the study area, the local travel demand model, and knowledge of the study area.

| Table ES-T11 - Study Intersections |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \# | Intersection | \# | Intersection |
| 1 | Soquel Ave \& Capitola Rd ${ }^{1}$ | 14 | $41^{\text {st }}$ Ave \& Hwy 1 SB Ramps ${ }^{2}$ |
| 2 | Soquel Ave \& $7^{\text {th }}$ Ave ${ }^{4}$ | 15 | $41^{\text {st }}$ Ave \& Gross Rd ${ }^{2}$ |
| 3 | Soquel Dr / Soquel Ave \& Soquel Ave ${ }^{3}$ | 16 | $41^{\text {st }}$ Ave \& Clares $\mathrm{St}^{4}$ |
| 4 | Soquel Dr \& Paul Sweet Rd / Hwy 1 On-Off Ramps ${ }^{3}$ | 17 | $41^{\text {st }}$ Ave \& Capitola Rd ${ }^{4}$ |
| 5 | Soquel Ave \& Hwy 1 SB On-Off Ramps ${ }^{4}$ | 18 | $41^{\text {st }}$ Ave \& Brommer St/Jade St ${ }^{4}$ |
| 6 | Soquel Ave \& $17^{\text {th }}$ Ave ${ }^{4}$ | 19 | Capitola Rd \& $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue ${ }^{4}$ |
| 7 | Soquel Ave \& Chanticleer ${ }^{4}$ | 20 | Capitola Rd \& 17 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue ${ }^{4}$ |
| 8 | Soquel Ave \& Project Driveway ${ }^{1}$ | 21 | Capitola Rd \& Chanticleer Ave ${ }^{4}$ |
| 9 | Soquel Ave / 40 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave \& Gross Rd ${ }^{1}$ | 22 | Capitola Rd and 30 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave $^{4}$ |
| 10 | 40th Ave \& Deanes Ln (NOT STUDIED) ${ }^{5}$ | 23 | Brommer St \& $17^{\text {th }}$ Ave ${ }^{1}$ |
| 11 | 40th Ave \& Clares St (NOT STUDIED ${ }^{5}$ | 24 | Brommer St \& $30^{\text {th }}$ Ave ${ }^{4}$ |
| 12 | $41^{\text {st }}$ Ave \& Soquel Dr ${ }^{2}$ | 25 | $17^{\text {th }}$ Ave \& Portola Dr ${ }^{4}$ |
| 13 | $41^{\text {st }}$ Ave \& Hwy 1 NB Ramps ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |

Notes:

1. Count data collected on May 17, 2018
2. Count data collected on October 18, 2016
3. Count data collected on March 6, 2018
4. Count data collected October 3, 2018
5. Intersection \#10 and \#11 were not analyzed in this analysis because the Project is not expected to distribute traffic to these intersections since a barrier exists at $40^{\text {th }}$ Avenue and Deans Lane and the Project does not propose to remove it (nor are any pending plans to remove the barrier). In all subsequent sections in this report, these two intersections are labelled as "Not Studied."
The following freeway segments were analyzed using Highway Capacity Software ("HCS"), which is based on Highway Capacity Manual $6{ }^{\text {th }}$ Edition (HCM 6), October 2016 methodologies, an industry standard:
6. Highway 1 - Morrissey Blvd to Soquel Dr
7. Highway 1 - Soquel Dr to $41^{\text {st }}$ Ave
8. Highway $1-41^{\text {st }}$ Ave to Porter St/Bay Ave
9. Highway 17 - Pasatiempo Overcrossing to Highway 1

## Analytical Methods and Information

The LOS analysis uses methods defined in the HCM 6 and Synchro 10 traffic analysis software, the latter of which is consistent with HCM 6. HCM 6 methodologies include procedures for analyzing side-street stop-controlled ("SSSC"), all-way stop-controlled ("AWSC"), and signalized intersections. The SSSC procedure defines LOS as a function of average control delay for each
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minor street approach movement. Conversely, the AWSC and signalized intersection procedures define LOS as a function of average control delay for the overall intersection.

Project-related deficiencies are determined by comparing conditions without the Project to those with the Project. Project-related deficiencies at study intersections are created when traffic from the Project causes the LOS to fall below the LOS standard identified for the County in Chapter 6 of this report. LOS analyses for study intersections maintained by agencies other than the County are provided for information purposes only. The LOS analysis set forth herein evaluates the following scenarios: Existing Conditions, the Existing Plus Project, Near Term Conditions, Near Term Plus Project, Cumulative Conditions and Cumulative Plus Project.

## LOS Results

Detailed operational effects associated with the forecasted Project traffic were evaluated for weekday AM and PM peak one-hour periods, which is consistent with accepted County guidelines and industry standards. Traffic data was collected during typical weekdays when local schools were in session and the weather was fair. Traffic data is collected over a peak period (two hours or more) and then the busiest one hour is analyzed. This is consistent with industry standard and HCM requirements. Given that County peak periods extend well over more than just one AM or PM peak hour, this analysis represents the busiest one hour during each peak period (i.e., the peak hour of the peak period conditions). In general, the PM peak period experiences higher delays in the County and around the Project site than the AM peak period.

The LOS findings were used to identify measures to improve vehicular delays, decrease travel times, and/or prevent cut-through traffic and measures/improvements that would provide operational benefits to the local roadway network. LOS deficiencies and potential identified improvements are summarized in Table ES-T12 below.
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Table ES-T12 - Project Deficiencies and Improvements

| Int \# | Location | Condition | Deficiency caused by the Addition of the Project Traffic | Improvement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \#3 | Soquel Drive / Soquel Avenue \& Soquel Avenue | Cumulative and Cumulative Plus Project | The addition of the Project traffic worsens the LOS from $C$ to $D$ in the PM and cause a deficiency. | Caltrans plans to widen Highway 1/Soquel Drive interchange. One westbound left-turn lane, one westbound right-turn lane, and a new southbound Highway 1 off-ramp will be constructed at this intersection. A conceptual layout is shown in Appendix O. These improvements are currently not funded, are not included in the County Capital Improvement Project (CIP), and may be constructed after 2040. The Cumulative deficiency will remain until the improvement is constructed. <br> The State Route 1 HOV Lane Widening Project Supplemental Report (May 2010) analyzed these improvements for the Santa Cruz Route 1 Tier I and Tier II FEIR and the results are included in Appendix $P$ for reference. More detail on the EIR https://sccrtc.org/projects/streets-highways/hwy 1 corridor/environmental-documents. <br> The deficiency is anticipated to be eliminated with implementation of the Caltrans improvements. |
| \#7 | Soquel Avenue / Chanticleer Avenue | Cumulative and Cumulative Plus Project Conditions | The addition of Project traffic worsens the side street LOS from Chanticleer Avenue from LOS D to LOS F in the PM. | The Project will restripe Soquel Avenue to include a continuous TWLTL from the Highway 1 SB Ramps past Chanticleer Avenue. The installation of this measure will provide sufficient space for waiting and or weaving for vehicles heading northbound on Soquel Avenue. In addition, the installation of the signal will also improve gaps in the traffic flow in the northbound direction. This is an improvement over the current very short 50 -foot merge lane that is inadequate to accommodate these movements in the future. The improvement will remove the deficiency caused by the Project. |
| \#9 | Soquel Avenue $/ 40^{\text {th }}$ Avenue \& Gross Road | Existing and Existing Plus Project Conditions | The addition of Project traffic worsens the LOS from $E$ to $F$ in the PM. The critical v/c increases by more than $1 \%$ on all the critical approach movements. | Install a diagonal diverter extending from the northwest corner to the southeast corner at this intersection. Residents in the neighborhood would exit the neighborhood at Rodeo Gulch Drive onto Soquel Avenue. If this improvement is not installed, cut through traffic along Gross Road and the delay at the $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue intersection will continue and degrade further in the future until the freeway is improved. <br> The diverter will prevent cut through traffic on Gross Road through the residential neighborhood and eliminate the congestion caused by the all-way stop at the intersection. Queues at this intersection are expected to shorten with these recommended improvements. This commute is slightly longer than the direct connection to $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue via Gross Road, but the benefits of removing cut through traffic through the neighborhood and the improvement of operations at the Gross Road $/ 40^{\text {th }}$ Avenue intersection, warrants the installation of this improvement. With this |
|  |  | Near Term and Near Term Plus Project Conditions | The addition of Project traffic worsens the LOS from $E$ to $F$ in the PM. The critical v/c increases by more than $1 \%$ on all the critical approach movements. |  |

## Kimley»"Horn

Table ES-T12 - Project Deficiencies and Improvements

| Int \# | Location | Condition | Deficiency caused by <br> the Addition of the <br> Project Traffic | Improvement |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
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Table ES-T12 - Project Deficiencies and Improvements

| Int \# | Location | Condition | Deficiency caused by the Addition of the Project Traffic | Improvement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Cumulative and Cumulative Plus Project Conditions | The addition of Project traffic worsens the LOS from $E$ to $F$ in the AM. The critical v/c increases by more than $1 \%$ on all the critical approach movements. | The State Route 1 HOV Lane Widening Project Supplemental Report (May 2010) analyzed these improvements for the Santa Cruz Route 1 Tier I and Tier II FEIR and the results are included in Appendix P for reference. These improvements will also improve operations at the intersections because of the close spacing of the intersection to the Highway $1 / 41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue interchange. <br> https://sccrtc.org/projects/streets-highways/hwy1corridor/environmental-documents. <br> If the Project installs the Caltrans improvement and the overhead signage and the barrier, the existing deficiency and the deficiencies caused by the Project will be reduced and/or eliminated. Conditions at this intersection would be further improved by the City of Capitola's planned signal improvements as well as the planned Highway 1 improvements. <br> Although this intersection is not subject to General Plan LOS policy because it is not a County intersection the Project proposes improvements that will eliminate the Project caused deficiency. |
| \#24 | Brommer Street \& $30^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | Existing and Existing Plus Project Conditions | The intersection operates at LOS F in PM Peak without Project and continues to operate at LOS F with the Project. The average delay increases from 38.4 seconds per vehicle to 39.1 seconds per vehicle with the addition of Project traffic. The critical v/c increases by more than $1 \%$ on the northbound and southbound critical movements. | Install signal control with permissive left-turn phasing. Peak Hour Signal Warrant \#3 based on California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CAMUTCD) is satisfied with Existing Conditions traffic and in Existing plus Project Conditions traffic. With existing geometry, signal control, eastbound/westbound split phasing, and permissive left-turn phasing, this intersection would operate at acceptable LOS with Cumulative plus Project conditions traffic volumes. The Peak Hour Signal Warrant \#3 evaluation is included in Appendix J . <br> For Existing Conditions, the intersection will improve the PM delay by 17.1 seconds per vehicle with installation of the signal. <br> For Near Term Conditions the intersection will improve the PM delay by 30.9 seconds per vehicle with installation of the signal. <br> For Cumulative Conditions the intersection will improve the PM delay by 19.3 seconds per vehicle with installation of the signal. |
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Table ES-T12 - Project Deficiencies and Improvements

| Int \# | Location | Condition | Deficiency caused by the Addition of the Project Traffic | Improvement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Near Term and Near Term Plus Project Conditions | The intersection operates at LOS F in PM Peak without Project and continues to operate at LOS F with the Project. The average delay increases from 55.7 seconds per vehicle to 56.5 seconds per vehicle with the addition of Project traffic. The critical v/c increases by more than $1 \%$ on the northbound and southbound critical movements. | Installation of a signal control with permissive left-turn phasing would cause the intersection to operate at an acceptable LOS in the Existing Plus Project and Near Term Plus Project and Cumulative Plus Project Conditions. The Project will pay a fair share of $14 \%$ towards the improvement and the Project will eliminate its incremental addition to the LOS deficiency (Project Trips through intersection / All Future trips through intersection). |
|  |  | Cumulative and Cumulative Plus Project Conditions | The intersection operates at LOS F in PM Peak without Project and continues to operate at LOS F with the Project. The average delay increases from 41.2 seconds per vehicle to 41.9 seconds per vehicle with the addition of Project traffic. The critical v/c increases by more than $1 \%$ on the northbound and southbound critical movements. |  |
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## LOS Conclusions

County Intersections - Existing Plus Project, Near Term Plus Project and Cumulative Plus Project. The Project is not fully consistent with the County's LOS policy because, although the Project does not cause any County intersections to degrade from an acceptable LOS to an unacceptable LOS, it does cause the $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio at any critical movement operating at an unacceptable LOS to increase by 1 percent or more with the Project.

- In the Existing Plus Project, Near Term Plus Project and Cumulative Plus Project scenarios, the Project will increase delays at the Soquel Avenue / 40 Avenue \& Gross Road intersection (Intersection \#9) which will already be operating at an unacceptable LOS without the Project. The Project will install a diagonal diverter extending from the northwest corner to the southeast corner at this intersection to eliminate the all-way stop. This improvement will eliminate the LOS deficiency. The improvement will also improve traffic conditions along other nearby roadways, reducing the time it takes to travel from Soquel Drive \& Rodeo Gulch Road to the southbound Highway 1 on-ramp from 8.15 minutes to 4.53 minutes.
- In the Existing Plus Project, Near Term Plus Project and Cumulative Plus Project scenarios, the Project will cause the Brommer Street \& $30^{\text {th }}$ Avenue intersection (Intersection \#24) to exacerbate the LOS E and/or F deficient conditions by adding delay, if no improvements are installed. The critical movement $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ increases by more than $1 \%$ for the northbound and southbound critical volumes. Installation of a signal control with permissive left-turn phasing would cause the intersection to operate at an acceptable LOS. The Project will pay a fair share of $14 \%$ towards the improvement and the Project will eliminate its incremental addition to the LOS deficiency (Project Trips through intersection / All Future trips through intersection).
- In the Cumulative Plus Project Condition, the Project would cause the Soquel Avenue / Chanticleer Avenue (Intersection \#7) delays during the PM peak hour for the northbound movement of this intersection to go from 25.6 seconds (LOS D) to 53.1 seconds (LOS F) if no improvements were installed. However, the Project will install approximately 3,500 feet of TWLTL striping (and restriping) along Soquel Avenue from Paul Minnie Avenue to the existing creek crossing (east of Mattison Lane). With this improvement, the intersection would operate at LOS C with 20.9 seconds of delay in the Cumulative Plus Project condition. Therefore, the Project will eliminate this LOS deficiency.
- As noted above, the TWLTL eliminates the deficiency for the northbound movement of this intersection in the Cumulative Plus Project condition and the LOS will improve from F to D .
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## Transportation Improvement Area Fees (Non-CEQA Analysis)

The Project is required to pay Transportation Improvement Area fees ("TIA Fees") based on daily net new trips. The Project is located within the Live Oak TIA fee area and fees collected in this area are currently (as of August 2020) assessed at $\$ 300$ per net new daily trip to fund roadside improvements and $\$ 300$ per net new daily trip to fund transportation improvements.

The Project is expected to generate 6,106 gross daily trips based on ITE assumptions, as shown on Table ES-T13 below and described further in Chapter 6 of this TIOA. As described in the Transportation Demand Management chapter (Chapter 3), the Project will implement a TDM program that is expected to reduce trips by 15.5 percent for employees and 20.5 percent for Members. For purposes of calculating TIA Fees, however, no reduction will be taken initially for the implementation of TDM measures. If TDM measures are proven to be effective, as evidenced by driveway counts to be performed after construction of the Project, a partial refund of TIA fees may be given to the Applicant to the extent it is shown that the actual trips to the Project site are less than what are assumed in this TIOA.

Table ES-T-13, below, provides a summary of existing trip credits, Project trips, and applicable TIA fee amounts:

- A gross TIA fee of $\mathbf{\$ 3 , 6 6 3 , 6 0 0}$ is estimated for the Project based on the assumption that it will generate 6,106 gross daily trips. This includes transportation improvement fees $(6,106$ trips $\times \$ 300=\$ 1,831,800)$ and roadside improvement fees $(6,106$ trips $\times \$ 300=$ $\$ 1,831,800)$.
- A total fee credit of $\mathbf{\$ 8 0 , 4 0 0}$ is estimated for the existing 134 trips per day generated from the light industrial land uses on the Project site that will be relocated/demolished prior to construction of the Project. This includes transportation improvement fees $(\$ 40,200)$ and roadside improvement fees $(\$ 40,200)$.
- Therefore, considering the above fee credit, it is estimated that the Project will be responsible for paying a total of $\$ 3,583,200$ (i.e., $\$ 3,663,600$ gross impact fee minus $\$ 80,400$ total fee credit $=\$ 3,583,200)$ in County TIA Fees.
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| Table ES-T13 - Transportation Improvement Area Fee Calculations |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LTE classification for <br> Existing and Project <br> Uses | Roadside <br> Improvement Fee |  |  |  | Transportation <br> Improvement Fee |  |
| Project | Daily <br> Trips | Fee per <br> Trip (\$) | Total <br> (\$) | Fee per <br> Trip (\$) | Total (\$) | Total Fee (\$) |
| Clinic (Project use) | 6,106 | $\$ 300$ | $\$ 1,831,800$ | $\$ 300$ | $\$ 1,831,800$ | $\$ 3,663,600$ |
| Credit | Daily <br> Trips | Credit <br> per Trip <br> (\$) | Total <br> (\$) | Credit <br> per Trip <br> (\$) | Total <br> (\$) | Total Credit <br> (\$) |
| Light Industrial <br> (Existing Use) | 134 | $\$ 300$ | $\$ 40,200$ | $\$ 300$ | $\$ 40,200$ | $\$ 80,400$ |
| Net Project TIA Fees <br> (i.e., Potential Project Fees- <br> Credit Fees) | $\$ 1,791,600$ | $\$ 1,791,600$ | $\$ 3,583,200$ |  |  |  |

## Other Transportation Analysis

## Transportation Hazards

All geometric improvements identified in this study as Project improvements will be designed and constructed per industry, local agency, and Caltrans standards and are not anticipated to substantially increase hazards or result in incompatible uses. The installation of the barrier between the through lane and the right-turn lane along the section between Gross Road and the Southbound On-Ramp on $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue in the northbound direction will reduce conflicts between vehicles that jump the queue and reduce conflicts between vehicles and bicycles.

## Emergency Access

The Project has two driveways off Soquel Avenue. These driveways both provide Emergency Vehicle access. Moreover, the Project will install a number of traffic improvements that will improve circulation in the Project vicinity. As such, the Project will not result in inadequate emergency access.

## Summary of Favorable Transportation Considerations

The following Table ES-T14 provides a summary of expected transportation benefits arising from the Project as further described in this TIOA.
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## Table ES-T14 - Summary of Benefits

| $\#$ | Benefit |
| :---: | :--- |
| 1 | Reduced VMT |

The Project will reduce VMT by approximately over 35,000 vehicle-miles per day under the Scenario A analysis (i.e., 44,416 for Existing Plus Project and 35,306 for the 2040 Plus Project) and by more than 20,000 vehicle miles per day (i.e., 20,322 for Cumulative Plus Project) under the Scenario B analysis, including eliminating a significant number of trips associated with Healthcare Consumers traveling to San Jose for healthcare services

## 2 Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program


#### Abstract

The Project will implement a robust TDM program for employees that will include a bike share program, commute management platform and rideshare support, emergency ride home benefit, TDM coordinator, and safe, well-lit and accessible pedestrian/bicycle facilities along Soquel Avenue. In addition, TDM measures will be employed for Members, including the availability of virtual care strategy that will reduce the number of trips that Members will make to the Project site, and safe, well-lit and accessible pedestrian/bicycle facilities along Soquel Avenue. In all, it is anticipated that the proposed TDM measures could result in a trip reduction of approximately 15.5 percent employee trips and 20.5 percent Member trips.

\section*{3 Soquel Avenue Sidewalk and Crosswalk Construction}

The Project will construct ADA-compliant sidewalk and curb ramps along its frontage on the south side of Soquel Avenue, which will extend west and east beyond its frontage and connect to existing sidewalk facilities along Soquel Avenue. These improvements will fill a critical gap in the County's pedestrian facility network and will improve pedestrian connectivity along Soquel Avenue.


## 4 Soquel Avenue Class II Bike Lanes

The Project will install approximately 4,200 feet of Class II bike lanes along Soquel Avenue from Paul Minnie Avenue to just east of Mattison Lane. These improvements will include restriping existing bike lanes and adding new green bike lane striping. It is anticipated that providing the green bike lanes would improve the safety of bicyclists by approximately 19 percent. The provision of these bike lanes will close the gap to the major new Chanticleer Avenue Highway 1 bicycle and pedestrian overcrossing towards Soquel Drive, close to the Project site. From a regional connectivity standpoint, this is a major improvement for bicyclists in the County.

## 5 Construct Traffic Signal at Main Project Driveway

The Project will construct a traffic signal at the Main Project Driveway. This improvement will benefit motorists traveling along Soquel Avenue and wishing to access local side-street stop-controlled roads along Soquel Avenue (such as Mattison Lane and Chanticleer Avenue) with a benefit of increased gaps for turning onto/or off-of Soquel Ave.

## $6 \quad$ Soquel Avenue Two-Way Left-Turn Lane

The Project will implement approximately 3,500 feet of Two-Way Left-Turn Lane ("TWLTL") striping (and restriping) along Soquel Avenue from Paul Minnie Avenue to the existing creek crossing (east of Mattison Lane). Providing TWLTL along this segment of roadway will provide drivers the ability to make left-turns out of adjacent side-streets in two movements, rather than crossing two lanes of traffic at the same time.

## $7 \quad$ Soquel Avenue \& 40 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue / Gross Road Diverter

The Project will construct a diagonal diverter at the intersection of Soquel Avenue \& Gross Road. This diverter would improve operations at this intersection and the Gross Road \& $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue intersection by reducing vehicle queues and delays. In addition, existing cut-through traffic through the Gross Road and $40^{\text {th }}$ Avenue neighborhoods would no longer be possible. Travel time from Soquel Drive \& Rodeo Gulch Road to SB Highway 1 would be improved from 8.15 minutes in Existing Only conditions to 4.53 minutes in Existing Plus Project conditions with this improvement.
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| Table ES-T14 - Summary of Benefits |  |
| :---: | :--- |
| $\#$ | Benefit |
| 8 | $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue \& Gross Road Overhead Wayfinding Signage and Lane Channelization Barrier |

The Project will install overhead signs and roadway markings to improve lane selection and use of the eastbound approach along Gross Road. The lane selection would be for southbound Highway 1 and eastbound $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue movements. A physical barrier will also be installed between the limit line and the diverge of the Highway 1 southbound on-ramp on $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue.
The installation of signage and roadway markings will improve operations in the area by reducing weaving amongst travel lanes on eastbound $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue. In addition, the barrier improvement will improve traffic operations in the area by preventing vehicles from jumping the queue for southbound on-ramp traffic as well as improve bicycle rider safety in the Class II bike lane at the Highway 1 southbound on-ramp at $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue.
$9 \quad$ Highway 17 Safety Effect
Construction of the Project will require that only $1.15 \%$ of Member trips to travel along Highway 17 to receive health care services in the San Jose area because they will be served at the Project site, thereby decreasing traffic along Highway 17 and consequently decreasing potential traffic collisions by a proportional 0.65 percent (approximately).

## 10 Transportation Improvement Area Fees

The Project will pay TIA Fees based on ITE trip generation assumptions, even though actual trips will be lower due to the implementation of Project TDM measures. In addition, no reduction in trip generation will be requested upfront for the implementation of TDM measures. The County of Santa Cruz collects Transportation Improvement Area Fees for new development in the Live Oak area. This fee includes both a transportation improvement fee to fund improvements to transportation infrastructure and a roadside improvement fee to fund roadside-related improvements. Based on the trip generation for the project, the Transportation Impact and Operational Analysis estimates this combined fee payment to be $\$ 3,583,200$. The fees would be utilized to contribute toward needed roadway or roadside improvements as determined by the Department of Public Works to maintain operations, safety, and bicycle/pedestrian connectivity based on County's Capital Improvement Program, corridor plans, and active transportation plans. The Department of Public Works may also require additional improvements to pedestrian and bicycle facilities in the nearby network and may apply the Transportation Improvement Area Fees toward these improvements. If the Applicant demonstrates, through driveway counts, that actual generated trips are less than what was assumed for purposes of calculating TIA Fees, then the Applicant may be entitled to a refund for the corresponding overpayment of fees.

| 11 | $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| The Project will contribute towards the potential installation of long-term planned improvements along the $41^{\text {st }}$ |  |
| Avenue corridor, which includes improvements along $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenues between Clares Street and Cory Street to |  |
| facilitate north-south vehicular, pedestrian and bicycle circulation. These proposed future improvements along the |  |
| $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue roadway would be supported by additional improvements along Gross Road, $40^{\text {th }}$ Avenue, and Clares |  |
| Street; as well as at the intersections of Soquel Avenue and Gross Road, Gross Road and $41^{\text {st }}$, Auto Plaza Drive |  |
| and $41^{\text {st }}$, Clares Street and $40^{\text {th }}$ Avenue, and Clares Street and $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue. The improvements include signal |  |
| modifications, intersection control changes, restriping, sidewalk and bicycle lane improvements, and installation of |  |
| a cycle track on $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue between Gross Road and Cory Street on the Highway 1 overpass. |  |

## 12 Brommer Street \& 30 ${ }^{\text {th }}$

The project applicant has also proposed a fair share contribution toward improvements at the intersection of Brommer Street and 30th Avenue to install traffic signal controls with permissive left-turn phasing. Installation of the signal would occur within the existing road right-of-way. Existing stop signs at the intersection would be removed. Installation of a signal control with permissive left-turn phasing would cause the intersection to operate at an acceptable LOS.
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Table ES-T14 - Summary of Benefits

## \# Benefit

The Project will pay an approximately $14 \%$ fair share payment or $\$ 105,000$ (i.e. $\$ 750,000 * 14 \%=\$ 105,000$ )
towards the potential installation of a signal at the intersection.
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## 1. INTRODUCTION

This Transportation Impact and Operational Analysis ("TIOA") reports the findings of the traffic analysis conducted for the proposed Medical Office Building ("MOB") Project (the "Project") at 5940 Soquel Avenue in the County of Santa Cruz ("County"), California. The TIOA covers two key components: (1) a vehicle miles traveled ("VMT") analysis required by the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") that evaluates the amount and distance of automobile travel associated with the Project, and (2) a mobility analysis that evaluates the Project's impacts on automobile delay and traffic congestion, which is not relevant to CEQA but is relevant to a consideration of the Project's consistency with the County's General Plan. It is proposed that Kaiser Permanente ("Kaiser" or "Proposed Tenant") will occupy the Project if PDP Santa Cruz, LLC (the "Applicant") is successful in obtaining Project entitlements. Kaiser-related data and assumptions were used to inform the VMT analysis, ${ }^{14}$ which are set forth in Appendix $\mathbf{S}$ to this document. The VMT analysis separately breaks down the traffic impacts associated with the Proposed Tenant's employees that will provide healthcare and support services in the Project ("employees") and its patients, visitors and non-clinical affiliated members ("Members") traveling to the Project.

This TIOA was prepared based on meetings with County Planning Department and Public Works staff, comments provided by the local community during two open house community meetings held on December 13, 2018 and January 30, 2019, and agency and public comments received in response to the Project's Notice of Preparation published on March 24, 2020. County Staff also provided comments to a draft Transportation Impact Study Assumptions Memorandum prepared be Kimley-Horn and Associates, which was finalized and dated September 19, 2018. This study complies with CEQA and Santa Cruz County, City of Santa Cruz, City of Capitola, and California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) traffic study guidelines and criteria.

## Project Description

The Project proposes to construct a MOB, containing approximately 160,000 square feet of gross building floor area, and a parking garage as shown in Figure F-1. The parking garage is proposed to contain 730 vehicle parking spaces, 47 of which will be designated as clean air vehicle spaces equipped with future electric vehicle charging capabilities and 38 motorcycle spaces. Within the parking garage on the first level, 160 bike spaces including 124 racks and 36 lockers are proposed. In addition, the Project will also provide 6 surface vehicle parking spaces adjacent to the parking garage.
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The Project also proposes to construct two access points along Soquel Avenue. The main Project driveway will be signalized and will provide full access to the site as shown in the Project site plan. A secondary driveway, east of the main driveway, will provide an access point for pickups and deliveries, as well as quiet ambulatory ingress and egress. The parking garage will not be accessible from the secondary driveway. Thus, it is not anticipated that employees or Members will utilize the secondary driveway. The secondary driveway will be stop-controlled on the northbound approach from the site and will be located along the easterly site boundary.

The Project's standard business hours will be from 8:30 AM to 5:30 PM Monday through Friday, with two minor exceptions. The first is urgent care, which will comprise approximately 9,600 square feet or 6 percent of the programmed square footage, and is anticipated to operate 24 hours per day, 7 days per week. The second is the post anesthesia care unit, which will compose approximately 4,800 square feet, or 3 percent of the programed square footage, and may operate beyond standard business hours 5 days a week depending on the medical condition of a Member.

The Project is planning to provide the following programs and services, which could include, but are not limited to: Obstetrics, Head and Neck Surgery, Surgery, Urology, Endocrinology, Gastroenterology, Hematology/Oncology, Infectious Diseases, Rheumatology, Nephrology, Pulmonology, Sleep Lab, Orthopedics, Podiatry, Pain Medicine, Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Primary Care (Internal Medicine or Family Practice), Dermatology, Allergy, Urgent Care, Chemotherapy Infusion, Audiology, Optometry, Ophthalmology, Imaging, Pharmacy, Laboratories, Sterile Processing, Blood Bank, Recovery, Building Support, Café, Vision Essentials, Administrative Offices and Conference Spaces.

## Project Transportation Improvements

## Project Site Access and Circulation

The Project site will be accessed from Soquel Avenue. The Project will construct one main signalized driveway entrance for employees and Members, which will provide access to the patient loading and unloading area, as well as the proposed parking garage. The main driveway will include a protected westbound left-turn pocket and eastbound right-turn pocket into the Project site from Soquel Avenue, as well as northbound left- and right-turn lanes exiting the Project site.

A secondary driveway will also be constructed east of the main entrance for deliveries, pickups, and ambulances. The secondary driveway south leg will be stop controlled and Soquel Avenue traffic will be free flow. The secondary driveway will experience very low and infrequent volumes throughout the day and no signal is anticipated for this location.

As shown in the Project site plan Figure F-2, the Project will construct a roadway through the center of the site, with the Project parking garage on the west side of the site and the MOB on the east side of the site. The parking garage will have two entrances/exits, one at the northeast end of the garage and one at the southeast end.
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A Member drop-off/pick-up zone will be provided near the main building entrance and accessed via the main Project Driveway. The drop-off/pick-up zone will provide capacity for approximately seven vehicles at a time.

For motorists traveling to the site, the north entrance/exit will allow for free right-turn movements into the garage. Traffic wishing to bypass the main garage entrance will use the southbound through lane, which will be stop-controlled, rather than the free southbound right-turn to bypass the main garage entrance and continue south. Motorists bypassing the main garage driveway will then access the secondary garage driveway or continue around to the drop-off/pick-up zone adjacent to the MOB. For motorists wishing to park in the garage after dropping-off Members in the loading/unloading zone adjacent to the MOB, motorists will have the opportunity to make a northbound right-turn at the north garage entrance/exit at turn into the garage to seek a parking space.

For motorists leaving the site, both garage exits will be stop controlled. The north entrance/exit will allow for the most direct route to leaving the site, by permitting motorists to make an eastbound right turn, which will bring them to the proposed Soquel Avenue \& Project Driveway signal. For travelers exiting from the south garage driveway, motorists would take an eastbound right turn, travel north past the drop-off/pick-up area, stop at the northbound through stop-controlled movement at the north garage entrance/exit, and then continue to the Soquel Avenue \& Project Driveway signal.

An east/west high visibility pedestrian crosswalk will be provided across the south leg of the north garage entrance/exit. Pedestrians will be able to utilize this proposed crosswalk to access the MOB after parking their vehicles and bikes. The Project will construct wayfinding signage to direct pedestrians to the crosswalk. Conflicting traffic will be stop controlled and pedestrians will have the right of way to cross at this location.

Bikes will access the site via the Soquel Avenue \& Project Driveway signalized intersection, traveling south and parking near the north parking garage entrance/exit, as shown in Figure F-2. After parking their bikes at the designated bike parking area, pedestrians will utilize the previously discussed east/west pedestrian crosswalk to access the Project site.

The Project will also construct ADA-compliant sidewalks along the north Project frontage (south side of Soquel Avenue), which will extend along the south side of Soquel Avenue and fill the existing gap in the County's sidewalk network.

## Project Mobility Improvements

The Project will provide numerous mobility improvements, including the following:
Main Traffic Driveway Signal: The Project site will be accessed from Soquel Avenue. The Project will construct one main signalized driveway entrance for employees and Members, which will provide access to the patient loading and unloading area, as well as the proposed parking garage. The main driveway will include a protected westbound left-turn pocket and eastbound right-turn pocket into the Project site from Soquel Avenue, as well as northbound left- and rightturn lanes exiting the Project site.
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Soquel Avenue Two-Way Left-Turn Lane Striping Improvements: The Project will implement approximately 3,500 feet of Two-Way Left-Turn Lane ("TWLTL") striping (and restriping) along Soquel Avenue from Paul Minnie Avenue to the existing creek crossing (east of Mattison Lane).

Green Bike Lanes Along Soquel Avenue: The Project will provide approximately 4,200 feet of Class 2 bike lane with green colored striping along Soquel Avenue from Paul Minnie Avenue to just east of Mattison Lane.

Sidewalk Installation Along Soquel Avenue: The Project will construct ADA-compliant sidewalks along the north Project frontage (south side of Soquel Avenue), which will extend along the south side of Soquel Avenue and fill an existing gap in the County's sidewalk network.

Soquel Avenue / $40^{\text {th }}$ Avenue \& Gross Road: The Project will install a diagonal diverter extending from the northwest corner to the southeast corner at this intersection. The diverter will prevent cut through traffic on Gross Road through the residential neighborhood, and eliminate the congestion caused by the all-way stop currently existing at the intersection.

41 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Avenue \& Gross Road Overhead Wayfinding Signage: The Project will install overhead signs and roadway markings to improve lane selection and use on the eastbound approach of Gross Road. The lane selection would be for southbound Highway 1 and northbound Highway 1 movements. The Project will also install a physical barrier between the limit line and the diverge of the Highway 1 southbound on-ramp on $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue. This barrier will prevent vehicles from jumping the queue for southbound on-ramp traffic and improve bicycle rider safety in the Class II bike lane at the Highway 1 southbound on-ramp at $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue.


Medical Office Building
Figure 1
Project Location Map
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Medical Office Building
Figure 2
Project Site Plan
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## Report Approach

The analysis in this report is broken down into two key components: a VMT-based analysis required by CEQA, and a mobility-based analysis that is provided for evaluating consistency with the County's General Plan, but which is not relevant for evaluating the significance of transportation-related environmental impacts. More specifically, in addition to the VMT analyses, this report considers transportation demand management ("TDM") measures, pedestrian, bicycle and transit mobility, parking supply and demand evaluation, local mobility analysis, Highway 1 and Highway 17 analyses, transportation impact area fees, and other transportation analyses for the Project.

## Report Organization

This report is organized as follows:
Chapter 2 (Vehicle Miles Traveled) discusses the methodology, assumptions, analysis, and findings of the Project's specific vehicle miles traveled evaluation.

Chapter 3 (Transportation Demand Management) describes potential TDM measures that the Project will implement to reduce the Project's trip generation and parking demand.

Chapter 4 (Pedestrian, Bicycle and Transit Mobility) presents the Project's potential effects on pedestrian, bicycle, and transit mobility.

Chapter 5 (Parking Supply and Demand Evaluation) describes the Project's proposed on-site parking supply. County Code requirements, ITE parking demand estimates, and a parking requirement comparison of other local communities are also presented in this chapter to evaluate the sufficiency of the proposed parking supply given anticipated demand.

Chapter 6 (Local Mobility Analysis) discusses the Project's trip generation characteristics, as well as the methodologies and assumptions used to estimate trip credits and net Project traffic added to the study roadway network. The Project's impact on the level of service ("LOS") of various intersections in the study area under Existing Conditions, Existing Plus Project Conditions, Near Term Conditions with and without the Project and Cumulative Conditions with and without the Project are also discussed.

Chapter 7 (Highway 1 and Highway 17 Evaluation) presents an evaluation of Highway 1 and Highway 17 study segment operational characteristics with and without the Project for Existing, Near Term, and Cumulative development conditions. Furthermore, the Project's potential effects on safety, as well as a discussion of Caltrans' planned improvements along Highway 1, are also included in this chapter.

Chapter 8 (Transportation Improvement Area Fees) provides estimates of the Project's Transportation Improvement Area fee responsibilities.

Chapter 9 (Other Transportation Analysis) provides a discussion of potential traffic hazards and emergency access associated with the Project.

A technical appendix is also attached containing information provided by the Applicant and Proposed Tenant to support the VMT analysis, traffic count data, future Highway 1 improvement details, concept layouts, signal warrants, and operational analysis output sheets.
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## 2. VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED

This chapter documents the Vehicle Miles Traveled ("VMT") analysis completed for the Project. The Project will be part of a network of medical facilities that provide various general and specialized medical services for the Proposed Tenant's Member-based medical system. As such, this analysis considers how the introduction of the Project, including its location and the nature of the services provided, affects the Proposed Tenant's Members' VMT. The Proposed Tenant's service area that was evaluated includes existing facilities which serve Members residing in the County. While most of the Proposed Tenant's existing facilities are located within the County, others are located outside of the County in locations such as Gilroy and San Jose. The facilities outside of the County are used by members needing specialized services not provided by facilities inside the County. As described herein, the Project will result in a reduction of at least 20,322 vehicle miles traveled, and thus will have a less than significant impact on transportation. The Project, which will be located within the County along Soquel Avenue, is planned to provide expanded services so that only a small portion of the Proposed Tenant's Members will have to travel to facilities outside of the County.

## Definitions

The following definitions are provided for the purpose of having a common understanding of the analysis provided within this section:

Existing Members: Current Members of the Proposed Tenant's healthcare system.
Healthcare Consumer: Consumers of healthcare services in the County, including Members and Other Healthcare Systems' patients.

Members: The Proposed Tenant's patients, visitors and non-clinical affiliated members. Collectively, as the context requires, the term "Members" may refer to Existing Members, Population Growth Members and Transferee Members.

Population Growth Members: Member growth that will occur over time via population growth.
Other Healthcare Systems: Sutter Health and Dignity Health.
Transferee Member: Member growth attributable to patients switching from Other Healthcare Systems to the Proposed Tenant.

## Background

In 2013 and 2018, respectively, CEQA and its implementing guidelines ("CEQA Guidelines") were significantly amended regarding the methods by which lead agencies are to evaluate a project's transportation impacts. As described in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(a):

Generally, vehicle miles travelled is the most appropriate measure of transportation impacts. For the purposes of this section, "vehicle miles traveled" refers to the amount and distance of automobile travel attributable to a project. Other relevant considerations may include the effects of the project on transit and non-motorized travel. Except as provided
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in subdivision (b)(2) below (regarding roadway capacity), a project's effect on automobile delay shall not constitute a significant environmental impact.

The CEQA Guidelines have eliminated traffic congestion and automobile delay from the list of issues required to be analyzed as part of a potential project's CEQA analysis and instead clarify that the appropriate criteria for analyzing a potential project's transportation impacts is VMT. This is because California needs to reduce VMT to achieve the State's long-term greenhouse gas ("GHG") reduction climate goals. Half of California's GHG emissions come from the transportation sector; therefore reducing VMT is an effective climate strategy. ${ }^{15}$ A VMT-focused transportation analysis encourages a reduction in VMT, as opposed to the former approach of evaluating transportation impacts based on level of service ("LOS") impacts, which often leads to roadway improvements that increase roadway capacity and, consequently, can induce more VMT, traffic and GHG emissions. ${ }^{16}$

Effective July 1, 2020, CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3(c) now requires lead agencies to assess transportation impacts based on VMT. On June 16, 2020, the County adopted its own thresholds based on the requirements of CEQA (Public Resources Code section 21099) and the CEQA Guidelines. ${ }^{17}$ As further described below, the threshold of significance, methodology, and analysis provided for in this section are based upon these adopted thresholds and the associated direction from County staff.

## Analyzing MOB VMT

As required by the California State legislature pursuant to SB 743, the California Governor's Office of Planning and Research ("OPR") prepared guidance to facilitate the adoption of VMT thresholds of significance by California jurisdictions. Although the 2018 Guidance ${ }^{18}$ does not specifically discuss MOBs, it does address the approach for analyzing land uses with the attributes of a MOB:

For office projects that feature a customer component, such as a government office that serves the public, a lead agency can analyze the customer VMT component of the project using the methodology for retail development (see below).

Santa Cruz County provided for this VMT analysis approach in its VMT thresholds adopted on June 16, 2020. ${ }^{19}$ Based on County requirements, MOB's are classified under the heading of "All
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other land uses," which provides for a threshold of significance of "no net increase in VMT". Accordingly, the Project will not have a significant transportation impact under CEQA if it results in no net increase in VMT.

The basic concept behind this analysis approach is that MOB's are similar to local retail uses in that they primarily serve pre-existing needs (i.e., they do not generate new trips, instead they meet a demand that would exist with or without the Project). Based on this, it can be presumed that the introduction of a new MOB will result in existing trips being redistributed, potentially resulting in shorter trip lengths when the MOB opens for service and is geographically located inbetween existing healthcare facilities. Given that the relative number of trips is constant, shorter trip lengths result in a VMT reduction. Essentially, a typical doctor visit is assumed to occur regardless of the proximity of the facility, but the proximity of the facility will determine the length of that trip and the resultant impact to the overall transportation system. Subsequently, this characteristic is used in this analysis to calculate the potential net increases or decrease in the overall Project VMT when the Project is constructed.

Figure F-3, below, demonstrates the concept described in this section visually and the measure of a "Net Change" in VMT as the metric by which the Project's potential transportation impact is determined.

Figure F-3 - Typical Effect of a MOB on VMT


As shown in the above graphic, the introduction of a new MOB often has the effect of redistributing existing patient trips in a manner that reduces average trip lengths, thereby resulting in a VMT
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reduction. (i.e. trip segments that were 3 miles prior to the new MOB are reduced to 1 mile with the addition of the new MOB).

## Scenarios

This TIOA provides two separate and independent analyses of the Project under the threshold of "no net increase in VMT."

The first analysis, identified as "Scenario A," considers the effect of the Project on the Proposed Tenant's Members. This scenario represents the Proposed Tenant's goal of providing nearly all medical services required by its Santa Cruz County Members in the geographical boundaries of the County itself. This will benefit the Proposed Tenant's Members residing in the County by providing improved access to necessary medical services, thereby reducing the percentage of trips that travel to the San Jose area for specialized services. Members that travel outside of the County necessarily add substantial VMT to the existing system. These trips will be reduced with the construction of the Project. Based on the forecasted data provided by the Proposed Tenant, it is estimated that the number of Member trips accessing services outside of the County will be significantly reduced when the Project becomes operational (from 29\% without the Project to $2.4 \%$ with the Project, as shown below).

The second analysis, identified as Scenario B, provides a more conservative VMT analysis by also considering the potential for Healthcare Consumers from Other Healthcare Systems to become Transferee Members who also receive healthcare services at the Project (in addition to the Proposed Tenant's Existing Members and Population Growth Members).

The two scenarios are described in more detail below.

## Scenario A

Under Scenario A, the following is considered:
A1: Existing No Project: VMT is evaluated under existing conditions (i.e., baseline). Specifically, VMT for Existing Members is determined based on current patterns, where most Members receive care at one of the Proposed Tenant's facilities in the County, but where almost 29-percent of Existing Member trips travel out of the County predominantly to receive specialized services. There are no new employees (because there is no Project) so employee VMT is based on the Proposed Tenant's existing facility locations in and outside of the County.
A2: Existing Plus Project: VMT is evaluated under exiting conditions, but with the addition of the Project. VMT for Members is determined based on the assumption that most Members receive care at the Project or one of the Proposed Tenant's existing facilities in the County. In this scenario, only about 2.4-percent of Members needing specific and highly specialized services that will not be provided at the Project continue to travel out of the County and the remaining Members currently traveling out of the County are redirected to the Project instead. VMT associated with Project employees is also included. For purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that the Project is fully occupied and operational.
A3: No Project 2040: 2040 VMT is evaluated based on a Healthcare Consumer distribution that represents forecasted 2040 household locations, which thereby impacts trip lengths
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because a higher concentration of people live near services, thus shortening trip lengths. Members receive care at one of the Proposed Tenant's facilities in the County, but almost 29percent of Member trips travel out of the County to receive specialized services. There are no new employees (because there is no Project) so employee VMT is based on existing facility locations.

A4: Plus Project 2040: 2040 VMT is evaluated based on a Healthcare Consumer distribution that represents forecasted 2040 household locations and assumes the addition of the Project. VMT for Members is determined based on the assumption that care is received at the Project or one of the Proposed Tenant's existing facilities in the County. In this scenario, most Members receive specialized services at the Project and about 2.4-percent of Members continue to travel out of the County for specific and highly specialized services that will not be provided at the Project. VMT associated with Project employees is also included.

## Scenario A Methodology

Santa Cruz County Travel Demand Model ("SCC TDM") data and related modeling techniques were used as the principle tool to determine VMT. Travel demand models are broadly considered to be the most accurate of available tools to assess VMT. Based on data provided by the Proposed Tenant about the facilities its Members in the County currently utilize, as well as limitations of the SCC TDM (i.e., it does not include areas outside of the County), a hybrid approach that relied on both the SCC TDM and other spatial analysis techniques was developed to meet the County's VMT analysis requirements. This approach accounted for the unique trip distribution and trip generation characteristics of the Project, as well as for the portion of VMT that would occur outside of the area covered by the SCC TDM.

## Project Trip Generation

As described in more detail below, for purposes of maintaining a conservative analysis, this TIOA assumes that the Project will produce 6,106 daily trips based on the trip generation rate for Clinics (the same rate as used in the TIOA). However, this number likely overstates the actual Project trip generation since, based on previously collected trip generation data for the Proposed Tenant, the Project is forecasted to produce significantly fewer trips than that. As shown in the trip generation comparison Table T-1 below, the average number of trips per 1,000 square-feet (sf) of similar sites operated by the Proposed Tenant in the vicinity of the Project is 24.21 daily trips. For the proposed 160,000 s.f. Project, this equates to approximately 3,874 daily trips, or only about 63-percent of the number of trips assumed and used in this VMT analysis. Trip generation is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 3.

The trip generation rate for the Project is understood to be lower than typical MOBs as a result of several unique operational characteristics specific to the Proposed Tenant, including:

- Not requiring referrals for out-of-network specialty care,
- Extensive use of telemedicine,
- Grouping visits and providing multiple services at one site, and
- An emphasis on preventative care.
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Note that the lower trip generation rate described above was not used as the basis of the VMT analysis contained herein and that the analysis is instead based on the typical trip generation characteristics of a Clinic as described in the current ITE Trip Generation Manual. As such, it is reasonable to assume that this TIOA analysis overstates the VMT of the Project (as compared to a typical MOB as defined by ITE) by approximately 37-percent (i.e., $63 \%$ is Proposed Tenant trip generation data). For purposes of this VMT analysis, Scenario $A$ and Scenario $B$ are based on the accommodation of the same total number of Project trips (representing the same number of Members and 300 employees). As such, existing conditions and future conditions analysis only consider the circumstances of Members that are forecasted to join the Proposed Tenant's network and Members currently within the Proposed Tenant's network residing within the County. This basis maintains an "apples-to-apples" comparison basis for the scenarios as required by SB $743 .{ }^{20}$

Table T-1 - Trip Generation Rate Comparison for Medical Office Buildings

|  |  | Independent Variable |  | Daily Trips |  | AM PEAK HOUR TRIPS |  |  |  |  |  | PM PEAK HOUR TRIPS |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Development | Data Source | Size ${ }^{4}$ | Unit | Rate | TOTAL DAILY | Rate | \% Entering | \% Exiting | Trips Entering | Trips Exiting | TOTAL AM | Rate | \% Entering | \% Exiting | Trips Entering | Trips Exiting | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { TOTAL } \\ \text { PM } \end{gathered}\right.$ |
| Proposed Project |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kaiser MOB | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { ITE LUC } 630 \\ \text { (Clinic) }^{1} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 160.000 | KSF | 38.16 | 6,106 | 3.69 | 78\% | 22\% | 461 | 130 | 591 | 3.28 | 29\% | 71\% | 152 | 373 | 525 |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { ITE LUC } 720 \\ (\mathrm{MOB})^{2} \end{gathered}$ | 160.000 | KSF | 34.80 | 5,568 | 2.78 | 78\% | 22\% | 347 | 98 | 445 | 4.10 | 39\% | 61\% | 256 | 400 | 656 |
| Similar Sites (2019) ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sutter/PAMF } \\ & \text { (Urgent Care) } \end{aligned}$ | Counts | 67.000 | KSF | 46.03 | 3,084 | 4.51 | 57\% | 43\% | 172 | 130 | 302 | 3.51 | 36\% | 64\% | 84 | 151 | 235 |
| $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Sutter/PAMF } \\ \text { (OB Office) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Counts | 63.306 | KSF | 16.85 | 1,067 | 1.04 | 50\% | 50\% | 33 | 33 | 66 | 1.44 | 32\% | 68\% | 29 | 62 | 91 |
| Skyport MOB (Kaiser) | Counts | 143.700 | KSF | 17.65 | 2,537 | 1.54 | 68\% | 32\% | 150 | 71 | 221 | 1.52 | 23\% | 77\% | 51 | 167 | 218 |
| Dublin MOB (Kaiser) | Counts | 215.000 | KSF | 16.28 | 3,501 | 1.41 | 83\% | 17\% | 251 | 53 | 304 | 1.46 | 30\% | 70\% | 93 | 220 | 313 |
| Similar Sites Average: |  | 122.252 | KSF | 24.21 | -- | 2.13 | 64\% | 36\% | -- | -- | -- | 1.98 | 30\% | 70\% | -- | -- | -- |

Notes:
2. ITE Land Use Code 720 (Medical Office Building) was used in the Santa Cruz Assumptions Memo based on ITE 10th Edition Data.
3. Similar sites driveway counts were performed on October 22, 2019 and used to determine trip generation characteristics.
4. Building size information provided by applicant.
5. Trip generation is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 3.

## Assumptions and Facts - Scenario A

The following assumptions and facts are applicable to the analysis for Scenario A:
A1. The trip distribution (i.e., trip length), used for the calculation of VMT and trip generation was developed based on the assumption that all patients travel to the closest facility that provides the medical services they require. Although some individuals may select a less optimal choice based on personal preference, the probability of this would likely be no different under any Scenario A condition (or Scenario B condition). Given this and the fact that there is not a sufficient basis or data to undertake such analysis, the TIOA reflects the assumption that the
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most optimal medical facility location, based on distance, is always selected by a Healthcare Consumer. It is further assumed that existing facilities of both the Proposed Tenant and Other Healthcare Systems can accommodate the demand for medical services based on this approach to trip distribution.

A2. In order to account for the effect of the Project on Healthcare Consumers, VMT from Members and employees of existing healthcare facilities operated by the Proposed Tenant inside and outside of the County.
A3. The facilities selected for this analysis are based on market data ${ }^{21}$ (as further described in Assumption \#8) that tracked the number of visits by service required at facilities operated by the Proposed Tenant. This includes six facilities located outside of the County and six facilities, including the Project, located within the County.

A4. Based on information provided by the Proposed Tenant, approximately 29percent of current Member trips are estimated to be served by facilities located outside of the County currently, mostly seeking services that the Proposed Tenant currently does not provide within the County. Based on information provided by the Proposed Tenant, when the Project becomes operational, it is assumed that trips to facilities outside of the County will be reduced to about 2.4percent of the total Member trips. These trips would be for highly specialized services that are not expected to be available at the Project, such as pediatric neurology or spine surgery. With the Project, it is assumed that other specialized services required by Members will be provided by the Project.

A5. Based on data provided by the Proposed Tenant, it is understood that on average, the Project will employ 300 individuals per day. For the purposes of this VMT analysis, only employee commute trips were accounted for as a part of the VMT analysis. This equates to 600 total Project trips (i.e., 2 times 300 one-way trips), as all employee trips for purposes of this analysis were conservatively assumed to be single occupancy trips.

A6. Employee trip generation for the Project is based on the proportion of employees (300 total) that matches the allocation of Healthcare Consumers to each healthcare facility, regardless of system. The origin of employees is based on the existing Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) data.

A7. Other trips, such as deliveries, were assumed to be minor in number and are adequately represented in terms of VMT by a Healthcare Consumer and/or employee trips included the analysis (the full trip generation, as used for this analysis, accounts for all Project trips). It is assumed that other elements of the analysis are a reasonable proxy for minor differences in any trip lengths.
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A8. This TIOA VMT analysis separates Member trips among twenty-eight different services based on market data provided by the Applicant. This data provided is based on a market analysis produced by Pivotal Analytics for specific medical services and is summarized in Table T-2, below. Pivotal Analytics ${ }^{22}$ provided Kimley-Horn with industry standard data that shows Healthcare Consumer information for the County and facilities located outside of the County operated by the Proposed Tenant used by Members located within the County. Pivotal Analytics is based on insurance claims data and together with the market data provided by the Proposed Tenant provides a comprehensive analysis of all medical services provided to residents of the County, including those of the Proposed Tenants and Healthcare Consumers served by other healthcare systems. The data provides current and future healthcare demand for services by service line using insurance claims information provided by healthcare insurance companies and demographic information provided by Geolytics. ${ }^{23}$ Additional data detail is provided in Appendix $\mathbf{R}$.

A9. The Proposed Tenant's membership forecasts for its Santa Cruz County MOBs for 2020 through 2040 were used as the basis for determining what percentage of trips were distributed amongst Members. This data is provided in Appendix S.
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Table T-2 - Population Demand for Medical Services

| Service | Distribution of Total Visits | Total Visits |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cardiology - Outpatient | 2.80\% | 16,074 |
| Cosmetic Procedures - Outpatient | 0.22\% | 1,263 |
| Dermatology - Outpatient | 2.80\% | 16,098 |
| Endocrinology - Outpatient | 0.29\% | 1,638 |
| ENT - Outpatient | 1.22\% | 6,980 |
| Evaluation and Management - Outpatient | 49.80\% | 286,044 |
| Gastroenterology - Outpatient | 1.36\% | 7,784 |
| General Surgery - Outpatient | 0.50\% | 2,845 |
| Gynecology \& Obstetrics | 1.84\% | 10,544 |
| Lab - Outpatient | 4.08\% | 23,410 |
| Miscellaneous Services - Outpatient | 5.61\% | 32,206 |
| Nephrology - Outpatient | 0.25\% | 1,432 |
| Neurology - Outpatient | 0.62\% | 3,567 |
| Neurosurgery - Outpatient | 0.06\% | 316 |
| Oncology - Outpatient | 0.73\% | 4,183 |
| Ophthalmology - Outpatient | 2.58\% | 14,846 |
| Orthopedics - Outpatient | 1.81\% | 10,389 |
| Pain Management - Outpatient | 0.71\% | 4,106 |
| Physical Therapy/Rehabilitation - Outpatient | 3.09\% | 17,769 |
| Podiatry - Outpatient | 0.34\% | 1,936 |
| Psychiatry - Outpatient | 4.00\% | 22,970 |
| Pulmonology - Outpatient | 0.39\% | 2,259 |
| Radiology - Outpatient | 10.65\% | 61,187 |
| Spine - Outpatient | 0.09\% | 490 |
| Thoracic Surgery - Outpatient | 0.01\% | 69 |
| Trauma - Outpatient | 2.80\% | 16,105 |
| Urology - Outpatient | 1.05\% | 6,055 |
| Vascular - Outpatient | 0.32\% | 1,843 |
|  | 100\% | 574,408 |

## Scenario A Analysis

As described above, Scenario A evaluates the effect of the Project on the Proposed Tenant's Members. To determine the impact of the addition of the Project on the total VMT for the Proposed Tenant's Members, the distance traveled by each Member to the facility that provides the service required was determined for both Existing and 2040 Conditions. The location of each of the Proposed Tenant's facilities can be seen in Figure F-4 below. This distance was then multiplied by the number of trips the Proposed Tenant's Members and employees in Santa Cruz County take in an average day to each of the Proposed Tenant's facilities. This was completed both for Project an No Project conditions.

The number of trips analyzed under Scenario A represents both the estimated current trip generation of existing facilities and the full utilization of the Project facility as determined based on the daily trip generation rate for Clinics (the same rate as used in the TIOA) included in the Trip Generation Manual, $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). Based on information provided by the Applicant it is understood that for the No Project scenario, nearly 29-percent of Member trips include facilities outside of the County, while only 2.4-percent of member trips include facilities outside of the County in the Plus Project scenario. Once the
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number of daily trips was determined for all facilities, the trips were distributed to the Member and corresponding employee locations throughout the County based on an optimized solution which considers both the availability of a service for a given facility as well as the proximity of that facility to a Member. Member locations are based on the Existing and 2040 population locations provided by the Santa Cruz County Travel Demand Model (SCC TDM), while the employee locations are based on Census employment data. The resultant trips were then multiplied by the distance of the shortest travel time to each facility to determine VMT in the aggregate for each scenario. A more detailed explanation of this methodology is provided in Appendix Z.

Figure F-4 - Proposed Tenant Facility Locations


## Scenario A Results

The VMT results for Healthcare Consumers under Scenario A are summarized below in Table T-3. For both Scenario A. 2 (Existing Plus Project) and Scenario A. 42040 (2040 Plus Project) conditions, the Project results in a net reduction of more than 44,000 VMT per day. The table includes VMT for both Member and employee trips. The results reflect that with the addition of the Project, there is a reduction in VMT, primarily due to the reduction in trips to facilities outside of the County as compared to the No Project scenarios.
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Table T-3 - Total Vehicle Miles Traveled by Scenario

| Analysis A |  | Patient Vehicle Miles <br> Traveled (VMT) | Employee Vehicle Miles <br> Traveled (VMT) | Combined <br> Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Existing | A1: Existing No Project | 97,275 | 24,567 | 121,843 |
|  | A2: Existing Plus Project | 53,300 | 24,126 | 77,426 |
|  | Net Reduction in VMT | $-43,975$ | -441 | $-44,416$ |
| $2 \mathbf{2 0 4 0}$ | A3: 2040 No Project | 96,601 | 24,567 | 121,168 |
|  | A4: 2040 Plus Project | 51,736 | 24,126 | 75,862 |
|  | Net Reduction in VMT | $-44,864$ | -441 | $-45,306$ |

## SCENARIO B ANALYSIS

As noted above, Scenario B considers a conservative approach to defining the No Project condition. Scenario B is predicated on a set of circumstances where a significant catalyst for growth results from patients of Other Healthcare Systems transferring to the Proposed Tenant's system as new Members once the Project is constructed (i.e., Transferee Members) to receive healthcare services at the Project. Accordingly, in the No Project condition for Scenario B (B1), VMT associated with these Transferee Members is allocated to Other Healthcare Systems in the Project condition for Scenario B (B2), VMT associated with these Transferee Members is allocated to the Project instead because they have become Healthcare Consumers that receive healthcare services at the Project. ${ }^{24}$ Given that a variety of considerations influence the growth of medical networks, including employer/employee selection, cost, and personal preferences, the transfer of patients from Other Healthcare Systems to become Transferee Members of the Proposed Tenant contemplated in this Scenario B likely represents the most conservative analysis.

B1: Cumulative No Project: 2040 VMT is evaluated based on a Healthcare Consumer distribution that represents forecasted 2040 household locations. In this scenario, Member trips are adjusted to account for Existing Members and Population Growth Members (i.e., new Members projected based on projected population growth). Most Existing Members and Population Growth Members receive care at one of the Proposed Tenant's facilities in the County, but almost 29-percent of Existing Member and Population Growth Member trips travel out of the County to receive medical services, since those specialized services are not offered at existing facilities in the County. There are no new employees (because there is no Project) so employee VMT is based on existing facility locations. Under this Scenario B1, Transferee Members remain with the Other Healthcare System in which they are assumed to belong and their VMT contribution is estimated based on their use of that system.
B2: Cumulative Plus Project: Under this condition, Transferee Members have transferred to the Proposed Tenant's membership base and the Project and are reflected in the Project's VMT, rather than in VMT attributable to the Other Healthcare Providers. VMT for Existing Members and Population Growth Members is determined based on the assumption that

[^14]
## Kimley»)Horn

care is received at the Project or at one of the Proposed Tenant's facilities in the County. In this scenario, most Members receive specialized services at the Project and very few continue to travel out of the County for specific and highly specialized services that will not be provided at the Project. VMT associated with employees is also included. From a mathematical standpoint, this Scenario B2 is identical to Scenario A: Plus Project 2040 and has the same resultant VMT.

## Methodology for Scenario B

The methodology described above for estimating VMT for Scenario A, including with respect to Project trip generation, also applies to the Scenario $B$ analysis. Like Scenario $A$, the Scenario $B$ analysis is also based on the accommodation of 6,106 Project trips (representing the same number of Members and employees). As such, the Scenario B analysis only considers the circumstances of Transferee Members and Population Growth Members that are forecasted to join the Proposed Tenant's network, as well as Members currently within the Proposed Tenant's network residing within the County. This basis maintains an "apples-to-apples" comparison basis for the two scenarios as required by SB $743 .{ }^{25}$

As noted with respect to Scenario A, this TIOA VMT analysis utilizes a trip generation rate based on the ITE Trip Generation Manual that overstates the VMT of the Project by 37 -percent, as compared to traffic counts collected from area MOBs (see Table T-4). This overly conservative ITE rate likely results in a substantial decrease (37-percent) for Transferee Members' VMT under Scenario B.2's (Cumulative Plus Project) condition as compared to Scenario B. 1 Cumulative No Project condition. For purposes of providing the most conservative analysis possible as part of this TIOA, however, this likely trip reduction is not considered in this report's VMT analysis, which instead is based on ITE trip generation rates instead.

## Assumptions and Facts - Scenario B

The assumptions and facts that are specific to Scenario B are provided below:
B1. All of the Assumptions and Facts applicable to Scenario A also apply to Scenario $B$ and are incorporated herein by reference, except Assumptions Number 2 (VMT sources) and 9 (membership forecasts) provided in Scenario A are modified as provided below.

B2. In order to account for the effect of the Project on Healthcare Consumers, VMT from a variety sources are considered, including those for Existing Members, Population Growth Members, Transferee Members, and healthcare facilities in the County. As such, VMT estimates for Scenario B presented for Cumulative No Project and Cumulative plus Project conditions include VMT to existing healthcare facilities in the County and to the Project. (This is a modification for

[^15]
## Kimley»)Horn

Scenario A, Assumption No. 2 in order to provide for the consideration of Transferee Members and Population Growth Members.)
B3. The Proposed Tenant's Membership forecasts for its in-County MOBs for 2020 through 2040 was used as the basis for determining what percentage of trips were distributed across each of the three sources of Members (i.e., Existing Members, Population Growth Members or Transferee Members). These data are provided in Appendix T. This is a modification for Scenario A, Assumption No. 9 modified for Scenario B in order to provide for the consideration of Existing Members, Population Growth Members and Transferee Members.

B4. The Proposed Tenant's Member growth under Cumulative conditions (Population Growth Members) is based on the population growth percentage between 2019 and 2040, as provided for in the SCC TDM.

B5. Transferee Members that are Healthcare Consumers of Other Healthcare Systems under the Cumulative No Project condition have 33 facilities to choose from, 15 for Dignity Health ("Healthcare System A") and 18 for Sutter Health ("Healthcare System B"). The location for all facilities of the Other Healthcare Systems are summarized in Table T-4 and Figure 5.
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Table T-4 - Location of Competing Other Healthcare Provider Facilities

| Location Letter | Name | Group | Street | City |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | Dignity Health Medical Group | Dignity Health | 1066 South Green Valley Road | Watsonville |
| B | Dignity Health Medical Group | Dignity Health | 575 Auto Center Dr | Watsonville |
| C | Dominican 1595 Center | Dignity Health | 1595 Soquel Drive | Santa Cruz |
| D | Dominican Family Practice | Dignity Health | 4700 Soquel Dr | Soquel |
| E | Dominican Family Practice - Aptos | Dignity Health | 9515 Soquel Drive | Aptos |
| F | Dominican Family Practice - Boulder Creek | Dignity Health | 13350 Big Basin Way | Boulder Creek |
| G | Dominican Family Practice - Capitola | Dignity Health | 528 Capitola Ave | Capitola |
| H | Dominican Family Practice - Dominican Way | Dignity Health | 1779 Dominican Way | Santa Cruz |
| 1 | Dominican Family Practice - Westside | Dignity Health | 2018 Mission Street | Santa Cruz |
| J | Dominican Hospital | Dignity Health | 1555 Soquel Drive | Santa Cruz |
| K | Dominican Obstretrics \& Gynecology | Dignity Health | 1505 Soquel Drive | Santa Cruz |
| L | Dominican Pediatrics \& Urgent Care | Dignity Health | 1820 41st Ave | Capitola |
| M | Dominican Urology | Dignity Health | 1667 Dominican Way | Santa Cruz |
| N | Frederick St | Dignity Health | 700 Frederick Street | Santa Cruz |
| 0 | Primary Care in your Neighborhood | Dignity Health | 223 Mt. Hermon Road | Scotts Valley |
| P | Aptos Center | Sutter | 7600 Old Dominion Court | Aptos |
| Q | Aptos Walk-In Care | Sutter | 26 Rancho Del Mar | Aptos |
| R | Capitola Center Lab | Sutter | 815 Bay Ave | Capitola |
| S | Commercial Crossing Center | Sutter | 2850 Commercial Crossing | Santa Cruz |
| T | Freedom PAMF | Sutter | 160 Green Valley Road | Freedom |
| U | Santa Cruz Allergy | Sutter | 3035 North Main Street | Soquel |
| V | Santa Cruz Cardiothoracic Surgery | Sutter | 1575 Soquel Drive | Santa Cruz |
| W | Santa Cruz Center | Sutter | 2025 Soquel Ave | Santa Cruz |
| X | Santa Cruz Chanticleer Center (2907) | Sutter | 2907 Chanticleer Ave | Santa Cruz |
| Y | Santa Cruz Chanticleer Center (2911) | Sutter | 2911 Chanticleer Ave | Santa Cruz |
| Z | Santa Cruz Gastroenterology | Sutter | 1662 Dominican Way | Santa Cruz |
| AA | Santa Cruz Neurology | Sutter | 1661 Soquel Drive | Santa Cruz |
| $A B$ | Santa Cruz Physical Therapy | Sutter | 1529 Seabright Ave | Santa Cruz |
| AC | Scotts Valley Center | Sutter | 4663 Scotts Valley Drive | Scotts Valley |
| AD | Scotts Valley El Rancho Drive Center | Sutter | 2980 El Rancho Drive | Santa Cruz |
| AE | Soquel Center | Sutter | 2950 Research Park Drive | Santa Cruz |
| AF | Watsonville PAMF | Sutter | 550 S Green Valley Rd | Watsonville |
| AG | Westside Center | Sutter | 1301 Mission Street | Santa Cruz |
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Figure F-5 - Other Healthcare Provider Facility Locations


## Scenario B Analysis

Generally, Scenario B follows the same analytical techniques outlined under the Scenario A analysis above. The primary differences between the two scenario analyses is the analysis of the prior trip patterns of Transferee Members under the Cumulative No Project condition (when they are participants in Other Healthcare Systems) versus their trip patterns under the Cumulative Plus Project condition (after they become Members that receive health care at the Project).

The number of Existing Members in 2020 and the Proposed Tenant's projected membership in 2040 for Santa Cruz County, as provided by the Proposed Tenant, was used as the basis for distributing Members across each of the three member sources: Existing Members, Population Growth Members, and Transferee Members. The 2020 Membership is estimated to be 35,071, while the 2040 Membership is projected to be 87,729 , for a 20 -year growth of 52,658 Members as shown in Appendix S. The SCC TDM was used as the basis to determine the population growth over the same period. It was determined that the population would grow by approximately 12.5 percent. As with Scenario A, the SCC TDM population distribution is the basis for the determination of Healthcare Consumer origins.

To determine Population Growth Members, the 2020 membership was multiplied by the population growth percentage for the County, resulting in a Membership growth of 4,394. The remaining growth of 48,264 is assumed to be the result of Transferee Members. As a result, the Cumulative Plus Project conditions assume that Membership is made up of 40-percent Existing Members, 5-percent Population Growth Members, and 55-percent Transferee Members as
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shown in Appendix T. Under the Scenario B. 1 Cumulative No Project conditions, the 55-percent of Transferee Member are analyzed as participants in Other Healthcare Systems.

As with Scenario A, the Applicant-provided market data were the basis of identifying the distribution of Member visits by service type and by facility for Scenario B1 and Scenario B2. Similarly, the data shows that almost 29-percent of Existing Members and Population Growth Members would travel outside the County for specialized services under the Scenario B. 1 Cumulative No Project Condition and almost 2.4-percent of total Member trips would continue to travel outside the County under the Scenario B. 2 Cumulative Plus Project condition for the purposes of obtaining highly specialized services that are not expected to be provided by the Project.

Figure F-6 displays the locations of Existing Members and Population Growth Members by TAZs (denoted as grey-lined areas defined in the travel demand model for land use forecasting) with each dot representing 25 Members. Figure F-7 displays the locations of Transferee Members that would otherwise receive care from Other Healthcare Providers by TAZ in density groupings of 25 Members. Appendix $\mathbf{R}$ includes information related to the basis of the assumption for continued use of the San Jose facility.

VMT for the Scenario B. 1 Cumulative No Project and the Scenario B. 2 Cumulative Plus Project condition was calculated in the same manner as Scenario A (see Appendix Z for more details). The primary difference being that the Cumulative No Project condition considers the VMT of Transferee Members as it relates to Other Healthcare Systems. Employees were also handled consistently with Scenario A.

Figure F-6 - Existing and Population Growth Member Locations for the Proposed Tenant
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Figure F-7 - Other Healthcare System Patient Locations


## Scenario B Results

The VMT results for Healthcare Consumers under Scenario B are summarized in Table T-5. For Scenario B. 2 (Cumulative Plus Project) conditions, the Project results in a net reduction of more than 20,000 VMT per day. The table includes the effect of Transferee Members leaving Other Healthcare Providers to become new Proposed Tenant Members receiving care at the Project instead. VMT was calculated for both Member trips and employee trips. The results reflect that with the addition of the Project in the Scenario B. 2 (Cumulative Plus Project) condition, there is a reduction in VMT primarily due to trips outside the County being significantly reduced as compared to the B. 1 (Cumulative No Project scenario).
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Table T-5 - Total Vehicle Miles Traveled by Medical Facility and Service Type

| Analysis B | Combined <br> Total |
| :---: | :---: |
| Patient Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) |  |
| B1: Cumulative No Project | $\mathbf{7 0 , 9 0 6}$ |
| B2: Cumulative Plus Project | 51,736 |
| Net Reduction in VMT |  |
| Employee Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) |  |
| B1: Cumulative No Project | $\mathbf{2 5 , 2 7 9}$ |
| B2: Cumulative Plus Project | $\mathbf{2 4 , 1 2 6}$ |
| Net Reduction in VMT |  |
| Patient + Employee Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) |  |
| B1: Cumulative No Project |  |
| B2: Cumulative Plus Project | $\mathbf{9 6 , 1 8 4}$ |
| Net Reduction in VMT |  |

With the addition of the Project, the Healthcare Consumers allocated to Healthcare System $A$ and Healthcare System $B$ become Transferee Members and their trips are diverted from the Other Healthcare Systems to the Project. VMT associated with Healthcare Consumers that currently are, and that after construction of the Project will continue to be patients of the Healthcare System A or Healthcare System B are not reflected in this Table.

## Conclusion

Conclusion: As shown in Table T-6 below, under all conditions for the Scenario A and Scenario B analyses, the Project results in a net VMT reduction. In Scenario A, which focuses on VMT associated with Members who receive services at the Proposed Tenant's existing facilities should the Project not be constructed, the Project results in reduction of 44,416 VMT in the Scenario A. 2 (Existing Plus Project) condition and a reduction of 35,306 VMT in the Scenario A. 4 ( 2040 Plus Project) condition as shown in Table T-3. In Scenario B, which provides a more conservative analysis that considers the VMT associated with Existing, Population Growth and Transferee Members, the Project results in a reduction of 20,322 VMT in the Scenario B. 2 (Cumulative Plus Project) condition as shown in Table T-5. In both Scenario A and Scenario B, this ultimate reduction in VMT with the Project is primarily due to the reduction in the number of trips traveling outside the County for specialized services since the majority of those services are provided by the Project.
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Table T-6 - Total Vehicle Miles Traveled by Scenario

| Analysis Scenario | Combined <br> Total |
| :---: | :---: |
| Patient + Employee Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) |  |
| A1: Existing No Project | $\mathbf{1 2 1 , 8 4 3}$ |
| A2: Existing Plus Project | $\mathbf{7 7 , 4 2 6}$ |
| Net Reduction in VMT | $-\mathbf{4 4 , 4 1 6}$ |
| A3: 2040 No Project | $\mathbf{1 2 1 , 1 6 8}$ |
| A4: 2040 Plus Project | $\mathbf{7 5 , 8 6 2}$ |
| Net Reduction in VMT | $-45,306$ |
| B1: Cumulative No Project | $\mathbf{9 6 , 1 8 4}$ |
| B2: Cumulative Plus Project | $\mathbf{7 5 , 8 6 2}$ |
| Net Reduction in VMT | $\mathbf{- 2 0 , 3 2 2}$ |

Based on the results of this TIOA analysis, the Project would not result in a net increase in VMT and, accordingly, would not have a significant transportation impact under CEQA.
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## 3. TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT (NON-CEQA ANALYSIS)

Transportation Demand Management ("TDM") measures are programs that can be implemented to reduce single occupancy vehicle ("SOV") travel to and from homes or places of work by offering travelers mode choice options. TDM options are intended to reduce roadway congestion and provide more choices for how to travel, both of which will assist in promoting business, providing access to opportunity, and improving the quality of life across the state. The County recognizes the value of TDM measures in its General Plan ${ }^{26}$ and Trip Reduction Ordinance. ${ }^{27}$

The Project has no significant transportation impacts under CEQA (as assessed by VMT), and therefore is not legally required to provide or incorporate TDM measures to mitigate such impacts. Nonetheless, the Project will voluntarily implement TDM measures to reduce reliance on SOVs and to assist in achieving state and local GHG reduction commitments, preserving the environment, improving health and safety and reducing congestion on local streets and highways. The trip generation assumptions used in this TIOA to analyze the Project's impacts on County roadways were not discounted to account for the implementation of TDM.

The Project proposes a targeted TDM strategy focusing on separate measures for employees and Members, as described in detail below.

## Employee-Focused TDM Measures

The Project proposes to provide the following TDM benefits to employees:

- Bike Share Program
- Commute Management Platform and Rideshare Support
- Emergency Ride Home Program
- TDM Coordinator
- Safe, Well-Lit, and Accessible Pedestrian/Bicycle Facilities along Soquel Avenue

Bike Share Program: To encourage employees to utilize transportation mode alternatives to SOVs, the Project proposes to fund the implementation of a Bike Share Program when available in the County. The program might include subsidized or discounted monthly memberships or other incentives to encourage bike commuting by employees. In addition to the bike share service, employees can also ride their own bikes to work, or take their own bike as a "first-mile, last-mile" service and complete the main trip on the METRO bus, placing their bike on a bus bike rack. An employee's trip comprises the entire journey from origin to destination. Employees may use a number of modes (types) of transport to complete the journey - they may walk, drive, ride a bicycle, - in many cases - combine a number of these modes. The METRO bus service would form the core of the trip, but they would complete the first and last portion on their own. For example, they must first bike to a bus stop, then take
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the bus, disembark at a stop closest to the Project site, then finish their trip on their bike. This is referred to as the first and last mile of the employee trip.

The Project will also install 4,200 feet of Class II bike lanes along Soquel Avenue to facilitate safe routes of travel to the Project site by bicycle. The Project will provide a designated area close to the front door for bikes to be parked. Though not specifically targeted to Members, bike share services will also be available when implemented by the County to Members wishing to travel to the Project from serviceable bike stations.

Commute Management Platform and Rideshare Support: The County has launched the Ride Amigos commute management platform for people that work in the County. Ride Amigos is a web-based service that includes ride matching and engagement through the gamification ${ }^{28}$ of SOV alternatives. This type of platform engages users and provides up-to-date commuting data to TDM administrators. Employees in the County can sign up to participate. The service will connect drivers with riders, allowing employees the opportunity to carpool together or with other commuters in the Santa Cruz area. Participants may also use the Ride Amigos platform to log SOV alternatives, such as carpool, bicycle trips and transit trips. The Proposed Tenant's TDM coordinator would work with the County to engage employees on the platform to encourage the use of alternative SOV modes through the platform's gamification functions. This measure would be implemented at no cost to employees.

To encourage ridesharing, the Project will have designated preferred parking for ride-share participants and be designed to provide adequate passenger loading/unloading and waiting areas for ride-share vehicles.

Emergency Ride Home Program: The Emergency Ride Home Program is a service that the Applicant (or Proposed Tenant) will register for and fund. Employees that commute to work using SOV alternatives will be able to take advantage of a free ride home in emergency situations should they be unable to take their alternative mode of travel home. This service would be, and is typically, capped at a predetermined maximum number of rides per period (such as month, quarter, or year) for each employee. Ecology Action is currently providing these services in the County. It is anticipated that the Proposed Tenant will subscribe to the organization, but the Proposed Tenant may also provide funding to its employees for taxi or Uber/Lyft emergency trips instead.

TDM Coordinator and Marketing Materials: The Proposed Tenant currently has TDM program Coordinators at its other facilities and provides marketing/informational materials to its employees at these locations. The TDM Coordinators encourage employees to sign up and utilize the available TDM resources and benefits provided by the Proposed Tenant. TDM Coordinators also measure and monitor program progress. Where applicable, they administer employee commute surveys. The Proposed Tenant (or other Project operator) will extend these services to the Project site to encourage and educate employees about the availability
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of alternative modes of commute. The TDM Coordinator will also work closely with the County to engage employees through the County commute management platform.

Safe, Well-Lit, and Accessible Pedestrian/Bicycle Facilities: The Project proposes to construct off-site pedestrian and bike facility improvements along Soquel Avenue, as discussed in detail in the Pedestrian, Bicycle and Transit Mobility Chapter (Chapter 4) of this TIOA. These active transportation improvements will be funded by the Project and are anticipated to provide substantial benefits and connectivity to employees that wish to travel to/from the Project on foot, from transit facilities or by bike. These improvements will enhance the local sidewalk and bicycle network and address existing pedestrian/bicycle deficiencies in the County.

Based on the data sources identified in Table T-7, it is anticipated that the TDM measures mentioned above and shown in detail in Table T-7 would reduce Project employee trip generation by approximately 15.5 percent.

## Member-Focused TDM Measures

In addition to the above TDM measures targeted at employees, the Project will also provide the following TDM measures intended to benefit Members:

- Virtual Care Strategy
- Safe, Well-Lit, and Accessible Pedestrian/Bicycle Facilities

Virtual Care Strategy: The Proposed Tenant allows Members the opportunity to conduct appointments with their medical practitioners virtually over the internet. This highly successful program is already in use and the ability to conduct appointments virtually removes the need for many Members to travel to and from physical medical offices. Particularly with the recent implications of COVID-19, virtual doctor's appointments have become the norm, and this manner of communication is anticipated to remain heavily utilized into the future, especially for more routine appointments. The Proposed Tenant anticipates extending this virtual care service to Members wishing to meet with medical practitioners based at the Project site. A target of 20 percent of all patient visits being accessed through the virtual care program is being established by the Applicant.
Safe, Well-Lit, and Accessible Pedestrian/Bicycle Facilities: The off-site pedestrian and bike facility improvements that will be funded by the Project along Soquel Avenue, and discussed as part of the employee TDM improvements above, will also provide a benefit to Members. Such active transportation improvements are anticipated to provide real benefits and connectivity to Members and visitors that wish to travel to/from the site on foot or by bike. These improvements will also improve the local sidewalk and bicycle network and address existing pedestrian/bicycle deficiencies in the County. The TDM trip reduction for Members could be as high as 0.5 percent for the off-site pedestrian and bike facility improvements, as described in Table T-7.

Fewer numbers of ill or infirm Members are expected to bike or walk to the site to receive care. As discussed further in the Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Transit Mobility Chapter (Chapter 4), Members that are senior citizens or that have temporary or permanent physical, cognitive, or psychiatric disabilities may be eligible to receive free or low cost door-to-door transportation
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to the Project via the METRO-operated ParaCruz service or the Lift Line program operated by Community Bridges. To be as conservative as possible, the Project does not assume any reduction in SOV use associated with these programs and therefore does not account for this as a Project TDM measure.

Based on data sources identified in Table T-7, it is anticipated that the above TDM measures would reduce Member trip generation by approximately 20.5 percent.

## Kimley»Horn

## Table T-7 - TDM Measure Summary

| Transportation Demand Management Measure | Description | TDM Type | Estimated Trip Reduction (\%) | Trip Reduction Source |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Employees Only |  |  |  |  |
| Bike Share Program | Bicycle share programs provide convenient rental bicycles to users. This allows urban residents and visitors to bicycle without needing to purchase, store and maintain a bike. | Incentive | 4\% | Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures, California Air Pollution Control Officers Association, August 2010. |
| Commute Management Platform (Ride Amigos or similar service) and Rideshare Support | Increases vehicle occupancy by providing ride-share matching services, designating preferred parking for ride-share participants, designing adequate passenger loading/unloading and waiting areas for ride-share vehicles, and providing a website or message board to connect riders and coordinate rides. | Incentive | 2.5\% | This service is already available to employees in the County and would only be a continuation/extension to employees at the Project. |
| Emergency Ride Home Program (ERH) | Provides an occasional subsidized ride to commuters who use alternative modes and eliminates a common constraint to the use of alternative modes. Guaranteed ride home for people if they need to go home in the middle of the day due to an emergency or stay late and need a ride at a time when transit service is not available. ERH programs may use taxies, company vehicles or rental cars. | Incentive | 3\% | Guaranteed Ride Home Programs: A Study of Program Characteristics, Utilization, and Cost by William B. Menczer (Federal Transit Administration); <br> Guaranteed Ride Home Program Evaluation 2013 by Alameda CTC. |
| On-site TDM Program Coordinator and TDM marketing materials | A TDM coordinator to monitor overall program progress, marketing and public outreach to promote awareness of TDM program. | Infrastructure | 4\% | Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures, California Air Pollution Control Officers Association, August 2010. |
| Safe, well-lit, and accessible pedestrian/bicycle facilities | Enhance the route for employees walking or bicycling to transit (typically off-site). Implements pedestrian network improvements throughout and around the Project site that encourages people to walk. | Infrastructure | 2\% | Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures, California Air Pollution Control Officers Association, August 2010. |
| Estimated Total Trip Reduction for Employees Only |  |  | 15.5\% |  |
| Members Only |  |  |  |  |
| Virtual Care Strategy | Resources to allow Members to access healthcare services or communicate with healthcare staff through online or off-site programs. | Infrastructure | 20\% | Based on the Proposed Tenant's ongoing program results See Appendix W. |
| Safe, well-lit, and accessible pedestrian/bicycle facilities | Enhance the route for Members walking or bicycling to transit (typically off-site). Implements pedestrian network improvements throughout and around the Project site that encourages people to walk. | Infrastructure | 0.5\% | Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures, California Air Pollution Control Officers Association, August 2010. |
| Estimated Total Trip Reduction for Members Only |  |  | 20.5\% |  |
| Notes: <br> 1. An Incentive is a measure that would entice a candidate employee or patient to make a mode shift choice and reduce their Single SOV trips. <br> 2. Infrastructure type is a physical feature that makes it more enticing for an employee or patient to make a mode choice from SOV to an alternative mode. <br> 3. TDM reduction percentages are consistent with the County's most recent VMT reduction strategies. The County TDM Policy is Attached in Appendix Y. |  |  |  |  |
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## Other TDM Considerations

Since the Project proposes to voluntarily implement and fund the TDM improvements described above, it is anticipated that trip generation estimates provided in this TIOA and used in the operational LOS analyses are very conservative because it does not incorporate the anticipated TDM measures in the overall analysis. In fact, with implementation of the TDM measures, it is anticipated that the Project will generate fewer trips than as analyzed in this TIOA, roughly on the order of 1165 Daily trips. This estimate is based on 300 employees working at the Project making trips during the AM and PM peak hours. The remainder of the daily 6,106 trips are made by Members and project support services (i.e. deliveries, pickups and drop-offs) of which $5 \%$ of the project support service trips are excluded from the TDM trip calculations shown in Table T-8.

Table T-8 - TDM Trip Calculations

| TDM Trip Calculations | Daily trips | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{AM} \\ & \text { trips } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PM } \\ & \text { trips } \end{aligned}$ | \% TDM | Non-peak hour trips | AM trips | PM trips |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | TDM Trips |  |  |
| Project Trip Generation | 6106 | 590 | 525 |  |  |  |  |
| Employee Trips | 600 | 300 | 300 | 15.50\% | 93 | 47 | 47 |
| Member and Project Support Service Trips | 5506 | 290 | 225 |  |  |  |  |
| Project Support Service Trip Reduction (5\%) | -275 | -15 | -11 |  |  |  |  |
| Net Member Trips | 5231 | 275 | 214 | 20.50\% | 1072 | 56 | 44 |
| Total TDM Trips |  |  |  |  | 1165 | 103 | 91 |

Moreover, trip generation rates used in this TIOA are based on ITE assumptions. As further described in Section 6 of this report, traffic data was collected at comparable facilities at the County's request. Those traffic counts indicate that ITE assumptions overstate actual trip generation by 23 percent to 52 percent. Based on implementation of TDM and the potential overestimation of trips utilizing ITE assumptions, it is likely that operational deficiencies to the local transportation will be substantially less than what is published in this TIOA.

Given the above, once the Project is constructed and fully operational, it is expected that the Project will monitor actual trip generation through a formalized driveway traffic count program. These counts would be collected at regular intervals, at a frequency to be mutually agreed upon with the County, and would be used to compare against the trip generation estimates published in this study, which are based on ITE data and which do not incorporate or assume TDM reductions. If future driveway counts demonstrate that the Project generates fewer trips than were assumed for the purposes of calculating TIA fees, then the Applicant / Proposed Tenant may receive a refund for the corresponding overpayment.

In addition, it is expected that an anonymous employee commute survey would be conducted annually for as long as the TDM program is implemented in order to assess the employee-focused measures and for internal planning purposes. A summary report of information collected from the annual survey could be provided to the County upon request.
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## 4. TRANSIT, BICYCLE, AND TRANSIT MOBILITY (NON-CEQA ANALYSIS)

The Project was evaluated to determine if it would adversely affect adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks) or generate pedestrian, bicycle, or transit travel demand that would not be accommodated by transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities and plans. The County's General Plan contains several policies related to transit, bicycle and transit mobility, including the following:

## Pedestrian-Oriented Policies:

Policy 3.10.3 Require adequate lighting for pedestrian and transit patron's movement where appropriate.

Policy 3.10.4 Require dedication and construction of walkways for through pedestrian traffic and internal pedestrian circulation in new developments where appropriate.

Policy 3.10.7 Provide for pedestrian movement in the design of parking areas.
Policy 3.10.8 Incorporate ADA standards in design of new projects and reconstruction where applicable. Prohibit landscaping and all other obstacles, such as telephone poles and fire hydrants, which would prevent pedestrian movement within this walkway. Require the use of materials which will provide an all-weather surface for walking.

Policy 3.10.10 All new development shall incorporate ADA standards into the design, where applicable.

## Bicycle-Oriented Policies:

Policy 3.8.1 Plan a bikeway network to integrate with other modes of transportation (train or transit stations and Park and Ride lots, etc.) in order to encourage and support the use of bicycling and reduce the use of motor vehicles.

Policy 3.8.4 Encourage the provision of bicycle racks, showers, lockers and other storage facilities at destinations, where practical and economically feasible, when reviewing discretionary permits for major activity centers and employer sites.

Policy 3.9.1 Design and construction regional bikeways in accordance with County and Caltrans standards in order to maximize safety and minimize potential conflicts with pedestrians and motor vehicles.

Policy 3.9.2 Construct and mark bicycle routes in conformance with state standards. Limit the number of driveways where feasible in new developments to reduce the potential for automobilebicycle conflicts.

Policy 3.9.3 Limit on-street parking where the need for a clear bike lane exists. Strip all arterials for bike lanes and strictly enforce parking limitations.
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## Project Transportation Improvements

## Project Site Access and Circulation

The Project site will be accessed from Soquel Avenue. The Project will construct one main signalized driveway entrance for employees and Members, which will provide access to the patient loading and unloading area, as well as the proposed parking garage. The main driveway will include a protected westbound left-turn pocket and eastbound right-turn pocket into the Project site from Soquel Avenue, as well as northbound left- and right-turn lanes exiting the Project site. A peak hour signal warrant for the main driveway indicates that a signal is warranted per the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices ("CAMUTCD") guidelines and the peak hour warrant analysis worksheet is included in Appendix J. Note that roundabouts require more right of way than signals and a roundabout at this driveway would not be feasible due to Highway 1 right-of-way constraints.

A secondary driveway will also be constructed east of the main entrance for deliveries, pickups, and ambulances. The secondary driveway south leg will be stop controlled and Soquel Avenue traffic will be free flow. The secondary driveway will experience very low and infrequent volumes throughout the day and no signal is anticipated for this location.

As shown in the Project site plan in Figure F-2, the Project will construct a roadway through the center of the site, with the Project parking garage on the west side of the site and the MOB on the east side of the site. The parking garage will have two entrances/exits, one at the northeast end of the garage and one at the southeast end.

A patient drop-off/pick-up zone will be provided near the main building entrance and accessed via the main Project Driveway. The drop-off/pick-up zone will provide capacity for approximately seven vehicles at a time.

For motorists traveling to the site, the north entrance/exit will allow for free right-turn movements into the garage. Traffic wishing to bypass the main garage entrance will use the southbound through lane, which will be stop-controlled, rather than the free southbound right-turn to bypass the main garage entrance and continue south. Motorists bypassing the main garage driveway will then have the opportunity to access the secondary garage driveway or continue around to the drop-off/pick-up zone adjacent to the MOB. For motorists wishing to park in the garage after dropping-off Members in the loading/unloading zone adjacent to the MOB, motorists will have the opportunity to make a northbound right-turn at the north garage entrance/exit at turn into the garage to seek a parking space.

For motorists leaving the site, both garage exits will be stop controlled. The north entrance/exit will allow for the most direct route to leaving the site, by permitting motorists to make an eastbound right turn, which will bring them to the proposed Soquel Avenue \& Project Driveway signal. For travelers exiting from the south garage driveway, motorists would take an eastbound right turn, travel north past the drop-off/pick-up area, stop at the northbound through stop-controlled movement at the north garage entrance/exit, and then continue to the Soquel Avenue \& Project Driveway signal.
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An east/west high visibility pedestrian crosswalk will be provided across the south leg of the north garage entrance/exit. Pedestrians will be able to utilize this proposed crosswalk to access the MOB after parking their vehicles and bikes. The Project will construct wayfinding signage to direct pedestrians to the crosswalk. Conflicting traffic will be stop controlled and pedestrians will have the right of way to cross at this location.

Bikes will access the site via the Soquel Avenue \& Project Driveway signalized intersection, traveling south and parking near the north parking garage entrance/exit, as shown in Figure F-2. After parking their bikes at the designated bike parking area, pedestrians will utilize the previously discussed east/west pedestrian crosswalk to access the Project site.

The Project will also construct ADA-compliant sidewalk along the north Project frontage (south side of Soquel Avenue), which will extend along the south side of Soquel Avenue and fill the existing gap in the County's sidewalk network.

## Off-site Mobility Improvements - Soquel Avenue Two-Way Left-Turn Lane Striping Improvements Project

The Project will implement approximately 3,500 feet of "TWLTL striping (and restriping) along Soquel Avenue from Paul Minnie Avenue to the existing creek crossing (east of Mattison Lane). These striping improvements will include restriping of the existing bike lanes and the addition of new green bike lane striping. Conceptual layouts for these Project improvements are included in Appendix I.

## Pedestrian Mobility

## Existing Conditions

Pedestrian facilities are characterized as sidewalk and crosswalks. No sidewalk currently exists along the Project site frontage along Soquel Avenue. Sidewalk exists just east of the Project site along the south side of Soquel Avenue in front of the Kraft's Body Shop and west of the Project site along the south side of Soquel Avenue in front of the Live Oak Business Park, which includes the County of Santa Cruz Sheriff's Office. Other than the sidewalk gap near the Project described above and sections of Mattison Lane, all local streets within $1 / 2$-mile of the Project site have existing sidewalks. Crosswalks near the Project site include crosswalks at Soquel Avenue \& $17^{\text {th }}$ Avenue, Chanticleer Avenue \& Soquel Avenue, and Rodeo Gulch Road \& Soquel Avenue intersections.

## Planned Improvements

The Project will construct ADA-compliant sidewalks and ramps along its frontage on the south side of Soquel Avenue, which will extend west and east beyond its frontage and connect to existing sidewalk facilities along Soquel Avenue. These improvements will fill a critical gap in the County's pedestrian facility network and will improve pedestrian connectivity along Soquel Avenue. Additionally, internal pedestrian connections will link the Project's entrance with the parking areas, as well as the Soquel Avenue frontage. Adequate lighting will be installed to enhance the safety and usability of new pedestrian paths of travel. Therefore, with construction
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of the Project and sidewalk improvements, employees and Members choosing to walk to the site would not be adversely affected based on pedestrian mobility, accessibility, or safety.

These improvements will further pedestrian travel policies set forth in the General Plan, including to require adequate lighting for pedestrian movement; require dedication and construction of walkways for through pedestrian traffic and internal pedestrian circulation in new development; provide for pedestrian movement in the design of parking areas; and incorporate ADA standards in the design of new projects. (General Plan, Policies 3.10.1-3.10.10.)

## Bicycle Mobility

## Existing Conditions

Existing Class I, II, and III bikeway facilities (within $1 / 2$ mile of the Project site) are discussed below:
Class I facilities are paved bicycle paths that are physically separated from the vehicular travel lane. No Class I facilities exist near the Project site.

Class II facilities, which are striped bike lanes along the street, exist along Soquel Avenue in eastbound and westbound directions, adjacent to the Project site. Class II bike lanes also exist along both sides of Chanticleer Avenue (approximately $1 / 4$ miles west of the Project site) and $17^{\text {th }}$ Avenue (approximately $1 / 2$ miles west of the Project site).

Class III bicycle facilities are bike routes denoted by signs that are shared with vehicles along the roadway. Class III bicycle facilities currently exist along Paul Minnie Road, approximately $1 / 2$ miles west of the Project site.

A bike and pedestrian overcrossing project is currently in final design and is expected to extend over Highway 1 and connect to Chanticleer Avenue on the north and south sides of Highway 1. The planned pedestrian and bike bridge are included in Figure F-8.
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Figure F-8 - Planned Chanticleer Bike Bridge


## Planned Improvements

The County's 2040 Regional Transportation Plan ("RTP") identifies the area of Soquel Avenue in the Project vicinity for striping/restriping as a bike connector in the future. The Project will provide approximately 4,200 feet of Class 2 bike lane along Soquel Avenue from Paul Minnie Avenue to just east of Mattison Lane, as illustrated in concept drawings included in Appendix I. These proposed improvements would improve safety and fill critical gaps in the County's bicycle network, as well as provide bicycle access to the Project site via Soquel Avenue. Striping for the bike lane will be colored green. Installation of colored and non-colored bicycle lanes at signalized intersections was evaluated in the Safety Performance Functions for Bicycle Crashes in New Zealand and Australia (2011) study ${ }^{29}$, which concluded that colored and non-colored bike lanes that were installed on facilities that previously had no bike striping and where cyclists shared the roadway with motor vehicles could realize a crash reduction factor ("CRF") of 39 and a CRF of 20 , respectively. This equates to a 39 percent reduction in collisions when colored bike lanes are installed and a 20 percent reduction in collisions when non-colored bike lanes are installed. It is therefore estimated that restriping existing bike lanes at intersections along Soquel Avenue and adding green paint would reduce collisions by approximately 19 percent. This results in a reduction of approximately two bike collisions out of every 10 bike collisions. With future construction of the Chanticleer bike bridge, bike traffic along Soquel Avenue is expected to increase substantially and the added benefit is therefore significant.

Parking will not be allowed along the bike lane within the Project's frontage, which will enhance bicyclist safety by reducing the potential for bicycle-vehicle conflicts.
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As discussed in the Transportation Demand Management Chapter (Chapter 3) of this TIOA, the Project would provide bicycle racks, showers, and lockers to facilitate bike travel to the Project site.

These bicycle mobility improvements advance General Plan policies addressing the bikeway system and bikeway safety by furthering the bikeway network's integration with other modes of transportation, including transit stations and other activity centers; and designing and constructing bikeways in accordance with County, Caltrans and state standards. (General Plan, Policies 3.8.13.8.4, 3.9.1-3.9.3.)

## Transit Mobility

## Existing Conditions

The Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO) provides transit services throughout the County and between the cities of Santa Cruz, Capitola, Watsonville, and Scotts Valley. The Project site is located in the general service area for METRO. However, good sidewalk connectivity does not currently exist between the existing METRO bus stops and the Project site (though they will be installed with the Project), and the closest bus stops to the Project site are located approximately one-mile walking distance away at the intersections of $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/Soquel Drive, $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/Capitola Road, and at the Transit Center at the Capitola Mall. METRO does not currently provide any routes that travel adjacent to the Project site along Soquel Avenue. Existing METRO routes and bus stops closest to the Project site are summarized below.

The Amtrak Highway 17 Express (Route 17) serves south Santa Cruz County and provides public transit that connects the County to the City of San Jose, with stops at the Santa Cruz Metro, the Cavallaro Transit Center in Scotts Valley, Diridon Station, and East Santa Clara \& South 6th intersection in San Jose. This express route primarily operates along Highway 17. The closest stop to the Project site is located approximately one mile west of the site at the Park \& Ride lot along Paul Sweet Road, northwest of Soquel Drive.

The Capitola Road/Watsonville Route (Route 69) serves south Santa Cruz County and provides public transit that connects the cities of Santa Cruz and Watsonville. It operates along Capitola Road, $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue, Soquel Drive, and Highway 1. The closest stop to the Project site is located approximately one-mile walking distance east of the site along $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue (south of the Gross Road intersection).

The Santa Cruz/Watsonville Route (Route 71) serves south Santa Cruz County and provides public transit to the cities of Santa Cruz, Capitola and Watsonville. It operates along Soquel Drive and Soquel Avenue and the closest stop to the Project site is located approximately 1 mile west of the site on Soquel Avenue (just east of the $7^{\text {th }}$ Street intersection) and approximately 1 mile west of the site along Soquel Drive at the Paul Sweet Road/Hwy 1 Southbound ramps intersection.

## Kimley»)Horn

## Planned Improvements

The Project does not propose any transit improvements. As noted, bus stops are located approximately one mile from the Project site.

METRO currently does not have plans or funding to construct a bus stop and run a transit route along Soquel Avenue near the Project site. A $1 / 4--1 / 2$-mile walk ( $5-10$ minutes) to a bus stop is typically considered the maximum acceptable distance for average transit riders as documented in the USDOT Federal Highway Administration's "Course on Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation" Coursebook ${ }^{30}$.

The closest bus stops are approximately 1 -mile walking distance, which is about a 20-minute walk, or a 7 -minute bike ride according to Google Maps. These bus stops are located at the intersections of $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/Soquel Drive, $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue/Capitola Road, and at the Transit Center at the Capitola Mall. METRO buses are equipped with bike racks. As discussed in the Transportation Demand Management Chapter (Chapter 3) of this report, the Project will also support bike share services.

According to 2006-2010 U.S. Census data cited by the SCCRTC's Regional Transportation Plan, approximately 3 percent of Healthcare Consumers use transit to travel to work. The analysis typically represents the highest level of transit ridership during the day, with other periods being lower. If it is conservatively assumed (from the standpoint of transit demand) that 3 percent of the proposed Tenant's employees and Members use transit during the peak hours of the day, it would represent approximately 18 passengers ( $0.03^{*} 590$ gross $A M$ peak hour trips $=18$ passengers) during the weekday AM peak period and 16 passengers ( $0.03 * 525$ gross PM peak hour trips $=16$ passengers) during the weekday PM peak period, which would have a minor impact on transit mobility, accessibility, or safety at any of the study intersections.

Transit service directly to the Project site will be available for disabled persons via the METROoperated ParaCruz service. Santa Cruz METRO ParaCruz is a shared-ride service, providing door-to-door public transportation for people who have a temporary or permanent physical, cognitive, or psychiatric disability that prevents them from making some or all of their trips on METRO's fixed route bus system. It is anticipated that this transit service will be available to employees and Members qualifying for ParaCruz services according to personal communication between Applicant and with METRO ParaCruz on 8/11/2020.

Pricing is generally comparable to METRO fares. Lift Line, a program operated by Community Bridges, also provides free door-to-door rides to qualifying seniors and people with disabilities needing transportation to medical appointments throughout Santa Cruz County. To provide a conservative analysis, this report does not quantify or assume any reduction in trips or VMT associated with employees and Members that might utilize ParaCruz and Lift Line services to travel to the Project.
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Ongoing discussion will be conducted with METRO, the Applicant and Proposed Tenant with regards to a transit service or closer bus stop location to the Project site. If ridership on METRO increases, a new route or even a feeder shuttle service to the Capitola Mall Transit Station may be considered as a first-mile, last-mile service.

## Transit Vehicle Delay

The Project would result in a net reduction in VMT and therefore will have a less than significant impact on transportation. CEQA no longer considers delay, congestion and other level of serviceoriented considerations when evaluating whether a Project will have a significant impact on the environment. (Public Resources Code, §21099(b)(2); CEQA Guidelines, §15064.3(a).) Nevertheless, for information purposes only, an analysis of the Project's potential to result in transit vehicle delays is provided below.

Transit vehicle delay was determined for each transit route within the study area based on the traffic data and the LOS analysis as indicated in Near Term Conditions section of Chapter 6. Transit vehicles for the routes in the study area are expected to use the shared right-of-way with other motorists. Since the Project is anticipated to increase vehicle delay at the study intersections (as further described in the Local Mobility Analysis Chapter (Chapter 7) of this report), transit vehicle delay may increase as well for Plus Project conditions. The change in vehicle transit delay from Near-Term Conditions to Near-Term Plus Project Conditions are described below and in Table T-9. Vehicle transit delay was not determined for Cumulative Conditions because the incremental delay due to the Project is less in future conditions and thus, the maximum transit delay is reflected in Near-Term Conditions.

Table T-9 shows the difference in delay between the Near-Term and Near-Term Plus Project Conditions for each transit route direction during the AM and PM peak hours. As shown in Table T-9, all routes experience an increase in delay with the addition of the Project, with a maximum increase in transit delay of 17.9 seconds in the AM peak hour and 12.4 seconds in the PM peak hour for Route 69A. This increase in transit delay for each route is minimal and should not significantly affect the overall schedule for the transit routes.

Based on the analysis below, Route 71 will experience a maximum increase in delay of 2.7 seconds and 6.8 seconds in the eastbound direction during the AM peak hour and PM peak hour, respectively along Soquel Avenue/Soquel Drive between Capitola Road and $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue. Route 69A and 69W will experience a maximum increase in delay of 4.0 seconds in the westbound direction during the AM peak hour and 8.7 seconds in the eastbound direction during the PM peak hour along Capitola Road between Soquel Avenue and $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue. Lastly, Route 69 W will experience a maximum increase in delay of 13.5 seconds and 3.4 seconds in the westbound direction during the AM and PM peak hour, respectively, along $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue between Capitola Road and Soquel Drive. This increase in transit delay for each route is minimal and should not significantly affect the overall schedule for the transit routes.
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Table T-9 - Summary of Near-Term Conditions Transit Delay

|  |  |  |  |  | Difference | Delay (se |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Dire | ion ${ }^{1}$ |  | Peak | PM | eak |
| Route | To/From | 1 | 2 | Direction 1 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Direction } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | Direction 1 | Direction 2 |
| 55 | Capitola Mall to Via Pacifica in City of Aptos | EB | WB | 2.0 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.7 |
| 66 | Capitola Mall to Santa Cruz Metro Center (via 17 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave) | EB | WB | 1.9 | 4.6 | 5.5 | 4.9 |
| 68 | Capitola Mall to Santa Cruz Metro Center (via Broadway and Portola Dr) | EB | WB | 1.7 | 1.1 | 2.4 | 0.5 |
| 69A | Santa Cruz Metro Center to Watsonville Transit Center (via Airport Blvd) | EB | WB | 2.2 | 17.9 | 12.4 | 7.5 |
| 69W | Santa Cruz Metro Center to Watsonville Transit Center (via Main St) | EB | WB | 2.8 | 17.5 | 10.1 | 7.3 |
| 71 | Santa Cruz Metro Center to Watsonville Transit Center | EB | WB | 2.7 | 0.2 | 6.8 | 0.6 |
| Notes: <br> ${ }^{1}$ NB - Northbound, SB - Southbound, EB - Eastbound, WB - Westbound |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Summary of Findings

This chapter of the TIOA evaluated pedestrian, bicycle, and transit networks in the Project vicinity and whether negative effects to these networks would be caused by the Project. As discussed in this chapter, the Project proposes to construct on-site and off-site improvements in compliance with adopted County standards that will improve pedestrian and bicycle mobility, and roadway improvements that will improve transit mobility. Therefore, the Project will not adversely affect local pedestrian, bicycle, and/or transit facilities and will implement several County General Plan goals relative to pedestrian and bicycle mobility.
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## 5. PARKING SUPPLY AND DEMAND EVALUATION (NONCEQA ANALYSIS)

Although parking is not considered an environmental impact criterion under CEQA requirements, a parking analysis was completed and presented in this chapter of the TIOA for information purposes.

## Proposed Parking Supply

The Project will construct a five-level parking garage, which will include a total of 730 vehicle parking stalls (including 619 standard spaces, 67 ADA spaces and 47 clean air vehicle spaces (including three ADA spaces). 38 motorcycle spaces will be provided in the parking garage as well. A total of 160 bike spaces will also be provided, consisting of 36 bike locker spaces and 124 bike rack spaces. In addition, the Project will also provide 6 surface vehicle parking spaces adjacent to the parking garage. The Project is providing a total of 736 parking spaces (garage + surface), which is 24 spaces more than the minimum Code required parking. Table T-10 summarizes the Project's proposed parking supply.

| Table T-10 - Parking Spaces Provided by the Project |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use <br> Description | Type | Rate | No. of Units | Spaces <br> Provided by <br> the Project |
| Medical | Vehicle Parking | 1 space per 217.4 square <br> Office | Bike Parking | 1 space per 1,000 square <br> feet of gross floor area |
|  | 160,000 |  |  |  |
| square feet | 736 |  |  |  |
|  |  | 160 |  |  |

There is currently insufficient parking to satisfy parking demands for some establishments in the immediate vicinity of the Project site. As such, the Project's parking garage will be sized to satisfy all parking on-site to avoid further constraining the availability of parking in the surrounding area.

The following sections discuss County Code parking requirements, ITE Parking Generation $5^{\text {th }}$ Edition recommendations, and the Proposed Tenant's parking design standards.

## Santa Cruz County Code Parking Requirements

On-site parking in this section was evaluated based on the Project description and the requirements stated in Santa Cruz County Code Section 13.1031.
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The County's Code requires 1 vehicle parking space per 225 square feet of gross floor area. The Code also requires 1 bike parking space per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area.

The Project will construct approximately 160,000 square feet of medical office uses. Table T-11 summarizes the parking requirements based on the County's Code.

For instance, Section 13.10.552 of the County's Code requires one vehicle parking space per 225 square feet of gross floor area. The Code also requires one bike parking space per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area. Based on the above requirements, the Project is required to provide 712 vehicle parking spaces and 160 bike parking spaces. However, the Project is providing 736 parking spaces, which is 24 spaces more than the minimum code required parking. In addition, a total of 38 motorcycle spaces will be provided in the parking garage.

| Table T-11 - Santa Cruz County Code Parking Requirements (Chapter 13.10) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use Description | Type | Rate | No. of Units | Spaces <br> Required |
| Medical Office | Vehicle Parking | 1 space per 225 square <br> feet of gross floor area | 160,000 | 712 |
|  | Bquare feet | 160 |  |  |

In addition to the above general parking requirements, the County's Code requires that for a project proposing between 501 and 1,000 parking spaces, two percent of the total spaces be ADA accessible. However, because the Project is a medical office, the County Planning Department is requiring the Project to provide the following ADA parking requirements based on the Applicant's Development Review Group meeting conducted on November 8, 2018 (Table T-12 below):

- Approximately 3\% of the parking spaces that serve the Project's employees shall be ADA accessible per California Building Code 11B-208
- Approximately $11 \%$ of the parking spaces that serve the Project's Members and visitors shall be ADA accessible per California Building Code 11B-208.2.1

| Table T-12 - County Required ADA Accessible Parking |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Functional <br> Program Summary | Project Building Area <br> (Square Feet) | \% of <br> Building <br> Area | Total <br> New <br> Parking <br> Spaces | California Building <br> Code ADA Space <br> Requirement (Project <br> ADA Space <br> Requirement) | Accessible <br> Parking <br> Requirement |
| TOTAL Employees | 48,405 | $30 \%$ | 223 | $11 \mathrm{~B}-208(3 \%)$ | 7 |
| TOTAL Members/Visitors | 111,595 | $70 \%$ | 513 | $11 \mathrm{~B}-208.2 .1(11 \%)$ | 56 |
| Project TOTAL | 160,000 | $100 \%$ | 736 |  | 63 |
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As shown in Table T-13 below, the Project is providing four more ADA parking spaces than required by the County Planning Department to accommodate for future flexibility in Potential Tenant's programming requirements.

| Table T-13 - Project ADA Accessible Parking |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Project ADA Parking Space Summary |  |
| County Required ADA Accessible Spaces | 63 |
| Project Proposed ADA Accessible Spaces | 67 |
| Additional ADA Accessible Spaces <br> Provided Above County Requirement | +4 |

## Proposed Tenant's Typical Parking Standards

It is the Proposed Tenant's customary standard to park all of its outpatient facilities at a ratio 1 space per 200 square feet of gross floor area (1:5), which would require a total of 800 parking spaces for the Project. However, considering the breadth of the Project's TDM programs and the fact that the planned intensity of medical services would require longer stays (and therefore less turnover in parking spaces) than other outpatient facilities, the Project is proposing 64 less spaces (approximately $12.5 \%$ ) than its healthcare systemwide standard.

## Other Parking Considerations

## ITE Parking Generation Parking Recommendations

On-site parking in this section was evaluated based on the Project description and recommendations from the Institute of Transportation Engineers Parking Generation $5^{\text {th }}$ Edition (dated January 2019). ITE provides parking recommendations for a variety of land uses based on empirical data collected from surveyed sites that include a variety of facilities. This analysis considers two potential ITE land use codes to evaluate parking: i) Land Use code 630 for a "Clinic" use, which was utilized to evaluate trip generation and provides a conservative analysis because it assumes a higher trip generation for site, and ii) Land Use Code 720, for a "medical office building" use, which assumes a lower trip generation rate and accordingly recommends a lower parking standard.

ITE provides parking rates based on both average and $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile demand. The average demand rate is the weighted average number of parked vehicles at a development site per one unit of the independent variable. The $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile demand is the point at which 85 percent of the values fall at or below and at which 15 percent of the values are above. Therefore, the $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile represents a more conservative (i.e. higher) demand estimate than the weighted average demand and indicates the parking demand that would occur 85 percent of the time.

ITE parking data is provided for Medical Office Buildings (Land Use 720). The data indicates that weekday $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile parking demand is 4.59 spaces per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area
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("GFA") for Medical Office Buildings. Average peak period demand is 3.23 spaces per 1,000 square feet GFA.

Given that the Project will construct approximately 160,000 square feet of medical office uses, Table T-14 summarizes ITE parking recommendations.

| Table T-14 - ITE Parking Generation (Medical Office) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use Description | Type | No. of Units | Avg. Demand ${ }^{32}$ | 85 th Percentile Demand ${ }^{33}$ |
|  | ITE Recommendations |  |  |  |
| Medical Office (LU 720) ${ }^{34}$ | Vehicle Parking | $\begin{gathered} 160,000 \\ \text { square feet } \end{gathered}$ | 517 | 734 |
| Total Parking Provided by the Project |  |  | 736 |  |

Based on Table T-14, the Project is recommended to provide a minimum of 517 vehicle parking spaces based on average peak period parking demand and 734 spaces based on the $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile parking demand. The Project proposes to provide a total of 736 parking spaces. Therefore, the Project would provide parking generally consistent with ITE recommendations.

Clinic (Land Use 630) ITE trip generation assumptions were used for the TIOA to provide a more conservative trip generation rate for the Project. For informational purposes, ITE parking data is provided for Clinic (Land Use 630) below. The data for Clinic uses indicates that weekday $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile parking demand is 4.77 spaces per 1,000 square feet of GFA for Medical Office Buildings. Average peak period demand is 3.89 spaces per 1,000 square feet GFA. Table T-15 summarizes ITE parking recommendations based on Clinic land uses.

| Table T-15-ITE Parking Generation (Clinic) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use Description | Type | No. of Units | Avg. Demand ${ }^{32}$ | 85 th Percentile Demand ${ }^{33}$ |
|  | ITE Recommendations |  |  |  |
| Clinic (LU 630) ${ }^{34}$ | Vehicle Parking | $\begin{gathered} 160,000 \\ \text { square feet } \end{gathered}$ | 622 | 763 |
| Total Parking Provided by the Project |  |  | 736 |  |

Based on Table T-15 the Project is recommended to provide a minimum of 622 vehicle parking spaces based on average peak period parking demand and 763 spaces based on the $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile parking demand. The Project proposes to provide a total of 736 parking spaces. Therefore, the Project would provide enough parking to serve average demand, however the
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proposed Parking would not be sufficient to serve the $85^{\text {th }}$ Percentile Demand under the ITE clinic rate (which is not governing).

## Similar Bay Area Jurisdictional Parking Requirements

Parking code requirements for various jurisdictions in the Santa Cruz, Monterey Bay, and San Jose areas were evaluated to provide a comparison to County rates. The below parking requirements were selected due to the similarities between their communities and County where the Project is proposed. Table T-16 below provides a summary of the various requirements for information purposes only since parking requirements for other jurisdictions are not binding upon or relevant to parking requirements in the County's jurisdiction.

| Maintaining Agency | Description | Off-Street Parking Requirement |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| County of Santa Cruz | Medical Offices | 1 | space | per | 225 | SQFT |
| City of Santa Cruz | Medical and dental clinics and offices | 1 | space | per | 200 | SQFT |
| City of Capitola | Medical Offices and Clinics | 1 | space | per | 300 | SQFT |
| City of Monterey | Offices, Medical or Dental | 1 | space | per | 275 | SQFT |
| City of Santa Clara | Medical and Dental Offices | 1 | space | per | 300 | SQFT |
| City of Sunnyvale | Medical Clinic | 1 | space | per | 200 | SQFT |
| City of San Jose | Medical Clinic / Out-Patient Facility | 1 | space | per | 250 | SQFT |
| City of Mountain View | Clinics, offices, labs, greater than 20ksf | 1 | space | per | 225 | SQFT |
| County of Monterey | Medical Clinic / Office | 1 | space | per | 200 | SQFT |
| County of Santa Clara | Clinics | 1 | space | per | 200 | SQFT |
|  | Average | 1 | space | per | 238 | SQFT |

## Parking Evaluation Summary of Findings

This section evaluated the Project's proposed parking supply and compared it to the following four requirement/recommendation thresholds:

- County Code Parking Requirement
- Proposed Tenant's Typical Parking Standard
- ITE Parking Generation Parking Recommendations
- Similar Bay Area Jurisdictional Parking Requirements

As described above, the Project will provide 736 vehicular parking spaces. This proposed parking supply will provide sufficient parking to comply with County Code and will be consistent with ITE Medical Office LU 720 recommendations, though there will be fewer parking spaces than the Proposed Tenant typically would provide in a similarly sized MOB. With the implementation of TDM and considering the healthcare services expected to be provided at the Project, the Proposed Tenant believes 736 parking spaces will nevertheless be adequate to support the MOB.
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The 736 parking spaces provided with the Project should also be sufficient to avoid impacting offstreet parking along nearby streets and neighborhoods.
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## 6. LOCAL MOBILITY ANALYSIS (LOS) (NON-CEQA ANALYSIS)

This TIOA does not just analyze transportation impacts under CEQA. It also provides a local mobility analysis to evaluate consistency with County requirements set forth in the County's General Plan. The County's General Plan Circulation Element requires development projects to analyze level of service ("LOS") impacts in order to assess roadway capacity. The information from an LOS analysis can be used to identify operating deficiencies on the roadway network, determine the effects of a project and potential improvements to offset such effects, and to more accurately update and apply the County's impact fee program. This LOS analysis is not a CEQA analysis, which provides specifically that "automobile delay, as described solely by level of service or similar measures of vehicular capacity or traffic congestion shall not be considered a significant impact on the environment." (Public Resources Code, §21099(b)(2); see also CEQA Guidelines, §15064.3(a) ["a project's effect on automobile delay shall not constitute a significant environmental impact."]) CEQA no longer focuses on LOS-based analyses because such analyses tend to result in mitigation measures calling for new or expanded roadways, which leads to more VMT and GHG emissions in contravention of the purposes of SB 743 (2013) and the State's climate change laws, including AB 32 (2006), requiring a reduction in state GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, and SB 32 (2016), requiring at least a 40 percent reduction in GHG emissions from 1990 levels by 2030. Accordingly, the local mobility analysis is provided at the request of the County for informational purposes only and not for purposes of evaluating the Project's transportation impacts under CEQA.

## Level of Service (LOS)

LOS is a qualitative measure used to describe operational conditions. LOS ranges from A (best), which represents minimal delay, to F (worst), which represents heavy delay and a facility that is operating at or near its functional capacity. See Table T-17 below for a more detailed description of LOS definitions. LOS analyses model whether deficient operations along the local transportation network would occur as a result of a proposed project. Thus, a detailed operational (i.e., LOS and other traffic operational measures) analysis was conducted as part of this TIOA to determine whether an acceptable LOS would be maintained with the addition of Project traffic. Potential improvements are identified where deficient/unacceptable LOS would likely occur within the County due to the Project.

## Kimley»)Horn

| Table T-17 - Intersection Level of Service Definitions |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Level of <br> Service | Description | Signalized <br> (Avg. control <br> delay per vehicle <br> sec/veh.) | Unsignalized <br> (Avg. control delay <br> per vehicle <br> sec/veh.) |
| A | Free flow with no delays. Users are virtually <br> unaffected by others in the traffic stream | less than 10 | less than 10 |
| B | Stable traffic. Traffic flows smoothly with few delays. | less than or equal <br> to 10 to 20 | less than or equal to <br> 10 to 15 |
| C | Stable flow but the operation of individual users <br> becomes affected by other vehicles. Modest delays. | less than or equal <br> to 20 to 35 | less than or equal to <br> 15 to 25 |
| D | Approaching unstable flow. Operation of individual <br> users becomes significantly affected by other <br> vehicles. Delays may be more than one cycle during <br> peak hours. | less than or equal <br> to 35 to 55 | less than or equal to <br> 25 to 35 |
| E | Unstable flow with operating conditions at or near the <br> capacity level. Long delays and vehicle queuing. | less than or equal <br> to 55 to 80 | less than or equal to <br> 35 to 50 |
| F | Forced or breakdown flow that causes reduced <br> capacity. Stop and go traffic conditions. Excessive <br> long delays and vehicle queuing. | greater than or <br> equal to 80 | greater than or equal <br> to 50 |

Sources: Transportation Research Board, Highway Capacity Manual $6^{\text {th }}$ Edition, National Research Council.

## County Regulations

The County's General Plan Circulation Element requires an LOS analysis. Objective 3.12 "Level of Service" provides that development shall not create traffic that exceeds acceptable levels of service on surrounding roadways. As described herein, there are deficient roadways currently existing in the vicinity of the Project; the Project does not create deficiencies. The General Plan contains the following LOS policies:

### 3.12.1. Level of Service (LOS) Policy

In reviewing the traffic impacts of a proposed development project or proposed roadway improvements, LOS C should be considered the objective, but LOS D is the minimum acceptable (where costs, right-of-way requirements, or environmental impacts of maintaining LOS under this policy are excessive, capacity enhancement may be considered infeasible). ${ }^{35}$
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Proposed development projects that would cause LOS at an intersection or on an uninterrupted highway segment to fall below D during the weekday peak hour will be required to mitigate their traffic impacts. Proposed development projects that would add traffic at intersections or on highways segments already at LOS E or F shall also be required to mitigate any traffic volume resulting in a $1 \%$ increase in the $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio of the sum of all critical movements.

### 3.12.2 Level of Service (LOS) Calculation Methods

Utilize the most current Highway Capacity Manual ("HCM") Operations Methodology for all existing levels of service analysis.

### 3.12.3. Transportation Improvement Area Fees as Mitigation Measures

Payment of an approved Transportation Improvement Area Fee proportional to the forecast trip generation will be required.

### 3.12.4. Reduced Traffic Generation

Forecast traffic generation for purposes of development project review may be reduced ("discounted") If proposed development can demonstrate lower than average traffic rates. For example, if the development site is adjacent to transit corridors, will have an effective Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program, or is in a mixed-use development, it is reasonable to expect lower-than-average auto use.

Based on the foregoing, for the purposes of this analysis, the following conditions would result in Project-related LOS deficiencies at County intersections:

- If the intersection operates at an acceptable LOS (i.e., LOS A, B, C, or D) without the Project during the weekday peak hour and degrades to an unacceptable LOS (i.e. LOS E or F) with the Project during the weekday peak hour.
- If the intersection operates at an unacceptable LOS (i.e., LOS E or F) without the Project during the weekday peak hour, and the volume/capacity ( $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ) ratio of any movements at the intersection increases by 1 percent or more with the Project. ${ }^{36}$


## Other Agency LOS Standards

Although not required by the County's General Plan, this TIOA considers LOS standards of other agencies having jurisdiction over roadways and intersections located outside the County that will be impacted by the Project as requested by the County for informational purposes. Applicable LOS standards for those other agencies are set forth below.
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## (a) California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)

Pursuant to SB 743, Caltrans evaluates a land use project's impacts on the state highway system utilizing VMT, rather than congestion or capacity related metrics, such as LOS or v/c ratios. Caltrans' "Vehicle Miles Traveled-Focused Transportation Impact Study Guide states that:
"When analyzing the impact of VMT on the State Highway System resulting from local land use projects, the focus will no longer be on traffic at intersections and roadways immediately around project sites. Instead, the focus will be on how projects are likely to influence the overall amount of automobile use." ${ }^{37}$

For informational purposes only, an LOS-based analysis of Caltrans facilities is provided using the previously applied LOS standard combined with the County v/c standard for significance criteria purposes. Caltrans also requires, as published on their website, a safety analysis of their facilities. ${ }^{38}$ This study relies on the Highway 1 EIR for future improvements, which did assess safety. ${ }^{39}$

Project-related deficiencies at study intersections occur when the addition of Project traffic:

- Cause operations to deteriorate from an acceptable level (LOS C or better) to an unacceptable level (LOS D or worse); or
- Causes the existing measure of effectiveness (average delay) to deteriorate at a Stateoperated intersection operating at LOS D or worse.

In addition, v/c ratios on the freeways were also considered in this study's freeway analysis because the study freeway network is considerably oversaturated during the peak periods (with and without the Project) and roadway density measures of effectiveness do not provide accurate representations of congestion conditions for oversaturated facilities. The characteristics of density, roadway geometry, congestion, speed and flow are interrelated and is used to calculate the $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$. High speeds have lower density, and low speeds higher density. Congestion is significant at low speeds, similar to what is experienced on Highway 1 in Santa Cruz during the peak and off-peak periods. There is an optimum density that occur at about 55-60 miles per hour, per the HCM.

## (b) City of Santa Cruz

The City of Santa Cruz is also required to apply a VMT-based metric for evaluating transportation impacts on the environment pursuant to CEQA. Like the County, however, the City of Santa Cruz has a General Plan goal of striving to maintain a LOS D or better at signalized intersections, but
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will accept a lower level of service and higher congestion at major regional intersections if necessary improvements would be prohibitively costly or result in significant, unacceptable environmental impacts. (City of Santa Cruz 2030 General Plan, Chapter 5, Mobility Element, p.55, Goal M.3.1.3, M3.1.4.) Any evaluation of the Project's LOS impact on City of Santa Cruz streets is for informational purposes only.

## (c) City of Capitola

The City of Capitola is also required to apply a VMT-based metric for evaluating transportation impacts on the environment pursuant to CEQA. The City of Capitola General Plan (adopted June 26, 2014 and updated March 13, 2019) (Policy MO-3.3), however, establishes a minimum LOS C traffic operation standard at intersections throughout the City, with the exception of the Village Area, Bay Avenue, and $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue (for which there is no LOS standard). Capitola General Plan Policy MP-3.4 permits a lower LOS and higher congestion at major regional intersections if necessary, improvements are considered infeasible, as determined by the City's Public Works Director, or result in significant, unacceptable environmental impacts. Any evaluation of the Project's LOS impact on City of Capitola streets is for informational purposes only.

## Analytical Methods and Information

This LOS analysis uses methods defined in the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) and Synchro 10 traffic analysis software. HCM methodologies include procedures for analyzing side-street stop-controlled ("SSSC"), all-way stop-controlled ("AWSC"), and signalized intersections. The SSSC procedure defines LOS as a function of average control delay for each minor street approach movement. Conversely, the AWSC and signalized intersection procedures define LOS as a function of average control delay for the overall intersection. Table T-17 relates the operational characteristics associated with each LOS category for signalized and unsignalized intersections.

Project-related deficiencies are determined by comparing conditions without the Project to those with the Project. Project-related deficiencies at study intersections are created when traffic from the Project causes the LOS to fall below the LOS standard identified for the County in the County Regulations section on page 46 LOS impacts on non-County maintained roadways and intersections are provided for informational purposes only and not for purposes of evaluating consistency with the County's LOS policy.

The LOS analysis set forth herein evaluates the following scenarios: Existing Conditions, Existing Plus Project, Near Term Conditions, Near Term Plus Project, Cumulative Conditions, and Cumulative Plus Project.

## Existing Conditions

## Existing Roadway Network

The Project will distribute traffic to a number of principal roadways within the study area. A description of these roadways is included below:
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Highway 1, also known as State Route 1, is a four-lane divided freeway in the Project vicinity that extends along the California coast and connects major cities including San Francisco, Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Luis Obispo, and Los Angeles to coastal communities. In the Project vicinity, Highway 1 is a major commuter and tourist route and has a posted speed limit of 65 miles per hour in the study area.

As a general note, SR 1 operates at a deficient LOS, but minor improvements to SR 1 are not recommended in this report because of the following:

SR 1 and the interchanges in the County were constructed many years ago pursuant to older standards and constraints, which have resulted in many mainline freeway sections and interchanges of SR 1 not being compliant with current Caltrans standards. These older improvements served Healthcare Consumers and visitors well for many years, but traffic growth and accidents have now resulted in severe congestion during the peak hours. No major freeway improvements have been made to increase capacity along the mainline to the south. The nonstandard features of the existing interchanges, ramps and the main line, including over- and under-crossings, have necessitated evaluation under the Highway 1 EIR as found in the Highway
1 Planned Improvements section on page 136 of this report. The Highway 1 EIR identified substantial challenges and improvements to alleviate the congestion. The Highway 1 EIR did not identify low cost or small improvements, even at the interchanges or at the ramps, because these would result in Design Exceptions per Caltrans requirements and most likely would not be approved. Caltrans and Santa Cruz RTC has over the last few years conducted the EIR studies to identify improvements to the freeway and the interchanges, and the Highway 1 EIR was certified in December 2018.40 The cost of these improvements are extensive and the final designs and construction of the auxiliary lanes are in process as a more permanent and effective fix. "Band-aid" improvements, i.e., lengthening or widening an on-ramp, will require design exceptions and must be substandard and may not result in real benefits to the Highway 1 system.

Highway 17 is a divided freeway in the Project vicinity. It extends from Highway 1 in the City of Santa Cruz to I-280 in San Jose. Highway 17 has a posted speed limit of 65 miles per hour in the study area and a cross section that varies from four to six lanes.

Soquel Avenue is an east-west arterial roadway that begins in Downtown Santa Cruz and extends eastward and continues to Highway 1 ramps, where it becomes a two-lane collector roadway extending past the Project site and terminates in the east at Gross Road.

In the Project vicinity, the roadway primarily provides access to industrial and retail land uses and is currently being utilized as a cut-through route during the PM peak periods when southbound Highway 1 is congested. Residential collector roadways including Paul Minnie Avenue, $17^{\text {th }}$ Avenue, Chanticleer Avenue, Mattison Lane, and South Rodeo Gulch Road intersect the collector segment of Soquel Avenue in the Project vicinity. Soquel Avenue is primarily a two-lane undivided roadway with a 35 mile per hour posted speed limit, except for an approximately 1,700 -foot
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segment near the Highway 1 southbound on- and off-ramps, where it varies between three and four lanes of undivided roadway and has a 25 mile per hour posted speed limit.

Soquel Drive is an east-west arterial roadway that begins at the existing Highway 1 overcrossing and extends eastward to Aptos, providing access to Highway 1 and connecting residential, retail and commercial land uses throughout Santa Cruz County, Soquel, and Aptos. In the Project vicinity, Soquel Drive has a 35 mile per hour posted speed limit, is a four-lane to two-lane, undivided arterial and has a two-way left-turn lane between Thurber Lane and Paul Sweet Road.
$41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue is a north-south arterial roadway that begins at Soquel Drive in the County and continues south to East Cliff Drive. $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue also provides access to Highway 1 and connects many residential, retail, and commercial land uses. North of the Highway 1 ramps, $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue is a four-lane divided arterial with a 25 mile per hour posted speed limit. South of the Highway 1 ramps, $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue is a six-lane divided arterial with a 35 mile per hour posted speed limit.

Capitola Road is an approximately 2.5 -mile east-west arterial roadway that extends from Soquel Avenue in the west to Wharf Road in the east. The roadway's primary function is to provide connections to the two major arterials of Soquel Avenue / Soquel Drive and $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue, as well as to provide access to residential land uses and Capitola Mall in the east. Capitola Road is a four-lane divided roadway from Soquel Avenue to $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue and from $30^{\text {th }}$ Avenue to $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue. From $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue to $30^{\text {th }}$ Avenue, Capitola Road varies between two-lane and four-lane undivided roadway, with some segments including a two-way left-turn lane. The posted speed limit on the roadway varies between 25 miles per hour and 35 miles per hour.

Brommer Street is an approximately 1.75 -mile east-west collector roadway that extends from $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue in the west to $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue in the east. The roadway primarily provides access to residential land uses and some local businesses. Brommer Street is a two-lane undivided roadway with a 25 mile per hour posted speed limit along its extent.
$\mathbf{1 7}^{\text {th }}$ Avenue is a north-south collector roadway that extends from Soquel Avenue in the north to Cliff Drive / Portola Drive in the south. The roadway provides access to residential and local business land uses, as well as parks and schools. A two-way left-turn lane exists along the Capitola Road to Kinsley Street segment of this roadway. $17^{\text {th }}$ Avenue is a two-lane undivided roadway with a 30 mile per hour posted speed limit. When school children are present, the speed limit is 25 miles per hour.

Mattison Lane is a short collector roadway that intersects $17^{\text {th }}$ Avenue and Soquel Avenue, south of Highway 1. North of Highway 1, Mattison Lane extends from the Good Shepherd School to Soquel Drive. North and south roadway segments are separated by Highway 1 and do not connect. The south segment primarily serves residential land uses and some local businesses. The north segment provides access to residential land uses and the Good Shepherd School. Both segments are two-lane undivided roadways. The north segment has a 25 mile per hour posted speed limit. The south segment does not have a posted speed limit but is assumed to be 25 miles per hour as well.
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Chanticleer Avenue is a north-south roadway that extends from Soquel Avenue in the north to Kinsley Street in the south. Residential land uses are located along the roadway, as well as Chanticleer Avenue Park, Live Oak Elementary School, and local businesses. It is a two-lane undivided roadway with a 25 mile per hour posted speed limit.

Paul Minnie Road is an approximately 1,500-foot-long north-south roadway that extends from Soquel Avenue in the north to Rodriguez Street in the south. Residential land uses are located along the roadway, as well as the Live Oak School District and Green Acres Elementary School. It is a two-lane undivided roadway with speed humps and a 25 mile per hour posted speed limit.

Rodriguez Street is an approximately 4,000-foot-long east-west collector circuitous local street that extends from the Capitola Road Extension in the west to Chanticleer Avenue in the east. The roadway provides access to the adjacent residential land uses and intersects Capitola Road Extension, $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue, Jose Avenue, Koopmans Avenue, Paul Minnie Avenue, $17^{\text {th }}$ Avenue, and Chanticleer Avenue, as well multiple cul-de-sacs. Three of the mid-segment intersections are allway stop controlled. It is a two-lane undivided roadway with a 25 mile per hour posted speed limit.

## Existing Peak-Hour Turning Movement Volumes

Weekday intersection turning movement volumes were collected for existing conditions LOS at the study intersections on the following days:

- Tuesday, October 18, 2016
- Tuesday, March 6, 2018
- Thursday, May 17, 2018
- Wednesday, October 3, 2018

Table T-18 identifies the dates that data were collected at each specific intersection.
These counts included vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians. Volumes for study intersections were collected during the AM and PM peak periods of 7:00-9:00 AM and 4:00-6:00 PM, respectively. All traffic counts were collected when local schools were in session and the weather was fair.

Field observations were conducted when count data was collected to observe queues and existing traffic patterns. Data and field visits indicate that peak traffic flow occurs for extended periods of time (typically from 7:00-9:00 AM and 4:00-7:00 PM). The highest one-hour morning (AM) and one-hour afternoon/evening (PM) peaks were selected for analysis, consistent with County guidance.

Peak hour volumes at each intersection's respective peak were conservatively used in this analysis, therefore, some volume imbalances were observed between study intersections. Where imbalances occurred, volumes were conservatively increased above what was counted. Thus, in some instances, peak hour volumes shown in operational analysis worksheets could indicate somewhat higher traffic volumes than what is shown in traffic count summary data included in Appendix A. U-turns are analyzed (and illustrated in all figures) as left turns since HCM methodologies do not support analysis of U-turns.
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Existing conditions lane geometry and intersection control is shown in Figure 9. Existing peak hour turning movement volumes are shown in Figure F-10. Intersection volume data sheets for all traffic counts are provided in Appendix A.

## (d) Count Data Comparison (2016 vs. 2019)

The analyses conducted in this study rely on traffic count data collected in October 2016 for four study intersections. After the existing conditions analysis was completed, newer data became available at the four intersections. This newer data was collected on October 24, 2019 for purposes of comparison to the 2016 counts.

A comparison of the 2016 and 2019 datasets is summarized in Table T-18 to illustrate how traffic volumes changed between 2016 and 2019 at the four study intersections that assumed 2016 data for analysis.

| Table T-18-2016 vs. 2019 Traffic Count Comparison |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \# | Intersection | AM Intersection Volume |  | PM <br> Intersection Volume |  | Total Intersection Volume |  |  |
|  |  | 2016 | 2019 | 2016 | 2019 | 2016 | 2019 |  |
| 12 | 41st Ave \& Soquel Dr | 2,106 | 2,110 | 2,130 | 2,168 | 4,236 | 4,278 | 0.33\% |
| 13 | 41st Ave \& Hwy 1 NB Ramps | 2,709 | 2,750 | 2,962 | 2,590 | 5,671 | 5,340 | -1.98\% |
| 14 | 41st Ave \& Hwy 1 SB Ramps | 3,161 | 3,192 | 3,605 | 3,307 | 6,766 | 6,499 | -1.33\% |
| 15 | 41st Ave \& Gross Rd | 2,896 | 2,930 | 3,444 | 3,183 | 6,340 | 6,113 | -1.21\% |

The summary data provided in the table above indicate that between 2016 and 2019, traffic volumes at $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue \& Soquel Drive (Intersection \#12) increased during the AM and PM peak hours. The compound annual growth for the combined AM and PM peak hours was approximately $0.33 \%$ per annum. The findings of this comparison would also apply to 2018 count data since they fall in the range of the data evaluated in Table T-18 and the 2018 data are thus reliable for use in this analysis.

Data at the $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue \& Highway 1 Ramps (Intersections \#13 \& \#14) and $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue \& Gross Road (Intersection \#15) are mixed and indicate that during the AM peak hour, volumes at each study intersection increased slightly between 2016 and 2019, however, PM peak hour volumes indicates a decrease between 2016 and 2019. Thus, PM peak hour count data at intersections \#13, \#14, and \#15 show a decrease in traffic.

The compound annual growth for the combined AM and PM peak hours for $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue \& Hwy 1 NB Ramps was approximately $-1.98 \%$ per annum, $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue \& Hwy 1 SB Ramps was approximately $-1.33 \%$ per annum, and $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue \& Gross Road was approximately $-1.21 \%$. In conclusion, this fluctuation in traffic volumes is negligible and the volumes analyzed are representative of 2019/2020 conditions.
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|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
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## Existing Level of Service at Study Intersections

Traffic operations were evaluated at the study intersections based on existing lane geometry, traffic control, and peak hour traffic volumes. Oversaturated flows were observed when traffic count data was collected during weekday AM and PM Peak periods at the intersection of Soquel Avenue $/ 40^{\text {th }}$ Avenue \& Gross Road. The southbound left-turn queue during the PM peak period was observed to extend roughly 2,500 feet northwest of the intersection (over the bridge). Due to metering and demand exceeding capacity and standing queues, the existing traffic count data does not reflect the traffic demand, but rather, the traffic service volumes. The unserved queue is the true demand at the signal. PM peak hour vehicle volumes were therefore increased beyond intersection turning movement count data indicated in Appendix A to reflect this demand (rather than service volume) based on field observations and 24 -hour tube count data, which was collected along Soquel Avenue west of Mattison Lane. The model was verified by comparing existing queues observed in the field and SimTraffic microsimulation queuing, which stochastically models vehicle arrival and queuing patterns.

In addition, queues at the Highway 1 SB Ramps at Soquel Drive overflow in the PM and cars use Soquel Avenue as a potential shortcut/bypass/alternative to Highway 1. In the morning queues overflow at the Highway 1 NB Ramps with Soquel Drive. In the AM, the congestion on the freeway is in the northbound direction and in the PM, in the southbound direction. In general, congestion on Highway 1 causes failure of traffic operational conditions at the interchanges. Traffic also overflows from Highway 1 to parallel corridors like Soquel Drive, Soquel Avenue, Capitola Avenue, Brommer Street and Portola Avenue.

Due to heavy freeway congestion, southbound off-ramp volumes at $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue are low during the PM peak for existing conditions. If traffic flow on the freeway improves, off-ramp volumes are expected to increase.

All study intersections currently operate at an acceptable LOS during existing conditions, except for the following:

- Soquel Drive \& Paul Sweet Road / Highway 1 On-Off Ramps (Intersection \#4) (AM \& PM Peaks)
- Soquel Avenue / 40 th Avenue \& Gross Road (Intersection \#9) (PM Peak)
- $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue \& Highway 1 SB Ramps (Intersection \#14) (AM Peak)
- $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue \& Gross Road (Intersection \#15) (AM \& PM Peaks)
- Brommer Street \& $30^{\text {th }}$ Avenue (Intersection \#24) (PM Peak)

Analysis results are summarized in Table T-19 and Synchro output sheets are provided in Appendix B.

Since the first draft report was compiled in 2019, Caltrans has changed the lane assignment at the intersection of Soquel Avenue \& Highway 1 SB On- and Off-Ramp (Intersection \#5) to include an exclusive eastbound left-turn lane. The approach lanes were restriped to include a separate left-turn lane and a separate through lane. Signal timing sheets available at that time were changed to reflect the new lane configuration and phasing optimized to obtain a representative

## Kimley»)Horn

LOS. This change resulted in an improvement of delay from 27.1 seconds to 20.3 seconds for the AM peak hour and from 27.7 seconds to 21.3 seconds for the PM peak hour. The LOS remains a LOS C for both peak hours. Synchro output sheets are provided in Appendix U.
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| Table T-19 - Existing Conditions Intersection Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \# | Intersection | Maintaining Agency | Control Type | Existing Conditions |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Movement | Delay | LOS | Movement | Delay | LOS |
| 1 | Soquel Ave \& Capitola Rd | CSC | Signal | - | 31.4 | C | - | 29.2 | C |
| 2 | Soquel Ave \& $7^{\text {th }}$ Ave | SCC | Signal | - | 16.8 | B | - | 17.1 | B |
| 3 | Soquel Dr / Soquel Ave \& Soquel Ave | Caltrans | Signal | - | 29.5 | C | - | 30.9 | C |
| 4 | Soquel Dr \& Paul Sweet Rd / Hwy 1 On-Off Ramps | Caltrans | Signal | - | 51.6 | D | - | 36.7 | D |
| 5 | Soquel Ave \& Hwy 1 SB On-Off Ramps | Caltrans | Signal | - | 27.1 | C | - | 27.7 | C |
| 6 | Soquel Ave \& $17^{\text {th }}$ Ave | SCC | Signal | - | 8.7 | A | - | 9.5 | A |
| 7 | Soquel Ave \& Chanticleer | SCC | SSSC | - | 5.4 | A | - | 2.7 | A |
| 7 | Worst Approach | SCC |  | NB | 13.7 | B | NB | 16.9 | C |
| 8 | Soquel Ave \& MOB Driveway |  | SSSC | - | 0.4 | A | - | 0.2 | A |
| 8 | Worst Approach |  | SSSC | NB | 11.3 | B | NB | 14.0 | B |
| 9 | Soquel Ave / 40 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave \& Gross Rd | SCC | AWSC | - | 10.9 | B | - | 36.5 | E |
| 11 | $40^{\text {th }}$ Ave \& Deanes Ln | NOT STUDIED |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | $40^{\text {th }}$ Ave \& Clares St | NOT STUDIED |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | $41^{\text {st }}$ Ave \& Soquel Dr | SCC | Signal | - | 23.7 | C | - | 38.0 | D |
| 13 | $41^{\text {st }}$ Ave \& Hwy 1 NB Ramps | Caltrans | Signal | - | 18.3 | B | - | 14.9 | B |
| 14 | $41^{\text {st }}$ Ave \& Hwy 1 SB Ramps | Caltrans | Signal | - | 36.7 | D | - | 7.5 | A |
| 15 | $41^{\text {st }}$ Ave \& Gross Rd | Caltrans | Signal | - | 36.6 | D | - | 46.8 | D |
| 16 | $41^{\text {st }}$ Ave \& Clares St | Capitola | Signal | - | 22.6 | C | - | 26.8 | C |
| 17 | $41^{\text {st }}$ Ave \& Capitola Rd | Capitola | Signal | - | 24.2 | C | - | 35.0 | D |
| 18 | $41^{\text {st }}$ Ave \& Brommer St/Jade St | Capitola | Signal | - | 18.6 | B | - | 27.6 | C |
| 19 | Capitola Rd \& $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | SCC | Signal | - | 18.5 | B | - | 21.0 | C |
| 20 | Capitola Rd \& 17 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | SCC | Signal | - | 19.9 | B | - | 27.1 | C |
| 21 | Capitola Rd \& Chanticleer Ave | SCC | Signal | - | 15.8 | B | - | 23.0 | C |
| 22 | Capitola Rd and $30{ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | Capitola | Signal | - | 20.3 | C | - | 25.4 | C |
| 23 | Brommer St \& $17{ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | SCC | Signal | - | 21.6 | C | - | 26.3 | C |
| 24 | Brommer St \& 30 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | SCC | AWSC | - | 12.0 | B | - | 38.4 | E |
| 25 | $17^{\text {th }}$ Ave \& Portola Dr | SCC | Signal | - | 19.4 | B | - | 20.2 | C |

Notes:

1. Analysis performed using $H C M 6^{\text {th }}$ Edition methodologies.
2. Delay indicated in seconds/vehicle.
3. Signal = Signal Control; AWSC = All-Way Stop Control; SSSC = Side-Street Stop Control
4. CSC = City of Santa Cruz; Caltrans = California Department of Transportation; SCC = Santa Cruz County; Capitola = City of Capitola
5. CSC LOS standard is D; Caltrans LOS standard is C; SCC LOS standard is D; Capitola does not have a LOS standard for $41^{\text {st }}$

Avenue.
6. Intersections that operate below maintaining agency's LOS standard are highlighted and shown in bold.
7. Intersection \#14 operates at LOS A in the PM because traffic to the intersection is controlled/metered at intersections \#13 and \#15. Intersections \#14 and \#15 are operated on one signal controller, managed by Caltrans. Caltrans' main objective is to avoid off-ramp queue spillback into the Highway 1 mainline.
8. Intersection \#5 shows overall LOS as acceptable. See Analysis section on page 72 for additional detail.
9. Intersection \#10 and \#11 were not analyzed in this analysis because the Project is not expected to distribute traffic to these intersections, since a barrier exists at 40th Avenue and Deans Lane and the Project does not propose to remove it (nor are any plans to remove the barrier pending).
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## Trip Generation Estimates

Trip generation estimates were developed for this Project using the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition (2017) and existing driveway counts at the Project site. A trip is defined in Trip Generation as a single or one-directional vehicle movement with either the origin or destination at the Project site. In other words, a trip can be either "to" or "from" the site. In addition, a single customer visit to a site is counted as two trips (i.e., one to and one from the site).

For the purposes of determining the worst-case effects of traffic on the surrounding street network, Project trips are typically estimated on weekdays between the hours of 7:00-9:00 AM and 4:006:00 PM, which is when peak commuter traffic causes the worst congestion and delay. While the Project itself may generate more traffic during other times of the day, the peak of "adjacent street traffic" represents the time period when to the greatest amount of congestion occurs on the network and when operational deficiencies would be triggered due to the Project.

Internal capture reductions are typically considered for mixed-use developments and developments with complementary land uses to account for trips made within the developments. Because there is only one proposed land use for this development, Medical Office, no internal capture trip reductions were assumed.

The new Project will generate some brand-new trips on the road network due to population growth. However, most of the trips will consist of diverted trips from other medical facilities either in Santa Cruz County or Santa Clara County. This is because constructing the new Project will not create additional demand for healthcare services in the County. Instead, it will redistribute trips for healthcare services that are already existing on the roadway network. Locating the MOB at the Project site improves destination proximity for many Healthcare Consumers that are currently traveling to Santa Clara County for healthcare services of the type that the Project will provide in Santa Cruz County (which will also result in shorted trips and reduced VMT).

Due to the diverted trip phenomenon described above, study intersections closest to the site will experience new Project trips fully, with minimal diverted trips. For study intersections further from the Project site, some Project trips will actually be diverted trips that travel through the intersections without the Project. This analysis conservatively assumes that all Project trips through the study intersections are new trips and does not take any reductions for the existing trips to existing medical facilities. Thus, the operating conditions reported for study intersections closest to the Project site will accurately show the anticipated delay and LOS, while study intersections further from the Project site will be somewhat conservative due to diverted trips not being accounted for and removed from existing volumes.

## Gross Project Trip Generation

ITE Land Use Code 630 (Clinic) was assumed for the Project trip generation estimates which is the most conservative trip generation rate that could be used for the Project. ITE land use data is based on empirical data collected from surveyed sites that included a variety of facilities including labs, supporting pharmacies, and a wide range of services, which most closely match the Project description. Based on this data and methodologies, the Project is expected to generate 6,106
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gross daily trips, including 590 gross AM peak hour trips (460 in / 130 out) and 525 gross PM peak hour trips (152 in / 373 out).

The trip generation estimates described above are based on the empirical ITE data and therefore include all Member trips, including those associated with patients, visitors, deliveries, pickups, staff trips, etc. It should also be noted that the Project is proposed to be an outpatient only facility and no overnight hospital services are provided. Hospitals that have overnight stay in the County include Dignity Health, Watsonville Community Hospital, and Sutter Health.

## Trip Credits

Existing traffic counts were collected at the driveway to the existing site from Soquel Avenue and the volumes were subtracted from gross Project trips as a credit to estimate the trip generation for the Project. It should be noted that the existing site access from Soquel Avenue provides access to the entire parcel, of which, only a portion will be redeveloped as part of the Project.

The daily existing trips were estimated using peak hour driveway count data at the driveway to the existing light industrial uses and assuming PM peak hour trips represent approximately 10 percent of the daily trips, which is a reasonable assumption based on experience and industry best practices (when daily data is unavailable). The driveway where existing counts were collected is currently used by roughly 6.63 acres of industrial uses. The Project proposes to occupy approximately 5.22 acres; therefore, the existing trip credit was reduced by roughly 21 percent ([6.63-5.22]/6.63=0.21) to account for the existing land uses that will not be demolished to facilitate construction of the Project.

Based on the data and assumptions described above, existing trip credit estimates assumed in the analysis include 134 daily trips, including 26 AM peak hour trips ( 13 in / 13 out), and 13 PM peak hour trips (6 in / 7 out).

## Net Project Trip Generation

The net trip generation assumes trip credits for the existing light industrial use, as discussed above. The Project is therefore expected to generate a net of 5,972 daily trips, including 564 trips ( 447 in / 117 out) during the AM peak hour and 512 trips ( 146 in / 366 out) during the PM peak hour. Table T-20 summarizes trip generation estimate for the Project.

[^26]
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## Trip Generation Comparison

As requested by the County, traffic data was collected at four medical office sites that provide similar services as the Project. Traffic data collected at the driveways of these four sites was used to estimate trip generation rates, which were then compared to the trip generation rates obtained from ITE data. A summary of the results (including driveway counts) is included in Table T-20. The trip generation rates of the four sites were observed to be considerably less (ranging from 23 percent to 52 percent less) than the ITE LUC 630 trip generation rates assumed in this study. Thus, the ITE trip generation rates used in this study present a conservative trip generation estimate and the actual Project trip generation could be substantially lower than what is analyzed and assumed in this TIOA.
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| Table T-20-Project Trip Generation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Uses ${ }^{1}$ | ITE Land Use Code | Project Size |  | Daily <br> Trips | AM Peak Hour |  |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Total Peak Hour | IN | 1 | OUT | Total Peak Hour | IN | / | OUT |
| Trip Generation Rates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clinic | 630 | - | $\begin{gathered} 1000 \text { Sq. } \\ \text { Ft. } \end{gathered}$ |  | 38.16 | 3.69 | 78\% | 1 | 22\% | 3.28 | 29\% | / | 71\% |
| Existing Conditions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Driveway Count | - | - | - | 170 | 33 | 17 | 1 | 16 | 17 | 8 | 1 | 9 |
| Reduce non-Project eastern portion (21\%) | - | - | - | -36 | -7 | -4 | 1 | -3 | -4 | -2 | 1 | -2 |
| Total Existing Conditions Trip Credit | - | - | - | 134 | 26 | 13 | 1 | 13 | 13 | 6 | 1 | 7 |
| Proposed Conditions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clinic | 630 | 160 | $\begin{gathered} 1000 \text { Sq. } \\ \text { Ft. } \end{gathered}$ | 6106 | 590 | 460 | 1 | 130 | 525 | 152 | / | 373 |
| Net Project Trips |  |  |  | 5,972 | 564 | 447 | 1 | 117 | 512 | 146 | 1 | 366 |

1. Trip generation rates published by Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), "Trip Generation," 10th Edition, 2017.

## Kimley»)Horn

## Trip Distribution and Assignment

Project trips are expected to utilize regional roadways, major arterials, and local collector roads to access the Project site. Trip distribution assumptions were developed based on consultation with County staff, SCCRTC Average Daily Traffic volumes, Caltrans Average Annual Daily Traffic volumes, the local travel demand model, and knowledge of the study area.

The following summarizes Project trip distribution assumptions which are also presented graphically in Figure F-.

- 19\% north along Highway 1
- $10 \%$ south along Highway 1
- $16 \%$ west along Soquel Avenue
- $9 \%$ west along Capitola Road
- $11 \%$ west along Brommer Avenue
- $5 \%$ east along Soquel Drive
- 9\% east along Capitola Road
- 5\% east along Jade Street
- $5 \%$ east along Cliff Drive
- $11 \%$ distributed south throughout local neighborhoods

The Project will construct two access points along Soquel Avenue and all travel to/from the site will utilize those two driveways. Approximately 67 percent of Project trips are anticipated to travel to/from the Project site via west Soquel Avenue and approximately 33 percent of Project trips are estimated to travel to/from the Project site via east Soquel Avenue.

Note that there are two different distribution markers in this figure - double arrowhead and quadruple arrowhead. The double arrowhead markers indicate the assumption that Project trips will travel to/from the Project site along these routes and does not necessarily indicate that Project trip origins and destinations are along these routes. The quadruple distribution marker indicates that Project trip origins and destinations are assumed to be in proximity to the markers. Thus, as indicated in Figure F- this analysis assumes that approximately 5 percent of Project trips are destined for and will originate from the local neighborhoods approximately southwest of the Project site. Similarly, approximately 6 percent of Project trips are destined for and will originate from the local neighborhoods approximately southeast of the Project site.

Figure F- shows the net Project trip assignment for AM and PM peak hour periods that would occur at study intersections during all Plus Project conditions based on the net new Project trip generation estimates as well as the Project trip distribution assumptions described above.


Medical Office Building
Figure F-11
Project Trip Distribution
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## Project Transportation Improvements

## Project Site Access and Circulation

The Project site will be accessed from Soquel Avenue. The Project will construct one main signalized driveway entrance for employees and Members, which will provide access to the patient loading and unloading area, as well as the proposed parking garage. The main driveway will include a protected westbound left-turn pocket and eastbound right-turn pocket into the Project site from Soquel Avenue, as well as northbound left- and right-turn lanes exiting the Project site. A peak hour signal warrant for the main driveway indicates that a signal is warranted per the CAMUTCD guidelines and the peak hour warrant analysis worksheet is included in Appendix J. Note that roundabouts require more right of way than signals and a roundabout at this driveway would not be feasible due to Highway 1 right-of-way constraints.

A secondary driveway will also be constructed east of the main entrance for deliveries, pickups, and ambulances. The secondary driveway south leg will be stop controlled and Soquel Avenue traffic will be free flow. The secondary driveway will experience very low and infrequent volumes throughout the day and no signal is anticipated for this location.

As shown in the Project site plan in Figure F-2, the Project will construct a roadway through the center of the site, with the Project parking garage on the west side of the site and the MOB on the east side of the site. The parking garage will have two entrances/exits, one at the northeast end of the garage and one at the southeast end.

A patient drop-off/pick-up zone will be provided near the main building entrance and accessed via the main Project Driveway. The drop-off/pick-up zone will provide capacity for approximately seven vehicles at a time.

For motorists traveling to the site, the north entrance/exit will allow for free right-turn movements into the garage. Traffic wishing to bypass the main garage entrance will use the southbound through lane, which will be stop-controlled, rather than the free southbound right-turn to bypass the main garage entrance and continue south. Motorists bypassing the main garage driveway will then have the opportunity to access the secondary garage driveway or continue around to the drop-off/pick-up zone adjacent to the MOB. For motorists wishing to park in the garage after dropping-off Members in the loading/unloading zone adjacent to the MOB, motorists will have the opportunity to make a northbound right-turn at the north garage entrance/exit at turn into the garage to seek a parking space.

For motorists leaving the site, both garage exits will be stop controlled. The north entrance/exit will allow for the most direct route to leaving the site, by permitting motorists to make an eastbound right turn, which will bring them to the proposed Soquel Avenue \& Project Driveway signal. For travelers exiting from the south garage driveway, motorists would take an eastbound right turn, travel north past the drop-off/pick-up area, stop at the northbound through stop-controlled movement at the north garage entrance/exit, and then continue on to the Soquel Avenue \& Project Driveway signal.
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An east/west high visibility pedestrian crosswalk will be provided across the south leg of the north garage entrance/exit. Pedestrians will be able to utilize this proposed crosswalk to access the MOB after parking their vehicles and bikes. The Project will construct wayfinding signage to direct pedestrians to the crosswalk. Conflicting traffic will be stop controlled and pedestrians will have the right of way to cross at this location.

Bikes will access the site via the Soquel Avenue \& Project Driveway signalized intersection, traveling south and parking near the north parking garage entrance/exit, as shown in Figure F-2. After parking their bikes at the designated bike parking area, pedestrians will utilize the previously discussed east/west pedestrian crosswalk to access the Project site.

The Project will also construct an ADA-compliant sidewalk along the north Project frontage (south side of Soquel Avenue), which will extend along the south side of Soquel Avenue and fill the existing gap in the County's sidewalk network.

On-site parking is evaluated in detail in CHAPTER 5 on page 42 of this report.

## Project Off-Site Mobility Improvements

The following offsite improvements will be implemented by the Project:
(e) Green Bike Lanes Along Soquel Avenue

The Project will install 4,200 feet of green striped Class II bike lanes along Soquel Avenue, as described in the Pedestrian, Bicycle and Transit Mobility Chapter (Chapter 4) of this report.
(f) Soquel Avenue Two-Way Left-Turn Lane Striping Improvements

The Project will implement approximately 3,500 feet of TWLTL striping (and restriping) along Soquel Avenue from Paul Minnie Avenue to the existing creek crossing (east of Mattison Lane). These striping improvements will include restriping of the existing bike lanes and the addition of new green bike lane striping. Conceptual layouts for these Project improvements are included in Appendix I.
(g) Measure of Effectiveness - Two-Way Left-Turn Lane along Soquel Avenue

Vehicle gap availability and acceptance is typically used to determine if motorists will have sufficient gaps in opposing vehicle traffic. Critical gap acceptance is evaluated in this section and compared to the vehicular flow rate of the opposing movements for motorists entering or exiting stop-controlled side-streets along Soquel Avenue.

Critical gap is defined in 2000 Highway Capacity Manual ("HCM") as the minimum acceptable time interval (in seconds) that is necessary to allow the entry of a vehicle movement. When the observed gap is less, then motorists are forced to wait longer to find acceptable gaps to enter the traffic stream. If the required gap is greater than the available gap, then vehicles will be forced to either choose a gap that is too small or will reroute to another intersection. Both choices are considered unsafe. Table T-21 indicates the base critical gaps by movement type for two-lane streets, as published in the HCM 2000.
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| Table T-21 - Base Critical Gaps |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Vehicle Movement | Base Single Movement <br> Critical Gap (s) |
|  | Two-Lane Major Street |
| Left turn from major | 4.1 |
| Right turn from minor | 6.2 |
| Through traffic on minor | 6.5 |
| Left turn from minor | 7.1 |

Soquel Avenue from Paul Minnie Avenue to the existing creek crossing (east of Mattison Lane) primarily consists of two undivided lanes. Traffic signal control exists at the $17^{\text {th }}$ Avenue intersection. Motorists that desire to make northbound left turns from side-streets (or driveways) onto Soquel Avenue are required to wait for gaps in both eastbound and westbound traffic along Soquel Avenue. Motorists that desire to make a southbound right turn must only wait for a gap in eastbound traffic along Soquel Avenue.

Average available gaps were estimated using existing conditions traffic volumes along Soquel Avenue and compared to existing plus Project traffic volumes and corresponding gaps. As shown in Table T-22, striping a two-way left-turn lane along Soquel Avenue would provide motorists a measurable benefit giving them the opportunity to make northbound left-turn movements from the site in two stages, which would provide higher average gap times than existing conditions and is an improvement over the existing conditions, when gaps in both directions has to be available at the same time.

| Table T-22 - Average Available Gaps |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | Movement | Opposing Vehicle Movement | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
|  |  |  | Opposing Vehicle |  | HCM Base Critical Gap | Opposing Vehicle |  | HCM Base Critical Gap |
|  |  |  | Volume (vph) | Gap (sec per veh) |  | Volume (vph) | Gap (sec per veh) |  |
| Existing Volumes \& Existing Striping (Single movements) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  <br> Paul Minnie Rd | NBL | WBT+EBT | 1269 | 2.8 | 7.1 | 1628 | 2.2 | 7.1 |
|  | NBR | EBT | 537 | 6.7 | 6.2 | 850 | 4.2 | 6.2 |
| Existing Plus Project Volumes \& Two-Way Left-Turn Lane Striping (Two Stage Left-Turn Movement) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Soquel Ave \& Paul Minnie Rd | NBL | WBT | 771 | 4.7 | N/A | 617 | 5.8 | N/A |
|  |  | EBT | 682 | 5.3 |  | 1178 | 3.1 |  |
|  | NBR | EBT | 682 | 5.3 | 6.2 | 1178 | 3.1 | 6.2 |

*Analysis represents volumes near Soquel Avenue \& Paul Minnie Avenue intersection.
As shown above, Existing volumes and striping provides motorists wishing to make left-turns and right-turns from Paul Minnie Road onto Soquel Avenue average vehicle gaps of approximately 2.8 seconds and 6.7 seconds during the AM Peak Hour, respectively. During the PM Peak Hour, northbound left and northbound rights have 2.2 second and 4.2 second average gaps, respectively. These gaps are insufficient when compared to the HCM Base Critical Gap.

As shown above, Existing Plus Project volumes and two-way left-turn lane striping provides motorists wishing to make left turns the opportunity to make the desired left turn onto Soquel
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Avenue in two movements - where the driver crosses opposing eastbound traffic and enters the two-way left-turn lane, and then waits for a gap in westbound traffic to enter the westbound Soquel Avenue traffic stream. The addition of the signal at the Project driveway may create additional gaps in the traffic stream for vehicles to enter Soquel Avenue from the driveways and the other side streets, including this one at Paul Minnie Road.

## Existing Plus Project Conditions

## Analysis

Traffic operations were evaluated at the study intersections for Existing Plus Project conditions. Figure F-13 shows the Existing Plus Project lane geometry and traffic control and Figure F-14 shows the Existing Plus Project peak hour traffic volumes.

No study intersections would degrade from acceptable LOS (without the Project) to unacceptable LOS (with the Project). However, the following intersections currently operating at deficient conditions will degrade further with the addition of Project traffic, as shown in Table T-23.

- Soquel Avenue / 40 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue \& Gross Road (Intersection \#9) (PM Peak)
- $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue \& Highway 1 SB Ramps (Intersection \#14) (AM Peak)
- $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue \& Gross Road (Intersection \#15) (AM \& PM Peaks)
- Brommer Street \& $30^{\text {th }}$ Avenue (Intersection \#24) (PM Peak)

Note that the intersection analysis of Soquel Avenue and Highway 1 Southbound On- and OffRamps (\#5) do not show a deficiency for the overall average delay and LOS. However, field observations indicate that the southbound off-ramp queue spills back onto the auxiliary lane/ existing lane on the freeway in the PM peak period. This is partly due to drivers trying to bypass the freeway congestion via Soquel Avenue or Capitola Road. The reconstruction of the interchange is expected to eliminate the queueing back onto the freeway. The increases in delay from the Project occur in the non-peak flow direction and do not result in deficiencies at the intersection.

The average delay per vehicle at the intersection of Soquel Avenue/Highway 1 is acceptable. However, due to congestion on Highway 1 in the PM in the southbound direction, the queue on the off-ramp overflows. This queue results primarily from traffic leaving the freeway and taking the local streets to go to their destination, or bypass the freeway and continue on frontage roads, i.e., Soquel Avenue and Soquel Drive to bypass the freeway congestion.

The below-described improvements would improve traffic operation at intersections 9, 14, 15 and 24, which currently operate at deficient conditions will degrade further with the addition of Project traffic. Pursuant to the County's General Plan LOS Policy 3.12.1, the Project will contribute to the deficiency at County maintained intersections already operating at an unacceptable LOS if the v/c ratio of the sum of all critical movements at the following intersections increase by $1 \%$ or more with the Project, in which case the General Plan LOS Policy requires mitigation or other improvement to address the deficiency. The v/c analysis is inapplicable to this intersection,
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however, if improvements can eliminate operational deficiencies by causing intersections to operate at LOS D or better.

- Soquel Dr \& Paul Sweet Road / Hwy 1 On-Off Ramps (Intersection \#4) The Project would not contribute any delay to this intersection during the AM or PM peak hour. The Project does not increase the $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ by more than one percent in any of the peak hours as indicated in Table T-23.

| Table T-23 - Soquel Drive \& Paul Sweet Road / Hwy 1 <br> On-Off-Ramps (Intersection \#4) <br> Critical Movement v/c Calculation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AM Peak |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Condition | EBLT+WBT | WBLT+EBT | NBLT+SBT | SBLT+NBT |  |  |  |  |  |
| Existing (v/c) | 2.174 | 0.828 | 1.696 | 1.263 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Existing + Project (v/c) | 2.176 | 0.828 | 1.696 | 1.263 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\boldsymbol{v / c}$ Change | $\mathbf{0 . 0 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 \%}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Condition |  |  |  |  |  | EBLT+WBT | WBLT+EBT | NBLT+SBT | SBLT+NBT |
| Existing (v/c) | 1.372 | 0.944 | 1.772 | 1.420 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Existing + Project (v/c) | 1.373 | 0.947 | 1.772 | 1.420 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\boldsymbol{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Change | $\mathbf{0 . 0 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 3 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 \%}$ |  |  |  |  |  |

Thus, the Project does not cause any new deficiency at the study intersections and no improvement is required.

- Soquel Avenue / 40 th Avenue \& Gross Road (Intersection \#9). During the PM peak hour, the Project would cause delays at this intersection to go from 36.5 seconds (LOS E) to 78.4 sections (LOS F) if no improvements were installed, but installation of the diverter proposed below would eliminate the intersection (and any associated) LOS deficiency.
- It is recommended to install a diagonal diverter extending from the northwest corner to the southeast corner at this intersection. The diverter will prevent cut through traffic on Gross Road through the residential neighborhood, and eliminate the congestion caused by the all-way stop at the intersection. Residents in the neighborhood would then exit the neighborhood at Rodeo Gulch Drive onto Soquel Avenue. This commute is slightly longer than the direct connection to $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue via Gross Road, but the benefits of removing cut through traffic through the neighborhood, and the improvement of operations at the Gross Road/40 Avenue intersection, warrants the installation of this improvement. In addition, if this improvement is not installed, cut through traffic on Gross Road and the delay at the intersection will continue and even worsen in the future, until the freeway is improved. The Project does increase the v/c by more than one percent in both the
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AM or PM Peak times as indicated below in Table T-24 (v/c ratio increase 10.09$23.57 \%$ at critical movements).

| Table T-24 <br> - Soquel Avenue / 40 <br> th <br> Road (Intersection \#9) <br> Critical Movement v/c Calculation |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AM Peak |  |  |  |  |
| Condition |  |  |  |  |
| EBLT+WBT | WBLT+EBT | NBLT+SBT | SBLT+NBT |  |
| Existing (v/c) | 0.199 | 0.199 | 0.393 | 0.393 |
| Existing + Project (v/c) | 0.224 | 0.224 | 0.485 | 0.485 |
| v/c Change | $12.56 \%$ | $12.56 \%$ | $23.41 \%$ | $23.41 \%$ |
| Condition | EBLT+WBT | WBLT+EBT | NBLT+SBT | SBLT+NBT |
| Existing (v/c) | 0.803 | 0.803 | 0.997 | 0.997 |
| Existing + Project (v/c) | 0.884 | 0.884 | 1.232 | 1.232 |
| $v / c$ Change | $10.09 \%$ | $10.09 \%$ | $23.57 \%$ | $23.57 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |

- Installation of the diverter would eliminate both the cut through traffic and the adverse delay at the intersection, improving the potential operational deficiencies and eliminating any LOS deficiency. Without the Project, it would also improve the existing condition during the PM peak hour. The traffic flow at this intersection would then be governed by the signal at Gross Road \& $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue, where additional improvements are recommended. The long cycle length at the $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue intersection results currently in queues spilling into the Gross Road intersection. These queues are expected to shorten from 8.15 minutes to 4.53 minutes with these recommended improvements, as shown in the graphic below. The installation of the diverter will result in additional traffic being added to the intersection of Rodeo Gulch Road and Soquel Avenue. The increase in traffic will add delay for vehicles on the northbound approach wanting to turn left or right onto Soquel Avenue. This delay is not anticipated to be substantial and during the PM peak hour, courtesy gaps will be taken to cross the queue that forms in the eastbound direction.
- The Project causes delay to increase at Intersection \#9 if no improvements are made. The recommended improvement installs a diverter, which makes all movement free. Thus, no delay would be attributed to this intersection. With installation of the diverter, the LOS deficiency would be eliminated.


## Kimley»"Horn



- $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue \& Highway 1 Southbound Ramps (Intersection \#14). During the AM peak hour, the Project would cause delays at this intersection to go from 36.7 seconds (LOS D) to 41.6 sections (LOS D). This is a Caltrans managed facility operating at LOS D and therefore evaluated (pursuant to now outdated standards applicable prior to adoption of VMT thresholds) based on additional delay caused by the Project. The Project does increase the $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ by more than one percent in both the AM or PM Peak times as indicated below in Table T-25 (v/c ratio increase 8\% at one critical movement).

| Table T-25 - 41 <br> st <br> (Intersection \#14enue \& Highway 1 Southbound Ramps <br> Critical Movement v/c Calculation |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection 14 |  |  |  |  |  |
| AM Peak |  |  |  |  |  |
| Condition | EBLT+WBT | WBLT+EBT | NBLT+SBT | SBLT+NBT |  |
| Existing (v/c) | 1.25 | 1.25 | 0.25 | 0.30 |  |
| Existing + Project (v/c) | 1.25 | 1.25 | 0.27 | 0.30 |  |
| $\boldsymbol{v / c}$ Change | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 . 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 \%}$ |  |
| PM Peak |  |  |  |  |  |
| Condition | EBLT+WBT | WBLT+EBT | NBLT+SBT | SBLT+NBT |  |
| Existing (v/c) | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.31 | 0.45 |  |
| Existing + Project (v/c) | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.31 | 0.45 |  |
| $\boldsymbol{v / c}$ Change | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 \%}$ |  |
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- Caltrans certified the environmental impact report ("EIR") for the Santa Cruz Route 1 Tier 1-Corridor Analysis of High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes and Transportation System Management Alternatives and Tier II- Build Project Analysis of $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue to Soquel Avenue/Drive Auxiliary Lanes and Chanticleer Avenue PedestrianBicycle Overcrossing, which identifies long-term improvement projects for providing capacity at Highway 1 interchanges. The identified improvements at the $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue interchange includes ramp widening and improvements and the overcrossing would be widened. These improvements are unconstrained and until funding becomes available, the operational deficiency would remain. Once the improvements are implemented, the facility is expected to operate at acceptable conditions.
- $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue \& Gross Road (Intersection \#15). During the AM peak hour, the Project would cause delays at this intersection to go from 36.8 seconds (LOS D) to 43.1 sections (LOS D) and during the PM peak hour, the Project would cause delays to go from 46.8 seconds (LOS D) to 51.7 sections (LOS D). The Project does increase the v/c by more than one percent in both the AM or PM Peak times as indicated below in Table T-26 Table (v/c ratio increase 1.85-33.58\% at critical movements).

| Table T-26 - 41 <br> \#t <br> \#15) Avenue \& Gross Road (Intersection <br> Critical Movement v/c Calculation |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AM Peak |  |  |  |  |
| Condition | EBLT+WBT | WBLT+EBT | NBLT+SBT | SBLT+NBT |
| Existing (v/c) | 0.54 | 0.54 | 1.37 | 1.30 |
| Existing + Project (v/c) | 0.56 | 0.55 | 1.83 | 1.30 |
| v/c Change | $3.70 \%$ | $1.85 \%$ | $33.58 \%$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 \%}$ |
| PM Peak |  |  |  |  |
| Condition | EBLT+WBT | WBLT+EBT | NBLT+SBT | SBLT+NBT |
| Existing (v/c) | 1.32 | 1.31 | 1.26 | 1.31 |
| Existing + Project (v/c) | 1.4 | 1.38 | 1.43 | 1.31 |
| v/c Change | $6.06 \%$ | $5.34 \%$ | $13.49 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |

- During the PM peak, southbound queues form on Gross Road and Soquel Avenue due to the cut-through traffic on Soquel Avenue trying to bypass the freeway congestion. These queues sometime spill back to Rodeo Gulch Drive on Soquel Avenue. Traffic also cut through the Gross Road neighborhood.
- The City of Capitola is planning the installation of an adaptive signal system along $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue, and this intersection is included in the design. The adaptive signal system is funded and would provide better coordination of traffic flow along the corridor because it measures real time vehicular demand and proportions/adjusts signal timing accommodating traffic.
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- In addition, the Project would install overhead signs and roadway markings to improve lane selection and use on the eastbound approach of Gross Road. The lane selection would be for southbound Highway 1 and northbound Highway 1 movements. See Appendix M for the conceptual layout of this improvement.
- The Project will also install a physical barrier between the limit line and the diverge of the Highway 1 southbound on-ramp on $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue. This barrier will prevent vehicles from jumping the queue for southbound on-ramp traffic. This improvement would also improve bicycle rider safety in the Class II bike lane at the Highway 1 southbound on-ramp at $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue.
- This barrier installation would require a Caltrans construction permit and approval. It can only be installed if approved by Caltrans.
- The Project's installation of overhead signs, roadway marking, diagonal diverter, and a physical barrier, as described above, would reduce the travel time from Soquel Drive \& Rodeo Gulch Road to the southbound Highway 1 on-ramp from 8.15 minutes under existing conditions to 4.53 minutes with the proposed improvements. The Project thus reduces the existing delay for all the road users at this location. Even without the adaptive signal system, the installation of these features by the Project would improve existing and plus Project conditions, thus eliminating any deficiency caused by the Project.

Alternative Improvement for congestion at $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue/Gross Road: Removal of the road barrier on $40^{\text {th }}$ Avenue at Deanes Lane

- The location of Gross Road at $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue results in eastbound afternoon traffic diverting from a congested SR 1 and cutting through the local streets along Soquel Avenue to $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue. The afternoon eastbound right turn movement at the intersections of Gross Road and $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue is 248 vehicles in Existing Plus Project conditions and these vehicles travel southbound on $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue. If the barrier at Deanes Lane is removed, some of this traffic could be expected to travel on $40^{\text {th }}$ Avenue towards Clares Street towards Capitola Mall. Some drivers may also choose to use Clares Street to gain access to $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue.
- The traffic that would use $40^{\text {th }}$ Avenue instead of 41 st Avenue would slightly improve the conditions at the intersection of Gross Road and $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue, however the heaviest movement at this intersection is the southbound left turns (639 PM peak hour vehicles) and the improvement there would not be noticeable. In addition, the traffic that would divert from Gross Road to $40^{\text {th }}$ Avenue would remain in the long eastbound queues on Soquel Avenue and most probably cut through the Gross Road neighborhood and make an eastbound right turn at Gross Road/ $40^{\text {th }}$ Avenue. Thus, traffic cut-through through the Gross Road neighborhood would increase if the barrier is removed and the diagonal diverter is not installed.
- For the non-peak periods, removing the barrier would benefit access to the Capitola Mall and reroute some traffic from $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue. It is also anticipated that a signal may be required at the intersection of Clares Street and $40^{\text {th }}$ Avenue to
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accommodate the additional traffic demand. The intersection is already congested during peak shopping periods with the current All Way Stop configuration.

- Brommer Street \& $30^{\text {th }}$ Avenue (Intersection \#24).
- During the PM peak hour, the Project would cause delays at this intersection to go from 38.4 seconds (LOS E) to 39.1 seconds (LOS E) The Project does increase the $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ by more than one percent in both the AM or PM Peak times as indicated below in Table T-27 (v/c ratio increasing 0.24-1.81\% at critical movements).
- The LOS deficiency could be eliminated with installation of a signal control with permissive left-turn phasing. Peak Hour Signal Warrant \#3 (CAMUTCD) is satisfied with Existing Conditions traffic and in Existing Plus Project Conditions traffic. With existing geometry, signal control, eastbound/westbound split phasing, and permissive left-turn phasing, this intersection would operate at acceptable LOS with Existing Plus Project conditions traffic volumes. The Peak Hour Signal Warrant \#3 evaluation is included in Appendix J.
- The Project only contributes 5 trips during the PM peak hour to the intersection and causes less than one second of delay. The proposed improvement would cause the Brommer Street \& $30^{\text {th }}$ Avenue intersection to operate at LOS C with the Project.
- The Project would pay a fair share contribution of $14 \%$ to the intersection improvement (i.e., the installation of a signal, since it is deficient already).

| Table T-27 - Brommer Street \& 30 <br> (h) <br> (Intersection \#24) Avenue <br> Critical Movement v/c Calculation |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AM Peak |  |  |  |  |  |
| Condition | EBLT+WBT | WBLT+EBT | NBLT+SBT | SBLT+NBT |  |
| Existing (v/c) | 0.756 | 0.756 | 0.664 | 0.664 |  |
| Existing + Project (v/c) | 0.760 | 0.760 | 0.676 | 0.676 |  |
| v/c Change | $\mathbf{0 . 5 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 5 3 \%}$ | $1.81 \%$ | $1.81 \%$ |  |
| PM Peak |  |  |  |  |  |
| Condition | EBLT+WBT | WBLT+EBT | NBLT+SBT | SBLT+NBT |  |
| Existing (v/c) | 1.673 | 1.673 | 0.852 | 0.852 |  |
| Existing + Project (v/c) | 1.677 | 1.677 | 0.865 | 0.865 |  |
| v/c Change | $\mathbf{0 . 2 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 2 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 5 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 5 3 \%}$ |  |
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## Microsimulation Analysis

The positive effect of the installation of some of these improvements cannot be evaluated using typical LOS analysis, but must be analyzed using microsimulation methodologies instead. LOS (HCM ${ }^{\text {th }}$ ) is a deterministic traffic analysis methodology, whereas microsimulation (SimTraffic) is a probabilistic/stochastic traffic analysis methodology that can provide more detailed, and statistically based measures of effectiveness. ${ }^{41}$

It is anticipated that some cut-through traffic traveling south along Highway 1 to Capitola and Aptos currently uses Mattison Lane between Soquel Avenue and Capitola Road. This traffic tries to avoid the Gross Road/40 th Avenue queuing and congestion. Analysis results from recommended improvements along Soquel Avenue would slightly improve operations (or at a minimum, operations would remain the same). Therefore, it is not anticipated that additional cutthrough traffic would divert to Mattison Lane due to the Project. In support of this, it should be noted again that there is a potential decrease in delay from 8 minutes to 4.59 minutes in the PM peak at the Gross Road/40 th Avenue and Gross Road $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue intersections. If the diverter at Gross Road and $40^{\text {th }}$ Avenue is not installed, more existing traffic would potentially divert down Mattison Lane in the future, and a signal may eventually be required at Capitola Road and traffic through the neighborhood may be impacted. A signal may, in turn, create more capacity and then more traffic may divert through the Mattison Road neighborhood.

Existing Plus Project analysis results are presented in Table T-28. Synchro output sheets are provided in Appendix C. A summary of the improvements for intersections operating at a deficient level of service is indicated in Table T-29.

Since the first draft report was compiled in 2019, Caltrans has changed the lane assignment at the intersection of Soquel Avenue \& Highway 1 SB On- and Off-Ramp (Intersection \#5) to include an exclusive eastbound left-turn lane. The approach lanes were restriped to include a separate left-turn lane and a separate through lane. Signal timing sheets available at that time were changed to reflect the new lane configuration and phasing optimized to obtain a representative LOS. This change resulted in a decrease of delay from 28.2 seconds to 20.7 seconds during the AM peak hour and from 29.4 seconds to 21.8 seconds during the PM peak hour. The LOS remains a LOS C for both peak hours. Synchro output sheets are provided in Appendix U.

[^27]
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Expect More. Experience Better.


|  | $20{ }^{20}$ |  | 22 ${ }^{\text {cien }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
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Table T-28 - Existing Plus Project Conditions Intersection Level of Service

| \# | Intersection | Maintaining Agency | Control Type | Existing Conditions |  |  |  |  |  | Existing Plus Project Conditions |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Movement | Delay | LOS | Movement | Delay | LOS | Movement | Delay | LOS | Movement | Delay | LOS |
| 1 | Soquel Ave \& Capitola Rd | CsC | Signal | - | 31.4 | C | - | 29.2 | c | - | 31.9 | C | - | 30.5 | c |
| 2 | Soquel Ave \& $7^{\text {l }}$ Ave | SCC | Signal | - | 16.8 | B | - | 17.1 | B | - | 17.7 | B | - | 17.1 | B |
| 3 | Soquel Dr / Soquel Ave \& Soquel Ave | Caltrans | Signal | - | 29.5 | C | - | 30.9 | C | - | 30.3 | C | - | 33.3 | C |
| 4 | Soquel Dr \& Paul Sweet Rd / Hwy 1 On-Off Ramps | Caltrans | Signal | - | 51.6 | D | - | 36.7 | D | - | 51.6 | D | - | 36.6 | D |
| 5 | Soquel Ave \& Hwy 1 SB On-Off Ramps | Caltrans | Signal | - | 27.1 | C | - | 27.7 | C | - | 28.2 | C | - | 29.4 | C |
| 6 | Soquel Ave \& $17^{\text {th }}$ Ave | SCC | Signal | - | 8.7 | A | - | 9.5 | A | - | 10.2 | B | - | 10.8 | B |
| 7 | Soquel Ave \& Chanticleer | SCC | sssc | - | 5.4 | A | - | 2.7 | A | - | 7.1 | A | - | 4.3 | A |
|  | Worst Approach |  |  | NB | 13.7 | B | NB | 16.9 | c | NB | 21.3 | C | NB | 29.7 | D |
| 8 | Soquel Ave \& MOB Driveway | scc | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { SSSC / } \\ & \text { Signal } \end{aligned}$ | - | 0.4 | A | - | 0.2 | A | . | 5.9 | A | . | 8.4 | A |
|  | Worst Approach |  |  | NB | 11.3 | B | NB | 14.0 | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | Soquel Ave / $40^{\text {th }}$ Ave \& Gross Rd | SCC | AWSC | . | 10.9 | B | - | 36.5 | E | - | 14.8 | B | - | 78.4 | F |
| 10 | 40th Ave \& Deanes Ln | NOT STUDIED |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | $40^{\text {th }}$ Ave \& Clares St | NOT STUDIED |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | $44^{\text {st }} \mathrm{Ave}$ \& Soquel Dr | SCC | Signal | - | 23.7 | C | - | 38.0 | D | - | 24.4 | C | - | 39.1 | D |
| 13 | $44^{\text {st }}$ Ave \& Hwy 1 NB Ramps | Caltrans | Signal | - | 18.3 | B | - | 14.9 | B | - | 18.4 | B | - | 15.0 | B |
| 14 | $44^{\text {st }}$ Ave \& Hwy 1 SB Ramps | Caltrans | Signal | - | 36.7 | D | - | 7.5 | A | - | 41.6 | D | - | 8.1 | A |
| 15 | $44^{\text {st }} \mathrm{Ave}$ \& Gross Rd | Caltrans | Signal | - | 36.6 | D | - | 46.8 | D | - | 43.1 | D | - | 51.7 | D |
| 16 | $4{ }^{\text {t }}$ Ave \& Clares St | Capitola | Signal | - | 22.6 | c | - | 26.8 | c | - | 22.9 | c | - | 27.0 | C |
| 17 | $41^{\text {st }}$ Ave \& Capitola Rd | Capitola | Signal | - | 24.2 | c | - | 35.0 | D | - | 25.0 | C | - | 36.0 | D |
| 18 | $4{ }^{\text {t }}$ Ave \& Brommer StJJade St | Capitola | Signal | - | 18.6 | B | - | 27.6 | c | - | 19.3 | B | - | 28.6 | C |
| 19 | Capitola Rd\& $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | SCC | Signal | - | 18.5 | B | - | 21.0 | c | - | 20.9 | c | - | 24.1 | c |
| 20 | Capitola Rd \& 17 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | SCC | Signal | - | 19.9 | B | - | 27.1 | c | - | 20.5 | C | - | 28.4 | c |
| 21 | Capitola Rd \& Chanticleer Ave | ScC | Signal | - | 15.8 | B | - | 23.0 | c | - | 16.3 | B | - | 24.1 | c |
| 22 | Capitola Rd and $30^{\text {ath }} \mathrm{Ave}$ | Capitola | Signal | - | 20.3 | c | - | 25.4 | c | - | 21.2 | c | - | 25.9 | c |
| 23 | Brommer St \& $17^{\text {th }}$ Ave | SCC | Signal | - | 21.6 | c | - | 26.3 | c | - | 22.0 | c | - | 26.9 | C |
| 24 | Brommer St \& $30^{\text {th }}$ Ave | SCC | AWSC | - | 12.0 | B | - | 38.4 | E | - | 12.1 | B | - | 39.1 | E |
| 25 | $17^{\text {m }}$ Ave \& Portola Dr | SCC | Signal | - | 19.4 | B | - | 20.2 | C | - | 19.5 | B | - | 20.4 | C |

Notes:

1. Analysis performed using HCM 6 th Edition methodologies.
2. Delay indicated in seconds/vehicle
3. Signal $=$ Signal Control; AWSC $=$ All-Way Stop Control; SSSC $=$ Side-Street Stop Control
4. CSC = City of Santa Cruz; Caltrans = California Department of Transportation; SCC = Santa Cruz County; Capitola = City of Capitola
5. CSC LOS standard is D; Caltrans LOS standard is C; SCC LOS standard is D; Capitola does not have a LOS standard for 41st Avenue.
6. Intersections that operate below maintaining agency's LOS standard are highlighted and shown in bold.
7. For intersection \#4, The Project does not increase intersection delay or increase critical $v / c$ by $1 \%$ or more. Thus, no Project deficiency is caused at this location.
8. Intersection \#5 shows overall LOS as acceptable. See Analysis section on page 72 for additional detail.
9. Intersection \#10 and \#11 were not analyzed in this analysis because the Project is not expected to distribute traffic to these intersections, since a barrier exists at 40th Avenue and Deans Lane and
managed by Caltrans. Caltrans' main objective is to avoid off-ramp queue spillback into the Highway 1 mainline
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Table T-29 - Improved Existing Plus Project Conditions Intersection Level of Service

| Int\# | Location | Condition | Deficiency caused by the Addition of Project Traffic | Improvement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \#9 | Soquel Avenue / $40^{\text {th }}$ Avenue \& Gross Road | Existing and <br> Existing Plus <br> Project Conditions | The addition of Project traffic worsens the LOS from $E$ to $F$ in the PM. The critical v/c increases by more than $1 \%$ on all the critical approach movements. | Install a diagonal diverter extending from the northwest corner to the southeast corner at this intersection. Residents in the neighborhood would exit the neighborhood at Rodeo Gulch Drive onto Soquel Avenue. If this improvement is not installed, cut through traffic along Gross Road and the delay at the $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue intersection will continue and degrade further in the future until the freeway is improved. <br> The diverter will prevent cut through traffic on Gross Road through the residential neighborhood and eliminate the congestion caused by the all-way stop at the intersection. Queues at this intersection are expected to shorten with these recommended improvements. This commute is slightly longer than the direct connection to $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue via Gross Road, but the benefits of removing cut through traffic through the neighborhood and the improvement of operations at the Gross Road $/ 40^{\text {th }}$ Avenue intersection, warrants the installation of this improvement. With this improvement, traffic flow at this intersection would then be governed by the signal at Gross Road \& $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue where additional improvements are recommended. <br> With the improvement, all movements would be uncontrolled; therefore, no delay would be attributed to this intersection (i.e., the only delay would be incurred at the $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue \& Gross Road signalized intersection). This improvement would cause travel time from Soquel Dr \& Rodeo Gulch Rd to SB Hwy 1 on-ramp to decrease by approximately 44\% when comparing Existing (No Project) to Existing Plus Project conditions. See Appendix M for the proposed layout. In addition, the current cut-through traffic along Gross Road through the neighborhood would also be eliminated. With this improvement the deficiency caused by the Project will be eliminated. Existing conditions will also be improved since the queues will be shortened. |
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Table T-29 - Improved Existing Plus Project Conditions Intersection Level of Service

| In\# | Location | Condition | Deficiency caused by the Addition of Project Traffic | Improvement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \#14 |  <br> Highway 1 <br> Southbound <br> Ramps | Existing and Existing Plus Project Conditions | The LOS remains at $D$ during the AM with the addition of the Project. The average delay increases from 36.7 t0 41.6 seconds per vehicle in the AM. The critical v/c increases by more than $1 \%$ on southbound approach movements. | Caltrans certified the EIR in December 2018 for the Santa Cruz Route 1 Tier 1Corridor Analysis of High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes and Transportation System Management Alternatives and Tier II- Build Project Analysis of $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue to Soquel Avenue/Rive Auxiliary Lanes and Chanticleer Avenue Pedestrian-Bicycle Overcrossing. The EIR identifies long term improvement projects for providing capacity at the interchanges and along the rail line. The TSM improvements at the $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue interchange include ramp widening and improvements and the overcrossing would be widened. The TSM improvements are unconstrained (not fully funded) and until funding becomes available, the operational deficiency would remain. Installation of this improvement is expected to eliminate the deficiency caused by the Project. <br> The State Route 1 HOV Lane Widening Project Supplemental Report (May 2010) analyzed these improvements for the Santa Cruz Route 1 Tier I and Tier II FEIR and the results are included in Appendix P for reference. https://sccrtc.org/projects/streets-highways/hwy1corridor/environmentaldocuments. |
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Table T-29 - Improved Existing Plus Project Conditions Intersection Level of Service

| Int\# | Location | Condition | Deficiency caused by the Addition of Project Traffic | Improvement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \#15 | $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue \& Gross Road <br> (City of Capitola jurisdiction and Caltrans control) |  | The LOS remains at $D$ during the AM and PM with the addition of the Project. The average delay increases from 36.5 to 43.1 seconds per vehicle in the AM and from 46.8 to 51.7 seconds per vehicle in the PM. The critical v/c increases by more than $1 \%$ on all the critical approach movements. | The City of Capitola received a grant to install an adaptive signal system along $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue and this intersection is included in its implementation plan. In addition, the Project would install overhead signs and roadway markings to improve lane selection and use on the eastbound approach of Gross Road. The lane selection would be for southbound Highway 1 and northbound Highway 1 movements. See Appendix $\mathbf{N}$ for the conceptual layout for improvement details. A barrier would be installed between Gross Road and Highway 1 Southbound Ramps. The barrier would be installed between the eastbound through lane over the freeway and the eastbound right-turn lane onto the freeway southbound on-ramp. This barrier installation would require a Caltrans encroachment permit/approval. It can only be installed if approved by Caltrans. <br> The adaptive signal system would provide better coordination of traffic flow along the corridor because it measures real time vehicular demand and proportions/adjusts signal timing. Furthermore, a physical barrier will be installed between the limit line and the diverge of the Highway 1 southbound on-ramp on $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue. This barrier will prevent vehicles from jumping the queue for southbound on-ramp traffic. This improvement would also improve bicycle rider safety in the Class II bike lane at the Highway 1 southbound on-ramp at $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue. A conceptual layout of these improvements are indicated in Appendix M. <br> The State Route 1 HOV Lane Widening Project Supplemental Report (May 2010) analyzed these improvements for the Santa Cruz Route 1 Tier I and Tier II FEIR and the results are included in Appendix $P$ for reference. https://sccrtc.org/projects/streets-highways/hwy1corridor/environmentaldocuments. |
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Table T-29 - Improved Existing Plus Project Conditions Intersection Level of Service

| Int\# | Location | Condition | Deficiency caused by the Addition of Project Traffic | Improvement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \#24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Brommer Street \& } \\ & 30^{\text {th }} \end{aligned}$ | Existing and Existing Plus Project Conditions | The intersection operates at LOS F in PM Peak without Project and continues to operate at LOS F with <br> Project. The average delay increases from 38.4 seconds per vehicle to 39.1 seconds per vehicle with the addition of Project traffic. The critical v/c increases by more than $1 \%$ on the northbound and southbound critical movements. | Install signal control with permissive left-turn phasing. Peak Hour Signal Warrant \#3 (CAMUTCD) is satisfied with Existing Conditions traffic and in Existing Plus Project Conditions traffic. With existing geometry, signal control, eastbound/westbound split phasing, and permissive left-turn phasing, this intersection would operate at acceptable LOS with Cumulative Plus Project conditions traffic volumes. The Peak Hour Signal Warrant \#3 evaluation is included in Appendix J. <br> For Existing Conditions, the intersection will improve the PM delay by 17.1 seconds per vehicle with installation of the signal. <br> Installation of a signal control with permissive left-turn phasing would cause the intersection to operate at an acceptable LOS. The Project will pay a fair share of $14 \%$ towards the improvement and the Project will eliminate its incremental addition to the LOS deficiency (Project Trips through intersection / All Future trips through intersection). |
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## Conclusions - Existing Plus Project Conditions

The implementation of the improvements described above will remove the deficiencies caused by the Project or will improve the conditions to better than existing conditions.

## Near Term Conditions

Near Term Conditions were determined in consultation with County staff and evaluate traffic volumes, transportation network improvements, and operations that would occur by the year 2021. The following development conditions are evaluated in this chapter:

- Near Term Conditions
- Near Term Plus Project Conditions


## Near Term Transportation Improvements

Per discussions with the County, as documented in the County's 2040 Regional Transportation Plan ("RTP"), and the 2018/2019 Capital Improvement Program ("CIP"), it is not assumed that any network capacity improvements will be implemented (including new intersections) in the study area by Near Term Conditions. Therefore, Existing Conditions geometries and intersection control are assumed for baseline Near Term conditions. In addition, no Near-Term signalization improvements, such as cycle lengths, offsets, or splits, are assumed for any of the study intersections.

Figure F-15 illustrates the intersection geometry and traffic control assumed in the Near-Term analysis, which are the same as Existing Conditions.

## Near Term Traffic Volume Development

Typically, Near Term Conditions can be calculated by either identifying the approved, but not yet constructed projects that would add traffic to a study transportation network in the Near Term or by estimating traffic growth, based on historical or future projections.

Kimley-Horn coordinated with County staff to determine if there were any development projects in the study area that are in various stages of planning or approval. The County provided a list of projects that are in various stages of the planning and approval process. The pending project information provided by the County was used to develop Near Term traffic volume forecasts along with travel demand model growth estimates. The list of pending/approved projects provided by the County is included in Appendix I.

Cumulative model plots were reviewed and determined to incorporate reasonable growth assumptions compared to the County's pending and approved projects list in the study area. In addition, increases to the Near-Term volume estimates were also made to account for three relatively large pending projects that are anticipated to be developed within the study area by 2021. Pending development projects manually added to volume growth estimates include the following*:

- Midpen Housing at Capitola Road \& $17^{\text {th }}$ Avenue
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- Development Assumption: 57 residential units, 30,178 square foot dental and medical clinic, 1,000 square foot retail facility.
- East Cliff Village Center Redevelopment at East Cliff Drive \& $15^{\text {th }}$ Avenue
- Development Assumption: 12,370 square feet of retail, 2,800 square foot restaurant, 164 units of assisted living/memory care, 60 room hotel, and 180 residential dwelling units.
- Swenson Mixed-Use Development at $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue \& Brommer Street
- Development Assumption: 40 residential units, up to 100 room visitor accommodations, and 8,500 square feet of commercial space.

In aggregate, traffic volume growth at the study intersections as a result of the combined model estimates and the addition of the three developments described above results in a compound annual growth rate ("CAGR") of approximately 1 percent per annum between Existing and NearTerm analysis conditions. Near Term peak hour volumes are presented in Figure F-15.
*Pending development assumptions provided by County Planning Department.

## Near Term Intersection Level of Service

Near Term conditions were evaluated at the study intersections based on lane geometry and traffic control illustrated in Figure F-15 and peak hour volumes in Figure F-16.

The following intersections operate at an unacceptable LOS under Near Term conditions:

- Soquel Drive \& Paul Sweet Road / Highway 1 On-Off Ramps (Intersection \#4) (AM \& PM Peaks)
- Soquel Avenue / 40 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue \& Gross Road (Intersection \#9) (PM Peak)
- $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue \& Highway 1 SB Ramps (Intersection \#14) (AM Peak)
- $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue \& Gross Road (Intersection \#15) (AM \& PM Peaks)
- Brommer Street \& 30 th Avenue (Intersection \#24) (PM Peak)

Results of the analysis are presented in Table T-30. Synchro output sheets are provided in Appendix D.

Since the first draft report was compiled in 2019, Caltrans has changed the lane assignment at the intersection of Soquel Avenue \& Highway 1 SB On- and Off-Ramp (Intersection \#5) to include an exclusive eastbound left-turn lane. The approach lanes were restriped to include a separate left-turn lane and a separate through lane. Signal timing sheets available at that time were changed to reflect the new lane configuration and phasing optimized to obtain a representative LOS. This change resulted in a decrease of delay from 26.9 seconds to 20.4 seconds during the AM peak hour and from 27.5 seconds to 21.1 seconds during the PM peak hour. The LOS remains a LOS C for both peak hours. Synchro output sheets are provided in Appendix U.
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| Table T-30 - Near Term Conditions Intersection Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \# | Intersection | Maintaining Agency | Control Type | Near Term Conditions |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Movement | Delay | LOS | Movement | Delay | LOS |
| 1 | Soquel Ave \& Capitola Rd | CSC | Signal | - | 50.7 | D | - | 37.6 | D |
| 2 | Soquel Ave \& $7^{\text {th }}$ Ave | SCC | Signal | - | 21.7 | C | - | 21.6 | C |
| 3 | Soquel Dr / Soquel Ave \& Soquel Ave | Caltrans | Signal | - | 29.5 | C | - | 31.3 | C |
| 4 | Soquel Dr \& Paul Sweet Rd / Hwy 1 On-Off Ramps | Caltrans | Signal | - | 57.5 | E | - | 38.7 | D |
| 5 | Soquel Ave \& Hwy 1 SB On-Off Ramps | Caltrans | Signal | - | 26.9 | C | - | 27.5 | C |
| 6 | Soquel Ave \& 17 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | SCC | Signal | - | 8.9 | A | - | 10.0 | B |
| 7 | Soquel Ave \& Chanticleer | C | SSSC | - | 5.4 | A | - | 2.7 | A |
| 7 | Worst Approach | C | SSSC | NB | 13.7 | B | NB | 16.9 | C |
| 8 | Soquel Ave \& MOB Driveway | CC | SSSC | - | 0.4 | A | - | 0.2 | A |
| 8 | Worst Approach | C | SSS | NB | 11.3 | B | NB | 14.0 | B |
| 9 | Soquel Ave / 40 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave \& Gross Rd | SCC | AWSC | - | 10.9 | B | - | 37.1 | E |
| 10 | 40th Ave \& Deanes Ln | NOT STUDIED |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | 40th Ave \& Clares St | NOT STUDIED |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | $41^{\text {st }}$ Ave \& Soquel Dr | SCC | Signal | - | 24.1 | C | - | 42.0 | D |
| 13 | $41^{\text {st }}$ Ave \& Hwy 1 NB Ramps | Caltrans | Signal | - | 18.2 | B | - | 15.4 | B |
| 14 | $41^{\text {st }}$ Ave \& Hwy 1 SB Ramps | Caltrans | Signal | - | 54.4 | D | - | 8.8 | A |
| 15 | $41^{\text {st }}$ Ave \& Gross Rd | Caltrans | Signal | - | 37.5 | D | - | 51.0 | D |
| 16 | $41^{\text {st }}$ Ave \& Clares St | Capitola | Signal | - | 23.2 | C | - | 27.4 | C |
| 17 | $41^{\text {st }}$ Ave \& Capitola Rd | Capitola | Signal | - | 24.9 | C | - | 36.4 | D |
| 18 | $41^{\text {st }}$ Ave \& Brommer St/Jade St | Capitola | Signal | - | 19.0 | B | - | 28.2 | C |
| 19 | Capitola Rd \& $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | SCC | Signal | - | 20.2 | C | - | 22.7 | C |
| 20 | Capitola Rd \& 17 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | SCC | Signal | - | 22.5 | C | - | 33.2 | C |
| 21 | Capitola Rd \& Chanticleer Ave | SCC | Signal | - | 16.0 | B | - | 23.7 | C |
| 22 | Capitola Rd and 30 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | Capitola | Signal | - | 21.2 | C | - | 26.5 | C |
| 23 | Brommer St \& $17^{\text {th }}$ Ave | SCC | Signal | - | 26.2 | C | - | 33.6 | C |
| 24 | Brommer St \& 30 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | SCC | AWSC | - | 14.3 | B | - | 55.7 | F |
| 25 | $17^{\text {th }}$ Ave \& Portola Dr | SCC | Signal | - | 20.5 | C | - | 21.2 | C |

Notes:

1. Analysis performed using HCM 6th Edition methodologies.
2. Delay indicated in seconds/vehicle.
3. Signal = Signal Control; AWSC = All-Way Stop Control; SSSC = Side-Street Stop Control
4. CSC = City of Santa Cruz; Caltrans = California Department of Transportation; SCC = Santa Cruz County; Capitola = City of Capitola 5. CSC LOS standard is D; Caltrans LOS standard is C; SCC LOS standard is D; Capitola does not have a LOS standard for 41st Avenue.
5. Intersections that operate below maintaining agency's LOS standard are highlighted and shown in bold.
6. For intersection \#4, The Project does not increase intersection delay or increase critical v/c by $1 \%$ or more. Thus, no Project deficiency is caused at this location.
7. Intersection \#5 shows overall LOS as acceptable. See Analysis section on page 72 for additional detail.
8. Intersection \#10 and \#11 were not analyzed in this analysis because the Project is not expected to distribute traffic to these intersections, since a barrier exists at 40th Avenue and Deans Lane and the Project does not propose to remove it (nor are any plans to remove the barrier pending).
9. Intersection \#14 operates at LOS A in the PM because traffic to the intersection is controlled/metered at intersections \#13 and \#15. Intersections \#14 and \#15 are operated on one signal controller, managed by Caltrans. Caltrans' main objective is to avoid off-ramp queue spillback into the Highway 1 mainline.
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## Near Term Plus Project Intersection Level of Service

Traffic operations were evaluated at the study intersections based on Near Term Plus Project conditions. Near Term Plus Project lane geometry and traffic control are shown in Figure F-17 and Near Term Plus Project peak hour traffic volumes are shown in Figure F-18.

No study intersections would degrade from acceptable LOS (without the Project) to unacceptable LOS (with the Project). However, some intersections currently operating at deficient conditions will degrade further with addition of Project traffic.

- Soquel Drive \& Paul Sweet Road / Highway 1 On-Off Ramps (Intersection \#4) (AM \& PM Peaks).
- Soquel Avenue / 40 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue \& Gross Road (Intersection \#9) (PM Peak)
- $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue \& Highway 1 SB Ramps (Intersection \#14) (AM Peak)
- $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue \& Gross Road (Intersection \#15) (AM \& PM Peaks)
- Brommer Street \& 30 th Avenue (Intersection \#24) (PM Peak)

Note that the intersection analysis of Soquel Avenue and Highway 1 Southbound On- and OffRamps (\# 5) does not show a deficiency for the overall average delay and LOS. However, field observations indicate that the southbound off-ramp queue spills back onto the auxiliary lane/ existing lane on the freeway in the PM peak period. This is partly due to drivers trying to bypass the freeway congestion via Soquel Avenue or Capitola Road. The reconstruction of the interchange is expected to eliminate the queueing back onto the freeway. The increases in delay from the Project occur in the non-peak flow direction and do not result in deficiencies at the intersection.

With respect to intersections that operate at an unacceptable LOS that will degrade further under Near Term Plus Project Conditions, the below-described improvements would improve the potential operational deficiencies. Pursuant to the County's General Plan LOS Policy 3.12.1, the Project will contribute to the deficiency at County maintained intersections if the v/c ratio at any critical movements at the following intersections increase by $1 \%$ or more with the Project, in which case the County's General Plan LOS Policy requires mitigation or other improvement to address the deficiency. The v/c analysis is inapplicable, however, if improvements can eliminate operational deficiencies by causing intersections to operate at LOS D or better. Also, the County's General Plan LOS Policy is not applicable to Caltrans-managed Intersection Nos. 4, 14 and 15; the analysis provided below for those intersections is therefore for informational purposes only.

- Soquel Drive \& Paul Sweet Road / Hwy 1 On-Off Ramps (Intersection \#4). Both with and without the Project, during the Cumulative (2040) Condition, this intersection will experience 57.5 seconds of delay in the AM peak hour (LOS E) and 38.6 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour (LOS D). The Project does not contribute to any deficiency at this intersection in terms of delay or increasing the $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio by more than $1 \%$ at any critical movement. The planned Caltrans improvements described below are anticipated to eliminate the non-Project related deficiency at this intersection.
- Caltrans plans to widen Highway 1/Soquel Drive interchange per the Highway 1 EIR certified in December 2018 and referenced throughout this document. The
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westbound left-turn lane will be converted to a through lane. One westbound rightturn lane, northbound left-turn lane, and an eastbound right-turn bay will be installed at this intersection. It is anticipated that the improvement will eliminate the deficiency. A detailed layout is shown in Appendix M. However, these improvements are currently unfunded, are not included in the County's CIP and may be constructed after 2040. The Cumulative operations will remain deficient until the improvements are constructed.

- It should also be noted that, consistent with SB 743, Caltrans evaluates a land use project's impacts on the state highway system utilizing VMT, rather than congestion or capacity related metrics, such as LOS or v/c. (Caltrans, "Vehicle Miles Traveled-Focused Transportation Impact Study Guide, (May 20, 2020), see pp. 4-5.)
- The Project would not contribute any delay to this intersection during the AM or PM peak hour because it does not increase the volume to capacity ("v/c") by more than one percent in either the AM or PM Peak times as indicated below in Table T-31 (at the most it increases the $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ by 0.21 percent).

| Table T-31- Soquel Drive \& Paul Sweet Road / Hwy 1 <br> On-Off- Ramps (Intersection \#4) <br> Critical Movement v/c Calculation     <br> AM Peak     <br> Condition     <br> EBLT+WBT     WBLT+EBT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NBLT+SBT | SBLT+NBT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Near Term (v/c) | 2.305 | 0.845 | 1.707 | 1.284 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Near Term + Project (v/c) | 2.307 | 0.845 | 1.707 | 1.284 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\boldsymbol{v / c}$ Change | $\mathbf{0 . 0 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 \%}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Condition |  |  |  |  |  | EBLT+WBT | WBLT+EBT | NBLT+SBT | SBLT+NBT |
| Near Term (v/c) | 1.412 | 0.959 | 1.786 | 1.424 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Near Term + Project (v/c) | 1.412 | 0.961 | 1.786 | 1.424 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\boldsymbol{v / c}$ Change | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 2 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 \%}$ |  |  |  |  |  |

- Soquel Avenue / $40^{\text {th }}$ Avenue \& Gross Road (Intersection \#9). During the PM peak hour, the Project would cause delays at this intersection to go from 37.1 seconds (LOS E) to 78.3 sections (LOS F) if no improvements were installed, but installation of the diverter proposed below would eliminate the intersection and therefore any associated delay. The Project does increase the v/c by more than one percent in both the AM or PM Peak times as indicated below in Table T-32 (v/c ratio increasing from 10.09-23.57\% at critical movements).
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| Table T-32 - Soquel Avenue / 40 <br> (In <br> (Intersection \#9) <br> Critical Movement v/C Calculation |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection 9 |  |  |  |  |
| AM Peak |  |  |  |  |
| Condition | EBLT+WBT | WBLT+EBT | NBLT+SBT | SBLT+NBT |
| Near Term (v/c) | 0.199 | 0.199 | 0.393 | 0.393 |
| Near Term + Project (v/c) | 0.224 | 0.224 | 0.485 | 0.485 |
| v/c Change | $12.56 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 2 . 5 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 . 4 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 . 4 1 \%}$ |
| PM Peak |  |  |  |  |
| Condition | EBLT+WBT | WBLT+EBT | NBLT+SBT | SBLT+NBT |
| Near Term (v/c) | 0.803 | 0.803 | 0.997 | 0.997 |
| Near Term + Project (v/c) | 0.884 | 0.884 | 1.232 | 1.232 |
| v/c Change | $10.09 \%$ | $10.09 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 3 . 5 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 . 5 7 \%}$ |

- Same improvements as described in Existing Plus Project Conditions for this intersection.
- $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue \& Highway 1 Southbound Ramps (Intersection \#14). During the AM peak hour, the Project would cause delays at this intersection to go from 54.4 seconds (LOS D) to 60.1 sections (LOS E). The Project does increase the v/c by more than one percent in both the AM or PM Peak times as indicated below in Table T-33 v/c ratio increasing from $0-3.85 \%$ increase at critical movements).

| Table T-33 - 41 <br> st <br> Ramps (Intersection \#14) <br> Critical Movement v/c Calculation |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AM Peak |  |  |  |  |  |
| Condition | EBLT+WBT | WBLT+EBT | NBLT+SBT | SBLT+NBT |  |
| Near Term (v/c) | 1.41 | 1.41 | 0.26 | 0.32 |  |
| Near Term + Project (v/c) | 1.41 | 1.41 | 0.27 | 0.32 |  |
| v/c Change | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 \%}$ | $3.85 \%$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 \%}$ |  |
| PM Peak |  |  |  |  |  |
| Condition | EBLT+WBT | WBLT+EBT | NBLT+SBT | SBLT+NBT |  |
| Near Term (v/c) | 0.69 | 0.69 | 0.32 | 0.47 |  |
| Near Term + Project (v/c) | 0.69 | 0.69 | 0.33 | 0.48 |  |
| v/c Change | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 \%}$ | $3.13 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 . 1 3 \%}$ |  |

- Same improvements as described in Existing Plus Project Conditions for this intersection.
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- $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue \& Gross Road (Intersection \#15). During the AM peak hour, the Project would cause delays at this intersection to go from 37.5 seconds (LOS D) to 45.2 sections (LOS D) and during the PM peak hour, the Project would cause delays to go from 51.0 seconds (LOS D) to 55.6 sections (LOS E).
- The Project does increase the volume to capacity ("v/c") by more than one percent in both the AM or PM Peak times as indicated below in Table T-34.

| Table T-34-41 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Avenue \& Gross Road (Intersection \#15) Critical Movement v/c Calculation |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection 15 |  |  |  |  |
| AM Peak |  |  |  |  |
| Condition | EBLT+WBT | WBLT+EBT | NBLT+SBT | SBLT+NBT |
| Near Term (v/c) | 0.54 | 0.54 | 1.40 | 1.35 |
| Near Term + Project (v/c) | 0.56 | 0.56 | 1.87 | 1.35 |
| v/c Change | 3.70\% | 3.70\% | 33.57\% | 0.00\% |
| PM Peak |  |  |  |  |
| Condition | EBLT+WBT | WBLT+EBT | NBLT+SBT | SBLT+NBT |
| Near Term (v/c) | 1.32 | 1.31 | 1.32 | 1.34 |
| Near Term + Project (v/c) | 1.40 | 1.38 | 1.48 | 1.34 |
| $v /$ Change | 6.06\% | 5.34\% | 12.12\% | 0.00\% |

- Same improvements as described in Existing Plus Project Conditions for this intersection, which will eliminate the all way stop and any associated delay at this intersection.
- Brommer Street \& $30^{\text {th }}$ Avenue (Intersection \#24). During the PM peak hour, the Project would cause delays at this intersection to go from 55.7 seconds (LOS F) to 56.5 seconds (LOS F). The Project does increase the v/c by more than one percent in both the AM or PM Peak times as indicated below in Table T-35 (v/c ratio increasing from 0.31-1.65\% at critical movements).
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| Table T-35 - Brommer Street \& 30 <br> (th <br> \#24) Avenue (Intersection <br> Critical Movement v/c Calculation |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AM Peak |  |  |  |  |
| Condition | EBLT+WBT | WBLT+EBT | NBLT+SBT | SBLT+NBT |
| Near Term (v/c) | 1.010 | 1.010 | 0.738 | 0.738 |
| Near Term + Project (v/c) | 1.014 | 1.014 | 0.750 | 0.750 |
| v/c Change | $\mathbf{0 . 4 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 4 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 6 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 6 3 \%}$ |
| PM Peak |  |  |  |  |
| Condition | EBLT+WBT | WBLT+EBT | NBLT+SBT | SBLT+NBT |
| Near Term (v/c) | 1.912 | 1.912 | 0.908 | 0.908 |
| Near Term + Project (v/c) | 1.918 | 1.918 | 0.923 | 0.923 |
| v/c Change | $\mathbf{0 . 3 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 3 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 6 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 6 5 \%}$ |

- Same improvements as described in Existing Plus Project Conditions for this intersection, which would improve the intersection to LOS C.


## Microsimulation Analysis

The positive effect of the installation of some of these improvements cannot be evaluated using typical LOS analysis, but must be analyzed using microsimulation methodologies instead. LOS (HCM ${ }^{\text {th }}$ ) is a deterministic traffic analysis methodology, whereas microsimulation (SimTraffic) is a probabilistic/stochastic traffic analysis methodology that can provide more detailed and statistically based measures of effectiveness. ${ }^{42}$

Near Term Plus Project analysis results are presented in Table T-36. Synchro output sheets are provided in Appendix E. A summary of the improvements for intersections operating at a deficient level of service is indicated in Table T-37.

Since the first draft report was compiled in 2019, Caltrans has changed the lane assignment at the intersection of Soquel Avenue \& Highway 1 SB On- and Off-Ramp (Intersection \#5) to include an exclusive eastbound left-turn lane. The approach lanes were restriped to include a separate left-turn lane and a separate through lane. Signal timing sheets available at that time were changed to reflect the new lane configuration and phasing optimized to obtain a representative LOS. This change resulted in a decrease of delay from 28.0 seconds to 20.8 seconds during the AM peak hour and from 29.2 seconds to 21.5 seconds during the PM peak hour. The LOS remains a LOS C for both peak hours. Synchro output sheets are provided in Appendix U.

[^28]
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| \# | Intersection | Table T-36-Near Term Plus Project Conditions Intersection Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Maintaining Agency | Control Type | Near Term Conditions |  |  |  |  |  | Near Term Plus Project Conditions |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Movement | Delay | LOS | Movement | Delay | LOS | Movement | Delay | LOS | Movement | Delay | LOS |
| 1 | Soquel Ave \& Capitola Rd | CsC | Signal | - | 50.7 | D | - | 37.6 | D | - | 51.0 | D | - | 40.9 | D |
| 2 | Soquel Ave \& $7^{\text {h }}$ Ave | SCC | Signal | - | 21.7 | C | - | 21.6 | C | - | 22.9 | c | - | 21.7 | C |
| 3 | Soquel Dr / Soquel Ave \& Soquel Ave | Caltrans | Signal | - | 29.5 | c | - | 31.3 | c | - | 30.3 | c | - | 33.7 | c |
| 4 | Soquel Dr \& Paul Sweet Rd/ Hwy 1 On-Off Ramps | Caltrans | Signal | - | 57.5 | E | - | 38.7 | D | - | 57.5 | E | - | 38.6 | D |
| 5 | Soquel Ave \& Hwy 1 SB OnOff Ramps | Caltrans | Signal | - | 26.9 | C | - | 27.5 | C | - | 28.0 | C | - | 29.2 | C |
| 6 | Soquel Ave \& $17^{\text {th }}$ Ave | SCC | Signal | - | 8.9 | A | - | 10.0 | B | - | 10.4 | B | - | 11.6 | B |
| 7 | Soquel Ave \& Chanticleer | SCC | sssc | - | 5.4 | A | - | 2.7 | A | - | 7.1 | A | - | 4.3 | A |
|  | Worst Approach |  |  | NB | 13.7 | B | NB | 16.9 | C | NB | 21.3 | C | - | 29.7 | D |
|  | Soquel Ave \& MOB Driveway | SCC | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SSSC / } \\ & \text { Signal } \end{aligned}$ | - | 0.4 | A | - | 0.2 | A | . | 5.9 | A | - | 8.4 | A |
| 8 | Worst Approach |  |  | NB | 11.3 | B | NB | 14.0 | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | Soquel Ave / $40^{\text {th }}$ Ave \& Gross Rd | SCC | AWSC | - | 10.9 | B | - | 37.1 | E | - | 14.8 | B | - | 78.3 | F |
| 10 | 40th \& Deanes Ln | NOT STUDIED |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | $40^{\text {th }}$ \& Clares St | NOT STUDIED |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | $4{ }^{15^{\text {t }} \text { Ave \& Soquel } \mathrm{Dr}}$ | SCC | Signal | - | 24.1 | C | - | 42.0 | D | - | 24.8 | C | - | 44.3 | D |
| 13 | $44^{\text {tr }}$ Ave \& Hwy 1 NB Ramps | Caltrans | Signal | - | 18.2 | B | - | 15.4 | B | - | 18.3 | B | - | 15.7 | B |
| 14 | $41^{\text {ts }}$ Ave \& Hwy 1 SB Ramps | Caltrans | Signal | - | 54.4 | D | - | 8.8 | A | - | 60.1 | E | - | 9.5 | A |
| 15 | $4{ }^{\text {st }}$ Ave \& Gross Rd | Caltrans | Signal | - | 37.5 | D | - | 51.0 | D | - | 45.2 | D | - | 55.6 | E |
| 16 | $41^{\text {ts }} \mathrm{Ave}$ \& Clares St | Capitola | Signal | - | 23.2 | c | - | 27.4 | C | - | 23.5 | c | - | 27.6 | C |
| 17 | $41^{\text {st }}$ Ave \& Capitola Rd | Capitola | Signal | - | 24.9 | C | - | 36.4 | D | - | 25.8 | C | - | 37.4 | D |
| 18 | $41^{\text {st }}$ Ave \& Brommer St/Jade St | Capitola | Signal | - | 19.0 | B | - | 28.2 | C | - | 19.9 | B | - | 29.2 | C |
| 19 | Capitola Rd \& $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | SCC | Signal | - | 20.2 | C | - | 22.7 | C | - | 23.0 | C | - | 26.3 | C |
| 20 | Capitola Rd \& 17 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | SCC | Signal | - | 22.5 | c | - | 33.2 | c | - | 23.2 | c | - | 35.6 | D |
| 21 | Capitola Rd \& Chanticleer Ave | SCC | Signal | - | 16.0 | B | - | 23.7 | C | - | 16.5 | B | - | 24.8 | C |
| 22 | Capitola Rd and $30^{\text {th }} \mathrm{Ave}$ | Capitola | Signal | - | 21.2 | C | - | 26.5 | c | - | 22.3 | c | - | 27.0 | C |
| 23 | Brommer St \& $17^{\text {th }}$ Ave | SCC | Signal | - | 26.2 | C | - | 33.6 | C | - | 26.7 | C | - | 34.7 | C |
| 24 | Brommer St \& 30 $0^{\text {th }}$ Ave | SCC | AWSC | - | 14.3 | B | - | 55.7 | F | - | 14.4 | B | - | 56.5 | F |
| 25 | $17^{\text {h }}$ Ave \& Portola Dr | SCC | Signal | - | 20.5 | C | - | 21.2 | C | - | 20.7 | C | - | 21.3 | C |

Notes:

1. Analysis performed using HCM $6^{\text {th }}$ Edition methodologies.
2. Delay indicated in seconds/vehicle
3. Signal $=$ Signal Control; AWSC $=$ All-Way Stop Control; SSSC $=$ Side-Street Stop Control
4. CSC = City of Santa Cruz; Caltrans = California Department of Transportation; SCC = Santa Cruz County; Capitola = City of Capitola
5. CSC LOS standard is D: Caltrans LOS standard is C: SCC LOS standard is D: Capitola does not have a LOS standard for $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue
6. Intersections that operate below maintaining agency's LOS standard are highlighted and shown in bold.
7. For intersection \#4, The Project does not increase intersection delay or increase critical v/c by $1 \%$ or more. Thus, no Project deficiency is caused at this location.
8. Intersection \#5 shows overall LOS as acceptable. See Analysis section on page 72 for additional detail.
9. Intersection \#10 and \#11 were not analyzed in this analysis because the Project is not expected to distribute traffic to these intersections, since a barrier exists at 40th Avenue and Deans Lane and the Project does not propose to remove it (nor are any plans to remove the barrier pending).
etered at intersections \#13 and \#15. Intersections \#14 and \#15 are operated on one signal controller
managed by Caltrans. Caltrans' main objective is to avoid off-ramp queue spillback into the Highway 1 mainline.
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Table T-37 - Improved Near Term Plus Project Conditions Conclusions

| Int\# | Location | Condition | Deficiency caused by the Addition of the Project Traffic | Improvement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \#9 | Soquel <br> Avenue / 40 $0^{\text {th }}$ <br> Avenue \& Gross Road | Near Term and Near Term Plus Project Conditions | The addition of the Project traffic worsens the LOS from $E$ to $F$ in the PM. The critical $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ increases by more than $1 \%$ on all the critical approach movements. | Install a diagonal diverter extending from the northwest corner to the southeast corner at this intersection. Residents in the neighborhood would exit the neighborhood at Rodeo Gulch Drive onto Soquel Avenue. If this improvement is not installed, cut through traffic along Gross Road and the delay at the $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue intersection will continue and degrade further in the future until the freeway is improved. <br> The diverter will prevent cut through traffic on Gross Road through the residential neighborhood and eliminate the congestion caused by the all-way stop at the intersection. Queues at this intersection are expected to shorten with these recommended improvements. This commute is slightly longer than the direct connection to $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue via Gross Road, but the benefits of removing cut through traffic through the neighborhood and the improvement of operations at the Gross Road/40 th Avenue intersection, warrants the installation of this improvement. With this improvement, traffic flow at this intersection would then be governed by the signal at Gross Road \& $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue where additional improvements are recommended. The improvement will remove the deficiency caused by the Project. <br> With this improvement, all movements would be uncontrolled; therefore, no delay would be attributed to this intersection (i.e., the only delay would be incurred at the $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue \& Gross Road signalized intersection). This improvement would cause travel time from Soquel Dr \& Rodeo Gulch Rd to SB Hwy 1 on-ramp to decrease by approximately 44\% when comparing Existing (No Project) to Existing Plus Project conditions. See Appendix M for the proposed layout. In addition, the current cut-through traffic along Gross Road through the neighborhood would also be eliminated. |

## Kimley»"Horn

Table T-37 - Improved Near Term Plus Project Conditions Conclusions

| Int\# | Location | Condition | Deficiency caused by the Addition of the Project Traffic | Improvement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \#14 |  <br> Highway 1 <br> Southbound Ramps | Near Term and Near Term Plus Project Conditions | The addition of the Project traffic worsens the LOS from D to E in the AM. The critical $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ increases by more than $1 \%$. | Caltrans certified the EIR for the Santa Cruz Route 1 Tier 1- Corridor Analysis of High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes and Transportation System Management Alternatives and Tier II- Build Project Analysis of $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue to Soquel Avenue/Rive Auxiliary Lanes and Chanticleer Avenue Pedestrian-Bicycle Overcrossing. The EIR identifies long term improvement projects for providing capacity at the interchanges and along the rail line. The TSM improvements at the $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue interchange include ramps widening and improvements and the overcrossing would be widened. The TSM improvements are unconstrained (not fully funded) and until funding becomes available, the operational deficiency would remain. The improvement is expected to remove the deficiency caused by the Project. <br> The State Route 1 HOV Lane Widening Project Supplemental Report (May 2010) analyzed these improvements for the Santa Cruz Route 1 Tier I and Tier II FEIR and the results are included in for Appendix P reference. <br> https://sccrtc.org/projects/streets-highways/hwy1corridor/environmental-documents. |
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Table T-37 - Improved Near Term Plus Project Conditions Conclusions

| Int\# | Location | Condition | Deficiency caused <br> by the Addition of <br> the Project Traffic | Improvement |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
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## Table T-37 - Improved Near Term Plus Project Conditions Conclusions

| Int\# | Location | Condition | Deficiency caused by the Addition of the Project Traffic | Improvement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \#24 | Brommer <br> Street \& $30^{\text {th }}$ | Near Term and Near Term Plus Project Conditions | The intersection operates at LOS F in PM Peak without Project and continues to operate at LOS F with the Project. <br> The average delay increases from 55.7 seconds per vehicle to 56.5 seconds per vehicle with the addition of the Project traffic. The critical v/c <br> increases by more than $1 \%$ on the northbound and southbound critical movements. | Install signal control with permissive left-turn phasing. Peak Hour Signal Warrant \#3 (CAMUTCD) is satisfied with Existing Conditions traffic and in Existing plus Project Conditions traffic. With existing geometry, signal control, eastbound/westbound split phasing, and permissive left-turn phasing, this intersection would operate at acceptable LOS with Cumulative Plus Project conditions traffic volumes. The Peak Hour Signal Warrant \#3 evaluation is included in Appendix J . <br> For Near Term Conditions the intersection will improve the PM delay by 30.9 seconds per vehicle with installation of the signal. <br> The Project would pay a fair share towards the installation of the signal. The deficiency caused by the Project will be eliminated with the installation of the signal. |
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## Conclusions - Near Term Plus Project

The implementation of the improvements described above will eliminate the deficiencies caused by the Project or will improve the conditions to better than existing conditions.

## Cumulative Conditions

Traffic operations were evaluated under the following cumulative conditions:

- Cumulative (2040) Conditions
- Cumulative (2040) Plus Project Conditions

The Cumulative (2040) Conditions (also referred to as "Cumulative") and Cumulative (2040) Plus Project Conditions (also referred to as "Cumulative Plus Project") analyses assume that signal timing changes (such as signal cycle lengths, offsets, and splits) will be implemented prior to 2040 to service traffic pattern changes and growth. Local intersection geometric operational improvements could be implemented as part of future development projects and as part of the County's ongoing signal retiming program. Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission ("SCCRTC") and Caltrans are also planning several Highway 1 main line and interchanges. Auxiliary lanes and High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes are planned for construction along Highway 1 in the study area. Status of the planning, design and improvements is continuously updated on the SCC RTC website ${ }^{43}$. These planned improvements are described in detail in Chapter 7 of this report.

No physical capacity lane improvements (geometric), new signal installation, or signal phasing changes that would require signal modifications, including those mentioned in the County's RTP, are included in the Cumulative or Cumulative Plus Project analyses as opposed to the Cumulative Plus Project improved conditions. Thus, all the freeway and the intersection geometries analyzed in the Cumulative and Cumulative Plus Project scenarios are assumed to be identical to the Existing and Near-Term Conditions intersection geometries.

The County's RTP identifies multiple funded, partially funded, and unfunded multimodal improvements in the Project study area (See Figure F-1) and bulleted below). These improvements are for informational purposes, and not included in the Cumulative or Cumulative Plus Project Analysis.

- $37^{\text {th }} / 38^{\text {th }}$ Avenue (Brommer Street to Eastcliff Drive) Multimodal Circulation Improvements and Greenway
- $41^{\text {st }}$ Ave Improvements Phase 2 (Hwy 1 Interchange to Soquel Drive)
- Chanticleer Avenue Improvements (Hwy 1 to Soquel Drive)
- Countywide ADA Access Ramps
- Countywide Bike Projects
- Countywide Sidewalks
- Mattison Lane Improvements (Chanticleer Avenue to Soquel Avenue)

[^29]
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- Paul Minnie Avenue Improvements (Rodriguez Street to Soquel Avenue)
- Paul Sweet Road Improvements (Soquel Drive to end)
- Soquel Avenue Improvements (City of SC to Gross Road)
- Soquel Drive Traffic Signal and Left-Turn Lane (Robertson Street)

The full RTP list of improvements is included in Appendix K and if implemented, will alleviate congestion on the network.

Figure F-19 illustrates the intersection geometry and traffic control used in the Cumulative analysis.

## Cumulative Volumes

Cumulative volumes in the study area were determined based on the SCCRTC Travel Demand Model, which was updated for 2019 "base year" conditions and 2040 "future year" condition. Land uses for the 2040 future year condition include reasonable growth consistent with the growth nodes in the Sustainable Santa Cruz County Plan (2014) and some major projects such as the proposed redevelopment of the Capitola Mall, the redevelopment of the Farmers Market site, and the expansion of the Dignity Healthcare Campus. Land use assumptions for future growth was provided by County Staff. These are all in the vicinity of the Project and also includes redevelopment growth and other natural growth anticipated in the County, also from AMBAG.

2040 future year condition roadway segment volumes from the SCCRTC Travel Demand Model were obtained for Cumulative traffic volume growth estimates. The same Model was used to plot bi-directional AM and PM peak-hour traffic volumes on each segment along roadways within the Project study area. The 2019 base year (2019) and future year (2040) forecast volumes were compared to determine the annual incremental growth in traffic volumes at study intersection approach and departure links. 2040 future year turning movement volumes were calculated by adding the growth increment to the base year traffic count volumes to calculate the final adjusted roadway link forecast volume. Final adjusted forecast volumes were then converted to Cumulative intersection turning movement volumes using a process commonly referred to as the Furness Method. The Furness Method uses an iterative process to derive future turning movement volumes based on future year roadway link volumes and an initial estimate of turning percentages (obtained from the existing intersection turning movement counts).

This TIOA report assumes that the SCCRTC Travel Demand Model, updated in July 2020, includes a reasonable estimate of growth in the Project study area and that future development projects approved or anticipated at the time that this TIOA was prepared (as provided by the County) were incorporated into the Travel Demand Model and, therefore, the Cumulative analyses. No additional manual assignments or adjustments were made to the Travel Demand Model or volume forecasts.

Changes in land use and improvements to the regional and local road network including Highway 1 in 2040 Conditions results in some local street cut through traffic diverting back to the freeway. Because of relatively low growth in some areas of the County, this may result in a slight reduction in Cumulative model volumes compared to Background Conditions. To be conservative, volumes
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entering the intersection for Cumulative Conditions were not reduced between Near Term Condition and Cumulative Conditions.

Cumulative peak hour traffic volumes are shown in Figure F-20.

## Cumulative (2040) Conditions Intersection Level of Service

Traffic operations were evaluated at the study intersections based on Cumulative lane geometry and intersection control as shown in Figure F-19 and Cumulative peak hour turning movement volumes as shown in Figure F-20.

The following intersections operate at an unacceptable LOS under Cumulative conditions:

- Soquel Drive \& Paul Sweet Road (Intersection \#4) (PM Peaks)
- Soquel Avenue / 40 th Avenue \& Gross Road (Intersection \#9) (PM Peak)
- $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue \& Highway 1 SB Ramps (Intersection \#14) (AM Peak)
- $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue \& Gross Road (Intersection \#15) (AM \& PM Peaks)
- Brommer Street \& $30^{\text {th }}$ Avenue (Intersection \#24) (PM Peak)

Results of the analysis are presented in Table T-38 and Synchro output sheets are provided in Appendix F.

Since the first draft report was compiled in 2019, Caltrans has changed the lane assignment at the intersection of Soquel Avenue \& Highway 1 SB On- and Off-Ramp (Intersection \#5) to include an exclusive eastbound left-turn lane. The approach lanes were restriped to include a separate left-turn lane and a separate through lane. Signal timing sheets available at that time were changed to reflect the new lane configuration and phasing optimized to obtain a representative LOS. This change resulted in a decrease of delay from 27.4 seconds to 22.0 seconds during the AM peak hour and from 30.4 seconds to 19.1 seconds during the PM peak hour. The LOS remains a LOS C during the AM peak hour and will improve to a LOS B in the PM peak hour. Synchro output sheets are provided in Appendix $\mathbf{U}$.
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| Table T-38-Cumulative (2040) Conditions Intersection Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \# | Intersection | Maintaining Agency | Control Type | Cumulative Conditions |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Movement | Delay | LOS | Movement | Delay | LOS |
| 1 | Soquel Ave \& Capitola Rd | CSC | Signal | - | 25.3 | C | - | 42.6 | D |
| 2 | Soquel Ave \& $7^{\text {th }}$ Ave | SCC | Signal | - | 22.5 | C | - | 26.5 | C |
| 3 | Soquel Dr / Soquel Ave \& Soquel Ave | Caltrans | Signal | - | 29.7 | C | - | 32.9 | C |
| 4 | Soquel Dr \& Paul Sweet Rd/ Hwy 1 OnOff Ramps | Caltrans | Signal | - | 53.9 | D | - | 40.7 | D |
| 5 | Soquel Ave \& Hwy 1 SB On-Off Ramps | Caltrans | Signal | - | 27.4 | C | - | 30.4 | C |
| 6 | Soquel Ave \& $17^{\text {th }}$ Ave | SCC | Signal | - | 8.9 | A | - | 9.7 | A |
| 7 | Soquel Ave \& Chanticleer | SCC | SSS | - | 5.3 | A | - | 3.0 | A |
| 7 | Worst Approach | SCC | SSS | NB | 15.3 | C | NB | 23.2 | C |
| 8 | Soquel Ave \& MOB Driveway | SCC | SSSC | - | 0.4 | A | - | 0.2 | A |
| 8 | Worst Approach | SCC | SSS | NB | 11.6 | B | NB | 15.7 | C |
| 9 | Soquel Ave / 40 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave \& Gross Rd | SCC | AWSC | - | 12.3 | B | - | 54.8 | F |
| 10 | $40^{\text {TH }}$ Ave \& Deanes Ln | NOT STUDIED |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | $40^{\text {th }}$ Ave \& Clares St | NOT STUDIED |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | $41^{\text {st }}$ Ave \& Soquel Dr | SCC | Signal | - | 25.3 | C | - | 26.1 | C |
| 13 | $41^{\text {st }}$ Ave \& Hwy 1 NB Ramps | Caltrans | Signal | - | 18.0 | B | - | 15.6 | B |
| 14 | $41^{\text {st }}$ Ave \& Hwy 1 SB Ramps | Caltrans | Signal | - | 46.9 | D | - | 8.6 | A |
| 15 | $41^{\text {st }}$ Ave \& Gross Rd | Caltrans | Signal | - | 44.9 | D | - | 47.2 | D |
| 16 | $41^{\text {st }}$ Ave \& Clares St | Capitola | Signal | - | 24.8 | C | - | 27.2 | C |
| 17 | $41^{\text {st }}$ Ave \& Capitola Rd | Capitola | Signal | - | 27.7 | C | - | 43.0 | D |
| 18 | $41^{\text {st }}$ Ave \& Brommer St/Jade St | Capitola | Signal | - | 19.3 | B | - | 28.5 | C |
| 19 | Capitola Rd \& $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | SCC | Signal | - | 20.3 | C | - | 24.1 | C |
| 20 | Capitola Rd \& 17 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | SCC | Signal | - | 21.3 | C | - | 33.6 | C |
| 21 | Capitola Rd \& Chanticleer Ave | SCC | Signal | - | 16.4 | B | - | 24.9 | C |
| 22 | Capitola Rd and $30{ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | Capitola | Signal | - | 23.0 | C | - | 29.1 | C |
| 23 | Brommer St \& $17^{\text {th }}$ Ave | SCC | Signal | - | 22.2 | C | - | 27.2 | C |
| 24 | Brommer St \& $30^{\text {th }}$ Ave | SCC | AWSC | - | 12.2 | B | - | 41.2 | E |
| 25 | $17^{\text {th }}$ Ave \& Portola Dr | SCC | Signal | - | 19.5 | B | - | 20.9 | C |

## Notes:

1. Analysis performed using $\mathrm{HCM}^{6}{ }^{\text {th }}$ Edition methodologies.
2. Delay indicated in seconds per vehicle.
3. Signal = Signal Control; AWSC = All-Way Stop Control; SSSC = Side-Street Stop Control
4. CSC = City of Santa Cruz; Caltrans = California Department of Transportation; SCC = Santa Cruz County; Capitola = City of Capitola
5. CSC LOS standard is D; Caltrans LOS standard is C; SCC LOS standard is D; Capitola does not have a LOS standard for $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue.
6. Intersections that operate below maintaining agency's LOS standard are highlighted and shown in bold.
7. For intersection \#4, The Project does not increase intersection delay or increase critical v/c by $1 \%$ or more. Thus, no Project deficiency is caused at this location.
8. Intersection \#5 shows overall LOS as acceptable. See Analysis section on page 72 for additional detail.
9. Intersection \#10 and \#11 were not analyzed in this analysis because the Project is not expected to distribute traffic to these intersections, since a barrier exists at $40^{\text {th }}$ Avenue and Deans Lane and the Project does not propose to remove it (nor are any plans to remove the barrier pending).
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10. Intersection \#14 operates at LOS A in the PM because traffic to the intersection is controlled/metered at intersections \#13 and \#15. Intersections \#14 and \#15 are operated on one signal controller, managed by Caltrans. Caltrans' main objective is to avoid off-ramp queue spillback into the Highway 1 mainline.
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## Cumulative (2040) Plus Project Conditions Intersection Level of Service

Traffic operations were evaluated at the study intersections based on Cumulative (2040) Plus Project Conditions. Cumulative Plus Project lane geometry and intersection control is shown in Figure F-21 and Cumulative Plus Project peak hour turning movement volumes are shown in Figure F-22.

No study intersections will degrade from an acceptable LOS (without the Project) to an unacceptable LOS (with the Project). However, the following intersections already operating at deficient LOS in the Cumulative scenario will degrade further with addition of Project traffic.

- Soquel Drive / Soquel Avenue \& Soquel Avenue (Intersection \#3) (PM Peaks)
- Soquel Drive \& Paul Sweet Road / Highway 1 On-Off Ramps (Intersection \#4) (AM \& PM Peaks).
- Soquel Avenue / Chanticleer Avenue (Intersection \#7) (PM Peak)
- Soquel Avenue / 40 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue \& Gross Road (Intersection \#9) (PM Peak)
- $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue \& Highway 1 SB Ramps (Intersection \#14) (AM Peak)
- $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue \& Gross Road (Intersection \#15) (AM \& PM Peaks)
- Brommer Street \& $30^{\text {th }}$ Avenue (Intersection \#24) (PM Peak)
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The following intersections will continue to operate at an unacceptable LOS under Cumulative Plus Project Conditions and the below-described improvements would improve the potential operational deficiencies. Pursuant to the County's General Plan LOS Policy 3.12.1, the Project will contribute to the deficiency at County maintained intersections if the v/c ratio of any critical movements at the following intersections increase by $1 \%$ or more with the Project. The v/c analysis is inapplicable, however, if improvements can eliminate operational deficiencies by causing intersections to operate at LOS D or better. Also, the County's General Plan LOS Policy is not applicable to Caltrans managed Intersection Nos. 3, 4, 14 and 15; the analysis provided below for those intersections is therefore for informational purposes only.

- Soquel Drive / Soquel Avenue \& Soquel Avenue (Intersection \#3) (PM Peaks). During the PM peak hour, the Project would cause delays at this intersection to go from 32.9 seconds (LOS C) to 39.6 sections (LOS D). The planned Caltrans improvements described below are anticipated to eliminate any deficiency at this intersection.
- Caltrans plans to widen Highway 1/Soquel Drive interchange. One westbound leftturn lane, one westbound right-turn lane, and a new southbound Highway 1 offramp will be constructed at this intersection. A conceptual layout is shown in Appendix $\mathbf{N}^{44}$. Implementation of these improvements would reduce the Projectrelated operational deficiency under Cumulative Plus Project conditions. However, these improvements are currently unfunded, are not included in the County Capital Improvement Project (CIP), and may be constructed after 2040. The Cumulative operations will be deficient until the improvement is constructed.
- It should be noted that any other incremental roadway geometric improvements (band-aid/small improvements to the freeway system - see Existing Conditions for more detail - at the intersection will not meet Caltrans standards and will ultimately require the above improvement to meet those standards. In addition, Intersection \#3 is geometrically constrained and any interim improvements, such as an additional northbound left-turn movement from Soquel Avenue to Soquel Avenue, would result in truck and vehicle turning maneuver conflicts and encroachment on the opposing and/or adjacent lane of travel.
- It should also be noted that, consistent with SB 743, Caltrans evaluates a land use project's impacts on the state highway system utilizing VMT, rather than congestion or capacity related metrics, such as LOS or v/c. (Caltrans, "Vehicle Miles Traveled-Focused Transportation Impact Study Guide, (May 20, 2020), see pp. 4-5.) It is unclear whether Caltrans will proceed with travel inducing projects, such as the capacity enhancing improvement described above. With this improvement the intersection is expected to operate at acceptable conditions. Caltrans has assumed growth in their forecasting of traffic on the freeway system through 2040.
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- Soquel Drive \& Paul Sweet Road / Hwy 1 On- Off-Ramps (Intersection \#4). Both with and without the Project, during the Cumulative (2040) Condition, this intersection will experience 53.9 seconds of delay in the AM peak hour (LOS D) and 40.7 seconds of delay during the PM peak hour (LOS D). The Project does not contribute to any deficiency at this intersection in terms of delay or increasing the $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio by more than $1 \%$ at any critical movement. The planned Caltrans improvements described below are anticipated to eliminate the non-Project related deficiency at this intersection.
- Caltrans plans to widen Highway 1/Soquel Drive interchange per the Highway 1 EIR certified in December 2018 and referenced throughout this TIOA document. The westbound left-turn lane will be converted to a through lane. One westbound right-turn lane, northbound left-turn lane, and an eastbound right-turn bay will be installed at this intersection. It is anticipated that the improvement will eliminate the deficiency. A detailed layout is shown in Appendix M. However, these improvements are currently unfunded, are not included in the County's CIP and may be constructed after 2040. The Cumulative operations will remain deficient until the improvements are constructed.
- It should also be noted that, consistent with SB 743, Caltrans evaluates a land use project's impacts on the state highway system utilizing VMT, rather than congestion or capacity related metrics, such as LOS or v/c. (Caltrans, "Vehicle Miles Traveled-Focused Transportation Impact Study Guide, (May 20, 2020), see pp. 4-5.)
- The Project would not contribute any delay to this intersection during the AM or PM peak hour because it does not increase the volume to capacity ("v/c") by more than one percent in either the AM or PM Peak times as indicated below Table T-39 (at the most it increases the v/c by 0.18 percent).

| Table T-39- Soquel Drive \& Paul Sweet Road / Hwy 1 <br> On-Off Ramps (Intersection \#4) <br> Critical Movement v/c Calculation     <br> Antersection 4 Peak     <br> Condition     <br> EBLT+WBT     WBLT+EBT |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cumulative (v/c) | 2.225 | 0.933 | 1.642 | 1.369 |
| Cumulative + Project (v/c) | 2.227 | 0.934 | 1.642 | 1.369 |
| v/c Change | $\mathbf{0 . 0 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 \%}$ |
| PM Peak |  |  |  |  |
| Condition | EBLT+WBT | WBLT+EBT | NBLT+SBT | SBLT+NBT |
| Cumulative (v/c) | 1.549 | 1.101 | 1.799 | 0.389 |
| Cumulative + Project (v/c) | 1.549 | 1.103 | 1.799 | 0.389 |
| v/c Change | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 \%}$ |
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- Soquel Avenue / Chanticleer Avenue (Intersection \#7). During the PM peak hour, the Project would cause delays the northbound movement of this intersection to go from 23.2 seconds (LOS D) to 53.1 seconds (LOS F) if no improvements were installed, but if the TWLTL (described below) is installed, the intersection would operate at LOS C with 20.9 seconds of delay in the Cumulative Plus Project condition.
- The Project will implement approximately 3,500 feet of TWLTL striping (and restriping) along Soquel Avenue from Paul Minnie Avenue to the existing creek crossing (east of Mattison Lane). These striping improvements will include restriping of the existing bike lanes and the addition of new green bike lane striping. Conceptual layouts for these Project improvements are included in Appendix I. This will improve the gap acceptance (the ability of a driver to observe a gap in the traffic stream and merge into the travel lane) for vehicles wishing to enter the traffic stream from Chanticleer onto Soquel Avenue. In addition, the installation of the signal at the Project driveway will generate gaps in the traffic stream during the yellow and red phase, which would them provide an opportunity for side street vehicles to enter the traffic stream on northbound Soquel Avenue.
- As noted above, the TWLTL eliminates the deficiency for the northbound movement of this intersection in the Cumulative Plus Project condition and the LOS will improve from F to D .
- Soquel Avenue / $40^{\text {th }}$ Avenue \& Gross Road (Intersection \#9). During the PM peak hour, the Project would cause delays at this intersection to go from 54.8 seconds (LOS E) to 105.9 sections (LOS F) if no improvements were installed, but installation of the diverter proposed below would eliminate the intersection and therefore any associated delay.
- Same improvements as described in Existing Plus Project Conditions for this intersection, which would eliminate the all way stop and any associated delay at this intersection.
- If the diverter were not installed at this intersection, as indicated below in Table T40, the Project would increase the $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ by more than one percent during the AM peak and PM peak hours (v/c increase is $10.28 \%-22.96 \%$ at critical movements). Installation of the diverter, however, eliminates all delay at this intersection for both the existing vehicles and the added Project vehicles.
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| Table T-40 - Soquel Avenue / 40 <br> th <br> (Intersection \#venue \& Gross Road <br> (Critical Movement v/c Calculation |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection 9 |  |  |  |  |
| AM Peak |  |  |  |  |
| Condition | EBLT+WBT | WBLT+EBT | NBLT+SBT | SBLT+NBT |
| Cumulative (v/c) | 0.214 | 0.214 | 0.448 | 0.448 |
| Cumulative + Project (v/c) | 0.243 | 0.243 | 0.548 | 0.548 |
| v/c Change | $13.55 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 3 . 5 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 . 3 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 . 3 2 \%}$ |
| PM Peak |  |  |  |  |
| Condition | EBLT+WBT | WBLT+EBT | NBLT+SBT | SBLT+NBT |
| Cumulative (v/c) | 0.895 | 0.895 | 1.189 | 1.189 |
| Cumulative + Project (v/c) | 0.987 | 0.987 | 1.462 | 1.462 |
| v/c Change | $\mathbf{1 0 . 2 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 . 2 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 . 9 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 . 9 6 \%}$ |

- $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue \& Highway 1 Southbound Ramps (Intersection \#14). During the AM peak hour, the Project would cause delays at Intersection \#14 to go from 46.9 seconds (LOS D) to 51.7 seconds (LOS D). The Project increases the v/c by more than one percent in the AM Peak hour as indicated below in Table T-41 (v/c increase is $7.41 \%$ at one critical movement).
- Caltrans certified an EIR for the Santa Cruz Route 1 Tier 1-Corridor Analysis of High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes and Transportation System Management Alternatives and Tier II- Build Project Analysis of $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue to Soquel Avenue/ Rive Auxiliary Lanes and Chanticleer Avenue Pedestrian-Bicycle Overcrossing in December 2018, which identifies long term improvement projects for providing capacity at this interchange. The identified improvements at the $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue interchange include ramps widening and improvements and the overcrossing would be widened. These improvements are unconstrained and until funding becomes available, the deficiency would remain.
- Consistent with SB 743, Caltrans evaluates a land use project's impacts on the state highway system utilizing VMT, rather than congestion or capacity related metrics, such as LOS or v/c (Caltrans, "Vehicle Miles Traveled-Focused Transportation Impact Study Guide, (May 20, 2020), see pp. 4-5.). It is unclear whether Caltrans will proceed with travel inducing projects, such as the capacity enhancing improvement described above.
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| Table T-41 - 41 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Avenue \& Highway 1 Southbound Ramps (Intersection \#14) Critical Movement v/c Calculation |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection 14 |  |  |  |  |
| AM Peak |  |  |  |  |
| Condition | EBLT+WBT | WBLT+EBT | NBLT+SBT | SBLT+NBT |
| Cumulative (v/c) | 1.29 | 1.29 | 0.27 | 0.39 |
| Cumulative + Project (v/c) | 1.29 | 1.29 | 0.29 | 0.39 |
| v/c Change | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 7.41\% | 0.00\% |
| PM Peak |  |  |  |  |
| Condition | EBLT+WBT | WBLT+EBT | NBLT+SBT | SBLT+NBT |
| Cumulative (v/c) | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.33 | 0.45 |
| Cumulative + Project (v/c) | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.33 | 0.45 |
| v/c Change | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |

- $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue \& Gross Road (Intersection \#15). During the AM peak hour, the Project would cause delays at this intersection to go from 44.9 seconds (LOS D) to 55.6 sections (LOS E). During the PM peak hour, the Project would cause delays to go from 47.2 seconds (LOS D) to 52.2 seconds (LOS D). The Project increases the v/c by more than one percent in the AM peak and PM peak hours as indicated below in Table T-42 (v/c ratio increasing from 3.57-29.68\%).
- Same improvements as described in Existing Plus Project Conditions for this intersection, but the intersection would continue to operate at LOS F.
- The Project increases the $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ by more than one percent in the AM peak and PM peak hours as indicated below in Table T-42 (v/c increase ranging from $3.57 \%$ to 29.68\%).

| Table T-42 - 41 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Avenue \& Gross Road (Intersection \#15) Critical Movement v/c Calculation |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection 15 |  |  |  |  |
| AM Peak |  |  |  |  |
| Condition | EBLT+WBT | WBLT+EBT | NBLT+SBT | SBLT+NBT |
| Cumulative (v/c) | 0.56 | 0.56 | 1.55 | 1.54 |
| Cumulative + Project (v/c) | 0.59 | 0.58 | 2.01 | 1.54 |
| v/c Change | 5.36\% | 3.57\% | 29.68\% | 0.00\% |
| PM Peak |  |  |  |  |
| Condition | EBLT+WBT | WBLT+EBT | NBLT+SBT | SBLT+NBT |
| Cumulative (v/c) | 1.36 | 1.35 | 1.42 | 1.31 |
| Cumulative + Project (v/c) | 1.44 | 1.42 | 1.58 | 1.31 |
| $v / c$ Change | 5.88\% | 5.19\% | 11.27\% | 0.00\% |
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- Brommer Street \& $30^{\text {th }}$ Avenue (Intersection \#24). During the PM peak hour, the Project would cause delays at this intersection to go from 41.2 seconds (LOS E) to 41.9 seconds (LOS E). The Project increases the v/c by more than one percent in the AM peak and PM peak hours as indicated below in Table T-43 (v/c ratio increasing from 0.51-1.92\%)
- Same improvements as described in Existing Plus Project Conditions for this intersection, which would result in the intersection operating at LOS C.

Table T-43 - Brommer Street \& 30 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue (Intersection \#24) Critical Movement v/c Calculation

| Intersection 24 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AM Peak |  |  |  |  |  |
| Condition | EBLT+WBT | WBLT+EBT | NBLT+SBT | SBLT+NBT |  |
| Cumulative (v/c) | 0.785 | 0.785 | 0.695 | 0.695 |  |
| Cumulative + Project (v/c) | 0.789 | 0.789 | 0.703 | 0.703 |  |
| $\boldsymbol{v} / c$ Change | $\mathbf{0 . 5 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 5 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 1 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 1 5 \%}$ |  |
| PM Peak |  |  |  |  |  |
| Condition | EBLT+WBT | WBLT+EBT | NBLT+SBT | SBLT+NBT |  |
| Cumulative (v/c) | 1.728 | 1.728 | 0.886 | 0.886 |  |
| Cumulative + Project (v/c) | 1.744 | 1.744 | 0.903 | 0.903 |  |
| $\boldsymbol{v / c}$ Change | $\mathbf{0 . 9 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 9 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 9 2 \%}$ |  |

## Microsimulation Analysis

The positive effect of the installation of some of these improvements cannot be evaluated using typical LOS analysis, but must be analyzed using microsimulation methodologies instead. LOS (HCM ${ }^{\text {th }}$ ) is a deterministic traffic analysis methodology, whereas microsimulation (SimTraffic) is a probabilistic/stochastic traffic analysis methodology that can provide more detailed and statistically based measures of effectiveness. ${ }^{45}$

Cumulative Plus Project analysis results are presented in Table T-44. Synchro output sheets are provided in Appendix G. A summary of the improvements for intersections operating at a deficient level of service is indicated in Table T-45.

Since the first draft report was compiled in 2019, Caltrans has changed the lane assignment at the intersection of Soquel Avenue \& Highway 1 SB On- and Off-Ramp (Intersection \#5) to include an exclusive eastbound left-turn lane. The approach lanes were restriped to include a separate left-turn lane and a separate through lane. Signal timing sheets available at that time were changed to reflect the new lane configuration and phasing optimized to obtain a representative LOS. This change resulted in a decrease of delay from 28.6 seconds to 21.7 seconds during the AM peak hour and from 32.8 seconds to 19.4 seconds during the PM peak hour. The LOS remains

[^31]
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a LOS C during the AM peak hour and will improve to a LOS B in the PM peak hour. Synchro output sheets are provided in Appendix U.
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Table T-44 - Cumulative Plus Project Conditions Intersection Level of Service

| \# | Intersection | Maintaining Agency | Control Type | Cumulative Conditions |  |  |  |  |  | Cumulative Plus Project Conditions |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Movement | Delay | LOS | Movement | Delay | LOS | Movement | Delay | LOS | Movement | Delay | LOS |
| 1 | Soquel Ave \& Capitola Rd | CSC | Signal | - | 25.3 | C | - | 42.6 | D | - | 25.2 | C | - | 47.1 | D |
| 2 | Soquel Ave \& $7^{\text {th }}$ Ave | SCC | Signal | - | 22.5 | C | - | 26.5 | C | - | 23.7 | C | - | 26.9 | C |
| 3 | Soquel Dr / Soquel Ave \& Soquel Ave | Caltrans | Signal | - | 29.7 | C | - | 32.9 | C | - | 31.0 | C | - | 39.6 | D |
| 4 | Soquel Dr \& Paul Sweet Rd / Hwy 1 On- OffRamps | Caltrans | Signal | - | 53.9 | D | - | 40.7 | D | - | 53.9 | D | - | 40.7 | D |
| 5 | Soquel Ave \& Hwy 1 SB On-Off Ramps | Caltrans | Signal | - | 27.4 | C | - | 30.4 | C | - | 28.6 | C | - | 32.8 | C |
| 6 | Soquel Ave \& 17 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | SCC | Signal | - | 8.9 | A | - | 9.7 | A | - | 10.5 | B | - | 11.8 | B |
| 7 | Soquel Ave \& Chanticleer | SCC | SSSC | ${ }^{-}$ | 5.3 | A | ${ }^{-}$ | 3.0 | A | ${ }^{-}$ | 7.8 | A | ${ }^{-}$ | 6.1 | A |
|  | Worst Approach |  |  | NB | 15.3 | C | NB | 23.2 | C | NB | 25.6 | D | NB | 53.1 | F |
| 8 | Soquel Ave \& MOB <br> Driveway <br> Worst Approach | SCC | SSSC / <br> Signal | ${ }^{-}$ | 0.4 11.6 | A B | NB | 0.2 15.7 | A C | - | 5.8 | A | - | 9.1 | A |
| 9 | Soquel Ave / 40 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave \& Gross Rd | SCC | AWSC | , | 12.3 | B | , | 54.8 | F | - | 18.6 | C | - | 105.9 | F |
| 10 | $40^{\text {th }}$ Ave \& Deanes Ln | NOT STUDIED |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | $40^{\text {th }}$ Ave \& Clares St | NOT STUDIED |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | $41^{\text {st }}$ Ave \& Soquel Dr | SCC | Signal | - | 25.3 | C | - | 26.1 | C | - | 26.1 | C | - | 26.7 | C |
| 13 | $41^{\text {st }}$ Ave \& Hwy 1 NB Ramps | Caltrans | Signal | - | 18.0 | B | - | 15.6 | B | - | 18.2 | B | - | 15.9 | B |
| 14 | 41 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Ave \& Hwy 1 SB Ramps | Caltrans | Signal | - | 46.9 | D | - | 8.6 | A | - | 51.7 | D | - | 9.4 | A |
| 15 | $41^{\text {st }}$ Ave \& Gross Rd | Caltrans | Signal | - | 44.9 | D | - | 47.2 | D | - | 55.6 | E | - | 52.2 | D |
| 16 | 41 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Ave \& Clares St | Capitola | Signal | - | 24.8 | C | - | 27.2 | C | - | 25.5 | C | - | 27.4 | C |
| 17 | 41 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Ave \& Capitola Rd | Capitola | Signal | - | 27.7 | C | - | 43.0 | D | - | 28.8 | C | - | 44.1 | D |

## Kimley»Horn

## Table T-44 - Cumulative Plus Project Conditions Intersection Level of Service

| 18 | $41^{\text {st }}$ Ave \& Brommer St/Jade St | Capitola | Signal | - | 19.3 | B | - | 28.5 | C | - | 20.1 | C | - | 29.5 | C |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19 | Capitola Rd \& $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | SCC | Signal | - | 20.3 | C | - | 24.1 | C | - | 23.3 | C | - | 28.2 | C |
| 20 | Capitola Rd \& 17 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue | SCC | Signal | - | 21.3 | C | - | 33.6 | D | - | 22.0 | C | - | 35.5 | D |
| 21 | Capitola Rd \& Chanticleer Ave | SCC | Signal | - | 16.4 | B | - | 24.9 | C | - | 16.8 | B | - | 26.2 | C |
| 22 | Capitola Rd and $30^{\text {th }}$ Ave | Capitola | Signal | - | 23.0 | C | - | 29.1 | C | - | 24.6 | C | - | 29.8 | C |
| 23 | Brommer St \& $17^{\text {th }}$ Ave | SCC | Signal | - | 22.2 | C | - | 27.2 | C | - | 23.0 | C | - | 27.9 | C |
| 24 | Brommer St \& 30 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave | SCC | AWSC | - | 12.2 | B | - | 41.2 | E | - | 12.3 | B | - | 41.9 | E |
| 25 | $17^{\text {th }}$ Ave \& Portola Dr | SCC | Signal | - | 19.5 | B | - | 20.9 | C | - | 19.6 | B | - | 21.1 | C |

Notes:

1. Analysis performed using $H C M 6^{\text {th }}$ Edition methodologies.
2. Delay indicated in seconds/vehicle.
3. Signal $=$ Signal Control; AWSC = All-Way Stop Control; SSSC $=$ Side-Street Stop Control
4. CSC = City of Santa Cruz; Caltrans = California Department of Transportation; SCC = Santa Cruz County; Capitola = City of Capitola
5. CSC LOS standard is D; Caltrans LOS standard is C; SCC LOS standard is D; Capitola does not have a LOS standard for 41st Avenue.
6. Intersections that operate below maintaining agency's LOS standard are highlighted and shown in bold.
7. For intersection \#4, The Project does not increase intersection delay or increase critical v/c by $1 \%$ or more. Thus, no Project deficiency is caused at this location.
8. Intersection \#5 shows overall LOS as acceptable. See Analysis section on page 72 for additional detail.
 any plans to remove the barrier pending).
 to avoid off-ramp queue spillback into the Highway 1 mainline.
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Table T-45 - Improved Cumulative Plus Project Conditions Conclusions

| Int\# | Location | Condition | Deficiency caused by the Addition of the Project Traffic | Improvement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \#3 | Soquel Drive / Soquel Avenue \& Soquel Avenue | Cumulative and Cumulative Plus Project | The addition of the Project traffic worsens the LOS from C to D in the PM and cause a deficiency. | Caltrans plans to widen Highway $1 /$ Soquel Drive interchange. One westbound left-turn lane, one westbound right-turn lane, and a new southbound Highway 1 off-ramp will be constructed at this intersection. A conceptual layout is shown in Appendix $O$. These improvements are currently not funded, are not included in the County Capital Improvement Project (CIP), and may be constructed after 2040. The Cumulative deficiency will remain until the improvement is constructed. <br> The State Route 1 HOV Lane Widening Project Supplemental Report (May 2010) analyzed these improvements for the Santa Cruz Route 1 Tier I and Tier II FEIR and the results are included in Appendix P for reference. More detail on the EIR https://scortc.org/projects/streets-highways/hwy1corridor/environmental-documents. <br> The deficiency is anticipated to be eliminated with implementation of the Caltrans improvements. |
| \#7 | Soquel Avenue / Chanticleer Avenue | Cumulative and Cumulative Plus Project Conditions | The addition of the Project traffic worsens the side street LOS from Chanticleer Avenue from LOS from LOS $D$ to LOS $F$ in the PM. | The Project will restripe Soquel Avenue to include a continuous TWLTL from the Highway 1 SB Ramps past Chanticleer Avenue. The installation of this measure will provide sufficient space for waiting and or weaving for vehicles heading northbound on Soquel Avenue. In addition, the installation of the signal will also improve gaps in the traffic flow in the northbound direction. This is an improvement over the current very short 50 feet merge lane that is inadequate to accommodate these movements in the future. The improvement will remove the deficiency caused by the Project. |
| \#9 | Soquel Avenue / 40th Avenue \& Gross Road | Cumulative and Cumulative Plus Project Conditions | In the PM, the addition of the Project traffic would increase the average delay from 54.3 seconds per vehicle to 105.9 seconds per vehicle and the LOS remains at $F$. The critical $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ increases by more than $1 \%$ on all the approach critical movements. | Install a diagonal diverter extending from the northwest corner to the southeast corner at this intersection. Residents in the neighborhood would exit the neighborhood at Rodeo Gulch Drive onto Soquel Avenue. If this improvement is not installed, cut through traffic along Gross Road and the delay at the $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue intersection will continue and degrade further in the future until the freeway is improved. <br> The diverter will prevent cut through traffic on Gross Road through the residential neighborhood and eliminate the congestion caused by the allway stop at the intersection. Queues at this intersection are expected to shorten with these recommended improvements. This commute is slightly longer than the direct connection to $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue via Gross Road, but the benefits of removing cut through traffic through the neighborhood and the improvement of operations at the Gross Road/40 Avenue intersection, warrants the installation of this improvement. With this improvement, traffic flow at this intersection would then be governed by the signal at Gross Road \& 41st Avenue where additional improvements are recommended. <br> All movements would be uncontrolled; therefore, no delay would be attributed to this intersection (i.e. the only delay would be incurred at the $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue \& Gross Road signalized intersection). This improvement would cause travel time from Soquel Dr and Rodeo Gulch Rd to SB Hwy 1 on-ramp to decrease by approximately 44\% when comparing Existing (no Project) to Existing Plus Project conditions. See Appendix M for the proposed layout. In addition, the current cut-through traffic along Gross Road through the neighborhood would also be eliminated. The deficiency will be eliminated with implementation of the improvement measure. |
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Table T-45 - Improved Cumulative Plus Project Conditions Conclusions

| Int\# | Location | Condition | Deficiency caused by the Addition of the Project Traffic | Improvement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \#14 | 41st Avenue \& Highway 1 Southbound Ramps | Cumulative and Cumulative Plus Project Conditions | The addition of the Project traffic worsens the delay from 46,9 seconds to 51.7 seconds and the LOS remains D. The critical movement $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ increases by more than $1 \%$. | Caltrans certified the EIR for the Santa Cruz Route 1 Tier 1-Corridor Analysis of High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes and Transportation System Management Alternatives and Tier II- Build Project Analysis of $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue to Soquel Avenue/Rive Auxiliary Lanes and Chanticleer Avenue Pedestrian-Bicycle Overcrossing in December 2018. The EIR identifies long term improvement projects for providing capacity at the interchanges and along the rail line. The TSM improvements at the $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue interchange include ramps widening and improvements and the overcrossing would be widened. The TSM improvements are unconstrained (not fully funded) and until funding becomes available, the operational deficiency would remain. The deficiency is anticipated to be eliminated when the improvements are installed. <br> The State Route 1 HOV Lane Widening Project Supplemental Report (May 2010) analyzed these improvements for the Santa Cruz <br> Route 1 Tier I and Tier II FEIR and the results are included in Appendix P for reference. https://sccrtc.org/projects/streets-highways/hwy1corridor/environmental-documents. |
| \#15 | 41st Avenue \& Gross Road (City of Capitola jurisdiction and Caltrans control) | Cumulative and Cumulative Plus Project Conditions | The addition of the Project traffic worsens the LOS from E to F in the AM. The critical $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ increases by more than $1 \%$ on all the critical approach movements. | The City of Capitola received a grant to install an adaptive signal system along $41{ }^{\text {st }}$ Avenue and this intersection is included in its implementation plan. In addition, the Project would install overhead signs and roadway markings to improve lane selection and use on the eastbound approach of Gross Road. The lane selection would be for southbound Highway 1 and northbound Highway 1 movements. See Appendix M for the conceptual layout for improvement details. A barrier would be installed between Gross Road and Highway 1 Southbound Ramps. The barrier would be installed between the eastbound through lane over the freeway and the eastbound right-turn lane onto the freeway southbound on-ramp. This barrier installation would require a Caltrans encroachment permit/approval. It can only be installed if approved by Caltrans. <br> The adaptive signal system would provide better coordination of traffic flow along the corridor because it measures real time vehicular demand and proportions/adjusts signal timing. Furthermore, a physical barrier will be installed between the limit line and the diverge of the Highway 1 southbound on-ramp on $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue. This barrier will prevent vehicles from jumping the queue for southbound on-ramp traffic. This improvement would also improve bicycle rider safety in the Class II bike lane at the Highway 1 southbound on-ramp at $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue. A conceptual layout of these improvements are indicated in Appendix M. <br> The State Route 1 HOV Lane Widening Project Supplemental Report (May 2010) analyzed these improvements for the Santa Cruz Route 1 Tier I and Tier II FEIR and the results are included in Appendix P for reference. https://sccrtc.org/projects/streets-highways/hwy1corridor/environmental-documents. |
| \#24 | Brommer Street \& 30th | Cumulative and Cumulative Plus Project Conditions | The intersection operates at LOS F in PM Peak without Project and continues to operate at LOS F with the Project. The average delay increases from 41.2 seconds per vehicle to 41.9 seconds per vehicle with the addition of the Project traffic. The critical $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ increases by more than $1 \%$ on the northbound and southbound critical movements. | Install signal control with permissive left-turn phasing. Peak Hour Signal Warrant \#3 (CAMUTCD) is satisfied with Existing Conditions traffic and in Existing Plus Project Conditions traffic. With existing geometry, signal control, eastbound/westbound split phasing, and permissive left-turn phasing, this intersection would operate at acceptable LOS with Cumulative Plus Project conditions traffic volumes. The Peak Hour Signal Warrant \#3 evaluation is included in Appendix J. <br> For Cumulative Conditions the intersection will improve the PM delay by 19.3 seconds per vehicle with installation of the signal. Installation of a signal control with permissive left-turn phasing would cause the intersection to operate at an acceptable LOS. The Project will pay a fair share of $14 \%$ towards the improvement and the Project will eliminate its incremental addition to the LOS deficiency (Project Trips through intersection / All Future trips through intersection). |
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## Conclusions - Cumulative Plus Project Conditions

In the Cumulative Plus Project Conditions, the improvements identified will remove the deficiencies caused by the Project.

## Highway 1 Overcrossing and $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue Corridor Improvements

At the request of the County, this TIOA evaluates whether the Project would benefit from construction of a potential Highway 1 overcrossing at 17 Avenue (" $17^{\text {th }}$ Avenue Overcrossing"), as envisioned in the Sustainable Santa Cruz County Plan (2014). The $17^{\text {th }}$ Avenue Overcrossing is not an approved or proposed project at this time. However, the Sustainable Santa Cruz County Plan envisions the potential redevelopment of land parcels to the north and south of Highway 1 between the Soquel Avenue and $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue interchanges. This redevelopment would result in potential growth in traffic on Soquel Drive and Soquel Avenue. Subsequently, the Sustainable Plan also indicates the potential for a new vehicular overcrossing from the east side to the west side of Highway 1 (i.e., the $17^{\text {th }}$ Avenue Overcrossing). No new access will be provided to Highway 1 by the $17^{\text {th }}$ Avenue Overcrossing. The most feasible location for such an overcrossing is at $17^{\text {th }}$ Avenue, since it already connects strategically to Capitola Avenue and further south, to Soquel Drive. Several existing parcels of land will be impacted by the overcrossing and the need for significant right-of-way acquisition is anticipated. The $17^{\text {th }}$ Avenue Overcrossing will not have pedestrian and bicycle access, which would be provided at the Chanticleer bicycle and pedestrian overcrossing, located immediately east of the proposed new vehicular overcrossing.

It is estimated that the $17^{\text {th }}$ Avenue Overcrossing would potentially improve traffic conditions at both the Soquel Avenue interchange and the $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue interchange with Highway 1. The model links origins and destination through the new road network that includes the overcrossing, which results in the diversion of trips from the two adjacent interchange overcrossings to the new bridge. The SCC Travel Demand Model forecast for the year 2040 indicates that approximately 4,640 daily vehicles will use this overcrossing when built and that the Project will contribute 54 daily trips (1.2\% of the total traffic) on the new $17^{\text {th }}$ Avenue Overcrossing. The Project would not add any AM peak hour trips onto the bridge and would add 1 vehicle in the PM peak hour. The construction of the new overcrossing would result in extensive construction and right-of-way acquisition at exorbitant cost (\$75-125 million). In addition, traffic volumes would increase on residential streets on the south side of Highway 1. The shift in volumes from the existing Soquel Drive /Highway 1 overcrossing and the existing $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue/Highway 1 overcrossing would only slightly improve operating conditions on these corridors. Subsequently it is concluded that the construction of a new overcrossing is not feasible and not recommended for implementation

The County, along with the City of Capitola, is planning for long-term future improvements along $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenues between Clares Street and Cory Street to facilitate north-south vehicular, pedestrian and bicycle circulation. Proposed future improvements along the $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue roadway would be supported by additional improvements along Gross Road, $40^{\text {th }}$ Avenue, and Clares Street; as well as at the intersections of Soquel Avenue and Gross Road, Gross Road and 41 st, Auto Plaza Drive and $41^{\text {st }}$, Clares Street and $40^{\text {th }}$ Avenue, and Clares Street and $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue. These improvements include signal modifications, intersection control changes, restriping, sidewalk and bicycle lane improvements, and installation of a cycle track on $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue between Gross Road and Cory
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Street on the Highway 1 overpass. The project will contribute toward the cost of these longterm improvements along the $\mathbf{4 1}^{\text {st }}$ Avenue corridor.


Medical Office Building
Figure F-23
Change in 2040 Daily Volumes Due to Potential 17th Avenue Overcrossing
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## 7. HIGHWAY 1 AND HIGHWAY 17 OPERATIONAL EVALUATION (NON-CEQA ANALYSIS)

This chapter evaluates the Project's impacts on Highway 1 and Highway 17. Caltrans has jurisdiction over these facilities and, pursuant to SB 743, evaluates a land use project's impacts on the state highway system utilizing VMT, rather than congestion or capacity related metrics, such as LOS or volume to capacity ratios. (Caltrans, "Vehicle Miles Traveled-Focused Transportation Impact Study Guide, (May 20, 2020), see pp. 4-5 ["When analyzing the impact of VMT on the State Highway System resulting from local land use projects, the focus will no longer be on traffic at intersections and roadways immediately around project sites. Instead, the focus will be on how projects are likely to influence the overall amount of automobile use."]). ${ }^{46}$ As noted in CHAPTER 2. VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED on page 8 of this TIOA, the Project will result in a reduction in existing VMT and therefore will not have a significant transportation impact on the environment. Moreover, it is expected that the Project will reduce the volume of vehicles (487 daily trips) traveling along Highway 17 between the County and San Jose by approximately 0.65 percent, which is presumed to have a commensurate or greater reduction in collisions on that segment of Highway 17 as explained on page 139 in header P of this section. For informational purposes only, the balance of this chapter discloses potential congestion and capacity related impacts the Project could have on Highway 1 and Highway 17. A select zone plot for the Project identifies the Project traffic on Highway 17 south of Pasatiempo Drive. This number was calculated as a percentage of the total Project traffic on the freeway at this location.

It is anticipated that the Project would add 107 new AM peak hour Project trips and 98 new PM peak hour Project trips to Highway 1, which, if evaluated using outdated LOS metrics, is already operating at unacceptable levels of service during both the AM and PM peak hour conditions. However, healthcare trips are nondiscretionary (in the sense that people generally must seek medical care when needed) and it is anticipated that local residents will stay within their immediate geographical locale and elect to travel to the Project site in Santa Cruz rather than to other existing Kaiser facilities in other facilities in Santa Cruz, Scotts Valley, San Jose, and Watsonville, for example. Therefore, many of the Project trips traveling along Highway 1 are actually redistributed existing and future medical care trips as discussed in CHAPTER 2. VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED of this report. In addition, it is anticipated that the Project would reduce trips along Highway 17, as discussed in the VMT Chapter of this report.

Per County recommendations, this chapter was prepared to provide and document an evaluation of Highway 1 and Highway 17 operational conditions, while determining what effects (if any) the Project would have on these roadway facilities. These roadway facilities were selected for evaluation based on discussions with County staff and based on the anticipated Project trip distribution.
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## Highway 1

This section describes the operational conditions along Highway 1, planned future improvements along Highway 1, and the potential effects that the Project would have along Highway 1 within the study area.

## Highway 1 Existing Operational Conditions

Highway 1 baseline data and measures of effectiveness (MOEs) included in the Caltrans Traffic Operations Report (2012), were updated by CDM Smith and published in 2017 in a memorandum titled Santa Cruz Highway 1 Widening/HOV Lane Project - Final 2016-2017 Traffic Analysis Update. The updated baseline data is summarized in Table T-46.

| Table T-46 - Highway 1 Baseline Measures of Effectiveness (Peak Hour) |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peak Hour <br> Performance <br> Measures | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
|  | Morning | Evening | Morning | Evening |
| Average Speeds <br> (mph) | 23 | 62 | 61 | 22 |
| Average Travel Time <br> (minutes/vehicle) | 31 | 10 | 10 | 31 |
| Travel Distance <br> (VMT) | 41,418 | 30,539 | 30,842 | 39,104 |
| Average Travel Delay <br> (minutes/vehicle) | 20 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Average Level of <br> Service (LOS) | F | C | C | F |

Source: Santa Cruz Highway 1 Widening/HOV Lane Project - Final 2016-2017 Traffic Analysis Update (July 2017).
This data indicates that Highway 1 traffic volumes in the Project vicinity are directional, with high traffic volumes/delay in the northbound direction during morning (AM) hours and high traffic volumes/delay in the southbound direction during evening (PM) hours.

## Highway 1 Volume to Capacity Ratios

As indicated in the Caltrans baseline conditions findings described above, Highway 1 currently operates at LOS F during weekday AM (northbound is LOS F) and PM (southbound is LOS F) peak hour conditions within the study area. While it anticipated that the estimated addition (or subtraction) of Project trips would provide an imperceptible change in operating conditions or LOS (LOS F represents the worst, most overcapacity roadway conditions possible) along these oversaturated facilities, this section is provided to quantify the estimated change in v/c along the study segments that would result from construction of the Project. V/C represents a measure of congestion of the freeway by dividing the traffic volume by the capacity of the roadway. If the $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ is above 0.8 (LOS E or $F$ ), the freeway starts to be congested. The $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ is not a linear function and
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is also dependent on speed, vehicle throughput, density per time period, type of road, number of lanes, etc.

## Analysis

## (h) Existing and Existing Plus Project (Highway 1)

Based on Caltrans PeMS (Performance Measurement System) data, major weekday peak hour congestion along Highway 1 (SR 1) occurs during the PM peak commuting hours. The data indicates that traffic flow volumes and speeds in the southbound direction through the study area decrease between 2:00 PM to 6:00 PM. A review of historical traffic trends was conducted using Google Maps, which shows that southbound SR 1 typically experiences sustained low speeds and traffic flows from Rio Del Mar to Highway 17 during the PM peak travel periods, which is shown in Figure F-24.
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Figure F-24 - Typical Peak-Hour Congestion along SR 1 (Source: Google Maps)


Based on this data and the relatively low addition of new Project trips to the study segments, freeway operations under Existing Plus Project conditions are expected to remain very similar to the Existing Conditions. Analysis results included in Table T-47 provides a summary of Existing and Existing Plus Project volumes and v/c ratios. As shown in Table T-47 v/c ratios are expected to increase by 0.02 at all of the study segments.

Highway Capacity Software ("HCS"), which is based on HCM 6 methodologies, the industry standard, were used to evaluate traffic operations on the study freeway segments and information regarding HCS inputs and analysis results can be found in Appendix $\mathbf{O}$.
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(i) Near Term and Near Term Plus Project (Highway 1)

Freeway operations under Near Term Plus Project conditions are expected to remain very similar to the Near-Term Conditions. No freeway segment is anticipated to experience a change in LOS as a result of the Project and, as shown in the table below, $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratios are expected to increase by 0.02 or less on any of the study segments. Analysis results are shown in Table T-48.

HCS was used to evaluate traffic operations on the study freeway segments and information regarding HCS inputs and analysis results can be found in Appendix $\mathbf{O}$.
(j) Cumulative and Cumulative Plus Project (Highway 1)

Freeway operations under Cumulative Plus Project conditions are expected to remain very similar to the Cumulative Conditions. No freeway segment is anticipated to experience a change in LOS as a result of the Project and, as shown in the table below, v/c ratios are expected to increase by 0.02 or less on any of the study segments. Analysis results are shown in Table T-4.

HCS was used to evaluate traffic operations on the study freeway segments and information regarding HCS inputs and analysis results can be found in Appendix 0.

## (k) Project Effects on Highway 1 Operations

As indicated in the segment analysis results in Table T-47, Table T-48, and Table T-4, the addition of Project traffic on the study segments would have a negligible effect on v/c and thus, Project related operational effects on the segments would also be indiscernible compared to Existing, Near Term, and Cumulative development conditions.
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Table T-47 - Existing Plus Project Conditions Segment Analysis (Highway 1)

| $\#$ | Study Segment | Direction | Lanes | Existing <br> Volume | Existing <br> V/C | Existing + <br> Project <br> Volume <br> $(\mathrm{Vph})$ | Existing + <br> Project <br> $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{C}$ | Project <br> Volume | Change in <br> V/C |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## AM Peak Hour

| 1 | SR 1 between Morrisey Blvd and Soquel Dr | NB | 2+1 | 3,563 | 0.60 | 3,585 | 0.62 | 22 | 0.02 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | SB | $2+1^{*}$ | 1,832 | 0.49 | 1,917 | 0.51 | 85 | 0.02 |
| 2 | SR 1 between Soquel Dr and 41st Ave | NB | 2 | 2,429 | 0.56 | 2,429 | 0.56 | 0 | 0.00 |
|  |  | SB | 2 | 1,739 | 0.45 | 1,739 | 0.45 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 3 | SR 1 between 41st Ave and Porter St/Bay Ave | NB | 2+1 | 3,667 | 0.91 | 3,712 | 0.92 | 45 | 0.01 |
|  |  | SB | 2+1 | 2,754 | 0.76 | 2,766 | 0.77 | 12 | 0.01 |

PM Peak Hour

| 1 | SR 1 between Morrisey Blvd and Soquel Dr | NB | 2+1 | 4,720 | 0.76 | 4,790 | 0.77 | 70 | 0.01 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | SB | $2+1$ * | 4,399 | 1.06 | 4,427 | 1.06 | 28 | 0.00 |
| 2 | SR 1 between Soquel Dr and 41st Ave | NB | 2 | 2,326 | 0.55 | 2,326 | 0.55 | 0 | 0.00 |
|  |  | SB | 2 | 4,234 | 1.03 | 4,234 | 1.03 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 3 | SR 1 between 41st Ave and Porter St/Bay Ave | NB | 2+1 | 2,553 | 0.64 | 2,568 | 0.64 | 15 | 0.00 |
|  |  | SB | 2+1 | 4,982 | 1.24 | 5,019 | 1.25 | 37 | 0.01 |

Note: +1 indicates an added auxiliary lane however no added capacity from this lane was assumed.
HCS analyzes traffic flows that take heavy vehicle percentage and peak hour factors into account, so similar volumes may result in different v/c ratios
*Right lane must exit at Soquel Dr intersection
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Table T-48 - Near Term Plus Project Conditions Segment Analysis (Highway 1)

| $\#$ | Study Segment | Direction | Lanes | Near <br> Term <br> Volume | Near <br> Near | Near <br> Term V/C <br> Project <br> Volume <br> $(v p h)$ | Term + <br> Project <br> V/C | Project <br> Volume | Change in <br> V/C |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

AM Peak Hour

| 1 | SR 1 between Morrisey Blvd and Soquel Dr | NB | 2+1 | 3,563 | 0.61 | 3,585 | 0.62 | 22 | 0.01 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | SB | 2+1* | 1,832 | 0.49 | 1,917 | 0.52 | 85 | 0.03 |
| 2 | SR 1 between Soquel Dr and 41st Ave | NB | 2 | 2,429 | 0.56 | 2,429 | 0.57 | 0 | 0.01 |
|  |  | SB | 2 | 1,739 | 0.43 | 1,739 | 0.44 | 0 | 0.01 |
| 3 | SR 1 between 41st Ave and Porter St/Bav Ave | NB | 2+1 | 3,694 | 0.92 | 3,739 | 0.93 | 45 | 0.01 |
|  |  | SB | 2+1 | 2,754 | 0.70 | 2,766 | 0.71 | 12 | 0.01 |

PM Peak Hour

| 1 | SR 1 between Morrisey Blvd and Soquel Dr | NB | 2+1 | 4,763 | 0.77 | 4,833 | 0.78 | 70 | 0.01 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | SB | $2+1^{*}$ | 4,430 | 1.06 | 4,458 | 1.07 | 28 | 0.01 |
| 2 | SR 1 between Soquel Dr and 41st Ave | NB | 2 | 2,326 | 0.55 | 2,326 | 0.55 | 0 | 0.00 |
|  |  | SB | 2 | 4,240 | 1.03 | 4,240 | 1.03 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 3 | SR 1 between 41st Ave and Porter St/Bay Ave | NB | 2+1 | 2,553 | 0.64 | 2,568 | 0.64 | 15 | 0.00 |
|  |  | SB | 2+1 | 4,991 | 1.24 | 5,028 | 1.25 | 37 | 0.01 |

Note: +1 indicates an added auxiliary lane however no added capacity from this lane was assumed.
HCS analyzes traffic flows that take heavy vehicle percentage and peak hour factors into account, so similar volumes may result in different v/c ratios
*Right lane must exit at Soquel Dr intersection
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Table T-49 - Cumulative Plus Project Conditions Segment Analysis (Highway 1)

| \# | Study Segment | Direction | Lanes | Cumulativ e Volume | Cumulativ e V/C | Cumulativ e + Project Volume (vph) | Cumulativ e + Project V/C | Project Volume | Change in V/C |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | SR 1 between Morrisey Blvd and Soquel Dr | NB | 2+1 | 3,862 | 0.66 | 3,884 | 0.67 | 22 | 0.01 |
|  |  | SB | $2+1^{*}$ | 2,038 | 0.54 | 2,123 | 0.56 | 85 | 0.02 |
| 2 | SR 1 between Soquel Dr and 41st Ave | NB | 2 | 2,669 | 0.61 | 2,669 | 0.61 | 0 | 0.00 |
|  |  | SB | 2 | 1,881 | 0.47 | 1,881 | 0.47 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 3 | SR 1 between 41st Ave and Porter St/Bav Ave | NB | 2+1 | 3,863 | 0.96 | 3,908 | 0.97 | 45 | 0.01 |
|  |  | SB | 2+1 | 3,098 | 0.78 | 3,110 | 0.79 | 12 | 0.01 |
| PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | SR 1 between Morrisey Blvd and Soauel Dr | NB | 2+1 | 5,034 | 0.81 | 5,104 | 0.82 | 70 | 0.01 |
|  |  | SB | $2+1^{*}$ | 4,627 | 1.11 | 4,655 | 1.12 | 28 | 0.01 |
| 2 | SR 1 between Soquel Dr and 41st Ave | NB | 2 | 2,377 | 0.56 | 2,377 | 0.56 | 0 | 0.00 |
|  |  | SB | 2 | 4,275 | 1.04 | 4,275 | 1.04 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 3 | SR 1 between 41st Ave and Porter St/Bav Ave | NB | 2+1 | 2,643 | 0.66 | 2,658 | 0.66 | 15 | 0.00 |
|  |  | SB | 2+1 | 5,047 | 1.26 | 5,084 | 1.27 | 37 | 0.01 |

Note: +1 indicates an added auxiliary lane however no added capacity from this lane was assumed.
HCS analyzes traffic flows that take heavy vehicle percentage and peak hour factors into account, so similar volumes may result in different v/c ratios
*Right lane must exit at Soquel Dr intersection
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## Highway 1 Planned Improvements

Currently, Caltrans has no impact fee program in place to help mitigate traffic impacts. However, Santa Cruz County RTC, in cooperation with Caltrans and the Federal Highway Administration ("FHWA"), is managing the Highway 1 Corridor Investment Program. The purpose of that project is to analyze alternative investments to relieve congestion on Highway 1 between San Andreas/Larkin Valley Road and Morrissey Boulevard. The goal of the Highway 1 Corridor Investment Program is to address several different needs in the existing transportation system:

- Bottlenecks along Highway 1 in both the southbound and northbound direction that cause congestion on a regular basis during peak travel periods.
- Travel time delays that are experienced by commuters, commerce, visitors, and emergency vehicles at various times of the day.
- "Cut-through" traffic, or traffic on local streets, that occurs and is increasing because drivers seek to avoid congestion on the highway in search of "short-cuts".
- Limited opportunities for pedestrians and bicyclists to cross Highway 1 within the project corridor.
- Recognize the limited funding available from state and federal sources and to be prepared to compete for discretionary funding opportunities when it periodically occurs at the state or federal level.

Environmental review has been completed for the Corridor Investment Program pursuant to the Highway 1 Tier I/Tier II Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment (DEIR/EA) which meets both state and federal environmental requirements. The study was certified in December 2018 and is currently in litigation. ${ }^{47}$ For purposes of environmental analysis, the Corridor Investment Program is divided into two components:

- Tier I - A long-term, program level analysis for the future of the Highway 1 corridor between Santa Cruz and Aptos. The Tier I concept for the corridor would be built over time through a series of smaller incremental projects (referred to as Tier II projects).
- Tier II - Project level analysis of a smaller incremental project within the Tier I corridor which would move forward based on available funding. Each of the Tier II projects would have independent utility and benefit to the public and Highway 1 operations.

Improvements studied by the DEIR/EA may be implemented incrementally as funding and priorities allow.

The current Tier II project includes northbound and southbound auxiliary lanes between $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue and Soquel Drive and a bike/pedestrian overcrossing of Highway 1 at Chanticleer Avenue. Preliminary design and environmental analysis began on a second-Tier II project in Fall
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2016 for the construction of a pedestrian/bicycle overcrossing of Highway 1 at Mar Vista Drive in Aptos.

Future Tier II projects will be subject to separate project level environmental analysis as part of the project development process and will be consistent with the long term (Tier I) vision chosen for the Highway 1 Corridor, which includes additional auxiliary lanes, the new interchanges, and the construction of the HOV lanes. More detail can be found at https://sccrtc.org/projects/streetshighways/hwy 1 corridor/environmental-documents.

In addition, the Santa Cruz County RTC is pursuing the use of future widened shoulders of SR 1 for bus-on-shoulder operations.

## Funding for Highway 1 Improvements

Measure D was a proposed $1 / 2$-cent local sales tax increase included on the November 2016 ballot in Santa Cruz County. The Measure, which will focus on transportation safety upgrades, roadway repairs, traffic relief, and transit augmentation, was approved by voters via a super majority (over $67 \%$ voting "yes").

Measure D will provide steady and direct funding to the County and all cities within the County to improve the transportation network, including Highway 1. Transportation improvements will include improvements of local streets, road maintenance, bicycle and pedestrian projects, transit and paratransit service upgrades, as well as implementation of many other projects and programs. Measure D funding will be supplemented by State and potentially Federal financial grants - https://sccrtc.org/funding-planning/measured/

Measure D funding will provide funding for the following improvements in the Project vicinity:

- $\$ 97$ million for auxiliary lanes between:
- Soquel Drive and $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue
- Bay Avenue/Porter Street and Park Avenue
- Park Avenue and State Park Drive
- $\$ 7$ million for 2 new bicycle and pedestrian bridges over Highway 1
- In Live Oak at Chanticleer Avenue
- In Seacliff/Aptos at Mar Vista Drive
- $\$ 21$ million for ongoing safety and operational service

As noted above, the Project results in a net decrease in VMT and therefore does not require improvements to Highway 1 to avoid or reduce transportation impacts to a less than significant level. Accordingly, the information set forth above regarding Highway 1 conditions and potential improvements is provided for information purposes only at the request of County staff.
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## Highway 17

This section describes the operational conditions along Highway 17 and the potential effects that the Project would have along Highway 17 within the study area, if the Project's transportation impacts were evaluated using outdated LOS metrics rather than VMT. This information is provided for informational purposes only at the request of County staff.

## Highway 17 Volume to Capacity Ratios

Highway 17 operates at LOS F during weekday AM and PM peak hour conditions within the study area and the addition (or subtraction) of Project trips would provide an imperceptible change in operating conditions along these oversaturated facilities. However, this section is provided to quantify the estimated change in volume to capacity ratios ( $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ) along the study segments that would result from construction of the Project.

## Analysis

## (I) Existing and Existing Plus Project (Highway 17)

Freeway operations under Existing Plus Project conditions are expected to remain very similar to the Existing Conditions. No freeway segment is anticipated to experience a change in LOS as a result of the Project and, as shown in the table below, v/c ratios are expected to increase by 0.02 or less on any of the study segments. Analysis results are shown in Table T-50.

HCS was used to evaluate traffic operations on the study freeway segments and information regarding HCS inputs and analysis results can be found in Appendix 0.
(m) Near Term and Near Term Plus Project (Highway 17)

Freeway operations under Near Term Plus Project conditions are expected to remain very similar to the Near-Term Conditions. No freeway segment is anticipated to experience a change in LOS as a result of the Project and, as shown in the table below, $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratios are expected to increase by 0.02 or less on any of the study segments. Analysis results are shown in Table T-51.

HCS was used to evaluate traffic operations on the study freeway segments and information regarding HCS inputs and analysis results can be found in Appendix 0.

## (n) Cumulative and Cumulative Plus Project (Highway 17)

Freeway operations under Cumulative Plus Project conditions are expected to remain very similar to the Cumulative Conditions. No freeway segment is anticipated to experience a change in LOS as a result of the Project and, as shown in the table below, v/c ratios are expected to increase by 0.02 or less on any of the study segments. Analysis results are shown in Table T-52.

HCS was used to evaluate traffic operations on the study freeway segments and information regarding HCS inputs and analysis results can be found in Appendix 0.
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## (o) Project Effects on Highway 17 Operations

As indicated in the segment analysis results in Table T-50, Table T-51, and Table T-52, the Project is expected to reduce traffic on the study segments due to medical care trips rerouting to the Project site in Santa Cruz (rather than traveling to San Jose to receive medical services which the Proposed Tenant currently does not provide in Santa Cruz County). This reduction in trips would have a negligible effect on v/c and thus, Project related operational effects/ improvements on the segments would also be indiscernible compared to Existing, Near Term, and Cumulative development conditions.

## (p) Project Effects on Highway 17 Safety

Highway 17 operates at an unacceptable LOS F (with and without the Project) during both AM and PM peak hour conditions. The Project would remove some County resident trips from Highway 17 segments. It would also divert County resident trips along other Highway 17 segments and Highway 1. The removal and rerouting of existing trips will occur because it is anticipated that local residents will stay within their immediate geographical locale and elect to travel to the Project site in Santa Cruz rather than to other existing Kaiser facilities in Scotts Valley, San Jose or Watsonville This reduction in trips would have a negligible effect on v/c (less than $1 \%$ reduction) and thus, Project-related operational effects/improvements on the segments would also be indiscernible compared to Existing, Near Term, and Cumulative development conditions

Traffic collisions, and thus roadway safety, is quantified by calculating collision rates in units of collisions per 100 million vehicle miles driven. One way to reduce the overall number of traffic collisions along roadways that experience a high number of collisions is to reduce traffic volumes along those roadways. As such, a reduction in collisions would be proportional to a reduction in vehicles. Thus, the Project would provide a potential safety benefit along Highway 17 by reducing travel along the roadway. Based on travel demand modeling and VMT results included in the VMT chapter (Chapter 2) of this report, daily volume reduction due to the Project and Santa Cruz residents staying local for healthcare is expected to be approximately 1.3 percent during the AM and PM peak hours ( $50 \%$ of daily volumes). Therefore, assuming the proportional relationship described above between traffic volumes and vehicle collisions, the number of accidents could also decrease proportionally by approximately 0.65 percent. ${ }^{48}$

Note that the above assumes a constant collision rate; typically, however, as traffic volumes go up, so do the crash rates. Therefore, this proportional evaluation is considered conservative.
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Table T-50 - Existing Plus Project Conditions Segment Analysis (Highway 17)

| \# | Study Segment | Direction | Lanes | Existing Volume | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Existing } \\ & \text { V/C } \end{aligned}$ | Existing + <br> Project <br> Volume (vph) | Existing + <br> Project V/C | Project Volume | Change in V/C |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Hwy 17 between Pasatiempo Overpass and Hwy 1 | NB | 3** | 3,018 | 0.90 | 2,998 | 0.75 | -20 | -0.15 |
|  |  | SB | 2+1 | 1,706 | 0.49 | 1,662 | 0.50 | -44 | 0.01 |
| PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Hwy 17 between Pasatiempo Overpass and Hwy 1 | NB | $3^{* *}$ | 2,996 | 0.72 | 2,958 | 0.73 | -38 | 0.01 |
|  |  | SB | $2+1$ | 1,950 | 0.55 | 1,922 | 0.56 | -28 | 0.01 |

Note: +1 indicates an added auxiliary lane however no added capacity from this lane was assumed.
HCS analyzes traffic flows that take heavy vehicle percentage and peak hour factors into account, so similar volumes may result in different v/c ratios
** Right Lane ends past Pasatiempo Overcrossing
Table T-51 - Near Term Plus Project Conditions Segment Analysis (Highway 17)

| \# | Study Segment | Direction | Lanes | Near <br> Term <br> Volume | Near <br> Term V/C | Near Term + Project Volume (vph) | Near Term + Project V/C | Project Volume | Change in V/C |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Hwy 17 between Pasatiempo Overpass and Hwy 1 | NB | $3^{* *}$ | 3,018 | 0.75 | 2,998 | 0.77 | -20 | 0.02 |
|  |  | SB | 2+1 | 1,706 | 0.48 | 1,662 | 0.50 | -44 | 0.02 |
| PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Hwy 17 between Pasatiempo Overpass and Hwy 1 | NB | 3** | 2,996 | 0.72 | 2,958 | 0.74 | -38 | 0.02 |
|  |  | SB | 2+1 | 1,950 | 0.55 | 1,922 | 0.57 | -28 | 0.02 |

Note: +1 indicates an added auxiliary lane however no added capacity from this lane was assumed.
HCS analyzes traffic flows that take heavy vehicle percentage and peak hour factors into account, so similar volumes may result in different v/c ratios
** Right Lane ends past Pasatiempo Overcrossing
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Table T-52 - Cumulative Plus Project Conditions Segment Analysis (Highway 17)

| \# | Study Segment | Direction | Lanes | Cumulativ e Volume | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { Cumulativ } \\ \text { e V/C } \end{array}\right\|$ | Cumulativ e + Project Volume (vph) | Cumulativ <br> e + Project V/C | Project <br> Volume | Change in V/C |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Hwy 17 between Pasatiempo Overpass and Hwy 1 | NB | 3** | 3,494 | 0.87 | 3,474 | 0.87 | -20 | 0.00 |
|  |  | SB | 2+1 | 1,861 | 0.52 | 1,817 | 0.53 | -44 | 0.01 |
| PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Hwy 17 between Pasatiempo Overpass and Hwy 1 | NB | 3** | 3,184 | 0.77 | 3,146 | 0.78 | -38 | 0.01 |
|  |  | SB | 2+1 | 2,169 | 0.61 | 2,141 | 0.62 | -28 | 0.01 |

Note: +1 indicates an added auxiliary lane however no added capacity from this lane was assumed.
HCS analyzes traffic flows that take heavy vehicle percentage and peak hour factors into account, so similar volumes may result in different v/c ratios
** Right Lane ends past Pasatiempo Overcrossing
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## 8. TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT AREA FEES (NONCEQA ANALYSIS)

Since 1989, Santa Cruz County has assessed Transportation Improvement Area fees ("TIA Fees") in four geographic subareas of Santa Cruz County - Aptos, Live Oak, Pajaro Valley and Soquel. For non-residential projects, the TIA Fees are based on daily net new trips generated by a development project. The TIA Fee includes a transportation improvement fee to fund major transportation infrastructure and a roadside improvement fee to fund roadside-related improvements. The revenue generated from TIA Fees is used to fund improvements identified in the Santa Cruz Capital Improvement Program, which is updated each year.

The Project is required to pay a TIA Fee based on daily net new trips. The Project is located within the Live Oak TIA fee area and fees collected in this area are currently assessed (August 2020) at $\$ 300$ per net new daily trip to fund roadside improvements and $\$ 300$ per net new daily trip to fund transportation improvements.

Based on the most current Santa Cruz County Fee Schedule (County of Santa Cruz Department of Public Works - Service \& Capital Improvement Fees schedule, revised December 12, 2017) ("Fee Schedule"), trip generation rates disclosed in a traffic study prepared for a project are used to calculate TIA Fees. The Fee Schedule (Page 11) states that "where a traffic study is required and accepted by the County during the environmental review of a project, a trip generation rate based on the report shall be used".

As described in the Local Mobility Analysis Chapter of this TIOA (Chapter 7, Trip Generation Estimates section on page 62), applying the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition (2017), the Project is expected to generate 6,106 gross daily trips. As further described in the Transportation Demand Management chapter of this report, the Project will implement a voluntary TDM program that is expected to reduce trips by approximately 15.5 percent for employees and 20.5 percent for Members. For purposes of calculating TIA Fees, however, no reduction will be taken for the effect of TDM measures upon the issuance of building permits. If TDM measures are proven to be effective, as evidenced by driveway counts to be performed after construction of the Project, a partial refund of TIA fees (to account for the overpayment) may be given to the Applicant to the extent it is shown that the actual trips to the Project site are less than 6,106 per day.

Table T-53, below, provides a summary of existing trip credits, Project trips, and TDM reductions based on the ITE rates and applicable TIA fee amounts:

- A total fee credit of $\$ 80,400$ is estimated for the existing 134 trips per day generated from the light industrial land uses on the Project site that will be relocated/demolished prior to construction of the Project. This includes transportation improvement fees $(\$ 40,200)$ roadside improvement fees $(\$ 40,200)$. See the discussion of "Trip Credits" in the Local Mobility Analysis Chapter (Chapter 7) for more information about the trip ends generated by the existing uses on the Project site.
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- A gross TIA fee of $\$ \mathbf{3 , 6 6 3 , 6 0 0}$ is estimated for the Project based on the assumption that it will generate 6,106 gross daily trips. This includes Live Oak Transportation Improvement fees $(6,106$ trips $x \$ 300=\$ 1,831,800)$ and Live Oak Roadside Improvement fees $(6,106$ trips $\times \$ 300=\$ 1,831,800$ ).
- However, taking into account the above fee credit, it is estimated that the Project will be responsible for paying a total of $\$ 3,583,200$ (i.e., $\$ 3,663,600$ gross impact fee minus $\$ 80,400$ fee credit $=\$ 3,583,200$ ) in County TIA Fees.
- The Project will voluntarily implement a TDM measures that are anticipated to reduce the daily trips generated by the Project. However, the Applicant will not seek a reduction in fee for this anticipated reduction in daily trips upfront. Rather, as detailed in Transportation Demand Management Chapter (Chapter 3) of this report, the Applicant or Proposed Tenant will monitor the Project's actual trip generation through implementation of a formalized driveway traffic count program. Should the data evidence that the Project does in fact meet or exceed its TDM reduction goals, it is anticipated that the Project would receive TIA Fee refunds, commensurate with the proven reduction of trips.

Table T-53, below, provides a summary of existing trip credits and Project trips:

| ITE classification for Existing and Project Uses |  | Roads provem | Fee | Trans Impro | ortation ment Fee | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project | Daily <br> Trips | Fee per Trip (\$) | Total (\$) | Fee per Trip (\$) | Total (\$) | Total Fee (\$) |
| Clinic (Project use) | 6,106 | \$300 | \$1,831,800 | \$300 | \$1,831,800 | \$3,663,600 |
| Credit | Daily Trips | Credit per Trip (\$) | Total (\$) | Credit per Trip (\$) | Total (\$) | Total Credit <br> (\$) |
| Light Industrial (Existing Use) | 134 | \$300 | \$40,200 | \$300 | \$40,200 | \$80,400 |
| Net Project TIA Fees |  | \$1,791,600 |  | \$1,791,600 |  | \$3,583,200 |

These TIA fees are estimates only and reflect the information available at the time that this report was prepared (August 2020). The estimates above must be confirmed by the County, are subject to change, and will be payable at the time the first building permit is issued.
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The County has earmarked traffic mitigating improvements in its Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) that the Project could potentially help fund through payment of the TIA Fees. The following improvements are included in the County's fee programs:

- $37^{\text {th }} / 38^{\text {th }}$ Avenue (Brommer Street to East Cliff Drive) Multimodal Circulation Improvements and Greenway
- $41^{\text {st }}$ Ave Improvements Phase 2 (Hwy 1 Interchange to Soquel Drive)
- Chanticleer Avenue Improvements (Hwy 1 to Soquel Drive)
- Countywide ADA Access Ramps
- Countywide Bike Projects
- Countywide Sidewalks
- Mattison Lane Improvements (Chanticleer Avenue to Soquel Avenue)
- Paul Minnie Avenue Improvements (Rodriguez Street to Soquel Avenue)
- Paul Sweet Road Improvements (Soquel Drive to end)
- Soquel Avenue Improvements (City of SC to Gross Road)
- Soquel Drive Traffic Signal and Left-Turn Lane (Robertson Street)
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## 9. OTHER TRANSPORTATION ANALYSIS

When considering transportation impacts, Appendix G, of the CEQA Guidelines recommends consideration of the following:
(a) Would the project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?
(b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?
(c) Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?
(d) Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

Question (a) is evaluated in the Local Mobility Analysis (LOS) Chapter (Chapter 7) of this report which considers the Project's consistency with General Plan and related programs, plans, ordinances and policies addressing the circulation system, and the Pedestrian, Bicycle and Transit Mobility Chapter 7 of this report. Question (b) is evaluated in the VMT Chapter 2 of this report. Questions (c) and (d) are evaluated in this chapter.

## Transportation Hazards

All geometric improvements identified in this study as Project improvements will be designed and constructed per industry, local agency, and Caltrans standards and are not anticipated to substantially increase hazards or result in incompatible uses. The installation of the barrier between the through lane and the right-turn lane along the section between Gross Road and the Southbound On-Ramp on $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue in the northbound direction, will reduce conflicts between vehicles that jump the queue, and reduce conflicts between vehicles and bicycles.

## Emergency Access

The Project has two driveways off Soquel Avenue. These driveways both provide Emergency Vehicle access. Moreover, the Project will install a number of traffic improvements that will improve circulation in the Project vicinity. As such, the Project will not result in inadequate emergency access.
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## APPENDICES
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## APPENDIX A. EXISTING CONDITIONS TRAFFIC COUNTS

## Capitola Rd \& Soquel Ave

## Peak Hour Turning Movement Count



7th Ave
Soquel Ave


Date: 10-04-2018
Count Period: 7:00 AM to 9:00 AM Peak Hour: 7:45 AM to 8:45 AM


Two-Hour Count Summaries

| Interval Start |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | 7th Ave |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 15-min <br> Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 | AM | 0 | 0 | 40 | 4 | 0 | 40 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 244 | 0 |
| 7:15 | AM | 0 | 0 | 68 | 8 | 0 | 48 | 104 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 316 | 0 |
| 7:30 | AM | 0 | 0 | 99 | 8 | 0 | 33 | 112 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 115 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 378 | 0 |
| 7:45 | AM | 0 | 0 | 139 | 18 | 0 | 51 | 126 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 128 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 491 | 1,429 |
| 8:00 | AM | 0 | 0 | 110 | 16 | 0 | 55 | 147 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 117 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 496 | 1,681 |
| 8:15 | AM | 0 | 0 | 137 | 24 | 0 | 59 | 163 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 91 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 504 | 1,869 |
| 8:30 | AM | 0 | 0 | 106 | 13 | 0 | 64 | 132 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 431 | 1,922 |
| 8:45 | AM | 0 | 0 | 117 | 5 | 1 | 54 | 124 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 103 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 425 | 1,856 |
| Count | Total | 0 | 0 | 816 | 96 | 1 | 404 | 984 | 0 | 0 | 181 | 0 | 803 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,285 | 0 |
|  | AII | 0 | 0 | 492 | 71 | 0 | 229 | 568 | 0 | 0 | 131 | 0 | 431 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,922 | 0 |
| Peak | HV | 0 | 0 | 21 | 2 | 0 | 11 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 0 |
|  | HV\% | - | - | 4\% | 3\% | - | 5\% | 4\% | - | - | 2\% | - | 2\% | - | - | - | - | 3\% | 0 |

Note: Two-hour count summary volumes include heavy vehicles but exclude bicycles in overall count.

| Interval Start | Heavy Vehicle Totals |  |  |  |  | Bicycles |  |  |  |  | Pedestrians (Crossing Leg) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | East | West | North | South | Total |
| 7:00 AM | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 8 |
| 7:15 AM | 4 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 8 | 10 | 0 | 18 |
| 7:30 AM | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 15 |
| 7:45 AM | 8 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 10 |
| 8:00 AM | 4 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 21 | 4 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 20 | 19 | 5 | 44 |
| 8:15 AM | 7 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 13 | 15 | 2 | 30 |
| 8:30 AM | 4 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 20 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 |
| 8:45 AM | 6 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Count Total | 36 | 43 | 19 | 0 | 98 | 19 | 38 | 15 | 0 | 72 | 0 | 54 | 61 | 17 | 132 |
| Peak Hr | 23 | 33 | 10 | 0 | 66 | 13 | 22 | 9 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 38 | 39 | 12 | 89 |

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles

| Interval <br> Start | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | 7th Ave |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 32 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 48 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 51 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 66 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 66 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 34 | 2 | 0 | 16 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 21 | 2 | 0 | 11 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 0 |

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

| Interval Start | Soquel Ave |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  | 7th Ave |  |  | 0 |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 33 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 49 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 43 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 44 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 39 |
| Count Total | 0 | 18 | 1 | 1 | 37 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.

7th Ave
Soquel Ave іみx

Date: 10-04-2018
Count Period: 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM Peak Hour: 4:30 PM to 5:30 PM


Two-Hour Count Summaries

| Interval Start |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | 7th Ave |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 15-min <br> Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 | PM | 0 | 0 | 203 | 26 | 0 | 63 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 484 | 0 |
| 4:15 | PM | 0 | 0 | 196 | 22 | 0 | 69 | 113 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 467 | 0 |
| 4:30 | PM | 0 | 0 | 241 | 13 | 0 | 72 | 122 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 524 | 0 |
| 4:45 | PM | 0 | 0 | 211 | 17 | 0 | 69 | 138 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 517 | 1,992 |
| 5:00 | PM | 0 | 0 | 231 | 24 | 1 | 72 | 127 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 538 | 2,046 |
| 5:15 | PM | 0 | 0 | 201 | 17 | 0 | 83 | 138 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 535 | 2,114 |
| 5:30 | PM | 0 | 0 | 232 | 22 | 0 | 78 | 91 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 503 | 2,093 |
| 5:45 | PM | 0 | 0 | 196 | 13 | 0 | 72 | 96 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 455 | 2,031 |
| Count | Total | 0 | 0 | 1,711 | 154 | 1 | 578 | 935 | 0 | 0 | 167 | 0 | 477 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4,023 | 0 |
|  | AII | 0 | 0 | 884 | 71 | 1 | 296 | 525 | 0 | 0 | 94 | 0 | 243 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,114 | 0 |
| Peak | HV | 0 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 0 |
|  | HV\% | - | - | 1\% | 1\% | 0\% | 2\% | 1\% | - | - | 1\% | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | 1\% | 0 |

Note: Two-hour count summary volumes include heavy vehicles but exclude bicycles in overall count.

| Interval Start | Heavy Vehicle Totals |  |  |  |  | Bicycles |  |  |  |  | Pedestrians (Crossing Leg) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | East | West | North | South | Total |
| 4:00 PM | 7 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 12 |
| 4:15 PM | 4 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 10 | 8 | 2 | 20 |
| 4:30 PM | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 10 |
| 4:45 PM | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 9 | 7 | 1 | 17 |
| 5:00 PM | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| 5:15 PM | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 8 | 7 | 1 | 16 |
| 5:30 PM | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 7 | 10 | 2 | 19 |
| 5:45 PM | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 9 |
| Count Total | 24 | 22 | 8 | 0 | 54 | 29 | 26 | 8 | 0 | 63 | 0 | 54 | 46 | 9 | 109 |
| Peak Hr | 11 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 23 | 21 | 14 | 4 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 25 | 20 | 4 | 49 |

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles

| Interval Start | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | 7th Ave |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 35 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 28 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 23 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 19 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 19 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 23 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 0 |

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

| Interval Start | Soquel Ave |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  | 7th Ave |  |  | 0 |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 26 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 32 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 39 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 40 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 37 |
| Count Total | 0 | 27 | 2 | 5 | 21 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 20 | 1 | 1 | 13 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.




Location: 2. Soquel Dr \& Paul Sweet Rd/Commercial Way Date: $3 / 6 / 2018$


Peak Hour: 4:30 PM - 5:30 PM
Peak 15: 5:05 PM - 5:20 PM
PHF: 0.961343

## Hwy 1 SB Ramps <br> Soquel Ave

Date: 10-04-2018


|  | HV \%: | PHF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EB | $2.7 \%$ | 0.82 |
| WB | $1.6 \%$ | 0.99 |
| NB | - | - |
| SB | $3.0 \%$ | 0.97 |
| TOTAL | $2.5 \%$ | 0.94 |

Two-Hour Count Summaries

| Interval Start |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | Hwy 1 SB Ramps |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15-min } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
|  | AM | 0 | 64 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 87 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 86 | 341 | 0 |
|  | AM | 0 | 63 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 145 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 108 | 424 | 0 |
|  | AM | 0 | 86 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 125 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 0 | 144 | 520 | 0 |
|  | AM | 0 | 114 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 138 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 0 | 133 | 546 | 1,831 |
| 8:00 | AM | 0 | 96 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 136 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 0 | 140 | 551 | 2,041 |
|  | AM | 0 | 99 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 0 | 155 | 589 | 2,206 |
|  | AM | 0 | 81 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 148 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 0 | 149 | 534 | 2,220 |
|  | AM | 0 | 88 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 137 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86 | 0 | 144 | 547 | 2,221 |
| Count | Total | 0 | 691 | 408 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,060 | 323 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 511 | 0 | 1,059 | 4,052 | 0 |
|  | All | 0 | 364 | 229 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 565 | 167 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 308 | 0 | 588 | 2,221 | 0 |
| Peak <br> Hour | HV | 0 | 10 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 21 | 55 | 0 |
|  | HV\% | - | 3\% | 3\% | - | - | - | 2\% | 2\% | - | - | - | - | - | 2\% | - | 4\% | 2\% | 0 |

Note: Two-hour count summary volumes include heavy vehicles but exclude bicycles in overall count.

| Interval Start | Heavy Vehicle Totals |  |  |  |  | Bicycles |  |  |  |  | Pedestrians (Crossing Leg) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | East | West | North | South | Total |
| 7:00 AM | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| 7:15 AM | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| 7:30 AM | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| 7:45 AM | 1 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 8:00 AM | 4 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 15 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 8:15 AM | 9 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 16 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 8:30 AM | 2 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 8:45 AM | 1 | 6 | 0 | 5 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Count Total | 23 | 18 | 0 | 41 | 82 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 18 |
| Peak Hr | 16 | 12 | 0 | 27 | 55 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 |


| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | Hwy 1 SB Ramps |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15-min } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 27 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 15 | 39 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 16 | 48 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 12 | 53 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 55 |
| Count Total | 0 | 14 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 31 | 82 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 10 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 21 | 55 | 0 |

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

| Interval Start | Soquel Ave |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  | 0 |  |  | Hwy 1 SB Ramps |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15-min } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Count Total | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.


Two-Hour Count Summaries

| Interval Start |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | Hwy 1 SB Ramps |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15-min } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 | PM | 0 | 88 | 114 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 122 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 143 | 0 | 102 | 581 | 0 |
| 4:15 | PM | 0 | 101 | 143 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 97 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 165 | 0 | 79 | 604 | 0 |
| 4:30 | PM | 0 | 81 | 136 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 114 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 150 | 0 | 120 | 612 | 0 |
| 4:4 | PM | 0 | 62 | 125 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 112 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 154 | 0 | 105 | 569 | 2,366 |
|  | PM | 0 | 72 | 145 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 112 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 | 0 | 89 | 572 | 2,357 |
| 5:1 | PM | 0 | 82 | 136 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 115 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 160 | 0 | 93 | 600 | 2,353 |
|  | PM | 0 | 65 | 126 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 182 | 0 | 125 | 595 | 2,336 |
|  | PM | 0 | 59 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 160 | 0 | 114 | 541 | 2,308 |
| Count | Total | 0 | 610 | 1,017 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 855 | 107 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,258 | 0 | 827 | 4,674 | 0 |
|  | All | 0 | 332 | 518 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 445 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 612 | 0 | 406 | 2,366 | 0 |
| Peak <br> Hour | HV | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 30 | 0 |
|  | HV\% | - | 1\% | 1\% | - | - | - | 2\% | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | 1\% | - | 2\% | 1\% | 0 |

Note: Two-hour count summary volumes include heavy vehicles but exclude bicycles in overall count.

| Interval Start | Heavy Vehicle Totals |  |  |  |  | Bicycles |  |  |  |  | Pedestrians (Crossing Leg) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | East | West | North | South | Total |
| 4:00 PM | 3 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 4:15 PM | 1 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 4:30 PM | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 4:45 PM | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 5:00 PM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| 5:15 PM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 10 | 11 | 0 | 18 | 39 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 15 |
| Peak Hr | 8 | 9 | 0 | 13 | 30 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 7 |


| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | Hwy 1 SB Ramps |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15-min } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 30 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 21 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 16 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 9 |
| Count Total | 0 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 12 | 39 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 30 | 0 |

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

| Interval Start | Soquel Ave |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  | 0 |  |  | Hwy 1 SB Ramps |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15-min } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | , | 6 |
| Count Total | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.

17th Ave
Soquel Ave しみx

Date: 10-04-2018
Count Period: 7:00 AM to 9:00 AM Peak Hour: 8:00 AM to 9:00 AM


Two-Hour Count Summaries

| Interval Start |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 15-min <br> Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM |  | 0 | 0 | 31 | 30 | 0 | 8 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 211 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM |  | 0 | 0 | 24 | 45 | 0 | 13 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 98 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 256 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM |  | 0 | 0 | 33 | 56 | 0 | 10 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 121 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 289 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM |  | 0 | 0 | 51 | 59 | 0 | 11 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 89 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 289 | 1,045 |
| 8:00 AM |  | 0 | 0 | 67 | 52 | 0 | 12 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 104 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 328 | 1,162 |
| 8:15 AM |  | 0 | 0 | 56 | 79 | 0 | 9 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 107 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 326 | 1,232 |
| 8:30 AM |  | 0 | 0 | 47 | 69 | 0 | 11 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 98 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 306 | 1,249 |
| 8:45 AM |  | 0 | 0 | 54 | 64 | 0 | 10 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 103 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 312 | 1,272 |
| Count Total |  | 0 | 0 | 363 | 454 | 0 | 84 | 561 | 0 | 0 | 796 | 0 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,317 | 0 |
| Peak <br> Hour | All | 0 | 0 | 224 | 264 | 0 | 42 | 296 | 0 | 0 | 412 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,272 | 0 |
|  | HV | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 0 |
|  | HV\% | - | - | 1\% | 2\% | - | 0\% | 1\% | - | - | 2\% | - | 3\% | - | - | - | - | 2\% | 0 |

Note: Two-hour count summary volumes include heavy vehicles but exclude bicycles in overall count.

| Interval Start | Heavy Vehicle Totals |  |  |  |  | Bicycles |  |  |  |  | Pedestrians (Crossing Leg) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | East | West | North | South | Total |
| 7:00 AM | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 7:15 AM | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 7:30 AM | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| 7:45 AM | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 AM | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| 8:15 AM | 5 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:30 AM | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:45 AM | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Count Total | 18 | 8 | 13 | 0 | 39 | 12 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 9 |
| Peak Hr | 9 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 22 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 |

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles

| Interval Start | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 17 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 18 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 22 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 23 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 22 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 5 | 13 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 0 |

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

| Interval Start | Soquel Ave |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  | 0 |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 12 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 |
| Count Total | 0 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.

17th Ave
Soquel Ave

むみ
Date: 10-04-2018
Count Period: 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM Peak Hour: 4:15 PM to 5:15 PM


Two-Hour Count Summaries

| Interval Start |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 | PM | 0 | 0 | 144 | 114 | 0 | 13 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 402 | 0 |
| 4:15 | PM | 0 | 0 | 163 | 134 | 0 | 11 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 440 | 0 |
| 4:30 | PM | 0 | 0 | 157 | 87 | 0 | 18 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 392 | 0 |
| 4:45 | PM | 0 | 0 | 135 | 122 | 0 | 17 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 394 | 1,628 |
| 5:00 | PM | 0 | 0 | 156 | 122 | 0 | 14 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 426 | 1,652 |
| 5:15 | PM | 0 | 0 | 161 | 126 | 0 | 14 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 423 | 1,635 |
| 5:30 | PM | 0 | 0 | 158 | 130 | 0 | 7 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 56 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 394 | 1,637 |
| 5:45 | PM | 0 | 0 | 129 | 116 | 0 | 13 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 375 | 1,618 |
| Count | Total | 0 | 0 | 1,203 | 951 | 0 | 107 | 415 | 0 | 0 | 516 | 0 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,246 | 0 |
|  | All | 0 | 0 | 611 | 465 | 0 | 60 | 221 | 0 | 0 | 267 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,652 | 0 |
| Peak <br> Hour | HV | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 |
|  | HV\% | - | - | 1\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | - | - | 1\% | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | 1\% | 0 |

Note: Two-hour count summary volumes include heavy vehicles but exclude bicycles in overall count.

| Interval Start | Heavy Vehicle Totals |  |  |  |  | Bicycles |  |  |  |  | Pedestrians (Crossing Leg) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | East | West | North | South | Total |
| 4:00 PM | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 4:15 PM | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 4:30 PM | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 4:45 PM | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 5:00 PM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 5:15 PM | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:30 PM | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| 5:45 PM | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Count Total | 15 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 24 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 12 |
| Peak Hr | 8 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 13 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 |

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles

| Interval Start | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 17 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 |

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

| Interval Start | Soquel Ave |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  | 0 |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 |
| Count Total | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.

Chanticleer Ave
Soquel Ave


Date: 10-04-2018
Count Period: 7:00 AM to 9:00 AM Peak Hour: 7:45 AM to 8:45 AM


Two-Hour Count Summaries

| Interval Start |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | Chanticleer Ave |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 15-min <br> Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 | AM | 0 | 0 | 28 | 10 | 0 | 7 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 121 | 0 |
| 7:15 | AM | 0 | 0 | 18 | 9 | 0 | 23 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 148 | 0 |
| 7:30 | AM | 0 | 0 | 27 | 13 | 0 | 14 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 159 | 0 |
| 7:45 | AM | 0 | 0 | 31 | 19 | 0 | 20 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 190 | 618 |
| 8:00 | AM | 0 | 0 | 49 | 24 | 0 | 20 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 215 | 712 |
| 8:15 | AM | 0 | 0 | 47 | 23 | 0 | 24 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 190 | 754 |
| 8:30 | AM | 0 | 0 | 32 | 17 | 0 | 11 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 165 | 760 |
| 8:45 | AM | 0 | 0 | 48 | 16 | 0 | 14 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 182 | 752 |
| Count | Total | 0 | 0 | 280 | 131 | 0 | 133 | 358 | 0 | 0 | 301 | 0 | 167 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,370 | 0 |
|  | AII | 0 | 0 | 159 | 83 | 0 | 75 | 185 | 0 | 0 | 162 | 0 | 96 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 760 | 0 |
| Peak | HV | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 |
|  | HV\% | - | - | 3\% | 2\% | - | 0\% | 2\% | - | - | 1\% | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | 1\% | 0 |

Note: Two-hour count summary volumes include heavy vehicles but exclude bicycles in overall count.

| Interval Start | Heavy Vehicle Totals |  |  |  |  | Bicycles |  |  |  |  | Pedestrians (Crossing Leg) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | East | West | North | South | Total |
| 7:00 AM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 AM | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15 AM | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Count Total | 8 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 18 | 8 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| Peak Hr | 6 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles

| Interval Start | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | Chanticleer Ave |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 |

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

| Interval Start | Soquel Ave |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  | Chanticleer Ave |  |  | 0 |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 |
| Count Total | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.

## Chanticleer Ave <br> Soquel Ave

Date: 10-04-2018
Count Period: 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM Peak Hour: 4:15 PM to 5:15 PM


Two-Hour Count Summaries

| Interval Start |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | Chanticleer Ave |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 15-min <br> Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 | PM | 0 | 0 | 108 | 41 | 0 | 24 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 264 | 0 |
| 4:15 | PM | 0 | 0 | 106 | 62 | 0 | 19 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 275 | 0 |
| 4:30 | PM | 0 | 0 | 121 | 45 | 0 | 20 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 270 | 0 |
| 4:45 | PM | 0 | 0 | 97 | 45 | 0 | 20 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 238 | 1,047 |
| 5:00 | PM | 0 | 0 | 115 | 52 | 0 | 22 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 269 | 1,052 |
| 5:15 | PM | 0 | 0 | 102 | 61 | 0 | 22 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 261 | 1,038 |
| 5:30 | PM | 0 | 0 | 107 | 63 | 0 | 16 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 238 | 1,006 |
| 5:45 | PM | 0 | 0 | 92 | 49 | 0 | 21 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 219 | 987 |
| Count | Total | 0 | 0 | 848 | 418 | 0 | 164 | 365 | 0 | 0 | 154 | 0 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,034 | 0 |
|  | AII | 0 | 0 | 439 | 204 | 0 | 81 | 207 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,052 | 0 |
| Peak | HV | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
|  | HV\% | - | - | 1\% | 1\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | - | - | 0\% | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | 1\% | 0 |

Note: Two-hour count summary volumes include heavy vehicles but exclude bicycles in overall count.

| Interval Start | Heavy Vehicle Totals |  |  |  |  | Bicycles |  |  |  |  | Pedestrians (Crossing Leg) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | East | West | North | South | Total |
| 4:00 PM | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 4:30 PM | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 5:00 PM | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:15 PM | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:30 PM | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:45 PM | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Count Total | 13 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 10 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Peak Hr | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles

| Interval Start | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | Chanticleer Ave |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 |

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

| Interval Start | Soquel Ave |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  | Chanticleer Ave |  |  | 0 |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 |
| Count Total | 0 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.

## Site Dwy \& Soquel Ave

## Peak Hour Turning Movement Count

ID: 18-08275-007
City: Santa Cruz


Cars (NOON)



Day: Thursday
Date: 05/17/2018

| $07: 0$ 04:0 | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{NO}- \\ \mathrm{NO} \\ \mathrm{NO} \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 09:00 } \\ & \text { NE } \\ & 06: 00 \end{aligned}$ |  | 0 0 $2_{1}^{2}$ -1 0 0 0 0 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PM | NOON | AM |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O } \\ & 0 \\ & \text { O} \\ & \hline \mathbf{D} \\ & \hline \mathbf{D} \\ & \text { © } \end{aligned}$ |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| 286 | 0 | 315 |  |  |
| 2 | 0 | 9 |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| 561 | 0 | 246 |  |  |
| PM | NOON | AM |  |  |



HT (PM)


## 40th Ave \& Gross Rd

## Peak Hour Turning Movement Count

ID: 18-08275-003
City: Santa Cruz

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & \stackrel{y}{3} \\ & \text { 우 } \\ & \underline{y} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\mathbf{u}} \end{aligned}$ | 07:30 AM - 08:30 AM |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | NONE |
|  | 04:00 PM - 05:00 PM |


| 40th Ave |
| :---: |
| SOUTHBOUND |

Day: Thursday
Date: 05/17/2018

| AM | 4 | 0 | 247 | 0 | 339 | AM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NOON | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NOON |
| PM | 2 | 3 | 253 | 0 | 235 | PM |

07:00 AM - 09:00 AM

NONE

04:00 PM - 06:00 PM


## 0 0 0 0 0 0

Cars (NOON)


HT (PM)
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| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Deanes Ln |  |  |  | Driveway |  |  |  |  | 40th Ave |  |  |  |  | 40th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | T | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | Deanes Ln |  |  |  | Driveway |  |  |  |  | 40th Ave |  |  |  |  | 40th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  | TH | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  |  | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 5 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 1 | 8 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| Count Total | 0 |  | 0 | 6 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 3 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 11 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 |  | 0 | 5 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 7 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.

www.idaxdata.com

| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Deanes Ln |  |  |  | Driveway |  |  |  |  | 40th Ave |  |  |  |  | 40th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | T | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | Deanes Ln |  |  |  | Driveway |  |  |  |  | 40th Ave |  |  |  |  | 40th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  | TH | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  |  | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 2 | 7 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 1 | 8 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 1 | 9 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Count Total | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 3 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 11 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 8 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.
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| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Clares St |  |  |  | Clares St |  |  |  |  | Driveway |  |  |  |  | 40th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT |  | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 5 | 11 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 3 | 13 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 6 | 18 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 4 | 18 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 14 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 13 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 25 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 |
| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | Clares St |  |  |  | Clares St |  |  |  |  | Driveway |  |  |  |  | 40th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  |  | RT | LT |  |  |  | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 2 | 6 |  | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 14 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Count Total | 0 |  | 3 | 1 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 3 |  | 3 | 7 |  | 1 | 1 | 21 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.
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| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Clares St |  |  |  | Clares St |  |  |  |  | Driveway |  |  |  |  | 40th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT |  | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 2 | 9 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 3 | 6 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Count Total | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 6 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 13 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | Clares St |  |  |  | Clares St |  |  |  |  | Driveway |  |  |  |  | 40th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  | TH | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 2 |  | 5 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 3 | 15 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 17 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 18 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 4 | 12 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Count Total | 0 |  | 3 | 0 | 1 |  | 3 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 3 |  | 0 | 4 |  | 9 | 0 | 24 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 3 |  | 0 | 2 |  | 2 | 0 | 12 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.
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| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Clares St |  |  |  |  | Clares St |  |  |  |  | 41st Ave |  |  |  |  | 41st Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 2 | 21 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 15 | 53 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 15 | 59 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 3 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 16 | 67 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 15 | 61 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 12 | 58 |
| Count Total | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 31 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 49 | 12 | 111 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 |  | 17 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 23 | 6 | 58 | 0 |
| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | Clares St |  |  |  |  | Clares St |  |  |  |  | 41st Ave |  |  |  |  | 41st Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  |  | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 1 |  | 3 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 1 | 10 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 1 | 10 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 3 | 5 |
| Count Total | 1 |  | 7 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 2 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 5 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.

www.idaxdata.com

| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Clares St |  |  |  | Clares St |  |  |  | 41st Ave |  |  |  |  | 41st Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT |  | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 7 | 24 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 6 | 26 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 20 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 4 | 18 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 3 | 14 |
| Count Total | 0 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 13 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 38 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 9 | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 2 | 26 | 0 |
| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | Clares St |  |  |  | Clares St |  |  |  | 41st Ave |  |  |  |  | 41st Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  | TH | RT | LT |  | TH | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 1 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 3 | 12 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 2 |  | 1 | 0 | 4 | 15 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 10 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 3 | 12 |
| Count Total | 0 |  | 3 | 0 | 1 |  | 5 | 1 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 2 | 4 |  | 4 | 1 | 23 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 |  | 3 | 0 | 1 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 12 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.
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Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.
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| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Capitola Rd |  |  |  |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  |  | 41st Ave |  |  |  |  | 41st Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 2 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 3 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 25 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 2 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 24 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 21 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 18 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 18 |
| Count Total | 0 | 11 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 9 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 43 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 21 | 0 |
| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | Capitola Rd |  |  |  |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  |  | 41st Ave |  |  |  |  | 41st Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  |  | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 3 | 14 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 7 | 15 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 3 | 16 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 2 | 15 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 6 | 18 |
| Count Total | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 3 |  | 6 |  | 1 | 5 |  | 8 |  | 1 | 0 |  |  | 2 | 32 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 3 |  | 6 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 16 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.
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| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Brommer St |  |  |  | Jade St |  |  |  |  | 41st Ave |  |  |  |  | 41st Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 10 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 26 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 26 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 29 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 10 | 29 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 14 | 38 |
| Count Total | 0 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 9 | 64 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 2 | 38 | 0 |
| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | Brommer St |  |  |  | Jade St |  |  |  |  | 41st Ave |  |  |  |  | 41st Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  | TH | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  |  | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 3 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 6 | 13 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 3 | 14 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 |  | 5 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 6 | 16 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 3 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 3 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 6 | 21 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 4 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 2 |  |  | 1 | 9 | 24 |
| Count Total | 0 |  | 10 | 3 | 0 |  | 11 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 4 |  | 0 | 2 |  |  | 4 | 37 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 |  | 7 | 0 | 0 |  | 9 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 4 |  | 0 | 2 |  |  | 1 | 24 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.
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| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Brommer St |  |  |  | Jade St |  |  |  |  | 41st Ave |  |  |  |  | 41st Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 14 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 15 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 11 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Count Total | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 22 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 11 | 0 |
| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | Brommer St |  |  |  | Jade St |  |  |  |  | 41st Ave |  |  |  |  | 41st Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  | TH | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  |  | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 2 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 3 |  | 1 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 9 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 3 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 5 | 27 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 7 | 28 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 |  | 2 | 1 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 5 | 17 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 3 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 6 | 18 |
| Count Total | 2 |  | 10 | 1 | 1 |  | 5 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 10 |  | 4 | 0 |  |  | 2 | 45 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 |  | 2 | 1 | 1 |  | 3 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 3 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 17 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.


Two-Hour Count Summaries

| Interval Start |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | 7th Ave |  |  |  | 7th Ave |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 15-\mathrm{min} \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 | AM | 0 | 0 | 30 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 39 | 27 | 0 | 10 | 53 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 21 | 1 | 202 | 0 |
| 7:1 | AM | 0 | 2 | 33 | 14 | 0 | 7 | 81 | 27 | 0 | 31 | 49 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 16 | 2 | 280 | 0 |
| 7:30 | AM | 0 | 0 | 52 | 18 | 0 | 9 | 110 | 30 | 0 | 30 | 62 | 9 | 0 | 11 | 24 | 4 | 359 | 0 |
| 7:4 | AM | 0 | 1 | 42 | 26 | 0 | 13 | 121 | 34 | 0 | 45 | 96 | 14 | 0 | 7 | 38 | 7 | 444 | 1,285 |
| 8:00 | AM | 0 | 2 | 59 | 26 | 0 | 9 | 155 | 22 | 0 | 48 | 80 | 15 | 0 | 16 | 44 | 16 | 492 | 1,575 |
| 8:1 | AM | 0 | 3 | 81 | 41 | 0 | 5 | 119 | 33 | 0 | 54 | 65 | 8 | 0 | 21 | 32 | 2 | 464 | 1,759 |
| 8:3 | AM | 0 | 0 | 74 | 35 | 0 | 14 | 108 | 24 | 0 | 31 | 56 | 11 | 0 | 20 | 50 | 7 | 430 | 1,830 |
| 8:4 | AM | 0 | 2 | 70 | 36 | 0 | 12 | 109 | 27 | 0 | 50 | 55 | 14 | 0 | 17 | 53 | 5 | 450 | 1,836 |
| Count | Total | 0 | 10 | 441 | 201 | 0 | 73 | 842 | 224 | 0 | 299 | 516 | 84 | 0 | 109 | 278 | 44 | 3,121 | 0 |
|  | All | 0 | 7 | 284 | 138 | 0 | 40 | 491 | 106 | 0 | 183 | 256 | 48 | 0 | 74 | 179 | 30 | 1,836 | 0 |
| Peak | HV | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 35 | 0 |
|  | HV\% | - | 0\% | 2\% | 2\% |  | 3\% | 1\% | 2\% |  | 2\% | 4\% | 0\% | - |  | 3\% | 0\% | 2\% | 0 |

Note: Two-hour count summary volumes include heavy vehicles but exclude bicycles in overall count.

| Interval Start | Heavy Vehicle Totals |  |  |  |  | Bicycles |  |  |  |  | Pedestrians (Crossing Leg) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | East | West | North | South | Total |
| 7:00 AM | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 7:15 AM | 2 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 9 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| 7:45 AM | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 21 |
| 8:00 AM | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 11 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 8:15 AM | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| 8:30 AM | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| 8:45 AM | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 |
| Count Total | 13 | 22 | 22 | 11 | 68 | 3 | 16 | 10 | 3 | 32 | 17 | 14 | 15 | 9 | 55 |
| Peak Hour | 8 | 8 | 13 | 6 | 35 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 14 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 19 |

## www.idaxdata.com

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles

| Interval Start | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | 7th Ave |  |  |  | 7th Ave |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15-min } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 33 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 11 | 38 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 36 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 36 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 35 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 7 | 0 | 8 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 68 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 35 | 0 |

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

| Interval Start | Capitola Rd |  |  | Capitola Rd |  |  | 7th Ave |  |  | 7th Ave |  |  | 15-min <br> Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 18 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 25 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 22 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 15 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 14 |
| Count Total | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 12 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 32 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.


Two-Hour Count Summaries

| Interval Start |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | 7th Ave |  |  |  | 7th Ave |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 15-\mathrm{min} \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 |  | 0 | 9 | 204 | 82 | 0 | 14 | 99 | 16 | 0 | 19 | 47 | 11 | 0 | 18 | 67 | 6 | 592 | 0 |
| 4:1 | PM | 0 | 4 | 236 | 83 | 0 | 21 | 98 | 14 | 0 | 32 | 37 | 16 | 0 | 32 | 59 | 7 | 639 | 0 |
| 4:30 | PM | 0 | 3 | 200 | 62 | 1 | 22 | 95 | 9 | 0 | 33 | 44 | 18 | 0 | 24 | 45 | 9 | 565 | 0 |
| 4:4 | PM | 0 | 5 | 205 | 64 | 0 | 8 | 91 | 19 | 0 | 29 | 41 | 23 | 0 | 25 | 47 | 3 | 560 | 2,356 |
| 5:00 | PM | 0 | 1 | 221 | 79 | 0 | 10 | 93 | 14 | 0 | 34 | 43 | 6 | 0 | 23 | 64 | 5 | 593 | 2,357 |
| 5:1 | PM | 0 | 5 | 244 | 76 | 0 | 7 | 116 | 9 | 0 | 40 | 43 | 10 | 0 | 31 | 62 | 6 | 649 | 2,367 |
| 5:3 | PM | 0 | 8 | 214 | 91 | 0 | 11 | 90 | 12 | 0 | 39 | 29 | 15 | 0 | 27 | 70 | 3 | 609 | 2,411 |
| 5:4 | PM | 0 | 3 | 200 | 63 | 0 | 14 | 80 | 9 | 0 | 27 | 45 | 8 | 0 | 11 | 53 | 4 | 517 | 2,368 |
| Count | otal | 0 | 38 | 1,724 | 600 | 1 | 107 | 762 | 102 | 0 | 253 | 329 | 107 | 0 | 191 | 467 | 43 | 4,724 | 0 |
|  | All | 0 | 19 | 884 | 310 | 0 | 36 | 390 | 54 | 0 | 142 | 156 | 54 | 0 | 106 | 243 | 17 | 2,411 | 0 |
| Peak | HV | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 18 | 0 |
|  | HV\% | - | 0\% | 1\% | 1\% | - | 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 1\% | 1\% | 0\% | - | 3\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1\% | 0 |

Note: Two-hour count summary volumes include heavy vehicles but exclude bicycles in overall count.

| Interval Start | Heavy Vehicle Totals |  |  |  |  | Bicycles |  |  |  |  | Pedestrians (Crossing Leg) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | East | West | North | South | Total |
| 4:00 PM | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 4:15 PM | 2 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| 4:30 PM | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 10 |
| 4:45 PM | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 5:00 PM | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| 5:15 PM | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| 5:30 PM | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 12 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 |
| 5:45 PM | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 10 |
| Count Total | 17 | 11 | 10 | 6 | 44 | 15 | 7 | 19 | 10 | 51 | 10 | 9 | 13 | 10 | 42 |
| Peak Hour | 7 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 18 | 10 | 1 | 13 | 7 | 31 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 17 |

## www.idaxdata.com

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles

| Interval Start | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | 7th Ave |  |  |  | 7th Ave |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15-min } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 28 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 25 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 20 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 18 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 16 |
| Count Total | 0 | 1 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 44 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 18 | 0 |

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

| Interval Start | Capitola Rd |  |  | Capitola Rd |  |  | 7th Ave |  |  | 7th Ave |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 23 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 24 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 26 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 31 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 28 |
| Count Total | 0 | 13 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 51 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 31 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.
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| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Capitola Rd |  |  |  |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 29 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 6 | 28 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 10 | 33 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 36 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 33 |
| Count Total | 0 | 3 | 9 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 2 |  | 11 | 1 | 0 | 7 |  | 10 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 2 | 62 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 1 |  | 6 | 1 | 0 | 3 |  | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 33 | 0 |
| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | Capitola Rd |  |  |  |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  |  | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 5 |  | 0 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 16 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 |  | 4 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 3 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 6 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 16 | 40 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 3 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 7 | 43 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 7 | 46 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 31 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 1 | 16 |
| Count Total | 0 |  | 8 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 11 |  | 2 | 2 |  | 15 |  | 0 | 2 |  |  | 2 | 56 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 |  | 2 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 3 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 3 |  | 0 | 1 |  |  | 0 | 16 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.
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| Four-Hour Count Summaries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 2:00 | PM | 0 | 5 | 106 | 20 | 0 | 12 | 99 | 16 | 0 | 24 | 68 | 16 | 0 | 20 | 79 | 12 | 477 | 0 |
| 2:15 | PM | 0 | 12 | 102 | 22 | 1 | 17 | 106 | 12 | 0 | 16 | 76 | 16 | 0 | 21 | 80 | 16 | 497 | 0 |
|  | PM | 0 | 11 | 126 | 19 | 0 | 26 | 136 | 18 | 0 | 32 | 58 | 18 | 0 | 32 | 71 | 15 | 562 | 0 |
| 2:45 | PM | 0 | 7 | 140 | 15 | 1 | 20 | 107 | 11 | 0 | 23 | 78 | 23 | 0 | 44 | 74 | 9 | 552 | 2,088 |
| 3:00 | PM | 0 | 10 | 176 | 35 | 0 | 22 | 112 | 11 | 0 | 23 | 63 | 22 | 0 | 27 | 66 | 9 | 576 | 2,187 |
|  | PM | 0 | 12 | 170 | 35 | 1 | 21 | 90 | 15 | 0 | 25 | 61 | 14 | 0 | 31 | 74 | 16 | 565 | 2,255 |
|  | PM | 0 | 7 | 194 | 19 | 0 | 26 | 106 | 14 | 0 | 21 | 52 | 12 | 0 | 49 | 77 | 7 | 584 | 2,277 |
| 3:4 | PM | 0 | 6 | 194 | 27 | 1 | 18 | 73 | 12 | 0 | 26 | 60 | 21 | 0 | 34 | 93 | 10 | 575 | 2,300 |
| 4:00 | PM | 0 | 13 | 212 | 30 | 1 | 19 | 119 | 19 | 0 | 24 | 36 | 14 | 0 | 43 | 69 | 9 | 608 | 2,332 |
| 4:15 | PM | 0 | 7 | 198 | 28 | 0 | 11 | 91 | 10 | 0 | 32 | 55 | 19 | 0 | 49 | 86 | 11 | 597 | 2,364 |
| 4:30 | PM | 0 | 6 | 210 | 22 | 0 | 29 | 79 | 9 | 0 | 13 | 48 | 14 | 0 | 43 | 59 | 11 | 543 | 2,323 |
| 4:45 | PM | 0 | 8 | 171 | 31 | 2 | 24 | 82 | 13 | 0 | 23 | 51 | 18 | 0 | 41 | 84 | 4 | 552 | 2,300 |
| 5:00 | PM | 0 | 9 | 213 | 26 | 1 | 23 | 106 | 11 | 0 | 23 | 53 | 23 | 0 | 48 | 89 | 5 | 630 | 2,322 |
|  | PM | 0 | 6 | 213 | 26 | 2 | 14 | 78 | 15 | 0 | 33 | 48 | 21 | 0 | 49 | 102 | 6 | 613 | 2,338 |
|  | PM | 0 | 12 | 210 | 29 | 3 | 16 | 91 | 10 | 0 | 15 | 34 | 18 | 0 | 55 | 87 | 8 | 588 | 2,383 |
| 5:4 | PM | 0 | 6 | 185 | 2 | 1 | 28 | 97 | 13 | 0 | 27 | 55 | 16 | 0 | 50 | 81 | 14 | 575 | 2,406 |
| Count | Total | 0 | 137 | 2,820 | 386 | 14 | 326 | 1,572 | 209 | 0 | 380 | 896 | 285 | 0 | 636 | 1,271 | 162 | 9,094 | 0 |
|  | All | 0 | 33 | 821 | 83 | 7 | 81 | 372 | 49 | 0 | 98 | 190 | 78 | 0 | 202 | 359 | 33 | 2,406 | 0 |
| Hour | HV | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
|  | HV\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0 |

Note: Four-hour count summary volumes include heavy vehicles but exclude bicycles in overall count.

| Interval Start | Heavy Vehicle Totals |  |  |  |  | Bicycles |  |  |  |  | Pedestrians (Crossing Leg) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | East | West | North | South | Total |
| 2:00 PM | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 9 | 19 |
| 2:15 PM | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 8 |
| 2:30 PM | 2 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 12 |
| 2:45 PM | 3 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 12 | 7 | 19 | 4 | 5 | 35 |
| 3:00 PM | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 13 | 5 | 16 | 7 | 41 |
| 3:15 PM | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 0 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 12 |
| 3:30 PM | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 7 |
| 3:45 PM | 3 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 13 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 6 |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 7 |
| 4:15 PM | 2 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 13 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 11 |
| 4:45 PM | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 8 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 8 |
| 5:15 PM | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 17 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 5:45 PM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 9 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 10 |
| Count Total | 26 | 25 | 21 | 32 | 104 | 28 | 16 | 19 | 22 | 85 | 59 | 56 | 48 | 53 | 216 |
| Peak Hour | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 23 | 11 | 7 | 4 | 15 | 37 |


| Four-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 2:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| 2:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 0 |
| 2:30 PM | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| 2:45 PM | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 11 | 37 |
| 3:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 37 |
| 3:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 37 |
| 3:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 37 |
| 3:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 13 | 39 |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 36 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 35 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 31 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 23 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 18 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| Count Total | 0 | 3 | 22 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 15 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 27 | 2 | 104 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Four-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15-min } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  |  | RT | LT | TH |  | RT | LT | TH |  | RT | LT | TH |  | RT |  |  |
| 2:00 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| 2:15 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 2:30 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 2:45 PM | 0 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 6 |  | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 12 | 23 |
| 3:00 PM | 0 |  |  | 2 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 9 | 26 |
| 3:15 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 0 | 8 | 31 |
| 3:30 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 5 |  | 0 | 9 | 38 |
| 3:45 PM | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 3 | 29 |
| 4:00 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 3 | 23 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 16 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 2 | 9 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 4 | 10 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 8 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 0 | 2 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 7 | 14 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 4 |  | 0 | 6 | 18 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 4 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 9 | 23 |
| Count Total | 0 | 2 |  | 4 | 2 | 13 |  | 1 | 4 | 15 |  | 0 | 0 | 20 |  | 2 | 85 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 3 |  | 1 | 0 | 6 |  | 0 | 2 | 4 |  | 0 | 0 | 5 |  | 2 | 23 | 0 |
| Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


www.idaxdata.com

| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | Chanticleer Ave |  |  |  |  | Chanticleer Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | T | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 13 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 11 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 14 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 19 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 18 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 31 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 19 | 0 |
| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | Chanticleer Ave |  |  |  |  | Chanticleer Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  | TH | RT | LT |  | TH | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  |  | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 5 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 3 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 6 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 1 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 9 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 |  | 2 | 1 | 0 |  | 1 | 3 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  |  | 0 | 9 | 29 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 5 | 29 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 3 | 0 |  | 4 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 8 | 31 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 2 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 7 | 29 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  |  | 2 | 8 | 28 |
| Count Total | 0 |  | 8 | 1 | 2 |  | 10 | 8 | 0 |  | 10 |  | 3 | 2 |  |  | 7 | 57 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 |  | 3 | 1 | 1 |  | 4 | 6 | 0 |  | 7 |  | 2 | 1 |  |  | 2 | 29 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.
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| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  |  | Chanticleer Ave |  |  |  | Chanticleer Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT |  | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 14 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 21 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  |  | Chanticleer Ave |  |  |  | Chanticleer Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  | TH | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH | RT | LT |  | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 2 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 5 | 21 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 17 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 3 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 4 | 16 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 2 | 2 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 11 | 22 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 |  | 3 | 1 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 1 | 9 | 26 |
| Count Total | 0 |  | 15 | 1 | 0 |  | 6 |  | 2 | 0 |  | 8 | 4 | 2 |  | 8 | 1 | 47 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 |  | 7 | 1 | 0 |  | 5 |  | 2 | 0 |  | 4 | 2 | 0 |  | 4 | 1 | 26 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.
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| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  |  | 30th Ave |  |  |  |  | 30th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT |  | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 6 | 14 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 4 | 13 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 7 | 17 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 5 | 16 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 30 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 |
| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  |  | 30th Ave |  |  |  |  | 30th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  |  | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 |  | 3 | 1 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 5 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 |  | 3 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 5 | 24 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 5 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 8 | 27 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 3 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 4 | 26 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 |  | 2 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 4 | 21 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 19 |
| Count Total | 0 |  | 15 | 4 | 1 |  | 13 |  | 1 | 7 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 43 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 |  | 5 | 2 | 0 |  | 5 |  | 0 | 7 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.
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| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  |  | 30th Ave |  |  |  |  | 30th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 4 | 17 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 11 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 9 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 6 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 23 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  |  | 30th Ave |  |  |  |  | 30th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  | TH | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 |  | 3 | 1 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 |  | 5 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 1 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 4 | 20 |
| 5:00 PM | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 6 | 21 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 |  | 1 | 2 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 6 | 23 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 4 | 20 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 6 | 22 |
| Count Total | 2 |  | 20 | 3 | 1 |  | 7 |  | 0 | 2 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 4 | 42 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 2 |  | 6 | 2 | 1 |  | 3 |  | 0 | 2 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 3 | 20 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.
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| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Brommer St |  |  |  |  | Brommer St |  |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 26 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 25 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 28 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 31 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 22 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 1 |  | 5 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 2 | 48 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 |  | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 4 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 31 | 0 |
| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | Brommer St |  |  |  |  | Brommer St |  |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH | RT | LT |  |  | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 |  | 3 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 6 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 |  | 2 |  | 4 | 0 |  | 6 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 18 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 |  | 0 |  | 4 | 0 |  | 4 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 5 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 18 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 |  | 3 |  | 6 | 0 |  | 4 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 7 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 26 | 68 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 |  | 2 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 3 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 7 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 24 | 86 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 |  | 3 |  | 2 | 0 |  | 5 |  | 0 | 2 |  | 4 | 1 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 20 | 88 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 0 | 5 | 75 |
| 8:45 AM | 1 |  | 1 |  | 4 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 12 | 61 |
| Count Total | 1 |  | 15 |  | 21 | 1 |  | 24 |  | 0 | 8 |  | 27 | 2 | 1 |  |  | 2 | 129 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 |  | 9 |  | 9 | 1 |  | 12 |  | 0 | 5 |  | 18 | 2 | 1 |  |  | 0 | 75 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.
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| Four-Hour Count Summaries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start |  | Brommer St |  |  |  | Brommer St |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 2:00 | PM | 0 | 12 | 33 | 20 | 0 | 18 | 47 | 5 | 0 | 13 | 90 | 19 | 0 | 17 | 88 | 12 | 374 | 0 |
| 2:15 | PM | 0 | 10 | 44 | 25 | 0 | 20 | 35 | 11 | 0 | 20 | 81 | 26 | 0 | 8 | 93 | 7 | 380 | 0 |
|  | PM | 0 | 12 | 36 | 21 | 0 | 22 | 40 | 5 | 0 | 19 | 87 | 17 | 0 | 12 | 88 | 11 | 370 | 0 |
| 2:45 | PM | 0 | 15 | 63 | 22 | 0 | 31 | 45 | 6 | 0 | 23 | 94 | 27 | 0 | 15 | 79 | 4 | 424 | 1,548 |
| 3:00 | PM | 0 | 8 | 75 | 31 | 0 | 26 | 52 | 7 | 0 | 22 | 87 | 22 | 0 | 14 | 67 | 9 | 420 | 1,594 |
|  | PM | 0 | 14 | 78 | 30 | 0 | 26 | 59 | 4 | 0 | 15 | 80 | 23 | 0 | 17 | 113 | 11 | 470 | 1,684 |
| 3:30 | PM | 0 | 11 | 81 | 28 | 0 | 28 | 46 | 5 | 0 | 12 | 76 | 25 | 0 | 11 | 82 | 15 | 420 | 1,734 |
| 3:4 | PM | 0 | 1 | 69 | 21 | 0 | 29 | 41 | 7 | 0 | 17 | 90 | 9 | 0 | 12 | 93 | 8 | 397 | 1,707 |
| 4:00 | PM | 0 | 6 | 72 | 31 | 0 | 25 | 44 | 7 | 0 | 23 | 65 | 32 | 0 | 20 | 84 | 8 | 417 | 1,704 |
|  | PM | 0 | 16 | 87 | 27 | 0 | 24 | 56 | 5 | 0 | 19 | 85 | 25 | 0 | 16 | 92 | 5 | 457 | 1,691 |
|  | PM | 0 | 9 | 76 | 39 | 0 | 23 | 46 | 9 | 0 | 21 | 67 | 29 | 0 | 16 | 82 | 8 | 425 | 1,696 |
| 4:45 | PM | 0 | 7 | 71 | 30 | 0 | 38 | 42 | 8 | 0 | 13 | 76 | 24 | 0 | 16 | 90 | 9 | 424 | 1,723 |
|  | PM | 0 | 14 | 73 | 30 | 0 | 27 | 55 | 6 | 0 | 18 | 77 | 33 | 0 | 18 | 85 | 10 | 446 | 1,752 |
| 5:15 | PM | 0 | 11 | 81 | 22 | 0 | 30 | 45 | 13 | 0 | 18 | 80 | 21 | 0 | 16 | 117 | 5 | 459 | 1,754 |
| 5:30 | PM | 0 | 11 | 84 | 26 | 0 | 34 | 54 | 4 | 0 | 13 | 59 | 22 | 0 | 11 | 106 | 4 | 428 | 1,757 |
| 5:4 | PM | 0 | 13 | 49 | 34 | 0 | 30 | 49 | 8 | 0 | 10 | 89 | 24 | 0 | 11 | 99 | 7 | 423 | 1,756 |
| Count | Total | 0 | 170 | 1,072 | 437 | 0 | 431 | 756 | 110 | 0 | 276 | 1,283 | 378 | 0 | 230 | 1,458 | 133 | 6,734 | 0 |
|  | All | 0 | 43 | 309 | 108 | 0 | 129 | 196 | 31 | 0 |  | 292 | 100 | 0 | 61 | 398 | 28 | 1,757 | 0 |
| Hour | HV | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 0 |
|  | HV\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 2\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 2\% | 1\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0 |

Note: Four-hour count summary volumes include heavy vehicles but exclude bicycles in overall count.

| Interval Start | Heavy Vehicle Totals |  |  |  |  | Bicycles |  |  |  |  | Pedestrians (Crossing Leg) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | East | West | North | South | Total |
| 2:00 PM | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 8 |
| 2:15 PM | 2 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 2:30 PM | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 6 |
| 2:45 PM | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 18 | 2 | 22 | 29 | 34 | 28 | 8 | 99 |
| 3:00 PM | 3 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 11 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 9 | 33 | 30 | 4 | 76 |
| 3:15 PM | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 9 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 19 |
| 3:30 PM | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 14 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 13 |
| 3:45 PM | 2 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 13 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 15 |
| 4:00 PM | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 13 | 6 | 1 | 13 | 3 | 23 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 15 |
| 4:30 PM | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 13 |
| 4:45 PM | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 1 | 13 |
| 5:00 PM | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 11 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 10 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 13 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 11 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 16 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Count Total | 23 | 10 | 34 | 30 | 97 | 54 | 23 | 51 | 29 | 157 | 96 | 96 | 119 | 32 | 343 |
| Peak Hour | 3 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 8 | 16 | 4 | 11 | 3 | 34 | 15 | 5 | 20 | 8 | 48 |


| Four-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Brommer St |  |  |  | Brommer St |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 2:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| 2:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| 2:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| 2:45 PM | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 11 | 34 |
| 3:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 11 | 38 |
| 3:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 36 |
| 3:30 PM | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 38 |
| 3:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 13 | 40 |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 34 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 32 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 28 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 18 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 17 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Count Total | 0 | 3 | 8 | 12 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 22 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 24 | 4 | 97 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| Four-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | Brommer St |  |  |  | Brommer St |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  |  | RT | LT | T |  | RT | LT | TH |  | RT | LT | TH |  | RT |  |  |
| 2:00 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 2 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| 2:15 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 2:30 PM | 0 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 6 | 0 |
| 2:45 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 4 | 12 |  | 2 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 22 | 40 |
| 3:00 PM | 0 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 8 | 40 |
| 3:15 PM | 0 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 7 | 43 |
| 3:30 PM | 0 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 0 | 6 |  | 0 | 14 | 51 |
| 3:45 PM | 0 | 0 |  | 3 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 4 |  | 0 | 10 | 39 |
| 4:00 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 0 | 13 | 44 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 9 | 46 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 | 38 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 |  |  | 3 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 7 | 35 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 5 | 27 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 4 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 10 | 28 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 2 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 12 | 34 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 16 | 43 |
| Count Total | 0 |  |  | 14 | 3 | 1 |  | 1 | 11 | 34 |  | 6 | 0 | 25 |  | 4 | 157 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 1 |  | 5 | 0 | 4 |  | 0 | 3 | 7 |  | 1 | 0 | 3 |  | 0 | 34 | 0 |
| Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Brommer St |  |  |  | Brommer St |  |  |  | 30th Ave |  |  |  |  | 30th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 5 | 9 |
| 8:00 AM |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 11 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 5 | 12 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 8 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 17 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 |
| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | Brommer St |  |  |  | Brommer St |  |  |  | 30th Ave |  |  |  |  | 30th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  | TH | RT | LT |  | TH | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 1 |  | 2 | 1 | 3 |  | 4 | 0 | 5 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 18 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 3 | 2 |  | 5 | 0 | 3 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 15 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 6 | 0 | 6 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 15 | 54 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 |  | 2 | 1 | 1 |  | 2 | 0 | 9 |  | 4 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 19 | 67 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 |  | 2 | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 8 | 57 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 5 | 47 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 |  | 1 | 2 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 5 | 37 |
| Count Total | 1 |  | 9 | 10 | 8 |  | 21 | 0 | 26 |  | 8 |  | 2 | 0 |  | 4 | 2 | 91 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 |  | 4 | 6 | 5 |  | 14 | 0 | 20 |  | 5 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 57 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.
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Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.
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| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | E Cliff Dr (W) |  |  |  | Portola Dr |  |  |  | E Cliff Dr (S) |  |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 14 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 2 | 7 | 18 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 2 | 6 | 22 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 6 | 21 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 6 | 25 |
| Count Total | 0 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 2 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 |  | 5 | 39 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |  | 4 | 25 | 0 |
| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | E Cliff Dr (W) |  |  |  | Portola Dr |  |  |  | E Cliff Dr (S) |  |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  | TH | RT | LT |  | TH | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 4 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 1 | 2 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 1 | 10 | 25 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 6 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 9 | 32 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 |  | 3 | 3 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 8 | 37 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 4 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 10 | 37 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 4 | 2 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 1 | 11 | 38 |
| Count Total | 0 |  | 8 | 4 | 0 |  | 22 | 4 | 7 |  | 5 |  | 0 | 5 |  | 5 | 3 | 63 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 |  | 4 | 4 | 0 |  | 15 | 3 | 2 |  | 3 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 5 | 1 | 38 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.
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| Four-Hour Count Summaries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start |  | E Cliff Dr (W) |  |  |  | Portola Dr |  |  |  | E Cliff Dr (S) |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 2:00 | PM | 0 | 28 | 62 | 44 | 0 | 3 | 73 | 28 | 0 | 17 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 31 | 27 | 13 | 341 | 0 |
| 2:15 | PM | 0 | 26 | 70 | 54 | 0 | 3 | 72 | 20 | 0 | 17 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 26 | 19 | 26 | 346 | 0 |
| 2:30 | PM | 0 | 23 | 74 | 34 | 0 | 2 | 67 | 23 | 0 | 21 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 21 | 9 | 25 | 314 | 0 |
| 2:45 | PM | 0 | 9 | 81 | 52 | 0 | 3 | 60 | 24 | 0 | 25 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 44 | 12 | 27 | 344 | 1,345 |
| 3:00 | PM | 0 | 15 | 100 | 38 | 0 | 6 | 69 | 23 | 0 | 21 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 23 | 19 | 21 | 349 | 1,353 |
|  | PM | 0 | 22 | 104 | 58 | 0 | 4 | 57 | 22 | 0 | 18 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 31 | 23 | 18 | 368 | 1,375 |
| 3:30 | PM | 0 | 15 | 103 | 69 | 0 | 1 | 79 | 19 | 0 | 21 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 27 | 20 | 23 | 391 | 1,452 |
| 3:4 | PM | 0 | 18 | 119 | 49 | 0 | 1 | 54 | 26 | 0 | 16 | 18 | 4 | 0 | 35 | 21 | 18 | 379 | 1,487 |
| 4:00 | PM | 0 | 12 | 119 | 49 | 0 | 5 | 62 | 19 | 0 | 20 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 32 | 23 | 11 | 365 | 1,503 |
|  | PM | 0 | 20 | 134 | 54 | 0 | 6 | 51 | 24 | 0 | 18 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 39 | 20 | 21 | 396 | 1,531 |
|  | PM | 0 | 12 | 111 | 61 | 0 | 3 | 63 | 24 | 0 | 17 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 21 | 22 | 30 | 374 | 1,514 |
| 4:45 | PM | 0 | 9 | 112 | 61 | 0 | 3 | 68 | 29 | 0 | 23 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 36 | 19 | 16 | 388 | 1,523 |
|  | PM | 0 | 11 | 136 | 56 | 0 | 6 | 70 | 21 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 1 | 0 | 36 | 27 | 25 | 429 | 1,587 |
| 5:15 | PM | 0 | 18 | 147 | 59 | 0 | 4 | 72 | 28 | 1 | 27 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 46 | 27 | 26 | 465 | 1,656 |
| 5:30 | PM | 0 | 18 | 113 | 66 | 0 | 2 | 63 | 23 | 1 | 15 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 39 | 24 | 24 | 396 | 1,678 |
| 5:4 | PM | 0 | 22 | 87 | 52 | 0 | 3 | 57 | 27 | 0 | 20 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 45 | 21 | 16 | 361 | 1,651 |
| Count | Total | 0 | 278 | 1,672 | 856 | 0 | 55 | 1,037 | 380 | 2 | 316 | 167 | 38 | 0 | 532 | 333 | 340 | 6,006 | 0 |
|  | All | 0 | 56 | 508 | 242 | 0 | 15 | 273 | 101 | 2 | 85 | 44 | 7 | 0 | 157 | 97 | 91 | 1,678 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | HV | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 1\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% |  | 0 |

Note: Four-hour count summary volumes include heavy vehicles but exclude bicycles in overall count.

| Interval Start | Heavy Vehicle Totals |  |  |  |  | Bicycles |  |  |  |  | Pedestrians (Crossing Leg) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | East | West | North | South | Total |
| 2:00 PM | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 2:15 PM | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 2:30 PM | 4 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 2:45 PM | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 8 |
| 3:00 PM | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 10 |
| 3:15 PM | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 10 |
| 3:30 PM | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 3:45 PM | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 4:00 PM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 13 |
| 4:15 PM | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 8 |
| 4:30 PM | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 6 |
| 4:45 PM | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| 5:00 PM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 9 | 1 | 17 | 1 | 1 | 20 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 12 |
| 5:30 PM | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 10 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 8 |
| Count Total | 26 | 16 | 2 | 11 | 55 | 38 | 25 | 32 | 21 | 116 | 31 | 60 | 12 | 23 | 126 |
| Peak Hour | 6 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 7 | 5 | 11 | 3 | 26 | 7 | 30 | 3 | 7 | 47 |


| Four-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | E Cliff Dr (W) |  |  |  | Portola Dr |  |  |  | E Cliff Dr (S) |  |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min <br> Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 2:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 2:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 2:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0 |
| 2:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 16 |
| 3:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 20 |
| 3:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 22 |
| 3:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 18 |
| 3:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 17 |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 11 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 13 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 15 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 16 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 14 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Count Total | 0 | 2 | 16 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 55 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 0 |
| Four-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | E Cliff Dr (W) |  |  |  | Portola Dr |  |  |  | E Cliff Dr (S) |  |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 15-min } \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  |  | RT | LT | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT | TH |  | RT |  |  |
| 2:00 PM | 0 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 2 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| 2:15 PM | 0 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 3 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| 2:30 PM | 0 |  |  | 5 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 1 | 11 | 0 |
| 2:45 PM | 0 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 4 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 7 | 35 |
| 3:00 PM | 0 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 3 | 5 | 33 |
| 3:15 PM | 0 |  |  | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 3 | 26 |
| 3:30 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 2 | 7 | 22 |
| 3:45 PM | 0 |  |  | 2 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 3 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 8 | 23 |
| 4:00 PM | 0 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 3 |  | 0 | 3 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 9 | 27 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 |  |  | 2 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 1 | 9 | 33 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 |  |  | 4 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 8 | 34 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 |  |  | 2 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 3 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 9 | 35 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 4 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 9 | 35 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 4 | 30 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 4 | 26 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 3 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 6 | 23 |
| Count Total | 0 |  | - | 23 | 0 | 21 |  | 4 | 22 |  | 8 |  | 2 | 1 | 13 |  | 7 | 116 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 4 |  | 3 | 0 | 4 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 4 |  | 1 | 0 | 3 |  | 0 | 26 | 0 |
| Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

7th Ave
Soquel Ave


Date: 10-04-2018
Count Period: 7:00 AM to 9:00 AM Peak Hour: 7:45 AM to 8:45 AM


Two-Hour Count Summaries

| Interval Start |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | 7th Ave |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 | AM | 0 | 0 | 40 | 4 | 0 | 40 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 244 | 0 |
| 7:15 | AM | 0 | 0 | 68 | 8 | 0 | 48 | 104 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 316 | 0 |
| 7:30 | AM | 0 | 0 | 99 | 8 | 0 | 33 | 112 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 115 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 378 | 0 |
| 7:45 | AM | 0 | 0 | 139 | 18 | 0 | 51 | 126 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 128 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 491 | 1,429 |
| 8:00 | AM | 0 | 0 | 110 | 16 | 0 | 55 | 147 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 0 | 117 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 496 | 1,681 |
| 8:15 | AM | 0 | 0 | 137 | 24 | 0 | 59 | 163 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 91 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 504 | 1,869 |
| 8:30 | AM | 0 | 0 | 106 | 13 | 0 | 64 | 132 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 431 | 1,922 |
| 8:45 | AM | 0 | 0 | 117 | 5 | 1 | 54 | 124 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 103 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 425 | 1,856 |
| Count | Total | 0 | 0 | 816 | 96 | 1 | 404 | 984 | 0 | 0 | 181 | 0 | 803 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,285 | 0 |
|  | AII | 0 | 0 | 492 | 71 | 0 | 229 | 568 | 0 | 0 | 131 | 0 | 431 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,922 | 0 |
| Peak | HV | 0 | 0 | 21 | 2 | 0 | 11 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 0 |
|  | HV\% | - | - | 4\% | 3\% | - | 5\% | 4\% | - | - | 2\% | - | 2\% | - | - | - | - | 3\% | 0 |

Note: Two-hour count summary volumes include heavy vehicles but exclude bicycles in overall count.

| Interval Start | Heavy Vehicle Totals |  |  |  |  | Bicycles |  |  |  |  | Pedestrians (Crossing Leg) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | East | West | North | South | Total |
| 7:00 AM | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 8 |
| 7:15 AM | 4 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 8 | 10 | 0 | 18 |
| 7:30 AM | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 15 |
| 7:45 AM | 8 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 10 |
| 8:00 AM | 4 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 21 | 4 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 20 | 19 | 5 | 44 |
| 8:15 AM | 7 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 13 | 15 | 2 | 30 |
| 8:30 AM | 4 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 20 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 |
| 8:45 AM | 6 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Count Total | 36 | 43 | 19 | 0 | 98 | 19 | 38 | 15 | 0 | 72 | 0 | 54 | 61 | 17 | 132 |
| Peak Hr | 23 | 33 | 10 | 0 | 66 | 13 | 22 | 9 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 38 | 39 | 12 | 89 |

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles

| Interval <br> Start | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | 7th Ave |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 32 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 48 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 51 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 66 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 66 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 34 | 2 | 0 | 16 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 21 | 2 | 0 | 11 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 0 |

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

| Interval Start | Soquel Ave |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  | 7th Ave |  |  | 0 |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 33 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 49 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 43 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 44 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 39 |
| Count Total | 0 | 18 | 1 | 1 | 37 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.

7th Ave
Soquel Ave іみx

Date: 10-04-2018
Count Period: 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM Peak Hour: 4:30 PM to 5:30 PM


Two-Hour Count Summaries

| Interval Start |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | 7th Ave |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 15-min <br> Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 | PM | 0 | 0 | 203 | 26 | 0 | 63 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 484 | 0 |
| 4:15 | PM | 0 | 0 | 196 | 22 | 0 | 69 | 113 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 467 | 0 |
| 4:30 | PM | 0 | 0 | 241 | 13 | 0 | 72 | 122 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 524 | 0 |
| 4:45 | PM | 0 | 0 | 211 | 17 | 0 | 69 | 138 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 517 | 1,992 |
| 5:00 | PM | 0 | 0 | 231 | 24 | 1 | 72 | 127 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 538 | 2,046 |
| 5:15 | PM | 0 | 0 | 201 | 17 | 0 | 83 | 138 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 535 | 2,114 |
| 5:30 | PM | 0 | 0 | 232 | 22 | 0 | 78 | 91 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 503 | 2,093 |
| 5:45 | PM | 0 | 0 | 196 | 13 | 0 | 72 | 96 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 455 | 2,031 |
| Count | Total | 0 | 0 | 1,711 | 154 | 1 | 578 | 935 | 0 | 0 | 167 | 0 | 477 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4,023 | 0 |
|  | AII | 0 | 0 | 884 | 71 | 1 | 296 | 525 | 0 | 0 | 94 | 0 | 243 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,114 | 0 |
| Peak | HV | 0 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 0 |
|  | HV\% | - | - | 1\% | 1\% | 0\% | 2\% | 1\% | - | - | 1\% | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | 1\% | 0 |

Note: Two-hour count summary volumes include heavy vehicles but exclude bicycles in overall count.

| Interval Start | Heavy Vehicle Totals |  |  |  |  | Bicycles |  |  |  |  | Pedestrians (Crossing Leg) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | East | West | North | South | Total |
| 4:00 PM | 7 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 12 |
| 4:15 PM | 4 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 10 | 8 | 2 | 20 |
| 4:30 PM | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 10 |
| 4:45 PM | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 9 | 7 | 1 | 17 |
| 5:00 PM | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| 5:15 PM | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 8 | 7 | 1 | 16 |
| 5:30 PM | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 7 | 10 | 2 | 19 |
| 5:45 PM | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 9 |
| Count Total | 24 | 22 | 8 | 0 | 54 | 29 | 26 | 8 | 0 | 63 | 0 | 54 | 46 | 9 | 109 |
| Peak Hr | 11 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 23 | 21 | 14 | 4 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 25 | 20 | 4 | 49 |

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles

| Interval Start | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | 7th Ave |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 35 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 28 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 23 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 19 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 19 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 23 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 0 |

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

| Interval Start | Soquel Ave |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  | 7th Ave |  |  | 0 |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 26 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 32 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 39 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 40 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 37 |
| Count Total | 0 | 27 | 2 | 5 | 21 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 20 | 1 | 1 | 13 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.




## 

## Quality Counts

 QLocation: 2. Soquel Dr \& Paul Sweet Rd/Commercial Way


[^35]
## Hwy 1 SB Ramps <br> Soquel Ave

Date: 10-04-2018
Count Period: 7:00 AM to 9:00 AM Peak Hour: 8:00 AM to 9:00 AM


Soquel Ave

|  | HV \%: | PHF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EB | $2.7 \%$ | 0.82 |
| WB | $1.6 \%$ | 0.99 |
| NB | - | - |
| SB | $3.0 \%$ | 0.97 |
| TOTAL | $2.5 \%$ | 0.94 |

Two-Hour Count Summaries

| Interval Start |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | Hwy 1 SB Ramps |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 | AM | 0 | 64 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 87 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 86 | 341 | 0 |
| 7:15 | AM | 0 | 63 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 145 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 108 | 424 | 0 |
| 7:30 | AM | 0 | 86 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 125 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 0 | 144 | 520 | 0 |
| 7:45 | AM | 0 | 114 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 138 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 0 | 133 | 546 | 1,831 |
| 8:00 | AM | 0 | 96 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 136 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 0 | 140 | 551 | 2,041 |
| 8:15 | AM | 0 | 99 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 0 | 155 | 589 | 2,206 |
| 8:30 | AM | 0 | 81 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 148 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 0 | 149 | 534 | 2,220 |
| 8:45 | AM | 0 | 88 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 137 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86 | 0 | 144 | 547 | 2,221 |
| Count | Total | 0 | 691 | 408 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,060 | 323 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 511 | 0 | 1,059 | 4,052 | 0 |
|  | All | 0 | 364 | 229 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 565 | 167 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 308 | 0 | 588 | 2,221 | 0 |
| Peak | HV | 0 | 10 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 21 | 55 | 0 |
|  | HV\% | - | 3\% | 3\% | - | - | - | 2\% | 2\% | - | - | - | - | - | 2\% | - | 4\% | 2\% | 0 |

Note: Two-hour count summary volumes include heavy vehicles but exclude bicycles in overall count.

| Interval Start | Heavy Vehicle Totals |  |  |  |  | Bicycles |  |  |  |  | Pedestrians (Crossing Leg) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | East | West | North | South | Total |
| 7:00 AM | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| 7:15 AM | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| 7:30 AM | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| 7:45 AM | 1 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 8:00 AM | 4 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 15 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 8:15 AM | 9 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 16 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 8:30 AM | 2 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 8:45 AM | 1 | 6 | 0 | 5 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Count Total | 23 | 18 | 0 | 41 | 82 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 18 |
| Peak Hr | 16 | 12 | 0 | 27 | 55 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 |


| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | Hwy 1 SB Ramps |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15-min } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 27 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 15 | 39 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 16 | 48 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 12 | 53 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 55 |
| Count Total | 0 | 14 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 31 | 82 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 10 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 21 | 55 | 0 |

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

| Interval Start | Soquel Ave |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  | 0 |  |  | Hwy 1 SB Ramps |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15-min } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Count Total | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.


Two-Hour Count Summaries

| Interval Start |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | Hwy 1 SB Ramps |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15-min } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 | PM | 0 | 88 | 114 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 122 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 143 | 0 | 102 | 581 | 0 |
| 4:15 | PM | 0 | 101 | 143 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 97 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 165 | 0 | 79 | 604 | 0 |
| 4:30 | PM | 0 | 81 | 136 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 114 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 150 | 0 | 120 | 612 | 0 |
| 4:45 | PM | 0 | 62 | 125 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 112 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 154 | 0 | 105 | 569 | 2,366 |
|  | PM | 0 | 72 | 145 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 112 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 | 0 | 89 | 572 | 2,357 |
| 5:1 | PM | 0 | 82 | 136 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 115 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 160 | 0 | 93 | 600 | 2,353 |
|  | PM | 0 | 65 | 126 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 182 | 0 | 125 | 595 | 2,336 |
|  | PM | 0 | 59 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 160 | 0 | 114 | 541 | 2,308 |
| Count | Total | 0 | 610 | 1,017 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 855 | 107 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,258 | 0 | 827 | 4,674 | 0 |
|  | All | 0 | 332 | 518 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 445 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 612 | 0 | 406 | 2,366 | 0 |
| Peak <br> Hour | HV | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 30 | 0 |
|  | HV\% | - | 1\% | 1\% | - | - | - | 2\% | 0\% | - | - | - | - | - | 1\% | - | 2\% | 1\% | 0 |

Note: Two-hour count summary volumes include heavy vehicles but exclude bicycles in overall count.

| Interval Start | Heavy Vehicle Totals |  |  |  |  | Bicycles |  |  |  |  | Pedestrians (Crossing Leg) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | East | West | North | South | Total |
| 4:00 PM | 3 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 4:15 PM | 1 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 4:30 PM | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 4:45 PM | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 5:00 PM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| 5:15 PM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 10 | 11 | 0 | 18 | 39 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 15 |
| Peak Hr | 8 | 9 | 0 | 13 | 30 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 7 |


| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | Hwy 1 SB Ramps |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15-min } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 30 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 21 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 16 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 9 |
| Count Total | 0 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 12 | 39 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 30 | 0 |

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

| Interval Start | Soquel Ave |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  | 0 |  |  | Hwy 1 SB Ramps |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15-min } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | , | 6 |
| Count Total | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.

17th Ave
Soquel Ave しみx

Date: 10-04-2018
Count Period: 7:00 AM to 9:00 AM Peak Hour: 8:00 AM to 9:00 AM


Two-Hour Count Summaries

| Interval Start |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 15-min <br> Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM |  | 0 | 0 | 31 | 30 | 0 | 8 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 211 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM |  | 0 | 0 | 24 | 45 | 0 | 13 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 98 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 256 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM |  | 0 | 0 | 33 | 56 | 0 | 10 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 121 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 289 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM |  | 0 | 0 | 51 | 59 | 0 | 11 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 89 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 289 | 1,045 |
| 8:00 AM |  | 0 | 0 | 67 | 52 | 0 | 12 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 104 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 328 | 1,162 |
| 8:15 AM |  | 0 | 0 | 56 | 79 | 0 | 9 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 107 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 326 | 1,232 |
| 8:30 AM |  | 0 | 0 | 47 | 69 | 0 | 11 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 98 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 306 | 1,249 |
| 8:45 AM |  | 0 | 0 | 54 | 64 | 0 | 10 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 103 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 312 | 1,272 |
| Count Total |  | 0 | 0 | 363 | 454 | 0 | 84 | 561 | 0 | 0 | 796 | 0 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,317 | 0 |
| Peak <br> Hour | All | 0 | 0 | 224 | 264 | 0 | 42 | 296 | 0 | 0 | 412 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,272 | 0 |
|  | HV | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 0 |
|  | HV\% | - | - | 1\% | 2\% | - | 0\% | 1\% | - | - | 2\% | - | 3\% | - | - | - | - | 2\% | 0 |

Note: Two-hour count summary volumes include heavy vehicles but exclude bicycles in overall count.

| Interval Start | Heavy Vehicle Totals |  |  |  |  | Bicycles |  |  |  |  | Pedestrians (Crossing Leg) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | East | West | North | South | Total |
| 7:00 AM | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 7:15 AM | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 7:30 AM | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| 7:45 AM | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 AM | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| 8:15 AM | 5 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:30 AM | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:45 AM | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Count Total | 18 | 8 | 13 | 0 | 39 | 12 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 9 |
| Peak Hr | 9 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 22 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 |

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles

| Interval Start | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 17 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 18 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 22 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 23 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 22 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 5 | 13 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 0 |

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

| Interval Start | Soquel Ave |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  | 0 |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 12 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 |
| Count Total | 0 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.

17th Ave
Soquel Ave

むみ
Date: 10-04-2018
Count Period: 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM Peak Hour: 4:15 PM to 5:15 PM


Two-Hour Count Summaries

| Interval Start |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 | PM | 0 | 0 | 144 | 114 | 0 | 13 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 402 | 0 |
| 4:15 | PM | 0 | 0 | 163 | 134 | 0 | 11 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 440 | 0 |
| 4:30 | PM | 0 | 0 | 157 | 87 | 0 | 18 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 392 | 0 |
| 4:45 | PM | 0 | 0 | 135 | 122 | 0 | 17 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 394 | 1,628 |
| 5:00 | PM | 0 | 0 | 156 | 122 | 0 | 14 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 426 | 1,652 |
| 5:15 | PM | 0 | 0 | 161 | 126 | 0 | 14 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 423 | 1,635 |
| 5:30 | PM | 0 | 0 | 158 | 130 | 0 | 7 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 56 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 394 | 1,637 |
| 5:45 | PM | 0 | 0 | 129 | 116 | 0 | 13 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 375 | 1,618 |
| Count | Total | 0 | 0 | 1,203 | 951 | 0 | 107 | 415 | 0 | 0 | 516 | 0 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,246 | 0 |
|  | All | 0 | 0 | 611 | 465 | 0 | 60 | 221 | 0 | 0 | 267 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,652 | 0 |
| Peak <br> Hour | HV | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 |
|  | HV\% | - | - | 1\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | - | - | 1\% | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | 1\% | 0 |

Note: Two-hour count summary volumes include heavy vehicles but exclude bicycles in overall count.

| Interval Start | Heavy Vehicle Totals |  |  |  |  | Bicycles |  |  |  |  | Pedestrians (Crossing Leg) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | East | West | North | South | Total |
| 4:00 PM | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 4:15 PM | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 4:30 PM | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 4:45 PM | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 5:00 PM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 5:15 PM | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:30 PM | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| 5:45 PM | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Count Total | 15 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 24 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 12 |
| Peak Hr | 8 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 13 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 |

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles

| Interval Start | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 17 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 |

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

| Interval Start | Soquel Ave |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  | 0 |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 |
| Count Total | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.

Chanticleer Ave
Soquel Ave


Date: 10-04-2018
Count Period: 7:00 AM to 9:00 AM Peak Hour: 7:45 AM to 8:45 AM


Two-Hour Count Summaries

| Interval Start |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | Chanticleer Ave |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 15-min <br> Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 | AM | 0 | 0 | 28 | 10 | 0 | 7 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 121 | 0 |
| 7:15 | AM | 0 | 0 | 18 | 9 | 0 | 23 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 148 | 0 |
| 7:30 | AM | 0 | 0 | 27 | 13 | 0 | 14 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 159 | 0 |
| 7:45 | AM | 0 | 0 | 31 | 19 | 0 | 20 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 190 | 618 |
| 8:00 | AM | 0 | 0 | 49 | 24 | 0 | 20 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 215 | 712 |
| 8:15 | AM | 0 | 0 | 47 | 23 | 0 | 24 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 190 | 754 |
| 8:30 | AM | 0 | 0 | 32 | 17 | 0 | 11 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 165 | 760 |
| 8:45 | AM | 0 | 0 | 48 | 16 | 0 | 14 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 182 | 752 |
| Count | Total | 0 | 0 | 280 | 131 | 0 | 133 | 358 | 0 | 0 | 301 | 0 | 167 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,370 | 0 |
|  | AII | 0 | 0 | 159 | 83 | 0 | 75 | 185 | 0 | 0 | 162 | 0 | 96 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 760 | 0 |
| Peak | HV | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 |
|  | HV\% | - | - | 3\% | 2\% | - | 0\% | 2\% | - | - | 1\% | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | 1\% | 0 |

Note: Two-hour count summary volumes include heavy vehicles but exclude bicycles in overall count.

| Interval Start | Heavy Vehicle Totals |  |  |  |  | Bicycles |  |  |  |  | Pedestrians (Crossing Leg) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | East | West | North | South | Total |
| 7:00 AM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 AM | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15 AM | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Count Total | 8 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 18 | 8 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| Peak Hr | 6 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles

| Interval Start | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | Chanticleer Ave |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 |

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

| Interval Start | Soquel Ave |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  | Chanticleer Ave |  |  | 0 |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 |
| Count Total | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.

## Chanticleer Ave <br> Soquel Ave

Date: 10-04-2018
Count Period: 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM Peak Hour: 4:15 PM to 5:15 PM


Two-Hour Count Summaries

| Interval Start |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | Chanticleer Ave |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 15-min <br> Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 | PM | 0 | 0 | 108 | 41 | 0 | 24 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 264 | 0 |
| 4:15 | PM | 0 | 0 | 106 | 62 | 0 | 19 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 275 | 0 |
| 4:30 | PM | 0 | 0 | 121 | 45 | 0 | 20 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 270 | 0 |
| 4:45 | PM | 0 | 0 | 97 | 45 | 0 | 20 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 238 | 1,047 |
| 5:00 | PM | 0 | 0 | 115 | 52 | 0 | 22 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 269 | 1,052 |
| 5:15 | PM | 0 | 0 | 102 | 61 | 0 | 22 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 261 | 1,038 |
| 5:30 | PM | 0 | 0 | 107 | 63 | 0 | 16 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 238 | 1,006 |
| 5:45 | PM | 0 | 0 | 92 | 49 | 0 | 21 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 219 | 987 |
| Count | Total | 0 | 0 | 848 | 418 | 0 | 164 | 365 | 0 | 0 | 154 | 0 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,034 | 0 |
|  | AII | 0 | 0 | 439 | 204 | 0 | 81 | 207 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,052 | 0 |
| Peak | HV | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
|  | HV\% | - | - | 1\% | 1\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | - | - | 0\% | - | 0\% | - | - | - | - | 1\% | 0 |

Note: Two-hour count summary volumes include heavy vehicles but exclude bicycles in overall count.

| Interval Start | Heavy Vehicle Totals |  |  |  |  | Bicycles |  |  |  |  | Pedestrians (Crossing Leg) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | East | West | North | South | Total |
| 4:00 PM | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 4:30 PM | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 5:00 PM | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:15 PM | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:30 PM | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:45 PM | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Count Total | 13 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 10 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Peak Hr | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles

| Interval Start | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  |  | Chanticleer Ave |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 |

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

| Interval Start | Soquel Ave |  |  | Soquel Ave |  |  | Chanticleer Ave |  |  | 0 |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 |
| Count Total | 0 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.

## Site Dwy \& Soquel Ave

## Peak Hour Turning Movement Count

ID: 18-08275-007
City: Santa Cruz


Cars (NOON)



Day: Thursday
Date: 05/17/2018

| $07: 0$ 04:0 | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{NO}- \\ \mathrm{NO} \\ \mathrm{NO} \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 09:00 } \\ & \text { NE } \\ & 06: 00 \end{aligned}$ |  | 0 0 $2_{1}^{2}$ -1 0 0 0 0 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PM | NOON | AM |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O } \\ & 0 \\ & \text { O} \\ & \hline \mathbf{D} \\ & \hline \mathbf{D} \\ & \text { © } \end{aligned}$ |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| 286 | 0 | 315 |  |  |
| 2 | 0 | 9 |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| 561 | 0 | 246 |  |  |
| PM | NOON | AM |  |  |



HT (PM)


## 40th Ave \& Gross Rd

## Peak Hour Turning Movement Count

ID: 18-08275-003
City: Santa Cruz

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & \stackrel{y}{3} \\ & \text { 우 } \\ & \underline{y} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\mathbf{u}} \end{aligned}$ | 07:30 AM - 08:30 AM |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | NONE |
|  | 04:00 PM - 05:00 PM |


| 40th Ave |
| :---: |
| SOUTHBOUND |

Day: Thursday
Date: 05/17/2018

| AM | 4 | 0 | 247 | 0 | 339 | AM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NOON | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NOON |
| PM | 2 | 3 | 253 | 0 | 235 | PM |

07:00 AM - 09:00 AM

NONE

04:00 PM - 06:00 PM


## 0 0 0 0 0 0

Cars (NOON)


HT (PM)
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| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Deanes Ln |  |  |  | Driveway |  |  |  |  | 40th Ave |  |  |  |  | 40th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | T | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | Deanes Ln |  |  |  | Driveway |  |  |  |  | 40th Ave |  |  |  |  | 40th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  | TH | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  |  | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 5 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 1 | 8 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| Count Total | 0 |  | 0 | 6 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 3 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 11 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 |  | 0 | 5 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 7 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.
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| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Deanes Ln |  |  |  | Driveway |  |  |  |  | 40th Ave |  |  |  |  | 40th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | T | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | Deanes Ln |  |  |  | Driveway |  |  |  |  | 40th Ave |  |  |  |  | 40th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  | TH | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  |  | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 2 | 7 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 1 | 8 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 1 | 9 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Count Total | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 3 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 11 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 8 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.
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| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Clares St |  |  |  | Clares St |  |  |  |  | Driveway |  |  |  |  | 40th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT |  | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 5 | 11 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 3 | 13 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 6 | 18 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 4 | 18 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 14 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 13 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 25 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 |
| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | Clares St |  |  |  | Clares St |  |  |  |  | Driveway |  |  |  |  | 40th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  |  | RT | LT |  |  |  | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 2 | 6 |  | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 14 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Count Total | 0 |  | 3 | 1 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 3 |  | 3 | 7 |  | 1 | 1 | 21 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.
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| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Clares St |  |  |  | Clares St |  |  |  |  | Driveway |  |  |  |  | 40th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT |  | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 2 | 9 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 3 | 6 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Count Total | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 6 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 13 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | Clares St |  |  |  | Clares St |  |  |  |  | Driveway |  |  |  |  | 40th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  | TH | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 2 |  | 5 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 3 | 15 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 17 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 18 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 4 | 12 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Count Total | 0 |  | 3 | 0 | 1 |  | 3 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 3 |  | 0 | 4 |  | 9 | 0 | 24 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 3 |  | 0 | 2 |  | 2 | 0 | 12 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.
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| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Clares St |  |  |  |  | Clares St |  |  |  |  | 41st Ave |  |  |  |  | 41st Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 2 | 21 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 15 | 53 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 15 | 59 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 3 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 16 | 67 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 15 | 61 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 12 | 58 |
| Count Total | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 31 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 49 | 12 | 111 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 |  | 17 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 23 | 6 | 58 | 0 |
| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | Clares St |  |  |  |  | Clares St |  |  |  |  | 41st Ave |  |  |  |  | 41st Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  |  | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 1 |  | 3 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 1 | 10 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 1 | 10 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 3 | 5 |
| Count Total | 1 |  | 7 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 2 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 5 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.
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| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Clares St |  |  |  | Clares St |  |  |  | 41st Ave |  |  |  |  | 41st Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT |  | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 7 | 24 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 6 | 26 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 20 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 4 | 18 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 3 | 14 |
| Count Total | 0 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 13 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 38 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 9 | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 2 | 26 | 0 |
| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | Clares St |  |  |  | Clares St |  |  |  | 41st Ave |  |  |  |  | 41st Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  | TH | RT | LT |  | TH | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 1 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 3 | 12 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 2 |  | 1 | 0 | 4 | 15 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 10 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 3 | 12 |
| Count Total | 0 |  | 3 | 0 | 1 |  | 5 | 1 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 2 | 4 |  | 4 | 1 | 23 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 |  | 3 | 0 | 1 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 12 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.
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Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.
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| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Capitola Rd |  |  |  |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  |  | 41st Ave |  |  |  |  | 41st Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 2 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 3 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 25 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 2 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 24 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 21 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 18 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 18 |
| Count Total | 0 | 11 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 9 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 43 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 21 | 0 |
| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | Capitola Rd |  |  |  |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  |  | 41st Ave |  |  |  |  | 41st Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  |  | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 3 | 14 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 7 | 15 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 3 | 16 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 2 | 15 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 6 | 18 |
| Count Total | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 3 |  | 6 |  | 1 | 5 |  | 8 |  | 1 | 0 |  |  | 2 | 32 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 3 |  | 6 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 16 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.
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| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Brommer St |  |  |  | Jade St |  |  |  |  | 41st Ave |  |  |  |  | 41st Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 10 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 26 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 26 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 29 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 10 | 29 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 14 | 38 |
| Count Total | 0 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 9 | 64 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 2 | 38 | 0 |
| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | Brommer St |  |  |  | Jade St |  |  |  |  | 41st Ave |  |  |  |  | 41st Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  | TH | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  |  | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 3 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 6 | 13 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 3 | 14 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 |  | 5 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 6 | 16 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 3 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 3 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 6 | 21 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 4 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 2 |  |  | 1 | 9 | 24 |
| Count Total | 0 |  | 10 | 3 | 0 |  | 11 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 4 |  | 0 | 2 |  |  | 4 | 37 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 |  | 7 | 0 | 0 |  | 9 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 4 |  | 0 | 2 |  |  | 1 | 24 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.
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| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Brommer St |  |  |  | Jade St |  |  |  |  | 41st Ave |  |  |  |  | 41st Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 14 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 15 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 11 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Count Total | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 22 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 11 | 0 |
| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | Brommer St |  |  |  | Jade St |  |  |  |  | 41st Ave |  |  |  |  | 41st Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  | TH | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  |  | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 2 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 3 |  | 1 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 9 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 3 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 5 | 27 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 7 | 28 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 |  | 2 | 1 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 5 | 17 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 3 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 6 | 18 |
| Count Total | 2 |  | 10 | 1 | 1 |  | 5 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 10 |  | 4 | 0 |  |  | 2 | 45 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 |  | 2 | 1 | 1 |  | 3 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 3 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 17 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.


Two-Hour Count Summaries

| Interval Start |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | 7th Ave |  |  |  | 7th Ave |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 15-\mathrm{min} \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 | AM | 0 | 0 | 30 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 39 | 27 | 0 | 10 | 53 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 21 | 1 | 202 | 0 |
| 7:1 | AM | 0 | 2 | 33 | 14 | 0 | 7 | 81 | 27 | 0 | 31 | 49 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 16 | 2 | 280 | 0 |
| 7:30 | AM | 0 | 0 | 52 | 18 | 0 | 9 | 110 | 30 | 0 | 30 | 62 | 9 | 0 | 11 | 24 | 4 | 359 | 0 |
| 7:4 | AM | 0 | 1 | 42 | 26 | 0 | 13 | 121 | 34 | 0 | 45 | 96 | 14 | 0 | 7 | 38 | 7 | 444 | 1,285 |
| 8:00 | AM | 0 | 2 | 59 | 26 | 0 | 9 | 155 | 22 | 0 | 48 | 80 | 15 | 0 | 16 | 44 | 16 | 492 | 1,575 |
| 8:1 | AM | 0 | 3 | 81 | 41 | 0 | 5 | 119 | 33 | 0 | 54 | 65 | 8 | 0 | 21 | 32 | 2 | 464 | 1,759 |
| 8:3 | AM | 0 | 0 | 74 | 35 | 0 | 14 | 108 | 24 | 0 | 31 | 56 | 11 | 0 | 20 | 50 | 7 | 430 | 1,830 |
| 8:4 | AM | 0 | 2 | 70 | 36 | 0 | 12 | 109 | 27 | 0 | 50 | 55 | 14 | 0 | 17 | 53 | 5 | 450 | 1,836 |
| Count | Total | 0 | 10 | 441 | 201 | 0 | 73 | 842 | 224 | 0 | 299 | 516 | 84 | 0 | 109 | 278 | 44 | 3,121 | 0 |
|  | All | 0 | 7 | 284 | 138 | 0 | 40 | 491 | 106 | 0 | 183 | 256 | 48 | 0 | 74 | 179 | 30 | 1,836 | 0 |
| Peak | HV | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 35 | 0 |
|  | HV\% | - | 0\% | 2\% | 2\% |  | 3\% | 1\% | 2\% |  | 2\% | 4\% | 0\% | - |  | 3\% | 0\% | 2\% | 0 |

Note: Two-hour count summary volumes include heavy vehicles but exclude bicycles in overall count.

| Interval Start | Heavy Vehicle Totals |  |  |  |  | Bicycles |  |  |  |  | Pedestrians (Crossing Leg) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | East | West | North | South | Total |
| 7:00 AM | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 7:15 AM | 2 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 9 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| 7:45 AM | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 21 |
| 8:00 AM | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 11 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 8:15 AM | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| 8:30 AM | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| 8:45 AM | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 |
| Count Total | 13 | 22 | 22 | 11 | 68 | 3 | 16 | 10 | 3 | 32 | 17 | 14 | 15 | 9 | 55 |
| Peak Hour | 8 | 8 | 13 | 6 | 35 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 14 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 19 |
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Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles

| Interval Start | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | 7th Ave |  |  |  | 7th Ave |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15-min } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 33 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 11 | 38 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 36 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 36 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 35 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 7 | 0 | 8 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 68 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 35 | 0 |

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

| Interval Start | Capitola Rd |  |  | Capitola Rd |  |  | 7th Ave |  |  | 7th Ave |  |  | 15-min <br> Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 18 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 25 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 22 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 15 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 14 |
| Count Total | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 12 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 32 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.


Two-Hour Count Summaries

| Interval Start |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | 7th Ave |  |  |  | 7th Ave |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 15-\mathrm{min} \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 |  | 0 | 9 | 204 | 82 | 0 | 14 | 99 | 16 | 0 | 19 | 47 | 11 | 0 | 18 | 67 | 6 | 592 | 0 |
| 4:1 | PM | 0 | 4 | 236 | 83 | 0 | 21 | 98 | 14 | 0 | 32 | 37 | 16 | 0 | 32 | 59 | 7 | 639 | 0 |
| 4:30 | PM | 0 | 3 | 200 | 62 | 1 | 22 | 95 | 9 | 0 | 33 | 44 | 18 | 0 | 24 | 45 | 9 | 565 | 0 |
| 4:4 | PM | 0 | 5 | 205 | 64 | 0 | 8 | 91 | 19 | 0 | 29 | 41 | 23 | 0 | 25 | 47 | 3 | 560 | 2,356 |
| 5:00 | PM | 0 | 1 | 221 | 79 | 0 | 10 | 93 | 14 | 0 | 34 | 43 | 6 | 0 | 23 | 64 | 5 | 593 | 2,357 |
| 5:1 | PM | 0 | 5 | 244 | 76 | 0 | 7 | 116 | 9 | 0 | 40 | 43 | 10 | 0 | 31 | 62 | 6 | 649 | 2,367 |
| 5:3 | PM | 0 | 8 | 214 | 91 | 0 | 11 | 90 | 12 | 0 | 39 | 29 | 15 | 0 | 27 | 70 | 3 | 609 | 2,411 |
| 5:4 | PM | 0 | 3 | 200 | 63 | 0 | 14 | 80 | 9 | 0 | 27 | 45 | 8 | 0 | 11 | 53 | 4 | 517 | 2,368 |
| Count | otal | 0 | 38 | 1,724 | 600 | 1 | 107 | 762 | 102 | 0 | 253 | 329 | 107 | 0 | 191 | 467 | 43 | 4,724 | 0 |
|  | All | 0 | 19 | 884 | 310 | 0 | 36 | 390 | 54 | 0 | 142 | 156 | 54 | 0 | 106 | 243 | 17 | 2,411 | 0 |
| Peak | HV | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 18 | 0 |
|  | HV\% | - | 0\% | 1\% | 1\% | - | 0\% |  | 0\% | - | 1\% | 1\% | 0\% | - | 3\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1\% | 0 |

Note: Two-hour count summary volumes include heavy vehicles but exclude bicycles in overall count.

| Interval Start | Heavy Vehicle Totals |  |  |  |  | Bicycles |  |  |  |  | Pedestrians (Crossing Leg) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | East | West | North | South | Total |
| 4:00 PM | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 4:15 PM | 2 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| 4:30 PM | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 10 |
| 4:45 PM | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 5:00 PM | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| 5:15 PM | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| 5:30 PM | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 12 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 |
| 5:45 PM | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 10 |
| Count Total | 17 | 11 | 10 | 6 | 44 | 15 | 7 | 19 | 10 | 51 | 10 | 9 | 13 | 10 | 42 |
| Peak Hour | 7 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 18 | 10 | 1 | 13 | 7 | 31 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 17 |

## www.idaxdata.com

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles

| Interval Start | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | 7th Ave |  |  |  | 7th Ave |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15-min } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 28 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 25 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 20 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 18 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 16 |
| Count Total | 0 | 1 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 44 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 18 | 0 |

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

| Interval Start | Capitola Rd |  |  | Capitola Rd |  |  | 7th Ave |  |  | 7th Ave |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 23 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 24 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 26 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 31 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 28 |
| Count Total | 0 | 13 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 51 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 31 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.
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| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Capitola Rd |  |  |  |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 29 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 6 | 28 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 10 | 33 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 36 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 33 |
| Count Total | 0 | 3 | 9 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 2 |  | 11 | 1 | 0 | 7 |  | 10 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 2 | 62 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 1 |  | 6 | 1 | 0 | 3 |  | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 33 | 0 |
| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | Capitola Rd |  |  |  |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  |  | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 5 |  | 0 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 16 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 |  | 4 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 3 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 6 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 16 | 40 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 3 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 7 | 43 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 7 | 46 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 31 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 1 | 16 |
| Count Total | 0 |  | 8 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 11 |  | 2 | 2 |  | 15 |  | 0 | 2 |  |  | 2 | 56 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 |  | 2 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 3 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 3 |  | 0 | 1 |  |  | 0 | 16 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.
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| Four-Hour Count Summaries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 2:00 | PM | 0 | 5 | 106 | 20 | 0 | 12 | 99 | 16 | 0 | 24 | 68 | 16 | 0 | 20 | 79 | 12 | 477 | 0 |
| 2:15 | PM | 0 | 12 | 102 | 22 | 1 | 17 | 106 | 12 | 0 | 16 | 76 | 16 | 0 | 21 | 80 | 16 | 497 | 0 |
|  | PM | 0 | 11 | 126 | 19 | 0 | 26 | 136 | 18 | 0 | 32 | 58 | 18 | 0 | 32 | 71 | 15 | 562 | 0 |
| 2:45 | PM | 0 | 7 | 140 | 15 | 1 | 20 | 107 | 11 | 0 | 23 | 78 | 23 | 0 | 44 | 74 | 9 | 552 | 2,088 |
| 3:00 | PM | 0 | 10 | 176 | 35 | 0 | 22 | 112 | 11 | 0 | 23 | 63 | 22 | 0 | 27 | 66 | 9 | 576 | 2,187 |
|  | PM | 0 | 12 | 170 | 35 | 1 | 21 | 90 | 15 | 0 | 25 | 61 | 14 | 0 | 31 | 74 | 16 | 565 | 2,255 |
|  | PM | 0 | 7 | 194 | 19 | 0 | 26 | 106 | 14 | 0 | 21 | 52 | 12 | 0 | 49 | 77 | 7 | 584 | 2,277 |
| 3:4 | PM | 0 | 6 | 194 | 27 | 1 | 18 | 73 | 12 | 0 | 26 | 60 | 21 | 0 | 34 | 93 | 10 | 575 | 2,300 |
| 4:00 | PM | 0 | 13 | 212 | 30 | 1 | 19 | 119 | 19 | 0 | 24 | 36 | 14 | 0 | 43 | 69 | 9 | 608 | 2,332 |
| 4:15 | PM | 0 | 7 | 198 | 28 | 0 | 11 | 91 | 10 | 0 | 32 | 55 | 19 | 0 | 49 | 86 | 11 | 597 | 2,364 |
| 4:30 | PM | 0 | 6 | 210 | 22 | 0 | 29 | 79 | 9 | 0 | 13 | 48 | 14 | 0 | 43 | 59 | 11 | 543 | 2,323 |
| 4:45 | PM | 0 | 8 | 171 | 31 | 2 | 24 | 82 | 13 | 0 | 23 | 51 | 18 | 0 | 41 | 84 | 4 | 552 | 2,300 |
| 5:00 | PM | 0 | 9 | 213 | 26 | 1 | 23 | 106 | 11 | 0 | 23 | 53 | 23 | 0 | 48 | 89 | 5 | 630 | 2,322 |
|  | PM | 0 | 6 | 213 | 26 | 2 | 14 | 78 | 15 | 0 | 33 | 48 | 21 | 0 | 49 | 102 | 6 | 613 | 2,338 |
|  | PM | 0 | 12 | 210 | 29 | 3 | 16 | 91 | 10 | 0 | 15 | 34 | 18 | 0 | 55 | 87 | 8 | 588 | 2,383 |
| 5:4 | PM | 0 | 6 | 185 | 2 | 1 | 28 | 97 | 13 | 0 | 27 | 55 | 16 | 0 | 50 | 81 | 14 | 575 | 2,406 |
| Count | Total | 0 | 137 | 2,820 | 386 | 14 | 326 | 1,572 | 209 | 0 | 380 | 896 | 285 | 0 | 636 | 1,271 | 162 | 9,094 | 0 |
|  | All | 0 | 33 | 821 | 83 | 7 | 81 | 372 | 49 | 0 | 98 | 190 | 78 | 0 | 202 | 359 | 33 | 2,406 | 0 |
| Hour | HV | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
|  | HV\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0 |

Note: Four-hour count summary volumes include heavy vehicles but exclude bicycles in overall count.

| Interval Start | Heavy Vehicle Totals |  |  |  |  | Bicycles |  |  |  |  | Pedestrians (Crossing Leg) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | East | West | North | South | Total |
| 2:00 PM | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 9 | 19 |
| 2:15 PM | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 8 |
| 2:30 PM | 2 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 12 |
| 2:45 PM | 3 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 12 | 7 | 19 | 4 | 5 | 35 |
| 3:00 PM | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 13 | 5 | 16 | 7 | 41 |
| 3:15 PM | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 0 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 12 |
| 3:30 PM | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 7 |
| 3:45 PM | 3 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 13 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 6 |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 7 |
| 4:15 PM | 2 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 13 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 11 |
| 4:45 PM | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 8 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 8 |
| 5:15 PM | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 17 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 5:45 PM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 9 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 10 |
| Count Total | 26 | 25 | 21 | 32 | 104 | 28 | 16 | 19 | 22 | 85 | 59 | 56 | 48 | 53 | 216 |
| Peak Hour | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 23 | 11 | 7 | 4 | 15 | 37 |


| Four-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 2:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| 2:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 0 |
| 2:30 PM | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| 2:45 PM | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 11 | 37 |
| 3:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 37 |
| 3:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 37 |
| 3:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 37 |
| 3:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 13 | 39 |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 36 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 35 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 31 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 23 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 18 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| Count Total | 0 | 3 | 22 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 15 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 27 | 2 | 104 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Four-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15-min } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  |  | RT | LT | TH |  | RT | LT | TH |  | RT | LT | TH |  | RT |  |  |
| 2:00 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| 2:15 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 2:30 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 2:45 PM | 0 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 6 |  | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 12 | 23 |
| 3:00 PM | 0 |  |  | 2 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 9 | 26 |
| 3:15 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 0 | 8 | 31 |
| 3:30 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 5 |  | 0 | 9 | 38 |
| 3:45 PM | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 3 | 29 |
| 4:00 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 3 | 23 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 16 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 2 | 9 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 4 | 10 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 8 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 0 | 2 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 7 | 14 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 4 |  | 0 | 6 | 18 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 4 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 9 | 23 |
| Count Total | 0 | 2 |  | 4 | 2 | 13 |  | 1 | 4 | 15 |  | 0 | 0 | 20 |  | 2 | 85 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 3 |  | 1 | 0 | 6 |  | 0 | 2 | 4 |  | 0 | 0 | 5 |  | 2 | 23 | 0 |
| Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | Chanticleer Ave |  |  |  |  | Chanticleer Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | T | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 13 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 11 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 14 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 19 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 18 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 31 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 19 | 0 |
| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | Chanticleer Ave |  |  |  |  | Chanticleer Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  | TH | RT | LT |  | TH | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  |  | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 5 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 3 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 6 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 1 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 9 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 |  | 2 | 1 | 0 |  | 1 | 3 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  |  | 0 | 9 | 29 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 5 | 29 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 3 | 0 |  | 4 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 8 | 31 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 2 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 7 | 29 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  |  | 2 | 8 | 28 |
| Count Total | 0 |  | 8 | 1 | 2 |  | 10 | 8 | 0 |  | 10 |  | 3 | 2 |  |  | 7 | 57 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 |  | 3 | 1 | 1 |  | 4 | 6 | 0 |  | 7 |  | 2 | 1 |  |  | 2 | 29 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.
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| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  |  | Chanticleer Ave |  |  |  | Chanticleer Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT |  | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 14 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 21 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  |  | Chanticleer Ave |  |  |  | Chanticleer Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  | TH | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH | RT | LT |  | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 2 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 5 | 21 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 17 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 3 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 4 | 16 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 2 | 2 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 11 | 22 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 |  | 3 | 1 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 1 | 9 | 26 |
| Count Total | 0 |  | 15 | 1 | 0 |  | 6 |  | 2 | 0 |  | 8 | 4 | 2 |  | 8 | 1 | 47 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 |  | 7 | 1 | 0 |  | 5 |  | 2 | 0 |  | 4 | 2 | 0 |  | 4 | 1 | 26 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.
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| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  |  | 30th Ave |  |  |  |  | 30th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT |  | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 6 | 14 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 4 | 13 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 7 | 17 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 5 | 16 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 30 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 |
| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  |  | 30th Ave |  |  |  |  | 30th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  |  | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 |  | 3 | 1 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 5 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 |  | 3 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 5 | 24 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 5 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 8 | 27 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 3 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 4 | 26 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 |  | 2 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 4 | 21 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 19 |
| Count Total | 0 |  | 15 | 4 | 1 |  | 13 |  | 1 | 7 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 43 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 |  | 5 | 2 | 0 |  | 5 |  | 0 | 7 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.
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| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  |  | 30th Ave |  |  |  |  | 30th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 4 | 17 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 11 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 9 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 6 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 23 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | Capitola Rd |  |  |  | Capitola Rd |  |  |  |  | 30th Ave |  |  |  |  | 30th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  | TH | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 |  | 3 | 1 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 |  | 5 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 1 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 4 | 20 |
| 5:00 PM | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 6 | 21 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 |  | 1 | 2 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 6 | 23 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 4 | 20 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 6 | 22 |
| Count Total | 2 |  | 20 | 3 | 1 |  | 7 |  | 0 | 2 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 4 | 42 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 2 |  | 6 | 2 | 1 |  | 3 |  | 0 | 2 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 3 | 20 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.
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| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Brommer St |  |  |  |  | Brommer St |  |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 26 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 25 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 28 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 31 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 22 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 1 |  | 5 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 2 | 48 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 |  | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 4 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 31 | 0 |
| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | Brommer St |  |  |  |  | Brommer St |  |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH | RT | LT |  |  | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 |  | 3 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 6 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 |  | 2 |  | 4 | 0 |  | 6 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 18 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 |  | 0 |  | 4 | 0 |  | 4 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 5 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 18 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 |  | 3 |  | 6 | 0 |  | 4 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 7 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 26 | 68 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 |  | 2 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 3 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 7 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 24 | 86 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 |  | 3 |  | 2 | 0 |  | 5 |  | 0 | 2 |  | 4 | 1 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 20 | 88 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 0 | 5 | 75 |
| 8:45 AM | 1 |  | 1 |  | 4 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 12 | 61 |
| Count Total | 1 |  | 15 |  | 21 | 1 |  | 24 |  | 0 | 8 |  | 27 | 2 | 1 |  |  | 2 | 129 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 |  | 9 |  | 9 | 1 |  | 12 |  | 0 | 5 |  | 18 | 2 | 1 |  |  | 0 | 75 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.
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| Four-Hour Count Summaries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start |  | Brommer St |  |  |  | Brommer St |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 2:00 | PM | 0 | 12 | 33 | 20 | 0 | 18 | 47 | 5 | 0 | 13 | 90 | 19 | 0 | 17 | 88 | 12 | 374 | 0 |
| 2:15 | PM | 0 | 10 | 44 | 25 | 0 | 20 | 35 | 11 | 0 | 20 | 81 | 26 | 0 | 8 | 93 | 7 | 380 | 0 |
|  | PM | 0 | 12 | 36 | 21 | 0 | 22 | 40 | 5 | 0 | 19 | 87 | 17 | 0 | 12 | 88 | 11 | 370 | 0 |
| 2:45 | PM | 0 | 15 | 63 | 22 | 0 | 31 | 45 | 6 | 0 | 23 | 94 | 27 | 0 | 15 | 79 | 4 | 424 | 1,548 |
| 3:00 | PM | 0 | 8 | 75 | 31 | 0 | 26 | 52 | 7 | 0 | 22 | 87 | 22 | 0 | 14 | 67 | 9 | 420 | 1,594 |
|  | PM | 0 | 14 | 78 | 30 | 0 | 26 | 59 | 4 | 0 | 15 | 80 | 23 | 0 | 17 | 113 | 11 | 470 | 1,684 |
| 3:30 | PM | 0 | 11 | 81 | 28 | 0 | 28 | 46 | 5 | 0 | 12 | 76 | 25 | 0 | 11 | 82 | 15 | 420 | 1,734 |
| 3:4 | PM | 0 | 1 | 69 | 21 | 0 | 29 | 41 | 7 | 0 | 17 | 90 | 9 | 0 | 12 | 93 | 8 | 397 | 1,707 |
| 4:00 | PM | 0 | 6 | 72 | 31 | 0 | 25 | 44 | 7 | 0 | 23 | 65 | 32 | 0 | 20 | 84 | 8 | 417 | 1,704 |
|  | PM | 0 | 16 | 87 | 27 | 0 | 24 | 56 | 5 | 0 | 19 | 85 | 25 | 0 | 16 | 92 | 5 | 457 | 1,691 |
|  | PM | 0 | 9 | 76 | 39 | 0 | 23 | 46 | 9 | 0 | 21 | 67 | 29 | 0 | 16 | 82 | 8 | 425 | 1,696 |
| 4:45 | PM | 0 | 7 | 71 | 30 | 0 | 38 | 42 | 8 | 0 | 13 | 76 | 24 | 0 | 16 | 90 | 9 | 424 | 1,723 |
|  | PM | 0 | 14 | 73 | 30 | 0 | 27 | 55 | 6 | 0 | 18 | 77 | 33 | 0 | 18 | 85 | 10 | 446 | 1,752 |
| 5:15 | PM | 0 | 11 | 81 | 22 | 0 | 30 | 45 | 13 | 0 | 18 | 80 | 21 | 0 | 16 | 117 | 5 | 459 | 1,754 |
| 5:30 | PM | 0 | 11 | 84 | 26 | 0 | 34 | 54 | 4 | 0 | 13 | 59 | 22 | 0 | 11 | 106 | 4 | 428 | 1,757 |
| 5:4 | PM | 0 | 13 | 49 | 34 | 0 | 30 | 49 | 8 | 0 | 10 | 89 | 24 | 0 | 11 | 99 | 7 | 423 | 1,756 |
| Count | Total | 0 | 170 | 1,072 | 437 | 0 | 431 | 756 | 110 | 0 | 276 | 1,283 | 378 | 0 | 230 | 1,458 | 133 | 6,734 | 0 |
|  | All | 0 | 43 | 309 | 108 | 0 | 129 | 196 | 31 | 0 |  | 292 | 100 | 0 | 61 | 398 | 28 | 1,757 | 0 |
| Hour | HV | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 0 |
|  | HV\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 2\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 2\% | 1\% | 0\% | - | 0\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0 |

Note: Four-hour count summary volumes include heavy vehicles but exclude bicycles in overall count.

| Interval Start | Heavy Vehicle Totals |  |  |  |  | Bicycles |  |  |  |  | Pedestrians (Crossing Leg) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | East | West | North | South | Total |
| 2:00 PM | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 8 |
| 2:15 PM | 2 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 2:30 PM | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 6 |
| 2:45 PM | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 18 | 2 | 22 | 29 | 34 | 28 | 8 | 99 |
| 3:00 PM | 3 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 11 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 9 | 33 | 30 | 4 | 76 |
| 3:15 PM | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 9 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 19 |
| 3:30 PM | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 14 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 13 |
| 3:45 PM | 2 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 13 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 15 |
| 4:00 PM | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 13 | 6 | 1 | 13 | 3 | 23 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 15 |
| 4:30 PM | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 13 |
| 4:45 PM | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 1 | 13 |
| 5:00 PM | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 11 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 10 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 13 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 11 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 16 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Count Total | 23 | 10 | 34 | 30 | 97 | 54 | 23 | 51 | 29 | 157 | 96 | 96 | 119 | 32 | 343 |
| Peak Hour | 3 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 8 | 16 | 4 | 11 | 3 | 34 | 15 | 5 | 20 | 8 | 48 |


| Four-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Brommer St |  |  |  | Brommer St |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 2:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| 2:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| 2:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| 2:45 PM | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 11 | 34 |
| 3:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 11 | 38 |
| 3:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 36 |
| 3:30 PM | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 38 |
| 3:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 13 | 40 |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 34 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 32 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 28 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 18 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 17 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Count Total | 0 | 3 | 8 | 12 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 22 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 24 | 4 | 97 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| Four-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | Brommer St |  |  |  | Brommer St |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  |  | RT | LT | T |  | RT | LT | TH |  | RT | LT | TH |  | RT |  |  |
| 2:00 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 2 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| 2:15 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 2:30 PM | 0 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 6 | 0 |
| 2:45 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 4 | 12 |  | 2 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 22 | 40 |
| 3:00 PM | 0 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 8 | 40 |
| 3:15 PM | 0 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 7 | 43 |
| 3:30 PM | 0 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 0 | 6 |  | 0 | 14 | 51 |
| 3:45 PM | 0 | 0 |  | 3 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 4 |  | 0 | 10 | 39 |
| 4:00 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 0 | 13 | 44 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 9 | 46 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 | 38 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 |  |  | 3 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 7 | 35 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 5 | 27 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 4 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 10 | 28 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 2 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 12 | 34 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 16 | 43 |
| Count Total | 0 |  |  | 14 | 3 | 1 |  | 1 | 11 | 34 |  | 6 | 0 | 25 |  | 4 | 157 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 1 |  | 5 | 0 | 4 |  | 0 | 3 | 7 |  | 1 | 0 | 3 |  | 0 | 34 | 0 |
| Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Brommer St |  |  |  | Brommer St |  |  |  | 30th Ave |  |  |  |  | 30th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 5 | 9 |
| 8:00 AM |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 11 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 5 | 12 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 8 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 17 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 |
| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | Brommer St |  |  |  | Brommer St |  |  |  | 30th Ave |  |  |  |  | 30th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  | TH | RT | LT |  | TH | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 1 |  | 2 | 1 | 3 |  | 4 | 0 | 5 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 18 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 3 | 2 |  | 5 | 0 | 3 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 15 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 6 | 0 | 6 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 15 | 54 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 |  | 2 | 1 | 1 |  | 2 | 0 | 9 |  | 4 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 19 | 67 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 |  | 2 | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 8 | 57 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 5 | 47 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 |  | 1 | 2 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 5 | 37 |
| Count Total | 1 |  | 9 | 10 | 8 |  | 21 | 0 | 26 |  | 8 |  | 2 | 0 |  | 4 | 2 | 91 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 |  | 4 | 6 | 5 |  | 14 | 0 | 20 |  | 5 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 57 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.
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Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.
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| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | E Cliff Dr (W) |  |  |  | Portola Dr |  |  |  | E Cliff Dr (S) |  |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 14 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 2 | 7 | 18 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 2 | 6 | 22 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 6 | 21 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 6 | 25 |
| Count Total | 0 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 2 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 |  | 5 | 39 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |  | 4 | 25 | 0 |
| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | E Cliff Dr (W) |  |  |  | Portola Dr |  |  |  | E Cliff Dr (S) |  |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  | TH | RT | LT |  | TH | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 4 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 1 | 2 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 1 | 10 | 25 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 6 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 9 | 32 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 |  | 3 | 3 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 8 | 37 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 4 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 10 | 37 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 4 | 2 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 1 | 11 | 38 |
| Count Total | 0 |  | 8 | 4 | 0 |  | 22 | 4 | 7 |  | 5 |  | 0 | 5 |  | 5 | 3 | 63 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 |  | 4 | 4 | 0 |  | 15 | 3 | 2 |  | 3 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 5 | 1 | 38 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.
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| Four-Hour Count Summaries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start |  | E Cliff Dr (W) |  |  |  | Portola Dr |  |  |  | E Cliff Dr (S) |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 2:00 | PM | 0 | 28 | 62 | 44 | 0 | 3 | 73 | 28 | 0 | 17 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 31 | 27 | 13 | 341 | 0 |
| 2:15 | PM | 0 | 26 | 70 | 54 | 0 | 3 | 72 | 20 | 0 | 17 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 26 | 19 | 26 | 346 | 0 |
| 2:30 | PM | 0 | 23 | 74 | 34 | 0 | 2 | 67 | 23 | 0 | 21 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 21 | 9 | 25 | 314 | 0 |
| 2:45 | PM | 0 | 9 | 81 | 52 | 0 | 3 | 60 | 24 | 0 | 25 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 44 | 12 | 27 | 344 | 1,345 |
| 3:00 | PM | 0 | 15 | 100 | 38 | 0 | 6 | 69 | 23 | 0 | 21 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 23 | 19 | 21 | 349 | 1,353 |
|  | PM | 0 | 22 | 104 | 58 | 0 | 4 | 57 | 22 | 0 | 18 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 31 | 23 | 18 | 368 | 1,375 |
| 3:30 | PM | 0 | 15 | 103 | 69 | 0 | 1 | 79 | 19 | 0 | 21 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 27 | 20 | 23 | 391 | 1,452 |
| 3:4 | PM | 0 | 18 | 119 | 49 | 0 | 1 | 54 | 26 | 0 | 16 | 18 | 4 | 0 | 35 | 21 | 18 | 379 | 1,487 |
| 4:00 | PM | 0 | 12 | 119 | 49 | 0 | 5 | 62 | 19 | 0 | 20 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 32 | 23 | 11 | 365 | 1,503 |
|  | PM | 0 | 20 | 134 | 54 | 0 | 6 | 51 | 24 | 0 | 18 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 39 | 20 | 21 | 396 | 1,531 |
|  | PM | 0 | 12 | 111 | 61 | 0 | 3 | 63 | 24 | 0 | 17 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 21 | 22 | 30 | 374 | 1,514 |
| 4:45 | PM | 0 | 9 | 112 | 61 | 0 | 3 | 68 | 29 | 0 | 23 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 36 | 19 | 16 | 388 | 1,523 |
|  | PM | 0 | 11 | 136 | 56 | 0 | 6 | 70 | 21 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 1 | 0 | 36 | 27 | 25 | 429 | 1,587 |
| 5:15 | PM | 0 | 18 | 147 | 59 | 0 | 4 | 72 | 28 | 1 | 27 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 46 | 27 | 26 | 465 | 1,656 |
| 5:30 | PM | 0 | 18 | 113 | 66 | 0 | 2 | 63 | 23 | 1 | 15 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 39 | 24 | 24 | 396 | 1,678 |
| 5:4 | PM | 0 | 22 | 87 | 52 | 0 | 3 | 57 | 27 | 0 | 20 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 45 | 21 | 16 | 361 | 1,651 |
| Count | Total | 0 | 278 | 1,672 | 856 | 0 | 55 | 1,037 | 380 | 2 | 316 | 167 | 38 | 0 | 532 | 333 | 340 | 6,006 | 0 |
|  | All | 0 | 56 | 508 | 242 | 0 | 15 | 273 | 101 | 2 | 85 | 44 | 7 | 0 | 157 | 97 | 91 | 1,678 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | HV | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 1\% | - | 0\% | 0\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |  | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% |  | 0 |

Note: Four-hour count summary volumes include heavy vehicles but exclude bicycles in overall count.

| Interval Start | Heavy Vehicle Totals |  |  |  |  | Bicycles |  |  |  |  | Pedestrians (Crossing Leg) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | EB | WB | NB | SB | Total | East | West | North | South | Total |
| 2:00 PM | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 2:15 PM | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 2:30 PM | 4 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 2:45 PM | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 8 |
| 3:00 PM | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 10 |
| 3:15 PM | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 10 |
| 3:30 PM | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 3:45 PM | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 4:00 PM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 13 |
| 4:15 PM | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 8 |
| 4:30 PM | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 6 |
| 4:45 PM | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| 5:00 PM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 9 | 1 | 17 | 1 | 1 | 20 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 12 |
| 5:30 PM | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 10 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 8 |
| Count Total | 26 | 16 | 2 | 11 | 55 | 38 | 25 | 32 | 21 | 116 | 31 | 60 | 12 | 23 | 126 |
| Peak Hour | 6 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 7 | 5 | 11 | 3 | 26 | 7 | 30 | 3 | 7 | 47 |


| Four-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | E Cliff Dr (W) |  |  |  | Portola Dr |  |  |  | E Cliff Dr (S) |  |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | 15-min <br> Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 2:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 2:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 2:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0 |
| 2:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 16 |
| 3:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 20 |
| 3:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 22 |
| 3:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 18 |
| 3:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 17 |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 11 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 13 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 15 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 16 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 14 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Count Total | 0 | 2 | 16 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 55 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 0 |
| Four-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | E Cliff Dr (W) |  |  |  | Portola Dr |  |  |  | E Cliff Dr (S) |  |  |  |  | 17th Ave |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 15-min } \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  |  | RT | LT | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT | TH |  | RT |  |  |
| 2:00 PM | 0 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 2 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| 2:15 PM | 0 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 3 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| 2:30 PM | 0 |  |  | 5 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 1 | 11 | 0 |
| 2:45 PM | 0 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 4 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 7 | 35 |
| 3:00 PM | 0 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 3 | 5 | 33 |
| 3:15 PM | 0 |  |  | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 3 | 26 |
| 3:30 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 2 | 7 | 22 |
| 3:45 PM | 0 |  |  | 2 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 3 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 8 | 23 |
| 4:00 PM | 0 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 3 |  | 0 | 3 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 9 | 27 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 |  |  | 2 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 1 | 9 | 33 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 |  |  | 4 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 8 | 34 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 |  |  | 2 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 3 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 9 | 35 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 4 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 9 | 35 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 4 | 30 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 4 | 26 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 3 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 6 | 23 |
| Count Total | 0 |  | - | 23 | 0 | 21 |  | 4 | 22 |  | 8 |  | 2 | 1 | 13 |  | 7 | 116 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 4 |  | 3 | 0 | 4 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 4 |  | 1 | 0 | 3 |  | 0 | 26 | 0 |
| Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Kimley»)Horn

## APPENDIX B. EXISTING CONDITIONS SYNCHRO OUTPUT SHEETS

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 种 | 7 | \% | 中 ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 | F |  | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 28 | 529 | 314 | 63 | 514 | 65 | 541 | 24 | 88 | 27 | 23 | 12 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 28 | 529 | 314 | 63 | 514 | 65 | 541 | 24 | 88 | 27 | 23 | 12 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 29 | 545 | 0 | 65 | 530 | 67 | 576 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 24 | 12 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap, veh/h | 48 | 2088 |  | 84 | 1922 | 242 | 625 | 0 |  | 53 | 46 | 83 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.03 | 0.58 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1795 | 3582 | 1598 | 1795 | 3187 | 401 | 3591 | 0 | 1598 | 996 | 854 | 1551 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 29 | 545 | 0 | 65 | 297 | 300 | 576 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 0 | 12 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/n | 1795 | 1791 | 1598 | 1795 | 1791 | 1797 | 1795 | 0 | 1598 | 1850 | 0 | 1551 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 1.8 | 8.4 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 8.8 | 8.9 | 17.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 0.8 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 1.8 | 8.4 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 8.8 | 8.9 | 17.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 0.8 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.22 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.54 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap (c), veh/h | 48 | 2088 |  | 84 | 1080 | 1084 | 625 | 0 |  | 99 | 0 | 83 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.61 | 0.26 |  | 0.78 | 0.27 | 0.28 | 0.92 | 0.00 |  | 0.53 | 0.00 | 0.14 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 88 | 2088 |  | 88 | 1080 | 1084 | 625 | 0 |  | 372 | 0 | 312 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.80 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 53.9 | 11.5 | 0.0 | 52.8 | 10.6 | 10.6 | 45.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 51.6 | 0.0 | 50.6 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 4.6 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 29.2 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 15.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/In | 0.9 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 3.6 | 3.7 | 9.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 58.5 | 11.8 | 0.0 | 82.0 | 11.2 | 11.2 | 61.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 53.2 | 0.0 | 50.9 |
| LnGrp LOS | E | B |  | F | B | B | E | A |  | D | A | D |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 574 | A |  | 662 |  |  | 576 | A |  | 64 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 14.1 |  |  | 18.1 |  |  | 61.4 |  |  | 52.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | E |  |  | D |  |


| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s | 9.2 | 69.3 | 10.0 | 7.0 | 71.5 | 23.5 |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 5.5 | 48.5 | 22.5 | 5.5 | 48.5 | 19.5 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+\|1), s | 6.0 | 10.4 | 5.1 | 3.8 | 10.9 | 19.7 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.0 | 4.4 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 4.4 | 0.0 |

Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 31.4 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | C |

Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.
Unsignalized Delay for [NBR, EBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | \％ | 7 |  | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | 1 |  | $\frac{1}{*}$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 个4 | F | \％ | 中 ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |  |  | 4 | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 6 | 643 | 354 | 313 | 588 | 6 | 230 | 2 | 936 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 6 | 643 | 354 | 313 | 588 | 6 | 230 | 2 | 936 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.86 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／n | 1900 | 1900 | 1737 | 1870 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1856 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 6 | 670 | 0 | 326 | 612 | 6 | 240 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 0 | 0 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap，veh／h | 11 | 1981 |  | 344 | 2696 | 26 | 262 | 2 |  | 9 | 0 | 17 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.01 | 0.55 | 0.00 | 0.39 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.02 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1810 | 3610 | 1472 | 1781 | 3663 | 36 | 1781 | 15 | 1572 | 495 | 0 | 990 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 6 | 670 | 0 | 326 | 302 | 316 | 242 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／n | 1810 | 1805 | 1472 | 1781 | 1805 | 1894 | 1796 | 0 | 1572 | 1485 | 0 | 0 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 0.5 | 15.4 | 0.0 | 26.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 19.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 0.5 | 15.4 | 0.0 | 26.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 19.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.02 | 0.99 |  | 1.00 | 0.33 |  | 0.67 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 11 | 1981 |  | 344 | 1328 | 1394 | 264 | 0 |  | 26 | 0 | 0 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.56 | 0.34 |  | 0.95 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.92 | 0.00 |  | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 48 | 1981 |  | 487 | 1328 | 1394 | 281 | 0 |  | 218 | 0 | 0 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（I） | 0.77 | 0.77 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.54 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 74.4 | 18.7 | 0.0 | 45.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 63.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 72.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 12.6 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 20.1 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 19.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 0.3 | 6.5 | 0.0 | 11.9 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 10.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 86.9 | 19.1 | 0.0 | 65.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 82.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 74.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | F | B |  | E | A | A | F | A |  | E | A | A |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 676 | A |  | 944 |  |  | 242 | A |  | 3 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 19.7 |  |  | 22.8 |  |  | 82.6 |  |  | 74.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | F |  |  | E |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 32.0 | 86.3 | 6.1 | 3.9 | 114.4 | 25.6 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 41.0 | 49.5 | 22.0 | 4.0 | 86.5 | 23.5 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋｜1），s | 28.6 | 17.4 | 2.3 | 2.5 | 2.0 | 21.9 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.4 | 7.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.3 | 0.2 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 29.5 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | C |

Notes
Unsignalized Delay for［NBR，EBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 中4 | P＇ | \％ | 紡 |  | \％ | 4 | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{F}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 155 | 832 | 593 | 4 | 1075 | 27 | 391 | 84 | 35 | 65 | 82 | 51 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 155 | 832 | 593 | 4 | 1075 | 27 | 391 | 84 | 35 | 65 | 82 | 51 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1870 | 1856 | 1841 | 1900 | 1841 | 1841 | 1811 | 1870 | 1856 | 1870 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 161 | 867 | 0 | 4 | 1120 | 28 | 470 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 85 | 53 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 2 | ， | 4 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap，veh／h | 101 | 2198 |  | 9 | 1992 | 50 | 539 | 0 |  | 169 | 104 | 65 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.06 | 0.62 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.57 | 0.57 | 0.16 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1781 | 3526 | 1560 | 1810 | 3483 | 87 | 3450 | 0 | 1572 | 1781 | 1090 | 680 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 161 | 867 | 0 | 4 | 562 | 586 | 470 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 0 | 138 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／n | 1781 | 1763 | 1560 | 1810 | 1749 | 1821 | 1725 | 0 | 1572 | 1781 | 0 | 1770 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 8.5 | 18.4 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 30.4 | 30.4 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.4 | 0.0 | 11.5 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 8.5 | 18.4 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 30.4 | 30.4 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.4 | 0.0 | 11.5 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.05 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.38 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 101 | 2198 |  | 9 | 1000 | 1042 | 539 | 0 |  | 169 | 0 | 168 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 1.60 | 0.39 |  | 0.43 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.87 | 0.00 |  | 0.40 | 0.00 | 0.82 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 101 | 2198 |  | 62 | 1000 | 1042 | 793 | 0 |  | 338 | 0 | 336 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 70.7 | 14.1 | 0.0 | 74.4 | 20.2 | 20.2 | 61.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 63.9 | 0.0 | 66.6 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 309.2 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 28.7 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 7.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 9.4 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 12.6 | 7.5 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 12.8 | 13.3 | 9.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 5.7 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 379.9 | 14.6 | 0.0 | 103.1 | 22.5 | 22.4 | 69.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 65.4 | 0.0 | 76.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | F | B |  | F | C | C | E | A |  | E | A | E |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 1028 | A |  | 1152 |  |  | 470 | A |  | 206 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 71.8 |  |  | 22.8 |  |  | 69.1 |  |  | 72.5 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | C |  |  | E |  |  | E |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration $(G+Y+R c)$ ，s | 5.3 | 98.0 | 27.9 | 13.0 | 90.3 | 18.8 |
| Change Period $(\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc})$ ，s | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 5.1 | 63.9 | 34.5 | 8.5 | 60.5 | 28.5 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 2.3 | 20.4 | 22.0 | 10.5 | 32.4 | 13.5 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.0 | 7.6 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 8.6 | 0.8 |

Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 51.6 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | $D$ |

Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement．
Unsignalized Delay for［NBR，EBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．


Notes

* HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier.

Unsignalized Delay for [SBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.

| $\rightarrow$ | 7 | 7 |  | 4 | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations 中 | 「 | ${ }^{4}$ | 中 | 年植 |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） 224 | 264 | 42 | 296 | 412 | 34 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） 224 | 264 | 42 | 296 | 412 | 34 |
| Initial Q $(Q b)$ ，veh 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus，Adj 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach No |  |  | No | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h 238 | 281 | 45 | 315 | 472 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Cap，veh／h 606 | 498 | 57 | 912 | 892 | 400 |
| Arrive On Green 0.32 | 0.32 | 0.03 | 0.48 | 0.25 | 0.00 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h 1885 | 1549 | 1810 | 1900 | 3591 | 1610 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h 238 | 281 | 45 | 315 | 472 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln1885 | 1549 | 1810 | 1900 | 1795 | 1610 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s 2.7 | 4.2 | 0.7 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s 2.7 | 4.2 | 0.7 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h 606 | 498 | 57 | 912 | 892 | 400 |
| V／C Ratio（X） 0.39 | 0.56 | 0.78 | 0.35 | 0.53 | 0.00 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h 2047 | 1681 | 1965 | 2063 | 3898 | 1748 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l）$\quad 1.00$ | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh 7.3 | 7.8 | 13.3 | 4.5 | 9.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh 0.4 | 1.0 | 20.4 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（ $50 \%$ ），veh／110．8 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 0.0 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh 7.7 | 8.8 | 33.7 | 4.7 | 9.5 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS A | A | C | A | A | A |
| Approach Vol，veh／h 519 |  |  | 360 | 472 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh 8.3 |  |  | 8.3 | 9.5 |  |
| Approach LOS A |  |  | A | A |  |
| Timer－Assigned Phs 1 | 2 |  | 4 |  | 6 |
| Phs Duration（ $G+Y+R \mathrm{c}$ ），s4．4 | 12.9 |  | 10.4 |  | 17.3 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s 3.5 | 4.0 |  | 3.5 |  | 4.0 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax）．，\＄ | 30.0 |  | 30.0 |  | 30.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋1退，\％ | 6.2 |  | 5.1 |  | 4.9 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s 0.1 | 2.5 |  | 1.7 |  | 1.8 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 8．7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS |  | A |  |  |  |

Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement．





| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 10.9 |
| Intersection LOS | B |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | 4 | 「' |  | ¢ |  |  | * |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 6 | 92 | 0 | 5 | 26 | 332 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 247 | 0 | 4 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 6 | 92 | 0 | 5 | 26 | 332 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 247 | 0 | 4 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Mvmt Flow | 6 | 96 | 0 | 5 | 27 | 346 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 257 | 0 | 4 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |  | NB |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |  | SB |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |  | EB |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |  | WB |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 9.2 |  |  | 11 |  |  |  | 8.3 |  | 11.5 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  |  | B |  |  |  | A |  | B |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $0 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $98 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $12 \%$ | $94 \%$ | $84 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $88 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 8 | 98 | 31 | 332 | 251 |
| LT Vol | 0 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 247 |
| Through Vol | 1 | 92 | 26 | 0 | 0 |
| RT Vol | 7 | 0 | 0 | 332 | 4 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 8 | 102 | 32 | 346 | 261 |
| Geometry Grp | 2 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 2 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.012 | 0.148 | 0.049 | 0.449 | 0.378 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 5.219 | 5.212 | 5.464 | 4.677 | 5.21 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 690 | 682 | 653 | 764 | 685 |
| Service Time | 3.219 | 3.291 | 3.22 | 2.433 | 3.282 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.012 | 0.15 | 0.049 | 0.453 | 0.381 |
| HCM Control Delay | 8.3 | 9.2 | 8.5 | 11.2 | 11.5 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | A | B | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 2.3 | 1.8 |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SB | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{*}$ | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | ${ }^{4}$ | 中t |  | \％ | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\dagger$ |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 1 | 339 | 372 | 135 | 543 | 5 | 608 | 5 | 86 | 0 | 9 | 3 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 1 | 339 | 372 | 135 | 543 | 5 | 608 | 5 | 86 | 0 | 9 | 3 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 | 1.00 |  | 0.92 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1700 | 1687 | 1687 | 1634 | 1687 | 1687 | 1856 | 1900 | 1856 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 1 | 365 | 400 | 145 | 584 | 5 | 658 | 0 | 92 | 0 | 10 | 3 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 0 |  | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap，veh／h | 2 | 597 | 517 | 178 | 1582 | 14 | 874 | 0 | 380 | 0 | 22 | 7 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.00 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.11 | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.02 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1619 | 1602 | 1386 | 1556 | 3255 | 28 | 3534 | 0 | 1536 | 0 | 1370 | 411 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 1 | 365 | 400 | 145 | 287 | 302 | 658 | 0 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／n1 | 1619 | 1602 | 1386 | 1556 | 1602 | 1681 | 1767 | 0 | 1536 | 0 | 0 | 1781 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 0.0 | 13.7 | 18.9 | 6.7 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 12.8 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 0.0 | 13.7 | 18.9 | 6.7 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 12.8 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.02 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.00 |  | 0.23 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 2 | 597 | 517 | 178 | 779 | 817 | 874 | 0 | 380 | － | 0 | 28 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.46 | 0.61 | 0.77 | 0.82 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.75 | 0.00 | 0.24 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.46 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 699 | 692 | 599 | 672 | 779 | 817 | 1908 | 0 | 830 | 0 | 0 | 481 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（I） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 37.0 | 18.9 | 20.5 | 32.0 | 11.9 | 11.9 | 25.8 | 0.0 | 22.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 36.1 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 46.8 | 3.7 | 9.4 | 3.4 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 13.5 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（ $50 \%$ ），veh／／10．0 |  | 5.2 | 6.9 | 2.6 | 2.8 | 3.0 | 5.3 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh LnGrp LOS | 83.7 | 22.6 | 29.9 | 35.5 | 13.0 | 12.9 | 27.1 | 0.0 | 22.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 49.6 |
|  | F | C | C | D | B | B | C | A | C | A | A | D |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 766 |  |  | 734 |  |  | 750 |  |  | 13 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 26.5 |  |  | 17.4 |  |  | 26.6 |  |  | 49.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | D |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 23.7 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | C |

Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement．


Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.
Unsignalized Delay for [NBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | F |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 浐 |  | \％ | 中蚛 | F |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 217 | 37 | 18 | 22 | 80 | 168 | 37 | 663 | 21 | 128 | 672 | 335 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 217 | 37 | 18 | 22 | 80 | 168 | 37 | 663 | 21 | 128 | 672 | 335 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 0.93 | 1.00 |  | 0.93 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 228 | 39 | 19 | 23 | 84 | 177 | 39 | 698 | 22 | 135 | 707 | 353 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Cap，veh／h | 553 | 185 | 90 | 63 | 229 | 232 | 53 | 1904 | 60 | 179 | 2277 | 691 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.03 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.10 | 0.44 | 0.44 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 3483 | 1165 | 568 | 404 | 1476 | 1496 | 1795 | 5118 | 161 | 1795 | 5147 | 1563 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 228 | 0 | 58 | 107 | 0 | 177 | 39 | 467 | 253 | 135 | 707 | 353 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／n | 1742 | 0 | 1733 | 1880 | 0 | 1496 | 1795 | 1716 | 1848 | 1795 | 1716 | 1563 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 4.6 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 8.8 | 1.7 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 5.7 | 6.9 | 12.6 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 4.6 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 8.8 | 1.7 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 5.7 | 6.9 | 12.6 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.33 | 0.21 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.09 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 553 | 0 | 275 | 292 | 0 | 232 | 53 | 1277 | 688 | 179 | 2277 | 691 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.41 | 0.00 | 0.21 | 0.37 | 0.00 | 0.76 | 0.74 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.75 | 0.31 | 0.51 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 945 | 0 | 470 | 510 | 0 | 406 | 371 | 2012 | 1084 | 603 | 3018 | 917 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 29.3 | 0.0 | 28.3 | 29.3 | 0.0 | 31.3 | 37.3 | 17.7 | 17.7 | 33.9 | 14.0 | 15.5 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 1.8 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 7.2 | 24.8 | 0.8 | 1.5 | 8.8 | 0.4 | 2.7 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 2.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 1.1 | 3.0 | 3.3 | 2.8 | 2.5 | 4.6 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 31.1 | 0.0 | 29.7 | 30.4 | 0.0 | 38.5 | 62.1 | 18.5 | 19.2 | 42.7 | 14.3 | 18.2 |
| LnGrp LOS | C | A | C | C | A | D | E | B | B | D | B | B |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 286 |  |  | 284 |  |  | 759 |  |  | 1195 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 30.8 |  |  | 35.4 |  |  | 21.0 |  |  | 18.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 6.3 | 38.8 | 16.0 | 11.7 | 33.4 | 16.3 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 4.0 | 4.6 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.6 | 4.0 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 16.0 | 45.4 | 21.0 | 26.0 | 45.4 | 21.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 3.7 | 14.6 | 10.8 | 7.7 | 9.7 | 6.6 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.1 | 19.6 | 1.3 | 0.5 | 15.5 | 2.5 |

Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 22.6 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | C |

Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green．

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SB | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | * ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ |  | 7 | * 1 |  |  | 蚛t |  | ${ }^{17}$ | 4 | ${ }^{7}$ |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 191 | 123 | 44 | 124 | 240 | 110 | 49 | 448 | 36 | 110 | 413 | 60 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 191 | 123 | 44 | 124 | 240 | 110 | 49 | 448 | 36 | 110 | 413 | 60 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/n | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 123 | 231 | 45 | 128 | 247 | 113 | 51 | 462 | 37 | 113 | 426 | 62 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Cap, veh/h | 331 | 564 | 107 | 381 | 521 | 229 | 66 | 1321 | 104 | 266 | 1117 | 484 |
| rrive On Green | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.04 | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.0 | 0.31 | 0.31 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1795 | 3056 | 582 | 1810 | 2472 | 1087 | 1795 | 4848 | 383 | 3483 | 3582 | 1552 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 123 | 140 | 136 | 128 | 188 | 172 | 51 | 325 | 174 | 113 | 426 | 62 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/n1 | 1795 | 1885 | 1753 | 1810 | 1900 | 1659 | 1795 | 1716 | 1800 | 1742 | 1791 | 1552 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 4.2 | 4.6 | 4.8 | 4.2 | 6.0 | 6.4 | 2.0 | 5.3 | 5.4 | 2.2 | 6.5 | 2.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 4.2 | 4.6 | 4.8 | 4.2 | 6.0 | 6.4 | 2.0 | 5.3 | 5.4 | 2.2 | 6.5 | 2.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.33 | 1.00 |  | 0.66 | 1.00 |  | 0.21 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 331 | 348 | 323 | 381 | 400 | 350 | 66 | 935 | 490 | 266 | 1117 | 484 |
| VIC Ratio(X) | 0.37 | 0.40 | 0.42 | 0.34 | 0.47 | 0.49 | 0.77 | 0.35 | 0.35 | 0.42 | 0.38 | 0.13 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 655 | 688 | 640 | 660 | 693 | 605 | 671 | 2238 | 1174 | 1301 | 2337 | 1012 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 24.8 | 25.0 | 25.1 | 23.3 | 24.0 | 24.2 | 33.2 | 20.4 | 20.4 | 30.7 | 18.7 | 17.2 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 1.0 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 0.7 | 1.2 | 1.5 | 22.7 | 0.8 | 1.6 | 1.5 | 0.8 | 0.4 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/In. 8 |  | 2.1 | 2.0 | 1.8 | 2.8 | 2.6 | 1.2 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 0.9 | 2.6 | 0.7 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh 25LnGrp LOS |  | 26.1 | 26.3 | 24.1 | 25.3 | 25.7 | 55.9 | 21.2 | 22.0 | 32.2 | 19.5 | 17.6 |
|  |  | C | C | C | C | C | E | C | C | C | B | B |
| LnGrp LOS |  | 399 |  |  | 488 |  |  | 550 |  |  | 601 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 26.1 |  |  | 25.1 |  |  | 24.6 |  |  | 21.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |


| Timer - Assigned Phs 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s9.3 | 23.6 | 19.3 | 6.6 | 26.3 | 17.4 |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s 4.0 | 4.6 | 4.6 | 4.0 | 4.6 | 4.6 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmaz¢., $¢$ | 45.4 | 25.4 | 26.0 | 45.4 | 25.4 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+\|14,2s | 7.4 | 8.4 | 4.0 | 8.5 | 6.8 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s 0.5 | 8.6 | 3.4 | 0.1 | 8.2 | 2.7 |

Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 24.2 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | C |

Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.

Synchro 9 Report


| Movement EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations ${ }^{\text {\％}}$ | 中 4 | 「 | ${ }^{4}$ | 性 |  | 9 | 4 | F＇ | \％ | F |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 284 | 138 | 40 | 491 | 106 | 183 | 256 | 48 | 74 | 179 | 30 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 284 | 138 | 40 | 491 | 106 | 183 | 256 | 48 | 74 | 179 | 30 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 |
| Parking Bus，Adj 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 305 | 148 | 43 | 528 | 114 | 197 | 275 | 52 | 80 | 192 | 32 |
| Peak Hour Factor 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Cap，veh／h 19 | 948 | 406 | 79 | 869 | 187 | 258 | 560 | 464 | 116 | 313 | 52 |
| Arrive On Green 0.01 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.04 | 0.30 | 0.30 | 0.14 | 0.30 | 0.30 | 0.06 | 0.20 | 0.20 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h 1795 | 3582 | 1534 | 1795 | 2916 | 626 | 1795 | 1885 | 1560 | 1795 | 1568 | 261 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 305 | 148 | 43 | 323 | 319 | 197 | 275 | 52 | 80 | 0 | 224 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln1795 | 1791 | 1534 | 1795 | 1791 | 1751 | 1795 | 1885 | 1560 | 1795 | 0 | 1830 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s 0.2 | 3.7 | 2.4 | 1.3 | 8.4 | 8.5 | 5.8 | 6.5 | 1.3 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 6.1 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s 0.2 | 3.7 | 2.4 | 1.3 | 8.4 | 8.5 | 5.8 | 6.5 | 1.3 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 6.1 |
| Prop In Lane 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.36 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.14 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h 19 | 948 | 406 | 79 | 534 | 522 | 258 | 560 | 464 | 116 | 0 | 365 |
| V／C Ratio（X） 0.43 | 0.32 | 0.36 | 0.55 | 0.61 | 0.61 | 0.76 | 0.49 | 0.11 | 0.69 | 0.00 | 0.61 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h 856 | 2954 | 1265 | 856 | 1477 | 1444 | 856 | 1037 | 858 | 856 | 0 | 1006 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh 26.8 | 16.1 | 5.0 | 25.6 | 16.4 | 16.4 | 22.5 | 15.8 | 13.9 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 19.9 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh 14.5 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 5.8 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.8 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 8.6 | 0.0 | 2.0 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／／10． 2 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 0.6 | 3.3 | 3.2 | 2.4 | 2.6 | 0.4 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 2.6 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh 41.4 | 16.4 | 5.7 | 31.3 | 17.7 | 17.8 | 24.2 | 16.0 | 14.0 | 33.6 | 0.0 | 21.9 |
| LnGrp LOS | B | A | C | B | B | C | B | B | C | A | C |
| Approach Vol，veh／h | 461 |  |  | 685 |  |  | 524 |  |  | 304 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh | 13.4 |  |  | 18.6 |  |  | 18.9 |  |  | 25.0 |  |
| Approach LOS | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phs Duration（ $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ），s4．6 | 21.3 | 7.5 | 21.2 | 6.4 | 19.4 | 12.8 | 15.9 |
| Change Period（ $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ），s 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | ＊5 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmadt．， C | 45.0 | 26.0 | 30.0 | 26.0 | 45.0 | 26.0 | ＊ 30 |
| Max Q Clear Time（ g c $\mathrm{C} \mid 12, \mathrm{~L}_{5}$ | 10.5 | 4.4 | 8.5 | 3.3 | 5.7 | 7.8 | 8.1 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s 0.0 | 5.5 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 3.2 | 0.1 | 1.6 |

Intersection Summary
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 18.5
HCM 6th LOS B
Notes
＊HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier．

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SB | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{4}$ | 中 ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |  | \% | 中t |  | \% | F |  | ${ }^{4}$ | F |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 31 | 250 | 88 | 52 | 392 | 48 | 146 | 355 | 47 | 66 | 236 | 57 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 31 | 250 | 88 | 52 | 392 | 48 | 146 | 355 | 47 | 66 | 236 | 57 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 0.94 | 1.00 |  | 0.94 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 33 | 263 | 93 | 55 | 413 | 51 | 154 | 374 | 49 | 69 | 248 | 60 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap, veh/h | 53 | 616 | 211 | 76 | 804 | 98 | 205 | 537 | 70 | 90 | 387 | 94 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.03 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.04 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.11 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.05 | 0.26 | 0.26 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1810 | 2596 | 888 | 1810 | 3212 | 393 | 1810 | 1640 | 215 | 1810 | 1469 | 355 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 33 | 180 | 176 | 55 | 231 | 233 | 154 | 0 | 423 | 69 | 0 | 308 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/n1 | 1810 | 1805 | 1679 | 1810 | 1805 | 1801 | 1810 | 0 | 1855 | 1810 | 0 | 1824 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.9 | 4.4 | 4.7 | 1.6 | 5.8 | 5.9 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 10.4 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 7.8 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 0.9 | 4.4 | 4.7 | 1.6 | 5.8 | 5.9 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 10.4 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 7.8 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.53 | 1.00 |  | 0.22 | 1.00 |  | 0.12 | 1.00 |  | 0.19 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 53 | 428 | 398 | 76 | 452 | 451 | 205 | 0 | 608 | 90 | 0 | 481 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.63 | 0.42 | 0.44 | 0.72 | 0.51 | 0.52 | 0.75 | 0.00 | 0.70 | 0.77 | 0.00 | 0.64 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 708 | 1223 | 1137 | 708 | 1223 | 1220 | 708 | 0 | 902 | 708 | 0 | 887 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 25.2 | 16.9 | 17.0 | 24.8 | 16.9 | 16.9 | 22.5 | 0.0 | 15.3 | 24.6 | 0.0 | 17.1 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 8.7 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 9.2 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 5.4 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 13.0 | 0.0 | 1.7 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ( $50 \%$ ),veh/110.5 |  | 1.7 | 1.6 | 0.8 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 3.1 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh LnGrp LOS | 33.9 | 17.2 | 17.3 | 34.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 | 28.0 | 0.0 | 16.4 | 37.6 | 0.0 | 18.8 |
|  | C | B | B | C | B | B | C | A | B | D | A | B |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 389 |  |  | 519 |  |  | 577 |  |  | 377 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 18.7 |  |  | 19.7 |  |  | 19.5 |  |  | 22.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |


| Timer - Assigned Phs | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s6.7 | 16.9 | 7.1 | 21.7 | 6.0 | 17.6 | 10.4 | 18.3 |
| Change Period ( $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmaz),5 | 35.5 | 20.5 | 25.5 | 20.5 | 35.5 | 20.5 | 25.5 |
|  | 6.7 | 4.0 | 12.4 | 2.9 | 7.9 | 6.3 | 9.8 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s 0.1 | 1.4 | 0.1 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 3.5 | 0.3 | 1.9 |

Intersection Summary
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 19.9

HCM 6th LOS B
Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.

| Movement EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 中 ${ }^{\text {P }}$ |  | \% | F |  | ${ }^{7}$ | F |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) 13 | 256 | 54 | 63 | 418 | 119 | 42 | 117 | 53 | 66 | 87 | 42 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) 13 | 256 | 54 | 63 | 418 | 119 | 42 | 117 | 53 | 66 | 87 | 42 |
| Initial Q $(Q b)$, veh 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) 1.00 |  | 0.91 | 1.00 |  | 0.92 | 1.00 |  | 0.94 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 |
| Parking Bus, Adj 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h 14 | 269 | 57 | 66 | 440 | 125 | 44 | 123 | 56 | 69 | 92 | 44 |
| Peak Hour Factor 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap, veh/h 26 | 926 | 191 | 89 | 958 | 269 | 67 | 287 | 131 | 92 | 303 | 145 |
| Arrive On Green 0.01 | 0.32 | 0.32 | 0.05 | 0.35 | 0.35 | 0.04 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.05 | 0.25 | 0.25 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h 1810 | 2920 | 603 | 1810 | 2722 | 763 | 1795 | 1200 | 546 | 1810 | 1199 | 574 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h 14 | 164 | 162 | 66 | 290 | 275 | 44 | 0 | 179 | 69 | 0 | 136 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln1810 | 1805 | 1718 | 1810 | 1805 | 1679 | 1795 | 0 | 1747 | 1810 | 0 | 1773 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s 0.4 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 1.7 | 5.8 | 5.9 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 2.9 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s 0.4 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 1.7 | 5.8 | 5.9 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 2.9 |
| Prop In Lane 1.00 |  | 0.35 | 1.00 |  | 0.45 | 1.00 |  | 0.31 | 1.00 |  | 0.32 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h 26 | 572 | 545 | 89 | 636 | 591 | 67 | 0 | 418 | 92 | 0 | 448 |
| V/C Ratio(X) 0.54 | 0.29 | 0.30 | 0.74 | 0.46 | 0.47 | 0.66 | 0.00 | 0.43 | 0.75 | 0.00 | 0.30 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h 622 | 1783 | 1697 | 622 | 1783 | 1659 | 810 | 0 | 600 | 816 | 0 | 609 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) $\quad 1.00$ | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh 22.8 | 11.9 | 12.0 | 21.8 | 11.6 | 11.7 | 22.1 | 0.0 | 15.0 | 21.8 | 0.0 | 14.1 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh 16.7 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 11.3 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 10.4 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 11.6 | 0.0 | 0.4 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/1r0.3 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 2.0 | 1.9 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.1 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh 39.5 | 12.2 | 12.3 | 33.1 | 12.2 | 12.3 | 32.6 | 0.0 | 15.7 | 33.4 | 0.0 | 14.5 |
| LnGrp LOS D | B | B | C | B | B | C | A | B | C | A | B |
| Approach Vol, veh/h | 340 |  |  | 631 |  |  | 223 |  |  | 205 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 13.4 |  |  | 14.4 |  |  | 19.0 |  |  | 20.8 |  |
| Approach LOS | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s6.4 | 15.1 | 6.3 | 18.8 | 5.7 | 15.8 | 4.7 | 20.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmaz),. | 16.0 | 16.0 | 46.0 | 21.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 46.0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 6.0 | 3.7 | 5.3 | 3.1 | 4.9 | 2.4 | 7.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 2.1 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 15.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS |  | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NB | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 中 ${ }^{\text {P }}$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | ${ }_{*}$ | F' |  | $\uparrow$ | 7 |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 14 | 353 | 73 | 84 | 405 | 11 | 118 | 3 | 89 | 19 | 3 | 36 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 14 | 353 | 73 | 84 | 405 | 11 | 118 | 3 | 89 | 19 | 3 | 36 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | . 00 |
| Work Zone On Approac |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 14 | 364 | 75 | 87 | 418 | 11 | 122 | 3 | 92 | 20 | 3 | 37 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap, veh/h | 26 | 687 | 139 | 115 | 556 | 450 | 149 | 2 | 651 | 141 | 12 | 672 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.01 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.06 | 0.29 | 0.29 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1810 | 2956 | 600 | 1810 | 1900 | 1540 | 0 | 5 | 1553 | 0 | 29 | 1603 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 14 | 220 | 219 | 87 | 418 | 11 | 125 | 0 | 92 | 23 | 0 | 37 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/lı | 1810 | 1805 | 1751 | 1810 | 1900 | 1540 | 5 | 0 | 1553 | 29 | 0 | 1603 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.4 | 5.1 | 5.2 | 2.3 | 9.5 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 0.4 | 5.1 | 5.2 | 2.3 | 9.5 | 0.2 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.34 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.98 |  | 1.00 | 0.87 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 26 | 419 | 407 | 115 | 556 | 450 | 151 | 0 | 651 | 153 | 0 | 672 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.54 | 0.52 | 0.54 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 0.02 | 0.83 | 0.00 | 0.14 | 0.15 | 0.00 | 0.06 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 986 | 1698 | 1647 | 967 | 1787 | 1448 | 151 | 0 | 651 | 153 | 0 | 672 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(I) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
|  |  | 16.0 | 16.1 | 22.0 | 15.3 | 12.0 | 23.6 | 0.0 | 8.6 | 13.6 | 0.0 | 8.2 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh 23.4 Incr Delay (d2), s/veh 16.8 |  | 0.4 | 0.4 | 9.5 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 28.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh 0.0 \%ile BackOfQ(50\%), veh//10. 3 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.2 | 3.7 | 0.1 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay (d),s/veh | 40.1 | 16.4 | 16.5 | 31.5 | 16.1 | 12.0 | 52.2 | 0.0 | 8.6 | 13.7 | 0.0 | 8.3 |
| LnGrp LOS | D | B | B | C | B | B | D | A | A | B | A | A |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 453 |  |  | 516 |  |  | 217 |  |  | 60 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 17.2 |  |  | 18.6 |  |  | 33.7 |  |  | 10.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |


| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s7.5 | 16.2 | 24.0 | 4.7 | 19.1 | 24.0 |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s 4.5 | 5.1 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.1 | 4.0 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmaž5,.s | 44.9 | 20.0 | 26.0 | 44.9 | 20.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+\|14,3s | 7.2 | 22.0 | 2.4 | 11.5 | 22.0 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s 0.2 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 0.0 |

Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 20.3 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | C |

Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.

| Movement EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | F |  | ${ }^{4}$ | F |  | ${ }^{7}$ | F |  | ${ }^{7}$ | p |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) 28 | 122 | 92 | 94 | 176 | 37 | 91 | 461 | 79 | 26 | 300 | 39 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) 28 | 122 | 92 | 94 | 176 | 37 | 91 | 461 | 79 | 26 | 300 | 39 |
| Initial Q $(Q b)$, veh 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) 1.00 |  | 0.92 | 1.00 |  | 0.94 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 |
| Parking Bus, Adj 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h 29 | 127 | 96 | 98 | 183 | 39 | 95 | 480 | 82 | 27 | 312 | 41 |
| Peak Hour Factor 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap, veh/h 57 | 213 | 161 | 131 | 395 | 84 | 127 | 603 | 103 | 55 | 568 | 75 |
| Arrive On Green 0.03 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.07 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.07 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.03 | 0.35 | 0.35 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h 1795 | 956 | 723 | 1810 | 1498 | 319 | 1795 | 1556 | 266 | 1810 | 1635 | 215 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h 29 | 0 | 223 | 98 | 0 | 222 | 95 | 0 | 562 | 27 | 0 | 353 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln1795 | 0 | 1679 | 1810 | 0 | 1817 | 1795 | 0 | 1822 | 1810 | 0 | 1850 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s 0.9 | 0.0 | 7.1 | 3.2 | 0.0 | 6.1 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 16.2 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 9.1 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s 0.9 | 0.0 | 7.1 | 3.2 | 0.0 | 6.1 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 16.2 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 9.1 |
| Prop In Lane 1.00 |  | 0.43 | 1.00 |  | 0.18 | 1.00 |  | 0.15 | 1.00 |  | 0.12 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h 57 | 0 | 375 | 131 | 0 | 479 | 127 | 0 | 706 | 55 | 0 | 643 |
| V/C Ratio(X) 0.50 | 0.00 | 0.60 | 0.75 | 0.00 | 0.46 | 0.75 | 0.00 | 0.80 | 0.49 | 0.00 | 0.55 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h 802 | 0 | 991 | 808 | 0 | 1072 | 802 | 0 | 1075 | 808 | 0 | 1091 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(I) $\quad 1.00$ | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh 28.3 | 0.0 | 20.7 | 27.0 | 0.0 | 18.3 | 27.1 | 0.0 | 16.1 | 28.3 | 0.0 | 15.6 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh 6.7 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 8.1 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 8.6 | 0.0 | 3.3 | 6.7 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/10.5 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 6.5 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 3.6 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh 34.9 | 0.0 | 22.2 | 35.1 | 0.0 | 19.0 | 35.6 | 0.0 | 19.3 | 35.0 | 0.0 | 16.7 |
| LnGrp LOS C | A | C | D | A | B | D | A | B | D | A | B |
| Approach Vol, veh/h | 252 |  |  | 320 |  |  | 657 |  |  | 380 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 23.6 |  |  | 24.0 |  |  | 21.7 |  |  | 18.0 |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |


| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s7.8 | 18.2 | 7.7 | 25.6 | 5.4 | 20.6 | 5.3 | 28.0 |  |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s 3.5 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 5.0 |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gma\&Q, 5 | 35.0 | 26.5 | 35.0 | 26.5 | 35.0 | 26.5 | 35.0 |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+\|155,2s | 9.1 | 5.1 | 11.1 | 2.9 | 8.1 | 2.9 | 18.2 |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.2 | 1.5 | 0.2 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 4.8 |

Intersection Summary
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 21.6
HCM 6th LOS


| Movement EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | $\uparrow$ | T' |  | 4 | ${ }^{7}$ |  | $\pm$ |  |  | ¢ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h 26 | 178 | 35 | 29 | 175 | 41 | 49 | 153 | 37 | 30 | 75 | 47 |
| Future Vol, veh/h 26 | 178 | 35 | 29 | 175 | 41 | 49 | 153 | 37 | 30 | 75 | 47 |
| Peak Hour Factor 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow 28 | 191 | 38 | 31 | 188 | 44 | 53 | 165 | 40 | 32 | 81 | 51 |
| Number of Lanes 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach RighNB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay 12.1 |  |  | 12 |  |  | 12.5 |  |  | 10.8 |  |  |
| HCM LOS B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  |



| Movement EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | 中 | T' | \% | + | ${ }^{1}$ | ${ }^{7}$ | p |  | ${ }^{7}$ | p |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) 76 | 149 | 105 | 25 | 338 | 105 | 110 | 57 | 12 | 107 | 66 | 95 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) 76 | 149 | 105 | 25 | 338 | 105 | 110 | 57 | 12 | 107 | 66 | 95 |
| Initial Q (Qb), veh 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.91 | 1.00 |  | 0.91 |
| Parking Bus, Adj 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h 84 | 166 | 0 | 28 | 376 | 0 | 122 | 63 | 13 | 119 | 73 | 106 |
| Peak Hour Factor 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Cap, veh/h 124 | 601 |  | 58 | 532 |  | 160 | 347 | 72 | 155 | 150 | 218 |
| Arrive On Green 0.07 | 0.32 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.28 | 0.00 | 0.09 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.09 | 0.23 | 0.23 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h 1795 | 1885 | 1598 | 1795 | 1885 | 1598 | 1810 | 1499 | 309 | 1795 | 655 | 951 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h 84 | 166 | 0 | 28 | 376 | 0 | 122 | 0 | 76 | 119 | 0 | 179 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln1795 | 1885 | 1598 | 1795 | 1885 | 1598 | 1810 | 0 | 1808 | 1795 | 0 | 1605 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s 2.3 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 8.9 | 0.0 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 3.2 | 0.0 | 4.8 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s 2.3 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 8.9 | 0.0 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 3.2 | 0.0 | 4.8 |
| Prop In Lane 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.17 | 1.00 |  | 0.59 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h 124 | 601 |  | 58 | 532 |  | 160 | 0 | 419 | 155 | 0 | 369 |
| V/C Ratio(X) 0.68 | 0.28 |  | 0.48 | 0.71 |  | 0.76 | 0.00 | 0.18 | 0.77 | 0.00 | 0.49 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h 576 | 1341 |  | 576 | 1341 |  | 580 | 0 | 761 | 576 | 0 | 676 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(I) 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh 22.7 | 12.7 | 0.0 | 23.7 | 16.1 | 0.0 | 22.2 | 0.0 | 15.4 | 22.3 | 0.0 | 16.7 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh 4.8 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 4.6 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/lı1. 1 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 1.6 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh 27.5 | 12.9 | 0.0 | 28.3 | 17.8 | 0.0 | 25.1 | 0.0 | 15.5 | 25.3 | 0.0 | 17.4 |
| LnGrp LOS C | B |  | C | B |  | C | A | B | C | A | B |
| Approach Vol, veh/h | 250 | A |  | 404 | A |  | 198 |  |  | 298 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 17.8 |  |  | 18.5 |  |  | 21.4 |  |  | 20.5 |  |
| Approach LOS | B |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |


| Timer - Assigned Phs 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s5.6 | 20.4 | 8.4 | 15.5 | 7.4 | 18.6 | 8.3 | 15.6 |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmakis, $\mathrm{S}_{\text {S }}$ | 35.5 | 16.0 | 21.0 | 16.0 | 35.5 | 16.0 | 21.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+\| $12, \infty$ | 5.3 | 5.3 | 6.8 | 4.3 | 10.9 | 5.2 | 3.7 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 2.3 | 0.1 | 0.2 |

Intersection Summary
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 19.4

```
HCM 6th LOS B
```

Notes
Unsignalized Delay for [EBR, WBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 中4 | 「 | 7 | 中 ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |  | \％ | $\uparrow$ | F |  | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 12 | 964 | 1085 | 72 | 408 | 35 | 485 | 19 | 31 | 53 | 31 | 25 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 12 | 964 | 1085 | 72 | 408 | 35 | 485 | 19 | 31 | 53 | 31 | 25 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 12 | 994 | 0 | 74 | 421 | 36 | 514 | 0 | 0 | 55 | 32 | 26 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap，veh／h | 25 | 2060 |  | 88 | 2032 | 173 | 577 | 0 |  | 84 | 49 | 113 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.01 | 0.58 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.61 | 0.61 | 0.16 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1795 | 3582 | 1598 | 1795 | 3331 | 283 | 3591 | 0 | 1598 | 1164 | 677 | 1562 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 12 | 994 | 0 | 74 | 225 | 232 | 514 | 0 | 0 | 87 | 0 | 26 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／n | 1795 | 1791 | 1598 | 1795 | 1791 | 1823 | 1795 | 0 | 1598 | 1842 | 0 | 1562 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 0.7 | 18.3 | 0.0 | 4.6 | 6.3 | 6.4 | 15.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.2 | 0.0 | 1.8 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 0.7 | 18.3 | 0.0 | 4.6 | 6.3 | 6.4 | 15.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.2 | 0.0 | 1.8 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.16 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.63 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 25 | 2060 |  | 88 | 1093 | 1112 | 577 | 0 |  | 133 | 0 | 113 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.48 | 0.48 |  | 0.84 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.89 | 0.00 |  | 0.65 | 0.00 | 0.23 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 88 | 2060 |  | 88 | 1093 | 1112 | 625 | 0 |  | 370 | 0 | 314 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.92 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 54.8 | 14.0 | 0.0 | 52.8 | 9.7 | 9.7 | 46.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.6 | 0.0 | 49.0 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 5.2 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 45.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 12.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／In | 0.4 | 7.5 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 7.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 0.7 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 60.0 | 14.8 | 0.0 | 98.1 | 10.2 | 10.2 | 58.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 52.6 | 0.0 | 49.4 |
| LnGrp LOS | E | B |  | F | B | B | E | A |  | D | A | D |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 1006 | A |  | 531 |  |  | 514 | A |  | 113 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 15.4 |  |  | 22.4 |  |  | 58.5 |  |  | 51.9 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | E |  |  | D |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 9.5 | 68.4 | 12.1 | 5.6 | 72.3 | 22.0 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 5.5 | 48.5 | 22.5 | 5.5 | 48.5 | 19.5 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋｜1），s | 6.6 | 20.3 | 7.2 | 2.7 | 8.4 | 17.7 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.0 | 8.7 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 0.3 |

Intersection Summary
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 29.2

HCM 6th LOS
C
Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement．
Unsignalized Delay for［NBR，EBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | 7 | - |  | 4 | $\dagger$ | 7 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 种 | F | \% | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | ${ }^{7}$ |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 8 | 726 | 442 | 388 | 639 | 2 | 198 | 1 | 684 | 5 | 5 | 9 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 8 | 726 | 442 | 388 | 639 | 2 | 198 | 1 | 684 | 5 | 5 | 9 |
| Initial $\mathrm{Q}(\mathrm{Qb})$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.87 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1900 | 1900 | 1737 | 1870 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1856 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 8 | 756 | 0 | 404 | 666 | 2 | 206 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 9 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 0 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 14 | 1857 |  | 419 | 2741 | 8 | 230 | 1 |  | 12 | 12 | 21 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.01 | 0.51 | 0.00 | 0.47 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1810 | 3610 | 1472 | 1781 | 3692 | 11 | 1787 | , | 1572 | 416 | 416 | 750 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 8 | 756 | 0 | 404 | 326 | 342 | 207 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/n | 1810 | 1805 | 1472 | 1781 | 1805 | 1898 | 1796 | 0 | 1572 | 1582 | 0 | 0 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.7 | 19.3 | 0.0 | 32.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 17.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 0.7 | 19.3 | 0.0 | 32.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 17.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.01 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.26 |  | 0.47 |
| Lane Grp Cap (c), veh/h | 14 | 1857 |  | 419 | 1340 | 1409 | 231 | 0 |  | 44 | 0 | 0 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.58 | 0.41 |  | 0.96 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.89 | 0.00 |  | 0.43 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 48 | 1857 |  | 487 | 1340 | 1409 | 281 | 0 |  | 232 | 0 | 0 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 0.65 | 0.65 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.68 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 74.2 | 22.4 | 0.0 | 39.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 64.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 71.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 9.2 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 28.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 17.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/In | 0.3 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 15.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 9.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 83.4 | 22.8 | 0.0 | 67.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 81.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 76.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | F | C |  | E | A | A | F | A |  | E | A | A |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 764 | A |  | 1072 |  |  | 207 | A |  | 19 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 23.4 |  |  | 25.7 |  |  | 81.3 |  |  | 76.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | F |  |  | E |  |


| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s | 38.3 | 81.2 | 7.7 | 4.1 | 115.4 | 22.8 |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 41.0 | 49.5 | 22.0 | 4.0 | 86.5 | 23.5 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+\|1), s | 34.9 | 21.3 | 3.8 | 2.7 | 2.0 | 19.0 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.4 | 7.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.9 | 0.3 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 30.9 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | C |

Notes
Unsignalized Delay for [NBR, EBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{*}$ | 中4 | F | \％ | 中t |  | \％ | $\uparrow$ | 「 | \％ | F |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 49 | 972 | 402 |  | 1042 | 13 | 483 | 14 | 48 | 114 | 145 | 92 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 49 | 972 | 402 | 3 | 1042 | 13 | 483 | 14 | 48 | 114 | 145 | 92 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1870 | 1856 | 1841 | 1900 | 1841 | 1841 | 1811 | 1870 | 1856 | 1870 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 51 | 1012 | 0 | 3 | 1085 | 14 | 514 | 0 | 0 | 119 | 151 | 96 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap，veh／h | 65 | 1942 |  | 7 | 1831 | 24 | 583 | 0 |  | 278 | 169 | 108 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.05 | 0.73 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.16 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1781 | 3526 | 1560 | 1810 | 3534 | 46 | 3450 | 0 | 1572 | 1781 | 1083 | 688 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 51 | 1012 | 0 | 3 | 537 | 562 | 514 | 0 | 0 | 119 | 0 | 247 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／n | 1781 | 1763 | 1560 | 1810 | 1749 | 1830 | 1725 | 0 | 1572 | 1781 | 0 | 1771 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 4.2 | 18.6 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 32.0 | 32.0 | 21.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.1 | 0.0 | 20.5 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 4.2 | 18.6 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 32.0 | 32.0 | 21.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.1 | 0.0 | 20.5 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.02 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.39 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 65 | 1942 |  | 7 | 906 | 948 | 583 | 0 |  | 278 | 0 | 277 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.78 | 0.52 |  | 0.42 | 0.59 | 0.59 | 0.88 | 0.00 |  | 0.43 | 0.00 | 0.89 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 101 | 1942 |  | 62 | 906 | 948 | 793 | 0 |  | 338 | 0 | 337 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.33 | 1.33 | 1.33 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 70.7 | 11.5 | 0.0 | 74.5 | 25.1 | 25.1 | 60.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 57.2 | 0.0 | 62.0 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 18.4 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 35.4 | 2.8 | 2.7 | 8.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 21.7 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 2.3 | 6.2 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 13.9 | 14.5 | 10.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 10.9 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 89.1 | 12.5 | 0.0 | 110.0 | 28.0 | 27.9 | 69.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 58.3 | 0.0 | 83.8 |
| LnGrp LOS | F | B |  | F | C | C | E | A |  | E | A | F |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 1063 | A |  | 1102 |  |  | 514 | A |  | 366 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 16.2 |  |  | 28.1 |  |  | 69.7 |  |  | 75.5 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | E |  |  | E |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 5.1 | 87.1 | 29.8 | 10.0 | 82.2 | 27.9 |
| Change Period $(\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc})$ ，s | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 5.1 | 63.9 | 34.5 | 8.5 | 60.5 | 28.5 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 2.2 | 20.6 | 23.8 | 6.2 | 34.0 | 22.5 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.0 | 9.4 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 8.0 | 0.9 |

Intersection Summary
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 36.7
HCM 6th LOS
D
Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement．
Unsignalized Delay for［NBR，EBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．

| 4 |  |  | 4 | ， | $+$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ¢中 | 中4 | T＇ | \％ | 「 |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） 332 | 518 | 445 | 53 | 612 | 406 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） 332 | 518 | 445 | 53 | 612 | 406 |
| Initial Q $(Q b)$ ，veh 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） 1.00 |  |  | 0.98 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus，Adj 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach | No | No |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln 1885 | 1885 | 1870 | 1870 | 1885 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h 342 | 534 | 459 | 55 | 631 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Cap，veh／h 531 | 894 | 795 | 347 | 745 |  |
| Arrive On Green 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.21 | 0.00 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h 1346 | 2357 | 3647 | 1551 | 3483 | 1598 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h 462 | 414 | 459 | 55 | 631 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln1818 | 1791 | 1777 | 1551 | 1742 | 1598 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s 16.5 | 14.6 | 9.2 | 2.3 | 13.9 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s 16.5 | 14.6 | 9.2 | 2.3 | 13.9 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane 0.74 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h 718 | 707 | 795 | 347 | 745 |  |
| V／C Ratio（X） 0.64 | 0.59 | 0.58 | 0.16 | 0.85 |  |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h 718 | 707 | 795 | 347 | 906 |  |
| HCM Platoon Ratio 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（I） 0.10 | 0.10 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh 19.6 | 19.0 | 27.7 | 25.0 | 30.2 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh 0.5 | 0.4 | 3.0 | 1.0 | 6.4 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ı6．8 | 5.9 | 4.2 | 0.9 | 6.4 | 0.0 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh 20.1 | 19.4 | 30.7 | 26.0 | 36.6 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS C | B | C | C | D |  |
| Approach Vol，veh／h | 876 | 514 |  | 631 | A |
| Approach Delay，s／veh | 19.8 | 30.2 |  | 36.6 |  |
| Approach LOS | B | C |  | D |  |
| Timer－Assigned Phs | 2 |  | 4 |  | 6 |
| Phs Duration（ $G+Y+R \mathrm{c}$ ），s | 36.2 |  | 21.3 |  | 22.5 |
| Change Period（ $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ），s | 4.6 |  | ＊ 4.2 |  | 4.6 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 27.9 |  | ＊ 21 |  | 17.9 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋｜1），s | 18.5 |  | 15.9 |  | 11.2 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 4.0 |  | 1.2 |  | 1.8 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl DelayHCM 6th LOS |  | 27.7 |  |  |  |
|  |  | C |  |  |  |

Notes
＊HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier．
Unsignalized Delay for［SBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．

|  | $\rightarrow$ | 7 |  | 4 | 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement EB | EBT EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | 4 ${ }^{\text {T}}$ | ${ }^{1}$ | 中 | - ${ }^{1}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) 61 | 611465 | 60 | 221 | 267 | 28 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) 61 | 611465 | 60 | 221 | 267 | 28 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus, Adj 1.0 | 1.001 .00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach N | No |  | No | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln 188 | 18851885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h 65 | 650495 | 64 | 235 | 312 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor 0.9 | 0.940 .94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Cap, veh/h 93 | 936772 | 81 | 1207 | 584 | 262 |
| Arrive On Green 0.5 | $0.50 \quad 0.50$ | 0.04 | 0.64 | 0.16 | 0.00 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h 188 | 18851555 | 1810 | 1900 | 3591 | 1610 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h 65 | 650495 | 64 | 235 | 312 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s), veh/h/ln188 | 18851555 | 1810 | 1900 | 1795 | 1610 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s 9. | 9.888 | 1.3 | 1.9 | 3.0 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s 9. | $9.8 \quad 8.7$ | 1.3 | 1.9 | 3.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h 93 | 936772 | 81 | 1207 | 584 | 262 |
| V/C Ratio(X) 0.6 | 0.690 .64 | 0.79 | 0.19 | 0.53 | 0.00 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h 152 | 15231256 | 1462 | 1535 | 2901 | 1301 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio 1.00 | 1.001 .00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(I) 1.00 | 1.001 .00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh 7 | 7.26 .9 | 17.6 | 2.8 | 14.3 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh 0 | 0.90 .9 | 15.6 | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh 0.0 | 0.00 .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ı2. | //12.8 2.0 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/v | , s/veh |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh 8 | 8.17 .8 | 33.2 | 2.9 | 15.0 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | A A | C | A | B | A |
| Approach Vol, veh/h 114 | 1145 |  | 299 | 312 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh 8. | 8.0 |  | 9.4 | 15.0 |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  | A | B |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs | 12 |  | 4 |  | 6 |
| Phs Duration ( $G+Y+R \mathrm{c}$ ), s5 | , s5.2 22.4 |  | 9.5 |  | 27.6 |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s 3.5 | s 3.54 .0 |  | 3.5 |  | 4.0 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), | axp, © 30.0 |  | 30.0 |  | 30.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+\| 1 , | +13,3 11.8 |  | 5.0 |  | 3.9 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s 0. | 0.16 .6 |  | 1.1 |  | 1.3 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl DelayHCM 6th LOS |  | 9.5 |  |  |  |
|  |  | A |  |  |  |

Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.





| Intersection |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 36.5 |  |
| Intersection LOS | E |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\pm$ |  |  | $\dagger$ | 「 |  | \$ |  |  | \$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 3 | 341 | 3 | 3 | 37 | 231 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 500 | 3 | 2 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 3 | 341 | 3 | 3 | 37 | 231 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 500 | 3 | 2 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.58 | 0.58 | 0.58 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Mvmt Flow | 3 | 383 | 3 | 3 | 40 | 251 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 556 | 3 | 2 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 24.7 |  |  | 14.5 |  |  | 10.9 |  |  | 56.8 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | C |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | F |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $29 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $99 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $14 \%$ | $98 \%$ | $93 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $5 \% \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 7 | 347 | 40 | 231 | 505 |
| LT Vol | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 500 |
| Through Vol | 1 | 341 | 37 | 0 | 3 |
| RT Vol | 4 | 3 | 0 | 231 | 2 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 12 | 390 | 43 | 251 | 561 |
| Geometry Grp | 2 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 2 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.025 | 0.716 | 0.089 | 0.464 | 0.976 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 7.595 | 6.607 | 7.407 | 6.649 | 6.261 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 469 | 5546 | 483 | 540 | 578 |
| Service Time | 5.685 | 4.566 | 5.165 | 4.407 | 4.3 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.026 | 0.714 | 0.089 | 0.465 | 0.971 |
| HCM Control Delay | 10.9 | 24.7 | 10.9 | 15.1 | 56.8 |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | C | B | C | F |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0.1 | 5.8 | 0.3 | 2.4 | 13.6 |



Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.

| Movement EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 | ${ }^{7}$ |  | 中4 | ${ }^{1}$ |  | 中t |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) 0 | 0 | 0 | 806 | 0 | 253 | 0 | 522 | 488 | 0 | 750 | 143 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) 0 | 0 | 0 | 806 | 0 | 253 | 0 | 522 | 488 | 0 | 750 | 143 |
| Initial Q $(Q b)$, veh |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 |
| Parking Bus, Adj |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln |  |  | 1885 | 1900 | 1826 | 0 | 1870 | 1900 | 0 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h |  |  | 886 | 0 | 278 | 0 | 574 | 0 | 0 | 824 | 157 |
| Peak Hour Factor |  |  | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% |  |  | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h |  |  | 1062 | 0 | 458 | 0 | 1888 |  | 0 | 1573 | 300 |
| Arrive On Green |  |  | 0.30 | 0.00 | 0.30 | 0.00 | 0.53 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.53 | 0.53 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h |  |  | 3591 | 0 | 1547 | 0 | 3647 | 1610 | 0 | 3054 | 564 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h |  |  | 886 | 0 | 278 | 0 | 574 | 0 | 0 | 495 | 486 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln |  |  | 1795 | 0 | 1547 | 0 | 1777 | 1610 | 0 | 1777 | 1748 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s |  |  | 12.7 | 0.0 | 8.5 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.9 | 9.9 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s |  |  | 12.7 | 0.0 | 8.5 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.9 | 9.9 |
| Prop In Lane |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.00 |  | 0.32 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h |  |  | 1062 | 0 | 458 | 0 | 1888 |  | 0 | 944 | 929 |
| V/C Ratio(X) |  |  | 0.83 | 0.00 | 0.61 | 0.00 | 0.30 |  | 0.00 | 0.52 | 0.52 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h |  |  | 1143 | 0 | 492 | 0 | 1888 |  | 0 | 944 | 929 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(I) |  |  | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.90 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh |  |  | 18.1 | 0.0 | 16.6 | 0.0 | 7.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.4 | 8.4 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh |  |  | 5.3 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 1.9 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/In |  |  | 5.3 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 3.5 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh |  |  | 23.4 | 0.0 | 18.8 | 0.0 | 7.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.3 | 10.3 |
| LnGrp LOS |  |  | C | A | B | A | A |  | A | B | B |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  |  |  | 1164 |  |  | 574 | A |  | 981 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  |  |  | 22.3 |  |  | 7.6 |  |  | 10.3 |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  | C |  |  | A |  |  | B |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs | 2 |  |  |  | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s | 34.5 |  |  |  | 34.5 |  | 20.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $Y+R \mathrm{R}$ ), $s$ | 5.3 |  |  |  | 5.3 |  | 4.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 28.0 |  |  |  | 28.0 |  | 17.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s | 7.0 |  |  |  | 11.9 |  | 14.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 4.4 |  |  |  | 7.2 |  | 1.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 14.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.
Unsignalized Delay for [NBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \％${ }^{\text {\％}}$ | F |  |  | $\uparrow$ | F | \％ | 中蚛 |  | \％ | 中蚛 | F |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 475 | 159 | 34 | 28 | 86 | 111 | 46 | 847 | 67 | 138 | 683 | 313 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 475 | 159 | 34 | 28 | 86 | 111 | 46 | 847 | 67 | 138 | 683 | 313 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 0.94 | 1.00 |  | 0.91 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 500 | 167 | 36 | 29 | 91 | 117 | 48 | 892 | 71 | 145 | 719 | 329 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Cap，veh／h | 738 | 315 | 68 | 51 | 161 | 165 | 62 | 1850 | 147 | 187 | 2324 | 706 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.03 | 0.38 | 0.38 | 0.10 | 0.45 | 0.45 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 3483 | 1485 | 320 | 454 | 1424 | 1461 | 1795 | 4844 | 384 | 1795 | 5147 | 1563 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 500 | 0 | 203 | 120 | 0 | 117 | 48 | 631 | 332 | 145 | 719 | 329 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／n | 1742 | 0 | 1805 | 1877 | 0 | 1461 | 1795 | 1716 | 1797 | 1795 | 1716 | 1563 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 11.6 | 0.0 | 8.8 | 5.3 | 0.0 | 6.8 | 2.3 | 12.2 | 12.3 | 6.9 | 7.8 | 12.9 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 11.6 | 0.0 | 8.8 | 5.3 | 0.0 | 6.8 | 2.3 | 12.2 | 12.3 | 6.9 | 7.8 | 12.9 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.18 | 0.24 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.21 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 738 | 0 | 382 | 212 | 0 | 165 | 62 | 1311 | 686 | 187 | 2324 | 706 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.68 | 0.00 | 0.53 | 0.57 | 0.00 | 0.71 | 0.77 | 0.48 | 0.48 | 0.77 | 0.31 | 0.47 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 832 | 0 | 431 | 448 | 0 | 349 | 327 | 1772 | 928 | 531 | 2657 | 807 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 31.9 | 0.0 | 30.8 | 36.9 | 0.0 | 37.6 | 42.1 | 20.6 | 20.6 | 38.4 | 15.4 | 16.7 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 4.1 | 0.0 | 4.1 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 7.7 | 24.3 | 1.3 | 2.4 | 9.3 | 0.3 | 2.2 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 5.3 | 0.0 | 4.2 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 1.4 | 4.9 | 5.3 | 3.4 | 2.9 | 4.7 |

Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh

| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 36.0 | 0.0 | 34.9 | 40.3 | 0.0 | 45.3 | 66.3 | 21.8 | 23.0 | 47.7 | 15.7 | 19.0 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| LnGrp LOS | D | A | C | D | A | D | E | C | C | D | B | B |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 703 |  |  | 237 |  |  | 1011 |  | 1193 |  |  |
| Approach Delay，slveh |  | 35.7 |  |  | 42.7 |  |  | 24.3 |  | 20.5 |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | C |  | C |  |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration $(G+Y+R c)$ ， | 7.0 | 44.3 | 13.9 | 13.2 | 38.2 | 22.6 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 4.0 | 4.6 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.6 | 4.0 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 16.0 | 45.4 | 21.0 | 26.0 | 45.4 | 21.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 4.3 | 14.9 | 8.8 | 8.9 | 14.3 | 13.6 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿C），s | 0.1 | 19.4 | 1.2 | 0.5 | 19.3 | 4.0 |

Intersection Summary

|  |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 26.8 |
| HCM 6th LOS | C |

Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green．


Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.


| Movement EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | 中4 | 7 | ${ }^{4}$ | 中t |  | ${ }^{4}$ | 中 | ${ }^{7}$ | ${ }^{1}$ | F |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） 19 | 884 | 310 | 36 | 390 | 54 | 142 | 156 | 54 | 106 | 243 | 17 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） 19 | 884 | 310 | 36 | 390 | 54 | 142 | 156 | 54 | 106 | 243 | 17 |
| Initial Q（Qb），veh 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 |
| Parking Bus，Adj 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h 20 | 951 | 333 | 39 | 419 | 58 | 153 | 168 | 58 | 114 | 261 | 18 |
| Peak Hour Factor 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Cap，veh／h 41 | 1405 | 606 | 67 | 1282 | 176 | 199 | 457 | 377 | 152 | 353 | 24 |
| Arrive On Green 0.02 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.04 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.11 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.08 | 0.20 | 0.20 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h 1795 | 3582 | 1544 | 1795 | 3152 | 433 | 1795 | 1885 | 1556 | 1795 | 1740 | 120 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h 20 | 951 | 333 | 39 | 237 | 240 | 153 | 168 | 58 | 114 | 0 | 279 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln1795 | 1791 | 1544 | 1795 | 1791 | 1794 | 1795 | 1885 | 1556 | 1795 | 0 | 1860 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s 0.8 | 16.3 | 7.4 | 1.6 | 6.7 | 6.8 | 6.1 | 5.5 | 2.2 | 4.6 | 0.0 | 10.4 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s 0.8 | 16.3 | 7.4 | 1.6 | 6.7 | 6.8 | 6.1 | 5.5 | 2.2 | 4.6 | 0.0 | 10.4 |
| Prop In Lane 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.24 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.06 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h 41 | 1405 | 606 | 67 | 728 | 730 | 199 | 457 | 377 | 152 | 0 | 378 |
| V／C Ratio（X） 0.49 | 0.68 | 0.55 | 0.58 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.77 | 0.37 | 0.15 | 0.75 | 0.00 | 0.74 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h 631 | 2178 | 939 | 631 | 1089 | 1091 | 631 | 764 | 631 | 631 | 0 | 754 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（I） 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh 35.7 | 18.6 | 6.2 | 35.1 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 32.0 | 23.3 | 22.0 | 33.1 | 0.0 | 27.6 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh 8.8 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 7.8 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 2.4 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 8.6 | 0.0 | 3.4 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／Ir0．4 | 6.2 | 3.9 | 0.8 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.7 | 2.4 | 0.8 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 4.9 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh 44.5 | 19.3 | 7.1 | 42.9 | 15.3 | 15.4 | 34.4 | 23.5 | 22.1 | 41.7 | 0.0 | 31.1 |
| LnGrp LOS D | B | A | D | B | B | C | C | C | D | A | C |
| Approach Vol，veh／h | 1304 |  |  | 516 |  |  | 379 |  |  | 393 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh | 16.6 |  |  | 17.4 |  |  | 27.7 |  |  | 34.2 |  |
| Approach LOS | B |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s5．7 | 35.1 | 10.3 | 22.9 | 6.8 | 34.0 | 13.2 | 20.0 |  |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s 4．0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | $* 5$ |  |
| Max Green Setting（Gma\＆6，© | 45.0 | 26.0 | 30.0 | 26.0 | 45.0 | 26.0 | ${ }^{*} 30$ |  |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋｜12，\＆ | 8.8 | 6.6 | 7.5 | 3.6 | 18.3 | 8.1 | 12.4 |  |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.0 | 3.8 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 10.8 | 0.1 | 1.8 |

Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 21.0 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | C |

Notes
＊HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier．

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SB | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{4}$ | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | ${ }^{4}$ | 中 ${ }^{\text {P }}$ |  | \% | F |  | \% | ¢ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 33 | 821 | 83 | 88 | 372 | 49 | 98 | 190 | 78 | 202 | 359 | 33 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 33 | 821 | 83 | 88 | 372 | 49 | 98 | 190 | 78 | 202 | 359 | 33 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 35 | 864 | 87 | 93 | 392 | 52 | 103 | 200 | 82 | 213 | 378 | 35 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap, veh/h | 50 | 1057 | 106 | 122 | 1149 | 151 | 136 | 280 | 115 | 263 | 497 | 46 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.03 | 0.32 | 0.32 | 0.07 | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.08 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.15 | 0.29 | 0.29 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1810 | 3295 | 332 | 1810 | 3187 | 419 | 1810 | 1267 | 520 | 1810 | 1708 | 158 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 35 | 473 | 478 | 93 | 221 | 223 | 103 | 0 | 282 | 213 | 0 | 413 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/n | 1810 | 1805 | 1821 | 1810 | 1805 | 1801 | 1810 | 0 | 1787 | 1810 | 0 | 1866 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 1.4 | 17.7 | 17.7 | 3.7 | 6.5 | 6.6 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 10.7 | 8.4 | 0.0 | 14.8 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 1.4 | 17.7 | 17.7 | 3.7 | 6.5 | 6.6 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 10.7 | 8.4 | 0.0 | 14.8 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.18 | 1.00 |  | 0.23 | 1.00 |  | 0.29 | 1.00 |  | 0.08 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 50 | 579 | 584 | 122 | 651 | 649 | 136 | 0 | 395 | 263 | 0 | 543 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.70 | 0.82 | 0.82 | 0.76 | 0.34 | 0.34 | 0.76 | 0.00 | 0.71 | 0.81 | 0.00 | 0.76 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 506 | 875 | 882 | 506 | 875 | 872 | 506 | 0 | 622 | 506 | 0 | 650 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(I) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 35.3 | 22.9 | 22.9 | 33.6 | 17.1 | 17.1 | 33.2 | 0.0 | 26.4 | 30.3 | 0.0 | 23.7 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 12.0 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 7.1 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 5.9 | 0.0 | 4.7 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh//10.8 |  | 7.4 | 7.4 | 1.8 | 2.6 | 2.7 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 6.8 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh LnGrp LOS | 47.3 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 40.6 | 17.4 | 17.5 | 41.5 | 0.0 | 28.2 | 36.3 | 0.0 | 28.3 |
|  | D | C | C | D | B | B | D | A | C | D | A | C |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 986 |  |  | 537 |  |  | 385 |  |  | 626 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 25.8 |  |  | 21.5 |  |  | 31.8 |  |  | 31.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |


| Timer - Assigned Phs | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phs Duration ( $G+Y+R \mathrm{C}$ ), 59.4 | 28.0 | 15.1 | 20.7 | 6.5 | 30.9 | 10.0 | 25.8 |
| Change Period ( $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmaz0, 5 | 35.5 | 20.5 | 25.5 | 20.5 | 35.5 | 20.5 | 25.5 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+19, 76 | 19.7 | 10.4 | 12.7 | 3.4 | 8.6 | 6.1 | 16.8 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s 0.1 | 3.8 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 3.4 | 0.2 | 1.9 |

Intersection Summary
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 27.1
HCM 6th LOS C
Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{4}$ | 性 |  | \% | 性 |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | 7 | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 28 | 1023 | 56 | 52 | 440 | 75 | 22 | 58 | 64 | 260 | 136 | 37 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 28 | 1023 | 56 | 52 | 440 | 75 | 22 | 58 | 64 | 260 | 136 | 37 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 0.92 | 1.00 |  | 0.93 | 1.00 |  | 0.92 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 29 | 1077 | 59 | 55 | 463 | 79 | 23 | 61 | 67 | 274 | 143 | 39 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap, veh/h | 44 | 1414 | 77 | 71 | 1291 | 218 | 37 | 123 | 136 | 325 | 452 | 123 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.02 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.04 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.02 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.18 | 0.32 | 0.32 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1810 | 3462 | 190 | 1810 | 3048 | 516 | 1795 | 783 | 860 | 1810 | 1427 | 389 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 29 | 561 | 575 | 55 | 273 | 269 | 23 | 0 | 128 | 274 | 0 | 182 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/n | 1810 | 1805 | 1847 | 1810 | 1805 | 1759 | 1795 | 0 | 1644 | 1810 | 0 | 1816 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 1.2 | 19.9 | 19.9 | 2.2 | 7.6 | 7.8 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 5.3 | 10.9 | 0.0 | 5.7 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 1.2 | 19.9 | 19.9 | 2.2 | 7.6 | 7.8 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 5.3 | 10.9 | 0.0 | 5.7 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.10 | 1.00 |  | 0.29 | 1.00 |  | 0.52 | 1.00 |  | 0.21 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 44 | 737 | 754 | 71 | 764 | 745 | 37 | 0 | 259 | 325 | 0 | 575 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.66 | 0.76 | 0.76 | 0.77 | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.63 | 0.00 | 0.49 | 0.84 | 0.00 | 0.32 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 389 | 1116 | 1142 | 389 | 1116 | 1088 | 507 | 0 | 354 | 511 | 0 | 575 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(I) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 36.0 | 18.9 | 18.9 | 35.4 | 14.6 | 14.6 | 36.2 | 0.0 | 28.6 | 29.5 | 0.0 | 19.3 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 15.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 16.1 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 16.5 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 7.3 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh | //10. 7 | 8.0 | 8.2 | 1.3 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 5.3 | 0.0 | 2.4 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay (d),s/veh | 51.7 | 20.6 | 20.6 | 51.5 | 14.8 | 14.9 | 52.6 | 0.0 | 30.1 | 36.8 | 0.0 | 19.6 |
| LnGrp LOS | D | C | C | D | B | B | D | A | C | D | A | B |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 1165 |  |  | 597 |  |  | 151 |  |  | 456 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 21.3 |  |  | 18.2 |  |  | 33.5 |  |  | 30.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |


| Timer - Assigned Phs 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), $\mathrm{s7} 7.4$ | 15.7 | 6.9 | 34.4 | 5.5 | 27.6 | 5.8 | 35.5 |
| Change Period ( $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmaz), ${ }^{\text {B }}$ | 16.0 | 16.0 | 46.0 | 21.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 46.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g c + M12, ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 7.3 | 4.2 | 21.9 | 2.9 | 7.7 | 3.2 | 9.8 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 8.5 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 3.7 |

Intersection Summary
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 23.0
HCM 6th LOS
C
Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.

| Movement EBL | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 性 |  | \% | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | F' |  | $\uparrow$ | 7 |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 30 | 1217 | 102 | 142 | 531 | 21 | 86 | 10 | 114 | 19 | 9 | 15 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 30 | 1217 | 102 | 142 | 531 | 21 | 86 | 10 | 114 | 19 | 9 | 15 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 |
| Parking Bus, Adj 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/n 19 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 31 | 1255 | 105 | 146 | 547 | 22 | 89 | 10 | 118 | 20 | 9 | 15 |
| Peak Hour Factor 0.07 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap, veh/h | 46 | 1494 | 125 | 189 | 1008 | 826 | 92 | 6 | 415 | 82 | 23 | 429 |
| Arrive On Green 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.44 | 0.44 | 0.10 | 0.53 | 0.53 | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.27 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h 18 | 1810 | 3361 | 280 | 1810 | 1900 | 1557 | 0 | 21 | 1546 | 0 | 86 | 1599 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 31 | 672 | 688 | 146 | 547 | 22 | 99 | 0 | 118 | 29 | 0 | 15 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s), veh/h/n18 | 1810 | 1805 | 1836 | 1810 | 1900 | 1557 | 21 | 0 | 1546 | 86 | 0 | 1599 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 1.3 | 24.6 | 24.8 | 5.9 | 14.1 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 1.3 | 24.6 | 24.8 | 5.9 | 14.1 | 0.5 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 |
| Prop In Lane 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.15 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.90 |  | 1.00 | 0.69 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 46 | 803 | 817 | 189 | 1008 | 826 | 97 | 0 | 415 | 105 | 0 | 429 |
| V/C Ratio(X) 0.67 | 0.67 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.77 | 0.54 | 0.03 | 1.02 | 0.00 | 0.28 | 0.28 | 0.00 | 0.03 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h 631 | 631 | 1087 | 1106 | 619 | 1144 | 938 | 97 | 0 | 415 | 105 | 0 | 429 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh 36 | 36.0 | 18.3 | 18.4 | 32.5 | 11.5 | 8.3 | 36.1 | 0.0 | 21.6 | 22.7 | 0.0 | 20.1 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh 15.8 | 15.8 | 3.3 | 3.4 | 6.5 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 95.8 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/1r0.7 | 110.7 | 10.0 | 10.3 | 2.9 | 5.5 | 0.2 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/ | s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh 51 | 51.8 | 21.6 | 21.8 | 39.0 | 11.7 | 8.3 | 131.9 | 0.0 | 21.7 | 23.2 | 0.0 | 20.2 |
| LnGrp LOS | D | C | C | D | B | A | F | A | C | C | A | C |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 1391 |  |  | 715 |  |  | 217 |  |  | 44 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 22.4 |  |  | 17.2 |  |  | 72.0 |  |  | 22.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | E |  |  | C |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s 2. | \$2.3 | 38.2 |  | 24.0 | 5.9 | 44.7 |  | 24.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s 4.5 | s 4.5 | 5.1 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.1 |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmaz) | 25, 5 | 44.9 |  | 20.0 | 26.0 | 44.9 |  | 20.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11 | 1710,5 | 26.8 |  | 22.0 | 3.3 | 16.1 |  | 22.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.3 | 6.4 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.6 |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl DelayHCM 6th LOS |  |  | 25.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.


| Timer - Assigned Phs 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), 80.1 | 25.3 | 7.0 | 25.5 | 6.4 | 29.1 | 7.0 | 25.5 |
| Change Period ( $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s 3.5 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 5.0 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmad). ${ }^{\text {F }}$ S | 35.0 | 26.5 | 35.0 | 26.5 | 35.0 | 26.5 | 35.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time ( g _ $\mathrm{c}+1 \mathrm{l}$ ¢, , 5 | 17.5 | 4.4 | 16.8 | 3.7 | 8.5 | 4.4 | 16.2 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s 0.3 | 2.8 | 0.1 | 3.7 | 0.1 | 1.5 | 0.1 | 3.5 |

## Intersection Summary

HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 26.3
HCM 6th LOS

| Intersection |
| :--- |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh38.4 |
| Intersection LOS $\quad$ E |


| Movement EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | $\uparrow$ | ${ }^{1}$ |  | 4 | F' |  | $\pm$ |  |  | 4 |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h 74 | 424 | 86 | 49 | 250 | 49 | 31 | 88 | 36 | 39 | 123 | 64 |
| Future Vol, veh/h 74 | 424 | 86 | 49 | 250 | 49 | 31 | 88 | 36 | 39 | 123 | 64 |
| Peak Hour Factor 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow 80 | 456 | 92 | 53 | 269 | 53 | 33 | 95 | 39 | 42 | 132 | 69 |
| Number of Lanes 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach RighNB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay 63.6 |  |  | 20.6 |  |  | 14.8 |  |  | 17.1 |  |  |
| HCM LOS F |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 EBLn1 EBLn2WBLn1WBLn2 SBLn1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, $\%$ | $20 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $17 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, $\%$ | $57 \%$ | $85 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $84 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $54 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $23 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $28 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Sttop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 155 | 498 | 86 | 299 | 49 | 226 |
| LT Vol | 31 | 74 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 39 |
| Through Vol | 88 | 424 | 0 | 250 | 0 | 123 |
| RT Vol | 36 | 0 | 86 | 0 | 49 | 64 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 167 | 535 | 92 | 322 | 53 | 243 |
| Geometry Grp | 2 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 2 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.348 | 1.028 | 0.157 | 0.639 | 0.094 | 0.486 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 7.72 | 6.912 | 6.118 | 7.412 | 6.607 | 7.371 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 468 | 525 | 587 | 492 | 546 | 491 |
| Service Time | 5.72 | 4.639 | 3.845 | 5.112 | 4.307 | 5.371 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.357 | 1.019 | 0.157 | 0.654 | 0.097 | 0.495 |
| HCM Control Delay | 14.8 | 72.9 | 10 | 22.3 | 10 | 17.1 |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | F | A | C | A | C |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 1.5 | 15.1 | 0.6 | 4.4 | 0.3 | 2.6 |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | 7 | $\uparrow$ | F' | \% | $\uparrow$ | 7 | ${ }^{7}$ | F |  | 7 | $\bigcirc$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 56 | 508 | 242 | 15 | 273 | 101 | 87 | 44 | 7 | 157 | 97 | 91 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 56 | 508 | 242 | 15 | 273 | 101 | 87 | 44 | 7 | 157 | 97 | 91 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.90 | 1.00 |  | 0.92 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/n 1 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 62 | 564 | 0 | 17 | 303 | 0 | 97 | 49 | 8 | 174 | 108 | 101 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Cap, veh/h | 99 | 701 |  | 37 | 636 |  | 127 | 302 | 49 | 222 | 211 | 197 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.05 | 0.37 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.34 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.12 | 0.25 | 0.25 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1795 | 1885 | 1598 | 1795 | 1885 | 1598 | 1810 | 1564 | 255 | 1795 | 855 | 800 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 62 | 564 | 0 | 17 | 303 | 0 | 97 | 0 | 57 | 174 | 0 | 209 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/n1 | 1795 | 1885 | 1598 | 1795 | 1885 | 1598 | 1810 | 0 | 1819 | 1795 | 0 | 1655 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 1.9 | 15.2 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 7.2 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 5.3 | 0.0 | 6.2 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 1.9 | 15.2 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 7.2 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 5.3 | 0.0 | 6.2 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.14 | 1.00 |  | 0.48 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 99 | 701 |  | 37 | 636 |  | 127 | 0 | 352 | 222 | 0 | 408 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.63 | 0.80 |  | 0.46 | 0.48 |  | 0.77 | 0.00 | 0.16 | 0.78 | 0.00 | 0.51 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 506 | 1180 |  | 506 | 1180 |  | 510 | 0 | 674 | 506 | 0 | 613 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(I) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 26.2 | 16.0 | 0.0 | 27.5 | 14.8 | 0.0 | 25.9 | 0.0 | 19.1 | 24.1 | 0.0 | 18.4 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 4.8 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 6.4 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0.7 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh//10.9 |  | 6.3 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 2.2 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh LnGrp LOS | 31.0 | 18.2 | 0.0 | 33.8 | 15.4 | 0.0 | 29.5 | 0.0 | 19.2 | 26.5 | 0.0 | 19.2 |
|  | C | B |  | C | B |  | C | A | B | C | A | B |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 626 | A |  | 320 | A |  | 154 |  |  | 383 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 19.5 |  |  | 16.4 |  |  | 25.7 |  |  | 22.5 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s5.2 | 25.6 | 8.0 | 18.0 | 7.1 | 23.6 | 11.0 | 15.0 |  |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmakक., | 35.5 | 16.0 | 21.0 | 16.0 | 35.5 | 16.0 | 21.0 |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+\|24,5s | 17.2 | 5.0 | 8.2 | 3.9 | 9.2 | 7.3 | 3.5 |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), $\mathbf{s}$ | 0.0 | 3.8 | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 1.8 | 0.1 | 0.2 |

Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 20.2 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | C |

Notes
Unsignalized Delay for [EBR, WBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.

## Kimley»)Horn

## APPENDIX C. EXISTING PLUS PROJECT CONDITIONS SYNCHRO OUTPUT SHEETS

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | ¢ $\uparrow$ | 「 | 7 | 个t |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 28 | 585 | 370 | 63 | 530 | 65 | 557 | 24 | 88 | 27 | 23 | 12 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 28 | 585 | 370 | 63 | 530 | 65 | 557 | 24 | 88 | 27 | 23 | 12 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 29 | 603 | 0 | 65 | 546 | 67 | 592 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 24 | 12 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap，veh／h | 48 | 2088 |  | 84 | 1929 | 236 | 625 | 0 |  | 53 | 46 | 83 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.03 | 0.58 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1795 | 3582 | 1598 | 1795 | 3199 | 391 | 3591 | 0 | 1598 | 996 | 854 | 1551 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 29 | 603 | 0 | 65 | 305 | 308 | 592 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 0 | 12 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／n | 1795 | 1791 | 1598 | 1795 | 1791 | 1800 | 1795 | 0 | 1598 | 1850 | 0 | 1551 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 1.8 | 9.5 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 9.1 | 9.2 | 18.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 0.8 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 1.8 | 9.5 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 9.1 | 9.2 | 18.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 0.8 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.22 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.54 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 48 | 2088 |  | 84 | 1080 | 1085 | 625 | 0 |  | 99 | 0 | 83 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.61 | 0.29 |  | 0.78 | 0.28 | 0.28 | 0.95 | 0.00 |  | 0.53 | 0.00 | 0.14 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 88 | 2088 |  | 88 | 1080 | 1085 | 625 | 0 |  | 372 | 0 | 312 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.72 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 53.9 | 11.7 | 0.0 | 52.8 | 10.6 | 10.6 | 45.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 51.6 | 0.0 | 50.6 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 4.6 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 29.2 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 18.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 0.9 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 3.7 | 3.8 | 9.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 58.5 | 12.1 | 0.0 | 82.0 | 11.3 | 11.3 | 64.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 53.2 | 0.0 | 50.9 |
| LnGrp LOS | E | B |  | F | B | B | E | A |  | D | A | D |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 632 | A |  | 678 |  |  | 592 | A |  | 64 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 14.2 |  |  | 18.1 |  |  | 64.4 |  |  | 52.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | E |  |  | D |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 9.2 | 69.3 | 10.0 | 7.0 | 71.5 | 23.5 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 5.5 | 48.5 | 22.5 | 5.5 | 48.5 | 19.5 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 6.0 | 11.5 | 5.1 | 3.8 | 11.2 | 20.3 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.0 | 4.9 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 0.0 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 31.9 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | C |

Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement．
Unsignalized Delay for［NBR，EBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | $\cdots$ | 7 | 4 | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | $p$ |  | 1 | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{1}$ | 44 | T | ${ }^{1}$ | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | \& |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 6 | 643 | 410 | 317 | 588 | 6 | 246 | 2 | 959 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 6 | 643 | 410 | 317 | 588 | 6 | 246 | 2 | 959 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.86 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1900 | 1900 | 1737 | 1870 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1856 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 6 | 670 | 0 | 330 | 612 | 6 | 256 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 0 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 11 | 1944 |  | 348 | 2666 | 26 | 277 | 2 |  | 9 | 0 | 17 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.01 | 0.54 | 0.00 | 0.39 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.02 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1810 | 3610 | 1472 | 1781 | 3663 | 36 | 1782 | 14 | 1572 | 495 | 0 | 990 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 6 | 670 | 0 | 330 | 302 | 316 | 258 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 1810 | 1805 | 1472 | 1781 | 1805 | 1894 | 1796 | 0 | 1572 | 1485 | 0 | 0 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.5 | 15.8 | 0.0 | 26.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 0.5 | 15.8 | 0.0 | 26.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.02 | 0.99 |  | 1.00 | 0.33 |  | 0.67 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 11 | 1944 |  | 348 | 1314 | 1378 | 279 | 0 |  | 26 | 0 | 0 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.56 | 0.34 |  | 0.95 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.93 | 0.00 |  | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 48 | 1944 |  | 487 | 1314 | 1378 | 281 | 0 |  | 218 | 0 | 0 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 0.75 | 0.75 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.46 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 74.4 | 19.6 | 0.0 | 45.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 62.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 72.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 12.3 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 20.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 19.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 0.3 | 6.7 | 0.0 | 12.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 11.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 86.6 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 65.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 82.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 74.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | F | B |  | E | A | A | F | A |  | E | A | A |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 676 | A |  | 948 |  |  | 258 | A |  | 3 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 20.6 |  |  | 23.1 |  |  | 82.2 |  |  | 74.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | F |  |  | E |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s | 32.3 | 84.8 |  | 6.1 | 3.9 | 113.2 |  | 26.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s | 3.0 | 4.0 |  | 3.5 | 3.0 | 4.0 |  | 3.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 41.0 | 49.5 |  | 22.0 | 4.0 | 86.5 |  | 23.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s | 28.9 | 17.8 |  | 2.3 | 2.5 | 2.0 |  | 23.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.4 | 7.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.3 |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay |  |  | 30.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes
Unsignalized Delay for [NBR, EBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 个个 | 「 | \％ | 中 ${ }_{\text {c }}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ | F | 7 | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 155 | 833 | 615 | 4 | 1079 | 27 | 391 | 84 | 35 | 65 | 82 | 51 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 155 | 833 | 615 | 4 | 1079 | 27 | 391 | 84 | 35 | 65 | 82 | 51 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1870 | 1856 | 1841 | 1900 | 1841 | 1841 | 1811 | 1870 | 1856 | 1870 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 161 | 868 | 0 | 4 | 1124 | 28 | 470 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 85 | 53 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap，veh／h | 101 | 2198 |  | 9 | 1993 | 50 | 539 | 0 |  | 169 | 104 | 65 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.06 | 0.62 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.57 | 0.57 | 0.16 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1781 | 3526 | 1560 | 1810 | 3483 | 87 | 3450 | 0 | 1572 | 1781 | 1090 | 680 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 161 | 868 | 0 | 4 | 564 | 588 | 470 | 0 | 0 | 68 | 0 | 138 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／n | 1781 | 1763 | 1560 | 1810 | 1749 | 1821 | 1725 | 0 | 1572 | 1781 | 0 | 1770 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 8.5 | 18.4 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 30.6 | 30.6 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.4 | 0.0 | 11.5 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 8.5 | 18.4 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 30.6 | 30.6 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.4 | 0.0 | 11.5 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.05 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.38 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 101 | 2198 |  | 9 | 1000 | 1042 | 539 | 0 |  | 169 | 0 | 168 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 1.60 | 0.39 |  | 0.43 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.87 | 0.00 |  | 0.40 | 0.00 | 0.82 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 101 | 2198 |  | 62 | 1000 | 1042 | 793 | 0 |  | 338 | 0 | 336 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 70.7 | 14.1 | 0.0 | 74.4 | 20.3 | 20.3 | 61.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 63.9 | 0.0 | 66.6 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 309.2 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 28.7 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 7.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 9.4 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 12.6 | 7.5 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 12.9 | 13.4 | 9.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 5.7 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 379.9 | 14.6 | 0.0 | 103.1 | 22.6 | 22.5 | 69.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 65.4 | 0.0 | 76.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | F | B |  | F | C | C | E | A |  | E | A | E |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 1029 | A |  | 1156 |  |  | 470 | A |  | 206 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 71.8 |  |  | 22.8 |  |  | 69.1 |  |  | 72.5 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | C |  |  | E |  |  | E |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration $(G+Y+R c)$ ，s | 5.3 | 98.0 | 27.9 | 13.0 | 90.3 | 18.8 |
| Change Period $(\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc})$ ，s | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 5.1 | 63.9 | 34.5 | 8.5 | 60.5 | 28.5 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 2.3 | 20.4 | 22.0 | 10.5 | 32.6 | 13.5 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.0 | 7.6 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 8.7 | 0.8 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 51.6 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | $D$ |

Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement．
Unsignalized Delay for［NBR，EBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | ＊$\uparrow$ | 性 | 「 | ${ }^{1 *}$ | 「 |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 364 | 289 | 604 | 167 | 393 | 88 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 364 | 289 | 604 | 167 | 393 | 588 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  |  | 0.98 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No | No |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1885 | 1885 | 1870 | 1870 | 1885 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 375 | 298 | 623 | 172 | 405 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |  |
| Cap，veh／h | 823 | 821 | 795 | 347 | 524 |  |
| Arrive On Green | 0.46 | 0.46 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.15 | 0.00 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1795 | 1885 | 3647 | 1551 | 3483 | 1598 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 375 | 298 | 623 | 172 | 405 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／n | 1795 | 1791 | 1777 | 1551 | 1742 | 159 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 11.4 | 8.6 | 13.2 | 7.7 | 8.9 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 11.4 | 8.6 | 13.2 | 7.7 | 8.9 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 823 | 821 | 795 | 347 | 524 |  |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.46 | 0.36 | 0.78 | 0.50 | 0.77 |  |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 823 | 821 | 795 | 347 | 906 |  |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（I） | 0.29 | 0.29 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 14.8 | 14.1 | 29.2 | 27.1 | 32.7 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 0.5 | 0.4 | 7.6 | 5.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh | h／1r4． 6 | 3.4 | 6.3 | 3.3 | 3.9 | 0.0 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh 15.4 |  | 14.4 | 36.8 | 32.1 | 35.1 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | B | B | D | C | D |  |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 673 | 795 |  | 405 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 15.0 | 35.8 |  | 35.1 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B | D |  | D |  |
| Timer－Assigned Phs |  | 2 |  | 4 |  | 6 |
| Phs Duration（ $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ）， s |  | 41.3 |  | 16.2 |  | 22.5 |
| Change Period（ $Y+\mathrm{Rc}$ ），s |  | 4.6 |  | ＊ 4.2 |  | 4.6 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s |  | 27.9 |  | ＊21 |  | 17.9 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s |  | 13.4 |  | 10.9 |  | 15.2 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s |  | 3.8 |  | 1.1 |  | 1.3 |

## Intersection Summary

HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 28.2

HCM 6th LOS C
Notes
＊HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier．
Unsignalized Delay for［SBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．


Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 7.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement E | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | 4 | 「 | * | 4 | ${ }^{7}$ | 「 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h 37 | 375 | 83 | 99 | 241 | 162 | 181 |
| Future Vol, veh/h 37 | 375 | 83 | 99 | 241 | 162 | 181 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control Fr | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | 25 | 170 | - | 145 | 0 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow 3 | 391 | 86 | 103 | 251 | 169 | 189 |




| Intersection |
| :--- |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh14.8 |
| Intersection LOS $\quad$ B |


| Movement EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | * |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | \& |  |  | \$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h 13 | 92 | 0 | 5 | 26 | 467 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 283 | 0 | 5 |
| Future Vol, veh/h 13 | 92 | 0 | 5 | 26 | 467 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 283 | 0 | 5 |
| Peak Hour Factor 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Mvmt Flow 14 | 96 | 0 | 5 | 27 | 486 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 295 | 0 | 5 |
| Number of Lanes 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach EB |  |  | WB |  |  |  | NB |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach WB |  |  | EB |  |  |  | SB |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left SB |  |  | NB |  |  |  | EB |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach RighNB |  |  | SB |  |  |  | WB |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay 9.9 |  |  | 16.6 |  |  |  | 8.9 |  | 13.7 |  |  |
| HCM LOS A |  |  | C |  |  |  | A |  | B |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 EBLn1WBLn1WBLn2 SBLn1 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $0 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $98 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $12 \%$ | $88 \%$ | $84 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $88 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 8 | 105 | 31 | 467 | 288 |
| LT Vol | 0 | 13 | 5 | 0 | 283 |
| Through Vol | 1 | 92 | 26 | 0 | 0 |
| RT Vol | 7 | 0 | 0 | 467 | 5 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 8 | 109 | 32 | 486 | 300 |
| Geometry Grp | 2 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 2 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.013 | 0.173 | 0.052 | 0.669 | 0.473 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 5.773 | 5.695 | 5.742 | 4.953 | 5.676 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 618 | 630 | 627 | 735 | 636 |
| Service Time | 3.826 | 3.733 | 3.442 | 2.653 | 3.709 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.013 | 0.173 | 0.051 | 0.661 | 0.472 |
| HCM Control Delay | 8.9 | 9.9 | 8.8 | 17.1 | 13.7 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | A | C | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 5.2 | 2.5 |



Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.


| Movement EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | 个4 | 「 |  | 性 |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 0 | 0 | 662 | 5 | 428 | 0 | 547 | 374 | 0 | 593 | 166 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） 0 | 0 | 0 | 662 | 5 | 428 | 0 | 547 | 374 | 0 | 593 | 166 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 |
| Parking Bus，Adj |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／n |  |  | 1885 | 1900 | 1826 | 0 | 1870 | 1900 | 0 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h |  |  | 731 | 0 | 470 | 0 | 601 | 0 | 0 | 652 | 182 |
| Peak Hour Factor |  |  | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ |  |  | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap，veh／h |  |  | 1143 | 0 | 492 | 0 | 1809 |  | 0 | 1386 | 386 |
| Arrive On Green |  |  | 0.32 | 0.00 | 0.32 | 0.00 | 0.51 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.51 | 0.51 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h |  |  | 3591 | 0 | 1547 | 0 | 3647 | 1610 | 0 | 2816 | 759 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h |  |  | 731 | 0 | 470 | 0 | 601 | 0 | 0 | 425 | 409 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln |  |  | 1795 | 0 | 1547 | 0 | 1777 | 1610 | 0 | 1777 | 1705 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s |  |  | 9.6 | 0.0 | 16.4 | 0.0 | 5.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.5 | 8.5 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s |  |  | 9.6 | 0.0 | 16.4 | 0.0 | 5.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.5 | 8.5 |
| Prop In Lane |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.00 |  | 0.45 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h |  |  | 1143 | 0 | 492 | 0 | 1809 |  | 0 | 905 | 868 |
| VIC Ratio（X） |  |  | 0.64 | 0.00 | 0.95 | 0.00 | 0.33 |  | 0.00 | 0.47 | 0.47 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h |  |  | 1143 | 0 | 492 | 0 | 1809 |  | 0 | 905 | 868 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） |  |  | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.96 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.74 | 0.74 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh |  |  | 16.1 | 0.0 | 18.4 | 0.0 | 8.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.7 | 8.7 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh |  |  | 1.3 | 0.0 | 29.4 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 1.4 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln |  |  | 3.6 | 0.0 | 8.9 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 2.9 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh |  |  | 17.3 | 0.0 | 47.8 | 0.0 | 8.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.0 | 10.1 |
| LnGrp LOS |  |  | B | A | D | A | A |  | A | B | B |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  |  |  | 1201 |  |  | 601 | A |  | 834 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  |  |  | 29.3 |  |  | 8.5 |  |  | 10.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  | C |  |  | A |  |  | B |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 2 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 33.3 | 33.3 | 21.7 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 5.3 | 5.3 | 4.2 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 28.0 | 28.0 | 17.5 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 7.5 | 10.5 | 18.4 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 4.6 | 6.3 | 0.0 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 18.4 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | B |

Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement．
Unsignalized Delay for［NBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 | 7 | 快 |  | \％ | 快 |  |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 272 | 16 | 101 | 14 | 7 | 26 | 136 | 975 | 21 | 91 | 1066 | 342 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 272 | 16 | 101 | 14 | 7 | 26 | 136 | 975 | 21 | 91 | 1066 | 342 |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time（s） | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 |  | 4.2 | 4.2 | 3.7 | 4.9 |  | 4.6 | 4.9 |  |
| Lane Util．Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.91 |  | 1.00 | 0.91 |  |
| Frpb，ped／bikes | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.97 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.98 |  |
| Flpb，ped／bikes | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 |  | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.96 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 1625 | 1646 | 1509 |  | 1792 | 1561 | 1745 | 4939 |  | 1745 | 4675 |  |
| FIt Permitted | 0.95 | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 1625 | 1646 | 1509 |  | 1792 | 1561 | 1745 | 4939 |  | 1745 | 4675 |  |
| Peak－hour factor，PHF | 0.86 | 0.61 | 0.80 | 0.85 | 0.44 | 0.79 | 0.66 | 0.86 | 0.61 | 0.67 | 0.94 | 0.85 |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 316 | 26 | 126 | 16 | 16 | 33 | 206 | 1134 | 34 | 136 | 1134 | 402 |
| RTOR Reduction（vph） | 0 | 0 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 171 | 171 | 31 | 0 | 32 | 5 | 206 | 1165 | 0 | 136 | 1483 | 0 |
| Confl．Peds．（\＃／hr） |  |  | 18 | 18 |  |  | 12 |  | 8 | 8 |  | 12 |
| Confl．Bikes（\＃／hr） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |


| Heavy Vehicles（\％） | $2 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Turn Type | Split | NA | Perm | Split | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Prot | NA |  |  |
| Protected Phases | 4 | 4 |  | 3 | 3 |  | 5 | 1 | 2 | 6 |  |  |


| Permitted Phases |  |  | 4 |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Actuated Green，G（s） | 29.5 | 29.5 | 29.5 | 16.5 | 16.5 | 15.7 | 40.0 | 16.0 | 41.2 |


| Effective Green， $\mathrm{g}(\mathrm{s})$ | 29.5 | 29.5 | 29.5 | 16.5 | 16.5 | 15.7 | 40.0 | 16.0 | 41.2 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Actuated g／C Ratio | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.13 | 0.33 | 0.13 | 0.34 |
| Clearance Time $(\mathrm{s})$ | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 3.7 | 4.9 | 4.6 | 4.9 |
| Vehicle Extension（s） | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.2 |
| Lane Grp Cap（vph） | 399 | 404 | 371 | 246 | 214 | 228 | 1647 | 232 | 1606 |
| v／s Ratio Prot | $\mathrm{co.11}$ | 0.10 |  | co |  |  | 0.12 | 0.24 | 0.08 |
| c0．32 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| v／s Ratio Perm |  |  | 0.02 |  | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| V／c Ratio | 0.43 | 0.42 | 0.08 | 0.13 | 0.02 | 0.90 | 0.71 | 0.59 | 0.92 |
| Uniform Delay，d1 | 38.1 | 38.0 | 34.8 | 45.4 | 44.7 | 51.4 | 34.8 | 48.8 | 37.8 |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.08 | 0.88 |
| Incremental Delay，d2 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 34.6 | 2.6 | 3.1 | 8.8 |
| Delay（s） | 38.8 | 38.8 | 34.9 | 45.6 | 44.8 | 85.9 | 37.4 | 55.7 | 42.0 |
| Level of Service | D | D | C | D | D | F | D | E | D |
| Approach Delay（s） |  | 37.7 |  | 45.2 |  |  | 44.7 |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  | $D$ |  |  | D | 43.1 |  |


| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| HCM 2000 Control Delay | 43.1 | HCM 2000 Level of Service | D |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity ratio | 0.66 |  | 17.9 |
| Actuated Cycle Length（s） | 119.9 | Sum of lost time（s） | C |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $66.3 \%$ | ICU Level of Service |  |
| Analysis Period（min） | 15 |  |  |
| c Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | 7 | $\checkmark$ | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $p$ | ， | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 蚛 |  | \％ | 个种 | F |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 219 | 37 | 18 | 22 | 80 | 172 | 37 | 730 | 21 | 129 | 689 | 336 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 219 | 37 | 18 | 22 | 80 | 172 | 37 | 730 | 21 | 129 | 689 | 336 |
| Initial $\mathrm{Q}(\mathrm{Qb})$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 0.93 | 1.00 |  | 0.93 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 231 | 39 | 19 | 23 | 84 | 181 | 39 | 768 | 22 | 136 | 725 | 354 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Cap，veh／h | 552 | 185 | 90 | 64 | 232 | 235 | 52 | 1910 | 55 | 180 | 2279 | 692 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.03 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.10 | 0.44 | 0.44 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 3483 | 1165 | 568 | 404 | 1476 | 1497 | 1795 | 5136 | 147 | 1795 | 5147 | 1563 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 231 | 0 | 58 | 107 | 0 | 181 | 39 | 512 | 278 | 136 | 725 | 354 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／n | 1742 | 0 | 1733 | 1880 | 0 | 1497 | 1795 | 1716 | 1851 | 1795 | 1716 | 1563 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 4.7 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 9.1 | 1.7 | 8.6 | 8.7 | 5.8 | 7.1 | 12.8 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 4.7 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 9.1 | 1.7 | 8.6 | 8.7 | 5.8 | 7.1 | 12.8 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.33 | 0.21 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.08 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 552 | 0 | 275 | 296 | 0 | 235 | 52 | 1276 | 689 | 180 | 2279 | 692 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.42 | 0.00 | 0.21 | 0.36 | 0.00 | 0.77 | 0.74 | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.76 | 0.32 | 0.51 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 935 | 0 | 465 | 504 | 0 | 402 | 367 | 1990 | 1074 | 596 | 2985 | 907 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 29.7 | 0.0 | 28.7 | 29.5 | 0.0 | 31.6 | 37.7 | 18.1 | 18.2 | 34.3 | 14.1 | 15.7 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 1.8 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 7.3 | 25.1 | 0.9 | 1.8 | 8.8 | 0.4 | 2.7 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／In | 2.1 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 3.7 | 1.1 | 3.3 | 3.8 | 2.9 | 2.6 | 4.6 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 31.5 | 0.0 | 30.0 | 30.5 | 0.0 | 38.9 | 62.8 | 19.1 | 19.9 | 43.1 | 14.5 | 18.4 |
| LnGrp LOS | C | A | C | C | A | D | E | B | B | D | B | B |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 289 |  |  | 288 |  |  | 829 |  |  | 1215 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 31.2 |  |  | 35.8 |  |  | 21.4 |  |  | 18.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 6.3 | 39.3 | 16.3 | 11.8 | 33.7 | 16.4 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 4.0 | 4.6 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.6 | 4.0 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 16.0 | 45.4 | 21.0 | 26.0 | 45.4 | 21.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 3.7 | 14.8 | 11.1 | 7.8 | 10.7 | 6.7 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.1 | 19.9 | 1.3 | 0.5 | 16.9 | 2.5 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 22.9 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | C |

## Notes

User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green．

| Movement EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ | $\hat{\wedge}^{\text {¢ }}$ |  | \% | ¢ ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 性 |  | ${ }^{7 *}$ | 个 $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) 192 | 126 | 44 | 124 | 260 | 130 | 49 | 493 | 36 | 118 | 421 | 61 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) 192 | 126 | 44 | 124 | 260 | 130 | 49 | 493 | 36 | 118 | 421 | 61 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 |
| Parking Bus, Adj 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | . 00 |
| Work Zone On Approach | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h 124 | 233 | 45 | 128 | 268 | 134 | 51 | 508 | 37 | 122 | 434 | 63 |
| Peak Hour Factor 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Cap, veh/h 326 | 556 | 105 | 395 | 523 | 252 | 67 | 1362 | 98 | 264 | 1136 | 493 |
| Arrive On Green 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.04 | 0.28 | 0.28 | 0.08 | 0.32 | 0.32 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h 1795 | 3060 | 578 | 1810 | 2393 | 1153 | 1795 | 4887 | 352 | 3483 | 3582 | 1553 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h 124 | 142 | 136 | 128 | 211 | 191 | 51 | 355 | 190 | 122 | 434 | 63 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln1795 | 1885 | 1753 | 1810 | 1900 | 1646 | 1795 | 1716 | 1807 | 1742 | 1791 | 1553 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s 4.4 | 4.8 | 5.0 | 4.3 | 7.1 | 7.5 | 2.0 | 6.0 | 6.1 | 2.4 | 6.8 | 2.1 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s 4.4 | 4.8 | 5.0 | 4.3 | 7.1 | 7.5 | 2.0 | 6.0 | 6.1 | 2.4 | 6.8 | 2.1 |
| Prop In Lane 1.00 |  | 0.33 | 1.00 |  | 0.70 | 1.00 |  | 0.19 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h 326 | 343 | 319 | 395 | 415 | 359 | 67 | 956 | 504 | 264 | 1136 | 493 |
| V/C Ratio(X) 0.38 | 0.41 | 0.43 | 0.32 | 0.51 | 0.53 | 0.77 | 0.37 | 0.38 | 0.46 | 0.38 | 0.13 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h 629 | 661 | 614 | 634 | 666 | 577 | 644 | 2149 | 1132 | 1249 | 2244 | 973 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh 26.1 | 26.2 | 26.3 | 23.8 | 24.9 | 25.1 | 34.6 | 21.0 | 21.1 | 32.1 | 19.2 | 17.6 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh 1.0 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 1.4 | 1.7 | 22.5 | 0.9 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 0.8 | 0.4 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/IIT. 9 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 1.9 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 1.3 | 2.4 | 2.7 | 10 | 2.7 | 08 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh 27.1 | 27.4 | 27.6 | 24.5 | 26.3 | 26.8 | 57.1 | 21.9 | 22.8 | 33.9 | 20.0 | 18.0 |
| LnGrp LOS C | C | C | C | C | C | E | C | C | C | B | B |
| Approach Vol, veh/h | 402 |  |  | 530 |  |  | 596 |  |  | 619 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 27.4 |  |  | 26.0 |  |  | 25.2 |  |  | 22.5 |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  | C |  |  | , |  |  | C |  |


| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s9.5 | 24.8 | 20.4 | 6.7 | 27.6 | 17.8 |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s 4.0 | 4.6 | 4.6 | 4.0 | 4.6 | 4.6 |
| Max Green Setting (Gma\&ís,s | 45.4 | 25.4 | 26.0 | 45.4 | 25.4 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+IA),4s | 8.1 | 9.5 | 4.0 | 8.8 | 7.0 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s 0.5 | 9.4 | 3.7 | 0.1 | 8.3 | 2.8 |

Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 25.0 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | C |

Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.



* HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier.

|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 个t |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 性 |  | ${ }^{*}$ | F |  | ${ }^{7}$ | F |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 43 | 252 | 88 | 54 | 395 | 48 | 146 | 371 | 56 | 66 | 239 | 60 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 43 | 252 | 88 | 54 | 395 | 48 | 146 | 371 | 56 | 66 | 239 | 60 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.94 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 45 | 265 | 93 | 57 | 416 | 51 | 154 | 391 | 59 | 69 | 252 | 63 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap, veh/h | 66 | 631 | 214 | 77 | 799 | 97 | 205 | 529 | 80 | 90 | 387 | 97 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.04 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.04 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.11 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.05 | 0.27 | 0.27 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1810 | 2602 | 884 | 1810 | 3215 | 391 | 1810 | 1607 | 242 | 1810 | 1458 | 364 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 45 | 181 | 177 | 57 | 232 | 235 | 154 | 0 | 450 | 69 | 0 | 315 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | n1810 | 1805 | 1680 | 1810 | 1805 | 1801 | 1810 | 0 | 1849 | 1810 | 0 | 1822 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 1.3 | 4.5 | 4.8 | 1.7 | 5.9 | 6.0 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 11.6 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 8.2 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 1.3 | 4.5 | 4.8 | 1.7 | 5.9 | 6.0 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 11.6 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 8.2 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.53 | 1.00 |  | 0.22 | 1.00 |  | 0.13 | 1.00 |  | 0.20 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 66 | 438 | 407 | 77 | 449 | 448 | 205 | 0 | 609 | 90 | 0 | 484 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.68 | 0.41 | 0.43 | 0.74 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.75 | 0.00 | 0.74 | 0.77 | 0.00 | 0.65 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 693 | 1197 | 1114 | 693 | 1197 | 1194 | 693 | 0 | 881 | 693 | 0 | 868 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(I) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | h 25.5 | 17.1 | 17.2 | 25.3 | 17.3 | 17.4 | 23.0 | 0.0 | 15.9 | 25.1 | 0.0 | 17.5 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 8.8 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 9.7 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 5.5 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 12.9 | 0.0 | 1.8 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh | h/If0. 7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 0.9 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 3.3 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, | , s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 34.3 | 17.3 | 17.4 | 35.0 | 18.5 | 18.5 | 28.5 | 0.0 | 17.4 | 38.0 | 0.0 | 19.2 |
| LnGrp LOS | C | B | B | D | B | B | C | A | B | D | A | B |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 403 |  |  | 524 |  |  | 604 |  |  | 384 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 19.3 |  |  | 20.3 |  |  | 20.2 |  |  | 22.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), | , 56.8 | 17.5 | 7.2 | 22.1 | 6.5 | 17.8 | 10.6 | 18.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s | s 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gma | ma20.5 | 35.5 | 20.5 | 25.5 | 20.5 | 35.5 | 20.5 | 25.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+ | +19,75 | 6.8 | 4.0 | 13.6 | 3.3 | 8.0 | 6.4 | 10.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | s 0.1 | 1.4 | 0.1 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 0.3 | 1.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl DelayHCM 6th LOS |  |  | 20.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 个 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 中t |  | ${ }^{7}$ | F |  | ${ }^{7}$ | F |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 24 | 256 | 54 | 63 | 418 | 148 | 42 | 117 | 53 | 71 | 89 | 47 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 24 | 256 | 54 | 63 | 418 | 148 | 42 | 117 | 53 | 71 | 89 | 47 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 0.91 | 1.00 |  | 0.91 | 1.00 |  | 0.94 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 25 | 269 | 57 | 66 | 440 | 156 | 44 | 123 | 56 | 75 | 94 | 49 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap, veh/h | 43 | 940 | 194 | 89 | 886 | 310 | 67 | 284 | 129 | 98 | 294 | 153 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.02 | 0.32 | 0.32 | 0.05 | 0.35 | 0.35 | 0.04 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.05 | 0.25 | 0.25 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1810 | 2921 | 603 | 1810 | 2553 | 892 | 1795 | 1200 | 546 | 1810 | 1161 | 605 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 25 | 163 | 163 | 66 | 309 | 287 | 44 | 0 | 179 | 75 | 0 | 143 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 1810 | 1805 | 1719 | 1810 | 1805 | 1641 | 1795 | 0 | 1746 | 1810 | 0 | 1766 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.6 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 1.7 | 6.4 | 6.5 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 4.1 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 3.1 |
| Cycle Q Clear (g_c), s | 0.6 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 1.7 | 6.4 | 6.5 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 4.1 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 3.1 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.35 | 1.00 |  | 0.54 | 1.00 |  | 0.31 | 1.00 |  | 0.34 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 43 | 581 | 553 | 89 | 627 | 570 | 67 | 0 | 413 | 98 | 0 | 447 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.58 | 0.28 | 0.29 | 0.74 | 0.49 | 0.50 | 0.66 | 0.00 | 0.43 | 0.77 | 0.00 | 0.32 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 613 | 1759 | 1675 | 613 | 1759 | 1599 | 799 | 0 | 592 | 805 | 0 | 599 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 22.8 | 11.9 | 12.0 | 22.2 | 12.1 | 12.2 | 22.4 | 0.0 | 15.3 | 22.0 | 0.0 | 14.3 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 11.9 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 11.5 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 10.6 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 11.8 | 0.0 | 0.4 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ | $1 / 10.4$ | 1.1 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 2.2 | 2.1 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 1.2 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, | , s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 34.8 | 12.2 | 12.3 | 33.7 | 12.7 | 12.9 | 33.0 | 0.0 | 16.1 | 33.9 | 0.0 | 14.7 |
| LnGrp LOS | C | B | B | C | B | B | C | A | B | C | A | B |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 351 |  |  | 662 |  |  | 223 |  |  | 218 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 13.8 |  |  | 14.9 |  |  | 19.4 |  |  | 21.3 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $G+Y+R \mathrm{C})$, | , 66.5 | 15.2 | 6.3 | 19.2 | 5.8 | 16.0 | 5.1 | 20.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s | s 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmaz) | 2X), 6 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 46.0 | 21.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 46.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+ | +17, 9 | 6.1 | 3.7 | 5.3 | 3.1 | 5.1 | 2.6 | 8.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 2.1 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 4.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrr DelayHCM 6th LOS |  |  | 16.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.


Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.

Intersection
Intersection Delay, s/veh12.1
Intersection LOS $\quad$ B

| Movement EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | \$ |  |  | \$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h 26 | 178 | 35 | 29 | 175 | 41 | 49 | 157 | 37 | 30 | 76 | 47 |
| Future Vol, veh/h 26 | 178 | 35 | 29 | 175 | 41 | 49 | 157 | 37 | 30 | 76 | 47 |
| Peak Hour Factor 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow 28 | 191 | 38 | 31 | 188 | 44 | 53 | 169 | 40 | 32 | 82 | 51 |
| Number of Lanes 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach RighNB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay 12.2 |  |  | 12.1 |  |  | 12.6 |  |  | 10.9 |  |  |
| HCM LOS B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 EBLn1 EBLn2WBLn1WBLn2 SBLn1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $20 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $20 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $65 \%$ | $87 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $86 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $15 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $31 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 243 | 204 | 35 | 204 | 41 | 153 |
| LT Vol | 49 | 26 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 30 |
| Through Vol | 157 | 178 | 0 | 175 | 0 | 76 |
| RT Vol | 37 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 41 | 47 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 261 | 219 | 38 | 219 | 44 | 165 |
| Geometry Grp | 2 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 2 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.409 | 0.379 | 0.057 | 0.379 | 0.067 | 0.262 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 5.64 | 6.22 | 5.443 | 6.22 | 5.435 | 5.74 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 635 | 577 | 655 | 577 | 656 | 622 |
| Service Time | 3.7 | 3.979 | 3.201 | 3.977 | 3.192 | 3.808 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.411 | 0.38 | 0.058 | 0.38 | 0.067 | 0.265 |
| HCM Control Delay | 12.6 | 12.8 | 8.5 | 12.8 | 8.6 | 10.9 |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | B | A | B | A | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 2 | 1.8 | 0.2 | 1.8 | 0.2 | 1 |



Notes
Unsignalized Delay for [EBR, WBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 个个 | 「 | \％ | 性 |  | \％ | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 12 | 983 | 1104 | 72 | 453 | 35 | 530 | 19 | 31 | 53 | 31 | 25 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 12 | 983 | 1104 | 72 | 453 | 35 | 530 | 19 | 31 | 53 | 31 | 25 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 12 | 1013 | 0 | 74 | 467 | 36 | 560 | 0 | 0 | 55 | 32 | 26 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap，veh／h | 25 | 2021 |  | 88 | 2015 | 155 | 616 | 0 |  | 84 | 49 | 113 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.01 | 0.56 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1795 | 3582 | 1598 | 1795 | 3361 | 258 | 3591 | 0 | 1598 | 1164 | 677 | 1562 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 12 | 1013 | 0 | 74 | 248 | 255 | 560 | 0 | 0 | 87 | 0 | 26 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1795 | 1791 | 1598 | 1795 | 1791 | 1829 | 1795 | 0 | 1598 | 1842 | 0 | 1562 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 0.7 | 19.2 | 0.0 | 4.6 | 7.2 | 7.3 | 17.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.2 | 0.0 | 1.8 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 0.7 | 19.2 | 0.0 | 4.6 | 7.2 | 7.3 | 17.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.2 | 0.0 | 1.8 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.14 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.63 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 25 | 2021 |  | 88 | 1074 | 1096 | 616 | 0 |  | 133 | 0 | 113 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.48 | 0.50 |  | 0.84 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.91 | 0.00 |  | 0.65 | 0.00 | 0.23 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 88 | 2021 |  | 88 | 1074 | 1096 | 625 | 0 |  | 370 | 0 | 314 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.91 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 54.8 | 14.8 | 0.0 | 52.8 | 10.4 | 10.4 | 45.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.6 | 0.0 | 49.0 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 5.2 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 45.3 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 15.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 0.4 | 7.9 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 8.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 0.7 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 60.0 | 15.7 | 0.0 | 98.1 | 10.9 | 10.9 | 61.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 52.6 | 0.0 | 49.4 |
| LnGrp LOS | E | B |  | F | B | B | E | A |  | D | A | D |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 1025 | A |  | 577 |  |  | 560 | A |  | 113 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 16.2 |  |  | 22.1 |  |  | 61.1 |  |  | 51.9 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | E |  |  | D |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 9.5 | 67.2 | 12.1 | 5.6 | 71.1 | 23.2 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 5.5 | 48.5 | 22.5 | 5.5 | 48.5 | 19.5 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 6.6 | 21.2 | 7.2 | 2.7 | 9.3 | 19.1 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.0 | 8.8 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 0.1 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 30.5 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | C |

Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement．
Unsignalized Delay for［NBR，EBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．


|  | 4 |  | $\checkmark$ | 7 |  | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\pm$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{1}$ | 44 | 7 | ${ }^{7}$ | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | F' |  | \$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 8 | 726 | 461 | 389 | 639 | 2 | 243 | 1 | 758 | 5 | 5 | 9 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 8 | 726 | 461 | 389 | 639 | 2 | 243 | 1 | 758 | 5 | 5 | 9 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.87 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1900 | 1900 | 1737 | 1870 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1856 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 8 | 756 | 0 | 405 | 666 | 2 | 253 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 9 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 0 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 14 | 1767 |  | 420 | 2651 | 8 | 274 | 1 |  | 12 | 12 | 21 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.01 | 0.49 | 0.00 | 0.47 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1810 | 3610 | 1472 | 1781 | 3692 | 11 | 1789 | 7 | 1572 | 416 | 416 | 750 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 8 | 756 | 0 | 405 | 326 | 342 | 254 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s), veh/h/ln | 1810 | 1805 | 1472 | 1781 | 1805 | 1898 | 1796 | 0 | 1572 | 1582 | 0 | 0 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.7 | 20.3 | 0.0 | 33.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 0.7 | 20.3 | 0.0 | 33.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.01 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.26 |  | 0.47 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 14 | 1767 |  | 420 | 1296 | 1363 | 275 | 0 |  | 44 | 0 | 0 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.58 | 0.43 |  | 0.96 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.92 | 0.00 |  | 0.43 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 48 | 1767 |  | 487 | 1296 | 1363 | 281 | 0 |  | 232 | 0 | 0 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(I) | 0.64 | 0.64 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.56 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 74.2 | 24.7 | 0.0 | 39.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 62.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 71.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 9.1 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 28.5 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 22.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 0.3 | 8.8 | 0.0 | 15.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 11.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 83.3 | 25.2 | 0.0 | 67.5 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 84.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 76.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | F | C |  | E | A | A | F | A |  | E | A | A |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 764 | A |  | 1073 |  |  | 254 | A |  | 19 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 25.8 |  |  | 25.8 |  |  | 84.7 |  |  | 76.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | F |  |  | E |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s | 38.4 | 77.4 |  | 7.7 | 4.1 | 111.7 |  | 26.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s | 3.0 | 4.0 |  | 3.5 | 3.0 | 4.0 |  | 3.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 41.0 | 49.5 |  | 22.0 | 4.0 | 86.5 |  | 23.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s | 35.0 | 22.3 |  | 3.8 | 2.7 | 2.0 |  | 22.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.4 | 7.8 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.9 |  | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay |  |  | 33.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Unsignalized Delay for [NBR, EBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 个个 | 「 | \％ | 性 |  | \％ | $\uparrow$ | 「 | ＊ | $\hat{\dagger}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 49 | 976 | 472 | ， | 1043 | 13 | 483 | 14 | 48 | 114 | 145 | 92 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 49 | 976 | 472 | 3 | 1043 | 13 | 483 | 14 | 48 | 114 | 145 | 92 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1870 | 1856 | 1841 | 1900 | 1841 | 1841 | 1811 | 1870 | 1856 | 1870 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 51 | 1017 | 0 | 3 | 1086 | 14 | 514 | 0 | 0 | 119 | 151 | 96 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap，veh／h | 65 | 1942 |  | 7 | 1831 | 24 | 583 | 0 |  | 278 | 169 | 108 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.05 | 0.73 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.16 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1781 | 3526 | 1560 | 1810 | 3534 | 46 | 3450 | 0 | 1572 | 1781 | 1083 | 688 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 51 | 1017 | 0 | 3 | 537 | 563 | 514 | 0 | 0 | 119 | 0 | 247 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／n | 1781 | 1763 | 1560 | 1810 | 1749 | 1830 | 1725 | 0 | 1572 | 1781 | 0 | 1771 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 4.2 | 18.8 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 32.1 | 32.1 | 21.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.1 | 0.0 | 20.5 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 4.2 | 18.8 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 32.1 | 32.1 | 21.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.1 | 0.0 | 20.5 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.02 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.39 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 65 | 1942 |  | 7 | 906 | 948 | 583 | 0 |  | 278 | 0 | 277 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.78 | 0.52 |  | 0.42 | 0.59 | 0.59 | 0.88 | 0.00 |  | 0.43 | 0.00 | 0.89 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 101 | 1942 |  | 62 | 906 | 948 | 793 | 0 |  | 338 | 0 | 337 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.33 | 1.33 | 1.33 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 70.7 | 11.5 | 0.0 | 74.5 | 25.2 | 25.2 | 60.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 57.2 | 0.0 | 62.0 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 18.4 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 35.4 | 2.9 | 2.7 | 8.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 21.7 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 2.3 | 6.3 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 13.9 | 14.5 | 10.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 10.9 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 89.1 | 12.5 | 0.0 | 110.0 | 28.0 | 27.9 | 69.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 58.3 | 0.0 | 83.8 |
| LnGrp LOS | F | B |  | F | C | C | E | A |  | E | A | F |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 1068 | A |  | 1103 |  |  | 514 | A |  | 366 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 16.2 |  |  | 28.2 |  |  | 69.7 |  |  | 75.5 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | E |  |  | E |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration $(G+Y+R c)$ ，s | 5.1 | 87.1 | 29.8 | 10.0 | 82.2 | 27.9 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 5.1 | 63.9 | 34.5 | 8.5 | 60.5 | 28.5 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 2.2 | 20.8 | 23.8 | 6.2 | 34.1 | 22.5 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.0 | 9.5 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 8.0 | 0.9 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 36.6 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | $D$ |

Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement．
Unsignalized Delay for［NBR，EBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．

| 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | * 4 | 44 | 「 | \% 1 | 「' |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) 332 | 538 | 564 | 53 | 640 | 406 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) 332 | 538 | 564 | 53 | 640 | 406 |
| Initial Q $(\mathrm{Qb})$, veh 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) 1.00 |  |  | 0.98 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus, Adj 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach | No | No |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln 1885 | 1885 | 1870 | 1870 | 1885 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h 342 | 555 | 581 | 55 | 660 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Cap, veh/h 510 | 890 | 795 | 347 | 771 |  |
| Arrive On Green 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.00 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h 1315 | 2390 | 3647 | 1551 | 3483 | 1598 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h 473 | 424 | 581 | 55 | 660 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln1819 | 1791 | 1777 | 1551 | 1742 | 1598 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s 17.2 | 15.2 | 12.1 | 2.3 | 14.6 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s 17.2 | 15.2 | 12.1 | 2.3 | 14.6 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane 0.72 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h 705 | 694 | 795 | 347 | 771 |  |
| V/C Ratio(X) 0.67 | 0.61 | 0.73 | 0.16 | 0.86 |  |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h 705 | 694 | 795 | 347 | 906 |  |
| HCM Platoon Ratio 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) 0.09 | 0.09 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh 20.3 | 19.7 | 28.8 | 25.0 | 29.9 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh 0.5 | 0.4 | 5.9 | 1.0 | 7.2 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/lı. 1 | 6.1 | 5.7 | 0.9 | 6.7 | 0.0 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh 20.7 | 20.0 | 34.7 | 26.0 | 37.1 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS C | C | C | C | D |  |
| Approach Vol, veh/h | 897 | 636 |  | 660 | A |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 20.4 | 33.9 |  | 37.1 |  |
| Approach LOS | C | C |  | D |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs | 2 |  | 4 |  | 6 |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s | 35.6 |  | 21.9 |  | 22.5 |
| Change Period ( $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s | 4.6 |  | * 4.2 |  | 4.6 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 27.9 |  | * 21 |  | 17.9 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+l1), s | 19.2 |  | 16.6 |  | 14.1 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 3.9 |  | 1.1 |  | 1.5 |

## Intersection Summary

HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 29.4

HCM 6th LOS C
Notes

* HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier.

Unsignalized Delay for [SBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.


Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 4.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | 个 | $\mathbf{r}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | 个 | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 510 | 204 | 156 | 379 | 72 | 76 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 510 | 204 | 156 | 379 | 72 | 76 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | 25 | 170 | - | 145 | 0 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 531 | 213 | 163 | 395 | 75 | 79 |



Intersection
Intersection Delay, s/veh78.4
Intersection LOS F

| Movement EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \& |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\ddagger$ |  |  | \$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h 5 | 341 | 3 | 3 | 37 | 276 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 612 | 3 | 6 |
| Future Vol, veh/h 5 | 341 | 3 | 3 | 37 | 276 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 612 | 3 | 6 |
| Peak Hour Factor 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.58 | 0.58 | 0.58 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Mvmt Flow 6 | 383 | 3 | 3 | 40 | 300 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 680 | 3 | 7 |
| Number of Lanes 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach RighNB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay 27.4 |  |  | 17.9 |  |  | 11.6 |  |  | 138.6 |  |  |
| HCM LOS D |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | F |  |  |


|  | NBLn1 EBLn1WBLn1WBLn2 SBLn1 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $29 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $99 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, $\%$ | $14 \%$ | $98 \%$ | $93 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $57 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 7 | 349 | 40 | 276 | 621 |
| LT Vol | 2 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 612 |
| Through Vol | 1 | 341 | 37 | 0 | 3 |
| RT Vol | 4 | 3 | 0 | 276 | 6 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 12 | 392 | 43 | 300 | 690 |
| Geometry Grp | 2 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 2 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.026 | 0.726 | 0.089 | 0.554 | 1.226 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 8.38 | 7.326 | 8.104 | 7.341 | 6.395 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 430 | 498 | 445 | 495 | 573 |
| Service Time | 6.38 | 5.326 | 5.804 | 5.041 | 4.437 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.028 | 0.787 | 0.097 | 0.606 | 1.204 |
| HCM Control Delay | 11.6 | 27.4 | 11.6 | 18.8 | 138.6 |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | D | B | C | F |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0.1 | 5.9 | 0.3 | 3.3 | 25.8 |



Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.


| Movement EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  |  | ${ }_{1}$ | $\uparrow$ | F＇ |  | 个1 | 「 |  | 性 |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 0 | 0 | 821 | 0 | 253 | 0 | 537 | 488 | 0 | 755 | 143 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） 0 | 0 | 0 | 821 | 0 | 253 | 0 | 537 | 488 | 0 | 755 | 143 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 |
| Parking Bus，Adj |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／n |  |  | 1885 | 1900 | 1826 | 0 | 1870 | 1900 | 0 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h |  |  | 902 | 0 | 278 | 0 | 590 | 0 | 0 | 830 | 157 |
| Peak Hour Factor |  |  | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ |  |  | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap，veh／h |  |  | 1072 | 0 | 462 | 0 | 1879 |  | 0 | 1567 | 296 |
| Arrive On Green |  |  | 0.30 | 0.00 | 0.30 | 0.00 | 0.53 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.53 | 0.53 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h |  |  | 3591 | 0 | 1547 | 0 | 3647 | 1610 | 0 | 3058 | 561 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h |  |  | 902 | 0 | 278 | 0 | 590 | 0 | 0 | 497 | 490 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln |  |  | 1795 | 0 | 1547 | 0 | 1777 | 1610 | 0 | 1777 | 1748 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s |  |  | 12.9 | 0.0 | 8.4 | 0.0 | 5.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.1 | 10.1 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s |  |  | 12.9 | 0.0 | 8.4 | 0.0 | 5.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.1 | 10.1 |
| Prop In Lane |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.00 |  | 0.32 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h |  |  | 1072 | 0 | 462 | 0 | 1879 |  | 0 | 940 | 924 |
| VIC Ratio（X） |  |  | 0.84 | 0.00 | 0.60 | 0.00 | 0.31 |  | 0.00 | 0.53 | 0.53 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h |  |  | 1143 | 0 | 492 | 0 | 1879 |  | 0 | 940 | 924 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） |  |  | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.89 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh |  |  | 18.1 | 0.0 | 16.5 | 0.0 | 7.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.5 | 8.5 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh |  |  | 5.7 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln |  |  | 5.4 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 3.6 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh |  |  | 23.8 | 0.0 | 18.6 | 0.0 | 7.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.4 | 10.5 |
| LnGrp LOS |  |  | C | A | B | A | A |  | A | B | B |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  |  |  | 1180 |  |  | 590 | A |  | 987 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  |  |  | 22.5 |  |  | 7.7 |  |  | 10.5 |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  | C |  |  | A |  |  | B |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 2 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration $(G+Y+R c), ~ s$ | 34.4 | 34.4 | 20.6 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 5.3 | 5.3 | 4.2 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 28.0 | 28.0 | 17.5 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 7.2 | 12.1 | 14.9 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 4.5 | 7.2 | 1.5 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 15.0 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | B |

Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement．
Unsignalized Delay for［NBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 | 7 | 惺 |  | 7 | 快 |  |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 679 | 26 | 274 | 44 | 16 | 107 | 83 | 1405 | 17 | 46 | 1013 | 240 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 679 | 26 | 274 | 44 | 16 | 107 | 83 | 1405 | 17 | 46 | 1013 | 240 |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time（s） | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 |  | 4.2 | 4.2 | 3.7 | 4.9 |  | 4.6 | 4.9 |  |
| Lane Util．Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.91 |  | 1.00 | 0.91 |  |
| Frpb，ped／bikes | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.97 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.98 |  |
| Flpb，ped／bikes | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 |  | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.97 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 1625 | 1641 | 1509 |  | 1784 | 1561 | 1745 | 4949 |  | 1745 | 4735 |  |
| FIt Permitted | 0.95 | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 1625 | 1641 | 1509 |  | 1784 | 1561 | 1745 | 4949 |  | 1745 | 4735 |  |
| Peak－hour factor，PHF | 0.86 | 0.61 | 0.80 | 0.85 | 0.44 | 0.79 | 0.66 | 0.86 | 0.61 | 0.67 | 0.94 | 0.85 |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 790 | 43 | 342 | 52 | 36 | 135 | 126 | 1634 | 28 | 69 | 1078 | 282 |
| RTOR Reduction（vph） | 0 | 0 | 124 | 0 | 0 | 117 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 419 | 414 | 219 | 0 | 88 | 18 | 126 | 1661 | 0 | 69 | 1322 | 0 |
| Confl．Peds．（\＃／hr） |  |  | 18 | 18 |  |  | 12 |  | 8 | 8 |  | 12 |
| Confl．Bikes（\＃／hr） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |


| Heavy Vehicles（\％） | $2 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Turn Type | Split | NA | Perm | Split | NA | Perm | Prot | NA |  | Prot | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 4 | 4 |  | 3 | 3 |  | 5 | 1 |  | 2 | 6 |  |


| Permitted Phases |  |  | 4 |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Actuated Green，G（s） | 30.0 | 30.0 | 30.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 13.3 | 43.6 | 12.4 | 43.6 |
| Effective Green， g （s） | 30.0 | 30.0 | 30.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 13.3 | 43.6 | 12.4 | 43.6 |
| Actuated g／C Ratio | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.11 | 0.36 | 0.10 | 0.36 |
| Clearance Time（s） | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 3.7 | 4.9 | 4.6 | 4.9 |
| Vehicle Extension（s） | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.2 |
| Lane Grp Cap（vph） | 406 | 410 | 377 | 238 | 208 | 193 | 1799 | 180 | 1721 |
| v／s Ratio Prot | c0．26 | 0.25 |  | c0．05 |  | c0．07 | c0．34 | 0.04 | 0.28 |
| v／s Ratio Perm |  |  | 0.14 |  | 0.01 |  |  |  |  |
| v／c Ratio | 1.03 | 1.01 | 0.58 | 0.37 | 0.09 | 0.65 | 0.92 | 0.38 | 0.77 |
| Uniform Delay，d1 | 45.0 | 45.0 | 39.4 | 47.4 | 45.5 | 51.1 | 36.5 | 50.2 | 33.7 |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.18 | 0.92 |
| Incremental Delay，d2 | 53.1 | 46.9 | 2.2 | 1.0 | 0.2 | 7.7 | 9.4 | 1.3 | 3.3 |
| Delay（s） | 98.1 | 91.9 | 41.6 | 48.3 | 45.7 | 58.8 | 46.0 | 60.5 | 34.4 |
| Level of Service | F | F | D | D | D | E | D | E | C |
| Approach Delay（s） |  | 79.4 |  | 46.8 |  |  | 46.9 |  | 35.6 |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  | D |  |  | D |  | D |


| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| HCM 2000 Control Delay | 51.7 | HCM 2000 Level of Service | D |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity ratio | 0.84 |  | 17.9 |
| Actuated Cycle Length（s） | 119.9 | Sum of lost time（s） | C |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $70.1 \%$ | ICU Level of Service |  |
| Analysis Period（min） | 15 |  |  |
| c Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |


|  | $\dagger$ | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 | $\leftarrow$ |  | 4 | $\dagger$ | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \％ 7 | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 恌 |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 个种 | r |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 475 | 159 | 34 | 28 | 86 | 112 | 46 | 870 | 67 | 142 | 736 | 316 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 475 | 159 | 34 | 28 | 86 | 112 | 46 | 870 | 67 | 142 | 736 | 316 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 0.94 | 1.00 |  | 0.91 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 500 | 167 | 36 | 29 | 91 | 118 | 48 | 916 | 71 | 149 | 775 | 333 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Cap，veh／h | 731 | 311 | 67 | 51 | 161 | 166 | 62 | 1866 | 144 | 191 | 2348 | 713 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.03 | 0.38 | 0.38 | 0.11 | 0.46 | 0.46 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 3483 | 1485 | 320 | 454 | 1424 | 1461 | 1795 | 4855 | 375 | 1795 | 5147 | 1563 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 500 | 0 | 203 | 120 | 0 | 118 | 48 | 646 | 341 | 149 | 775 | 333 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／n | 1742 | 0 | 1805 | 1877 | 0 | 1461 | 1795 | 1716 | 1799 | 1795 | 1716 | 1563 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 11.8 | 0.0 | 8.9 | 5.4 | 0.0 | 7.0 | 2.4 | 12.8 | 12.8 | 7.2 | 8.6 | 13.1 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 11.8 | 0.0 | 8.9 | 5.4 | 0.0 | 7.0 | 2.4 | 12.8 | 12.8 | 7.2 | 8.6 | 13.1 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.18 | 0.24 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.21 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 731 | 0 | 379 | 213 | 0 | 166 | 62 | 1319 | 692 | 191 | 2348 | 713 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.68 | 0.00 | 0.54 | 0.56 | 0.00 | 0.71 | 0.77 | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.78 | 0.33 | 0.47 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 820 | 0 | 425 | 442 | 0 | 344 | 322 | 1745 | 915 | 523 | 2618 | 795 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（I） | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 32.5 | 0.0 | 31.4 | 37.5 | 0.0 | 38.2 | 42.7 | 20.8 | 20.9 | 38.8 | 15.5 | 16.8 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 4.3 | 0.0 | 4.2 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 7.8 | 24.2 | 1.3 | 2.5 | 9.3 | 0.4 | 2.2 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 5.4 | 0.0 | 4.3 | 2.7 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 1.4 | 5.1 | 5.6 | 3.6 | 3.2 | 4.8 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 36.9 | 0.0 | 35.6 | 40.8 | 0.0 | 46.0 | 66.9 | 22.1 | 23.4 | 48.2 | 15.9 | 19.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | D | A | D | D | A | D | E | C | C | D | B | B |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 703 |  |  | 238 |  |  | 1035 |  |  | 1257 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 36.5 |  |  | 43.4 |  |  | 24.6 |  |  | 20.5 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 7.1 | 45.3 | 14.1 | 13.5 | 38.9 | 22.7 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 4.0 | 4.6 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.6 | 4.0 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 16.0 | 45.4 | 21.0 | 26.0 | 45.4 | 21.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 4.4 | 15.1 | 9.0 | 9.2 | 14.8 | 13.8 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.1 | 20.3 | 1.2 | 0.5 | 19.5 | 3.9 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 27.0 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | C |

Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green．

| Movement EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations \% | * $\downarrow$ |  | 7 | ¢ $\downarrow$ |  |  | 惺 |  | \% ${ }^{17}$ | 性 | F |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) 388 | 549 | 121 | 216 | 242 | 95 | 128 | 541 | 90 | 178 | 459 | 89 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) 388 | 549 | 121 | 216 | 242 | 95 | 128 | 541 | 90 | 178 | 459 | 89 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 |
| Parking Bus, Adj 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h 364 | 617 | 125 | 190 | 295 | 98 | 132 | 558 | 93 | 184 | 473 | 92 |
| Peak Hour Factor 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Cap, veh/h 465 | 784 | 159 | 350 | 526 | 170 | 171 | 1207 | 197 | 284 | 926 | 400 |
| Arrive On Green 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.10 | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.08 | 0.26 | 0.26 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h 1795 | 3028 | 612 | 1810 | 2721 | 880 | 1795 | 4432 | 724 | 3483 | 3582 | 1547 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h 364 | 384 | 358 | 190 | 204 | 189 | 132 | 429 | 222 | 184 | 473 | 92 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/n1795 | 1885 | 1754 | 1810 | 1900 | 1701 | 1795 | 1716 | 1725 | 1742 | 1791 | 1547 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s 17.3 | 17.4 | 17.5 | 8.7 | 8.9 | 9.3 | 6.6 | 9.6 | 9.9 | 4.7 | 10.4 | 4.3 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s 17.3 | 17.4 | 17.5 | 8.7 | 8.9 | 9.3 | 6.6 | 9.6 | 9.9 | 4.7 | 10.4 | 4.3 |
| Prop In Lane 1.00 |  | 0.35 | 1.00 |  | 0.52 | 1.00 |  | 0.42 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h 465 | 488 | 455 | 350 | 367 | 329 | 171 | 934 | 470 | 284 | 926 | 400 |
| V/C Ratio(X) 0.78 | 0.79 | 0.79 | 0.54 | 0.55 | 0.58 | 0.77 | 0.46 | 0.47 | 0.65 | 0.51 | 0.23 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h 496 | 521 | 485 | 500 | 525 | 470 | 508 | 1696 | 853 | 986 | 1770 | 765 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) $\quad 1.00$ | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh 31.6 | 31.7 | 31.7 | 33.4 | 33.5 | 33.6 | 40.6 | 27.8 | 27.9 | 40.9 | 29.1 | 26.8 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh 8.1 | 7.9 | 8.6 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 2.3 | 10.0 | 1.3 | 2.7 | 3.5 | 1.6 | 1.1 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/Ir8.5 | 8.9 | 8.4 | 4.0 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 4.0 | 4.3 | 2.1 | 4.5 | 1.7 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh 39.7 | 39.6 | 40.3 | 35.3 | 35.3 | 35.9 | 50.6 | 29.1 | 30.6 | 44.4 | 30.7 | 27.9 |
| LnGrp LOS D | D | D | D | D | D | D | C | C | D | C | C |
| Approach Vol, veh/h | 1106 |  |  | 583 |  |  | 783 |  |  | 749 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 39.9 |  |  | 35.5 |  |  | 33.1 |  |  | 33.7 |  |
| Approach LOS | D |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |


| Timer - Assigned Phs 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), \$1.5 | 29.6 | 22.4 | 12.8 | 28.3 | 28.4 |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s 4.0 | 4.6 | 4.6 | 4.0 | 4.6 | 4.6 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmaz¢.¢ | 45.4 | 25.4 | 26.0 | 45.4 | 25.4 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c $+119,7$ \% | 11.9 | 11.3 | 8.6 | 12.4 | 19.5 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s 0.8 | 11.2 | 3.7 | 0.5 | 9.2 | 3.7 |

Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 36.0 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | D |

Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.



* HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier.


User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.


| Timer - Assigned Phs | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), 88.4 | 15.7 | 7.0 | 34.8 | 5.5 | 28.6 | 6.2 | 35.6 |
| Change Period ( $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmaz), ${ }^{\text {B }}$ | 16.0 | 16.0 | 46.0 | 21.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 46.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c + MII, ${ }^{\text {S }}$ | 7.4 | 4.3 | 22.4 | 3.0 | 8.7 | 3.6 | 10.2 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 8.4 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 3.8 |

Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 24.1 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS |  |

Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement E | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 性 |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ | F |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | $\stackrel{7}{7}$ |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 34 | 1228 | 106 | 142 | 538 | 21 | 87 | 10 | 114 | 19 | 9 | 16 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 34 | 1228 | 106 | 142 | 538 | 21 | 87 | 10 | 114 | 19 | 9 | 16 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) 1 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 |
| Parking Bus, Adj 1 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln 19 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 35 | 1266 | 109 | 146 | 555 | 22 | 90 | 10 | 118 | 20 | 9 | 16 |
| Peak Hour Factor 0 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap, veh/h | 50 | 1502 | 129 | 189 | 1010 | 828 | 91 | 6 | 412 | 81 | 23 | 426 |
| Arrive On Green 0 | 0.03 | 0.45 | 0.45 | 0.10 | 0.53 | 0.53 | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.27 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h 18 | 1810 | 3352 | 288 | 1810 | 1900 | 1557 | 0 | 21 | 1546 | 0 | 86 | 1599 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 35 | 680 | 695 | 146 | 555 | 22 | 100 | 0 | 118 | 29 | 0 | 16 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/n18 | 1810 | 1805 | 1835 | 1810 | 1900 | 1557 | 21 | 0 | 1546 | 86 | 0 | 1599 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 1.4 | 25.0 | 25.3 | 5.9 | 14.5 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 1.4 | 25.0 | 25.3 | 5.9 | 14.5 | 0.5 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 4.6 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
| Prop In Lane $\quad 1$ | 1.00 |  | 0.16 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.90 |  | 1.00 | 0.69 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 50 | 809 | 822 | 189 | 1010 | 828 | 97 | 0 | 412 | 104 | 0 | 426 |
| V/C Ratio(X) 0 | 0.70 | 0.84 | 0.85 | 0.77 | 0.55 | 0.03 | 1.04 | 0.00 | 0.29 | 0.28 | 0.00 | 0.04 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h 6 | 626 | 1079 | 1097 | 614 | 1135 | 930 | 97 | 0 | 412 | 104 | 0 | 426 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio 1 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) 1 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh 3 | 36.2 | 18.3 | 18.4 | 32.8 | 11.6 | 8.4 | 36.4 | 0.0 | 21.9 | 23.0 | 0.0 | 20.4 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh 1 | 16.3 | 3.6 | 3.7 | 6.5 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 101.4 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/Ir. | $1 / 10.8$ | 10.2 | 10.5 | 2.9 | 5.6 | 0.2 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s | , s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh 5 | 52.5 | 21.9 | 22.1 | 39.3 | 11.8 | 8.4 | 137.8 | 0.0 | 22.0 | 23.5 | 0.0 | 20.4 |
| LnGrp LOS | D | C | C | D | B | A | F | A | C | C | A | C |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 1410 |  |  | 723 |  |  | 218 |  |  | 45 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 22.8 |  |  | 17.3 |  |  | 75.1 |  |  | 22.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | E |  |  | C |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s | , 22.4 | 38.8 |  | 24.0 | 6.1 | 45.1 |  | 24.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s | s 4.5 | 5.1 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.1 |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmaz | 225 | 44.9 |  | 20.0 | 26.0 | 44.9 |  | 20.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11 | -17,93 | 27.3 |  | 22.0 | 3.4 | 16.5 |  | 22.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.3 | 6.4 |  | 0.0 | 0.1 | 2.7 |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrr DelayHCM 6th LOS |  |  | 25.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | 7 | F |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | 7 | F |  | \% | F |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 49 | 309 | 108 | 129 | 196 | 31 | 62 | 294 | 100 | 61 | 406 | 38 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 49 | 309 | 108 | 129 | 196 | 31 | 62 | 294 | 100 | 61 | 406 | 38 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 0.93 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 51 | 322 | 112 | 134 | 204 | 32 | 65 | 306 | 104 | 64 | 423 | 40 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap, veh/h | 81 | 389 | 135 | 177 | 556 | 87 | 92 | 412 | 140 | 92 | 529 | 50 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.04 | 0.30 | 0.30 | 0.10 | 0.35 | 0.35 | 0.05 | 0.31 | 0.31 | 0.05 | 0.31 | 0.31 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1795 | 1310 | 455 | 1810 | 1590 | 249 | 1795 | 1325 | 450 | 1810 | 1701 | 161 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 51 | 0 | 434 | 134 | 0 | 236 | 65 | 0 | 410 | 64 | 0 | 463 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/n | n1795 | 0 | 1765 | 1810 | 0 | 1839 | 1795 | 0 | 1775 | 1810 | 0 | 1862 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 2.0 | 0.0 | 16.0 | 5.0 | 0.0 | 6.7 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 14.5 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 15.9 |
| Cycle Q Clear (g_c), s | 2.0 | 0.0 | 16.0 | 5.0 | 0.0 | 6.7 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 14.5 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 15.9 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.26 | 1.00 |  | 0.14 | 1.00 |  | 0.25 | 1.00 |  | 0.09 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 81 | 0 | 524 | 177 | 0 | 643 | 92 | 0 | 552 | 92 | 0 | 579 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.63 | 0.00 | 0.83 | 0.76 | 0.00 | 0.37 | 0.71 | 0.00 | 0.74 | 0.69 | 0.00 | 0.80 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 681 | 0 | 884 | 686 | 0 | 921 | 681 | 0 | 889 | 686 | 0 | 932 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 32.8 | 0.0 | 22.9 | 30.7 | 0.0 | 17.0 | 32.6 | 0.0 | 21.6 | 32.6 | 0.0 | 22.1 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 7.9 | 0.0 | 3.4 | 6.5 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 9.5 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 9.0 | 0.0 | 3.7 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh | h/lı1. 0 | 0.0 | 6.8 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 6.0 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 7.1 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay | , s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay (d),s/veh | 40.7 | 0.0 | 26.3 | 37.3 | 0.0 | 17.3 | 42.1 | 0.0 | 24.4 | 41.7 | 0.0 | 25.8 |
| LnGrp LOS | D | A | C | D | A | B | D | A | C | D | A | C |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 485 |  |  | 370 |  |  | 475 |  |  | 527 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 27.8 |  |  | 24.5 |  |  | 26.8 |  |  | 27.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs | , | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), | , 30.3 | 25.8 | 7.1 | 26.7 | 6.6 | 29.4 | 7.1 | 26.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), | s 3.5 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 5.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gma | 240,s | 35.0 | 26.5 | 35.0 | 26.5 | 35.0 | 26.5 | 35.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+ | +17, $0_{5}$ | 18.0 | 4.5 | 17.9 | 4.0 | 8.7 | 4.4 | 16.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | S 0.3 | 2.7 | 0.1 | 3.8 | 0.1 | 1.5 | 0.1 | 3.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl DelayHCM 6th LOS |  |  | 26.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |
| :--- |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh39.1 |
| Intersection LOS $\quad$ E |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | \$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 74 | 424 | 86 | 49 | 250 | 49 | 31 | 89 | 36 | 39 | 127 | 64 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 74 | 424 | 86 | 49 | 250 | 49 | 31 | 89 | 36 | 39 | 127 | 64 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 80 | 456 | 92 | 53 | 269 | 53 | 33 | 96 | 39 | 42 | 137 | 69 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |


| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Opposing Approach | WB | EB | SB | NB |
| Opposing Lanes | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Conflicting Approach Left SB | NB | EB | WB |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Conflicting Approach RighNB | SB | WB | EB |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| HCM Control Delay | 65 | 20.8 | 14.9 | 17.5 |
| HCM LOS | F | C | B |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 EBLn1 | EBLn2WBLn1WBLn2 SBLn1 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $20 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $17 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $57 \%$ | $85 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $84 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $55 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $23 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $00 \%$ | $28 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 156 | 498 | 86 | 299 | 49 | 230 |
| LT Vol | 31 | 74 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 39 |
| Through Vol | 89 | 424 | 0 | 250 | 0 | 127 |
| RT Vol | 36 | 0 | 86 | 0 | 49 | 64 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 168 | 535 | 92 | 322 | 53 | 247 |
| Geometry Grp | 2 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 2 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.352 | 1.033 | 0.158 | 0.642 | 0.095 | 0.496 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 7.758 | 6.946 | 6.152 | 7.452 | 6.647 | 7.396 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 466 | 525 | 584 | 489 | 542 | 490 |
| Service Time | 5.758 | 4.674 | 3.88 | 5.152 | 4.347 | 5.39 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.361 | 1.019 | 0.158 | 0.658 | 0.098 | 0.504 |
| HCM Control Delay | 14.9 | 74.5 | 10 | 22.6 | 10 | 17.5 |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | F | A | C | A | C |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 1.6 | 15.2 | 0.6 | 4.5 | 0.3 | 2.7 |


|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\uparrow$ | F | \% | $\uparrow$ | F | 7 | F |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 57 | 508 | 242 | 15 | 273 | 102 | 87 | 44 | 7 | 161 | 97 | 95 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 57 | 508 | 242 | 15 | 273 | 102 | 87 | 44 | 7 | 161 | 97 | 95 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.90 | 1.00 |  | 0.92 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 63 | 564 | 0 | 17 | 303 | 0 | 97 | 49 | 8 | 179 | 108 | 106 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Cap, veh/h | 99 | 699 |  | 37 | 634 |  | 127 | 301 | 49 | 227 | 208 | 204 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.06 | 0.37 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.34 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.13 | 0.25 | 0.25 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1795 | 1885 | 1598 | 1795 | 1885 | 1598 | 1810 | 1564 | 255 | 1795 | 833 | 818 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 63 | 564 | 0 | 17 | 303 | 0 | 97 | 0 | 57 | 179 | 0 | 214 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/n1 | 1795 | 1885 | 1598 | 1795 | 1885 | 1598 | 1810 | 0 | 1819 | 1795 | 0 | 1650 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 2.0 | 15.3 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 7.3 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 5.5 | 0.0 | 6.4 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 2.0 | 15.3 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 7.3 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 5.5 | 0.0 | 6.4 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.14 | 1.00 |  | 0.50 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 99 | 699 |  | 37 | 634 |  | 127 | 0 | 350 | 227 | 0 | 411 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.63 | 0.81 |  | 0.46 | 0.48 |  | 0.77 | 0.00 | 0.16 | 0.79 | 0.00 | 0.52 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 503 | 1173 |  | 503 | 1173 |  | 507 | 0 | 670 | 503 | 0 | 607 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(1) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 26.4 | 16.1 | 0.0 | 27.6 | 15.0 | 0.0 | 26.1 | 0.0 | 19.2 | 24.2 | 0.0 | 18.5 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 4.9 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 6.4 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0.8 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),S/veh 0.0\%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/110.9 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 6.3 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 2.3 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh LnGrp LOS | 31.3 | 18.4 | 0.0 | 34.0 | 15.5 | 0.0 | 29.7 | 0.0 | 19.4 | 26.5 | 0.0 | 19.2 |
|  | C | B |  | C | B |  | C | A | B | C | A | B |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 627 | A |  | 320 | A |  | 154 |  |  | 393 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 19.7 |  |  | 16.5 |  |  | 25.9 |  |  | 22.5 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s5.2 | 25.7 | 8.0 | 18.2 | 7.2 | 23.7 | 11.2 | 15.0 |  |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmaxक,. | 35.5 | 16.0 | 21.0 | 16.0 | 35.5 | 16.0 | 21.0 |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c $+124,5$ | 17.3 | 5.0 | 8.4 | 4.0 | 9.3 | 7.5 | 3.5 |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), $\mathbf{s}$ | 0.0 | 3.7 | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 1.8 | 0.2 | 0.2 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 20.4 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | C |

Notes
Unsignalized Delay for [EBR, WBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.

## Kimley»)Horn

## APPENDIX D. <br> NEAR TERM CONDITIONS SYNCHRO OUTPUT SHEETS

|  | $\dagger$ | $\rightarrow$ |  |  | 4 |  | 4 | 4 | $p$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 个4 | 「 | \％ | 性 |  | \％ | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 29 | 543 | 404 | 121 | 517 | 65 | 582 | 24 | 108 | 27 | 23 | 12 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 29 | 543 | 404 | 121 | 517 | 65 | 582 | 24 | 108 | 27 | 23 | 12 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 30 | 560 | 0 | 125 | 533 | 67 | 618 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 24 | 12 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 1 | 1 | 1 | ， | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | － | 0 |
| Cap，veh／h | 49 | 2079 |  | 88 | 1922 | 241 | 625 | 0 |  | 53 | 46 | 83 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.03 | 0.58 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1795 | 3582 | 1598 | 1795 | 3189 | 399 | 3591 | 0 | 1598 | 996 | 854 | 1551 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 30 | 560 | 0 | 125 | 298 | 302 | 618 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 0 | 12 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／n | 1795 | 1791 | 1598 | 1795 | 1791 | 1798 | 1795 | 0 | 1598 | 1850 | 0 | 1551 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 1.9 | 8.7 | 0.0 | 5.5 | 8.9 | 9.0 | 19.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 0.8 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 1.9 | 8.7 | 0.0 | 5.5 | 8.9 | 9.0 | 19.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 0.8 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.22 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.54 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 49 | 2079 |  | 88 | 1079 | 1083 | 625 | 0 |  | 99 | 0 | 83 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.62 | 0.27 |  | 1.42 | 0.28 | 0.28 | 0.99 | 0.00 |  | 0.53 | 0.00 | 0.14 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 88 | 2079 |  | 88 | 1079 | 1083 | 625 | 0 |  | 372 | 0 | 312 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.75 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 53.9 | 11.7 | 0.0 | 53.3 | 10.6 | 10.6 | 46.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 51.6 | 0.0 | 50.6 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 4.6 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 240.1 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 28.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 0.9 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 8.4 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 10.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 58.6 | 12.0 | 0.0 | 293.3 | 11.2 | 11.2 | 74.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 53.2 | 0.0 | 50.9 |
| LnGrp LOS | E | B |  | F | B | B | E | A |  | D | A | D |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 590 | A |  | 725 |  |  | 618 | A |  | 64 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 14.4 |  |  | 59.9 |  |  | 74.3 |  |  | 52.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | E |  |  | E |  |  | D |  |
| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration（ $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ），$s$ | 9.5 | 69.0 |  | 10.0 | 7.0 | 71.5 |  | 23.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period（ $Y+R \mathrm{R}$ ），s | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 5.5 | 48.5 |  | 22.5 | 5.5 | 48.5 |  | 19.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋1），s | 7.5 | 10.7 |  | 5.1 | 3.9 | 11.0 |  | 21.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.0 | 4.5 |  | 0.1 | 0.0 | 4.4 |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl DelayHCM 6th LOS |  |  | 50.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement．
Unsignalized Delay for［NBR，EBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．


| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 6 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), 86.2 | 23.9 | 26.6 | 40.2 |  |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s 4.5 | 5.0 | 4.5 | 5.0 |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax9, s | 33.0 | 28.5 | 33.0 |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+T11),6s | 12.8 | 21.3 | 8.9 |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.2 | 5.5 | 0.8 | 6.1 |

## Intersection Summary

HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 21.7

HCM 6th LOS C

|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 |  | 4 | 4 | 4 | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{4}$ | 个个 | 「 | \％ | 个 ${ }^{2}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | \＄ |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 6 | 678 | 370 | 324 | 621 | 6 | 232 | 2 | 936 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 6 | 678 | 370 | 324 | 621 | 6 | 232 | 2 | 936 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.86 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1900 | 1900 | 1737 | 1870 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1856 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 6 | 706 | 0 | 338 | 647 | 6 | 242 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 0 | 0 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap，veh／h | 11 | 1954 |  | 356 | 2694 | 25 | 264 | 2 |  | 9 | 0 | 17 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.01 | 0.54 | 0.00 | 0.40 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.02 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1810 | 3610 | 1472 | 1781 | 3665 | 34 | 1781 | 15 | 1572 | 495 | 0 | 990 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 6 | 706 | 0 | 338 | 319 | 334 | 244 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1810 | 1805 | 1472 | 1781 | 1805 | 1894 | 1796 | 0 | 1572 | 1485 | 0 | 0 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 0.5 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 27.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 0.5 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 27.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.02 | 0.99 |  | 1.00 | 0.33 |  | 0.67 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 11 | 1954 |  | 356 | 1327 | 1392 | 266 | 0 |  | 26 | 0 | 0 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.56 | 0.36 |  | 0.95 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.92 | 0.00 |  | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 48 | 1954 |  | 487 | 1327 | 1392 | 281 | 0 |  | 218 | 0 | 0 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 0.72 | 0.72 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.54 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 74.4 | 19.6 | 0.0 | 44.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 63.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 72.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 11.8 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 21.6 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 19.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 0.3 | 7.1 | 0.0 | 12.4 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 10.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 86.2 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 65.9 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 82.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 74.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | F | B |  | E | A | A | F | A |  | E | A | A |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 712 | A |  | 991 |  |  | 244 | A |  | 3 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 20.6 |  |  | 22.7 |  |  | 82.8 |  |  | 74.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | F |  |  | E |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration $(G+Y+R c)$ ，s | 33.0 | 85.2 | 6.1 | 3.9 | 114.2 | 25.7 |
| Change Period $(\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc})$ ，s | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 41.0 | 49.5 | 22.0 | 4.0 | 86.5 | 23.5 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 29.6 | 18.7 | 2.3 | 2.5 | 2.0 | 22.1 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.4 | 7.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.7 | 0.1 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 29.5 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | C |

Notes
Unsignalized Delay for［NBR，EBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | ¢ 4 | 「 | \％ | 个 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | \％ | $\uparrow$ | 「 | \％ | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 167 | 850 | 593 | 4 | 1081 | 27 | 424 | 92 | 36 | 68 | 83 | 56 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 167 | 850 | 593 | 4 | 1081 | 27 | 424 | 92 | 36 | 68 | 83 | 56 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1870 | 1856 | 1841 | 1900 | 1841 | 1841 | 1811 | 1870 | 1856 | 1870 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 174 | 885 | 0 | 4 | 1126 | 28 | 511 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 86 | 58 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap，veh／h | 101 | 2143 |  | 9 | 1938 | 48 | 580 | 0 |  | 176 | 104 | 70 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.06 | 0.61 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1781 | 3526 | 1560 | 1810 | 3483 | 87 | 3450 | 0 | 1572 | 1781 | 1054 | 711 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 174 | 885 | 0 | 4 | 565 | 589 | 511 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 0 | 144 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／n | 1781 | 1763 | 1560 | 1810 | 1749 | 1821 | 1725 | 0 | 1572 | 1781 | 0 | 1764 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 8.5 | 19.7 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 31.8 | 31.8 | 21.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.6 | 0.0 | 12.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 8.5 | 19.7 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 31.8 | 31.8 | 21.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.6 | 0.0 | 12.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.05 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.40 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 101 | 2143 |  | 9 | 973 | 1013 | 580 | 0 |  | 176 | 0 | 174 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 1.72 | 0.41 |  | 0.43 | 0.58 | 0.58 | 0.88 | 0.00 |  | 0.40 | 0.00 | 0.83 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 101 | 2143 |  | 62 | 973 | 1013 | 793 | 0 |  | 338 | 0 | 335 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 70.7 | 15.4 | 0.0 | 74.4 | 21.8 | 21.8 | 60.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 63.4 | 0.0 | 66.3 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 363.7 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 28.7 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 8.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 9.4 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 14.1 | 8.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 13.5 | 14.1 | 10.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 5.9 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 434.5 | 16.0 | 0.0 | 103.1 | 24.3 | 24.2 | 69.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 64.9 | 0.0 | 75.8 |
| LnGrp LOS | F | B |  | F | C | C | E | A |  | E | A | E |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 1059 | A |  | 1158 |  |  | 511 | A |  | 215 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 84.7 |  |  | 24.6 |  |  | 69.7 |  |  | 72.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  | C |  |  | E |  |  | E |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 5.3 | 95.7 | 29.7 | 13.0 | 88.0 | 19.3 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 5.1 | 63.9 | 34.5 | 8.5 | 60.5 | 28.5 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 2.3 | 21.7 | 23.7 | 10.5 | 33.8 | 14.0 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.0 | 7.8 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 8.6 | 0.8 |

## Intersection Summary

HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 57.5

HCM 6th LOS
E
Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement．
Unsignalized Delay for［NBR，EBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ** | 44 | F' | 7 | 「' |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) 374 | 240 | 565 | 167 | 308 | 589 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) 374 | 240 | 565 | 167 | 308 | 589 |
| Initial Q $(\mathrm{Qb})$, veh 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) 1.00 |  |  | 0.98 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus, Adj 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach | No | No |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln 1885 | 1885 | 1870 | 1870 | 1885 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h 386 | 247 | 582 | 172 | 318 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Cap, veh/h 870 | 868 | 795 | 347 | 432 |  |
| Arrive On Green 0.48 | 0.48 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.12 | 0.00 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h 1795 | 1885 | 3647 | 1551 | 3483 | 1598 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h 386 | 247 | 582 | 172 | 318 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln1795 | 1791 | 1777 | 1551 | 1742 | 1598 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s 11.3 | 6.6 | 12.2 | 7.7 | 7.0 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s 11.3 | 6.6 | 12.2 | 7.7 | 7.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h 870 | 868 | 795 | 347 | 432 |  |
| V/C Ratio(X) 0.44 | 0.28 | 0.73 | 0.50 | 0.74 |  |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h 870 | 868 | 795 | 347 | 906 |  |
| HCM Platoon Ratio 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) 0.41 | 0.41 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh 13.5 | 12.3 | 28.8 | 27.1 | 33.8 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh 0.7 | 0.3 | 5.9 | 5.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/lı4.5 | 2.6 | 5.7 | 3.3 | 3.1 | 0.0 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh 14.2 | 12.7 | 34.7 | 32.1 | 36.2 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS B | B | C | C | D |  |
| Approach Vol, veh/h | 633 | 754 |  | 318 | A |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 13.6 | 34.1 |  | 36.2 |  |
| Approach LOS | B | C |  | D |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs | 2 |  | 4 |  | 6 |
| Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s | 43.4 |  | 14.1 |  | 22.5 |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s | 4.6 |  | * 4.2 |  | 4.6 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 27.9 |  | *21 |  | 17.9 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+l1), s | 13.3 |  | 9.0 |  | 14.2 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 3.6 |  | 0.9 |  | 1.6 |

## Intersection Summary

HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 26.9

HCM 6th LOS C
Notes

* HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier.

Unsignalized Delay for [SBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.


Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | $\uparrow$ |  |  | - | Mr |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 239 | 8 | 9 | 315 | 9 | 7 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 239 | 8 | 9 | 315 | 9 | 7 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 11 |
| Mvmt Flow | 266 | 9 | 10 | 350 | 10 | 8 |


| Major/Minor | Major1 |  | Major2 |  | Minor1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 0 | 0 | 276 | 0 | 642 | 272 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 272 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 370 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | - | - | 4.12 | - | 6.51 | 6.31 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - | - | 5.51 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | 5.51 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | - | - | 2.218 | - | 3.599 | 3.399 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - | 1287 | - | 424 | 746 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 753 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 679 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% | - | - |  | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - | 1286 | - | 419 | 745 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - | - | 512 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 745 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 679 | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  | WB |  | NB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 |  | 0.2 |  | 11.3 |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  |  |  | B |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBLn1 EBT EBR WBL WBT |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 593 | - | - | 1286 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.03 | - |  | 0.008 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 11.3 | - | - | 7.8 | 0 |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | B | - | - | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0.1 | - | - | 0 | - |


| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 10.9 |
| Intersection LOS | B |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | \$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | * |  |  | \& |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 6 | 92 | 0 | 5 | 26 | 332 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 247 | 0 | 4 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 6 | 92 | 0 | 5 | 26 | 332 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 247 | 0 | 4 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Mvmt Flow | 6 | 96 | 0 | 5 | 27 | 346 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 257 | 0 | 4 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |  | NB |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |  | SB |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |  | EB |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |  | WB |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 9.2 |  |  | 11 |  |  |  | 8.3 |  | 11.5 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  |  | B |  |  |  | A |  | B |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $0 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $98 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $12 \%$ | $94 \%$ | $84 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $88 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 8 | 98 | 31 | 332 | 251 |
| LT Vol | 0 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 247 |
| Through Vol | 1 | 92 | 26 | 0 | 0 |
| RT Vol | 7 | 0 | 0 | 332 | 4 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 8 | 102 | 32 | 346 | 261 |
| Geometry Grp | 2 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 2 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.012 | 0.148 | 0.049 | 0.449 | 0.378 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 5.219 | 5.212 | 5.464 | 4.677 | 5.21 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 690 | 682 | 653 | 764 | 685 |
| Service Time | 3.219 | 3.291 | 3.22 | 2.433 | 3.282 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.012 | 0.15 | 0.049 | 0.453 | 0.381 |
| HCM Control Delay | 8.3 | 9.2 | 8.5 | 11.2 | 11.5 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | A | B | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 2.3 | 1.8 |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\downarrow$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | 蚛 |  | \％ | 性 |  | \％ | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | ¢ |  |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） 1 | 355 | 372 | 140 | 543 | 5 | 608 | 5 | 101 | 0 | 9 | 3 |  |
| Future Volume（veh／h） 1 | 355 | 372 | 140 | 543 | 5 | 608 | 5 | 101 | 0 | 9 | 3 |  |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 | 1.00 |  | 0.91 |  |
| Parking Bus，Adj 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Work Zone On Approach | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／n 1700 | 1687 | 1687 | 1634 | 1687 | 1687 | 1856 | 1900 | 1856 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |  |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h 1 | 382 | 400 | 151 | 584 | 5 | 658 | 0 | 109 | 0 | 10 | 3 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 |  |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Cap，veh／h 2 | 596 | 515 | 184 | 1593 | 14 | 873 | 0 | 379 | 0 | 22 | 7 |  |
| Arrive On Green 0.00 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.12 | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.02 |  |
| Sat Flow，veh／h 1619 | 1602 | 1385 | 1556 | 3255 | 28 | 3534 | 0 | 1536 | 0 | 1370 | 411 |  |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h 1 | 382 | 400 | 151 | 287 | 302 | 658 | 0 | 109 | 0 | 0 | 13 |  |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／n1619 | 1602 | 1385 | 1556 | 1602 | 1681 | 1767 | 0 | 1536 | 0 | 0 | 1781 |  |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s 0．0 | 14.7 | 19.1 | 7.1 | 8.4 | 8.4 | 12.9 | 0.0 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 |  |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s 0.0 | 14.7 | 19.1 | 7.1 | 8.4 | 8.4 | 12.9 | 0.0 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 |  |
| Prop In Lane $\quad 1.00$ |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.02 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.00 |  | 0.23 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h 2 | 596 | 515 | 184 | 784 | 822 | 873 | 0 | 379 | 0 | 0 | 28 |  |
| V／C Ratio（X） 0.46 | 0.64 | 0.78 | 0.82 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.75 | 0.00 | 0.29 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.46 |  |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h 691 | 684 | 592 | 664 | 784 | 822 | 1887 | 0 | 820 | 0 | 0 | 475 |  |
| HCM Platoon Ratio 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Upstream Filter（I）$\quad 1.00$ | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh 37.4 | 19.4 | 20.8 | 32.2 | 11.9 | 11.9 | 26.1 | 0.0 | 22.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 36.6 |  |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh 48.0 | 4.3 | 9.6 | 3.4 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 13.5 |  |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh 0.0 \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／lif． 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
|  | 5.7 | 7.0 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 5.4 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 |  |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh 85.4 | 23.7 | 30.3 | 35.6 | 13.0 | 12.9 | 27.5 | 0.0 | 23.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.1 |  |
| LnGrp LOS | C | C | D | B | B | C | A | C | A | A | D |  |
|  | 783 |  |  | 740 |  |  | 767 |  |  | 13 |  |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh 27 | 27.2 |  |  | 17.6 |  |  | 26.9 |  |  | 50.1 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | D |  |  |
| Timer－Assigned Phs | 2 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration（ $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ）， 83.4 | 32.9 |  | 5.7 | 4.6 | 41.7 |  | 23.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period（ $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ），s 4.5 | 5.0 |  | 4.5 | 4.5 | 5.0 |  | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax\％． 6 | 32.0 |  | 20.0 | 32.0 | 31.0 |  | 40.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋19，1s | 21.1 |  | 2.5 | 2.0 | 10.4 |  | 14.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s 0.2 | 6.8 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.8 |  | 3.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay |  | 24.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Notes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement．


| Movement E | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | 44 | 「 |  | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 647 | 9 | 428 | 0 | 613 | 374 | 0 | 576 | 194 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 647 | 9 | 428 | 0 | 613 | 374 | 0 | 576 | 194 |
| Initial Q（Qb），veh |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） |  |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 |
| Parking Bus，Adj |  |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  |  |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln |  |  |  | 1885 | 1900 | 1826 | 0 | 1870 | 1900 | 0 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h |  |  |  | 718 | 0 | 470 | 0 | 674 | 0 | 0 | 633 | 213 |
| Peak Hour Factor |  |  |  | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ |  |  |  | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap，veh／h |  |  |  | 1143 | 0 | 492 | 0 | 1809 |  | 0 | 1317 | 443 |
| Arrive On Green |  |  |  | 0.32 | 0.00 | 0.32 | 0.00 | 0.51 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.51 | 0.51 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h |  |  |  | 3591 | 0 | 1547 | 0 | 3647 | 1610 | 0 | 2681 | 870 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h |  |  |  | 718 | 0 | 470 | 0 | 674 | 0 | 0 | 434 | 412 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln |  |  |  | 1795 | 0 | 1547 | 0 | 1777 | 1610 | 0 | 1777 | 1681 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s |  |  |  | 9.4 | 0.0 | 16.4 | 0.0 | 6.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.7 | 8.8 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s |  |  |  | 9.4 | 0.0 | 16.4 | 0.0 | 6.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.7 | 8.8 |
| Prop In Lane |  |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.00 |  | 0.52 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h |  |  |  | 1143 | 0 | 492 | 0 | 1809 |  | 0 | 905 | 856 |
| V／C Ratio（X） |  |  |  | 0.63 | 0.00 | 0.95 | 0.00 | 0.37 |  | 0.00 | 0.48 | 0.48 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h |  |  |  | 1143 | 0 | 492 | 0 | 1809 |  | 0 | 905 | 856 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio |  |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（I） |  |  |  | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.96 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.76 | 0.76 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh |  |  |  | 16.0 | 0.0 | 18.4 | 0.0 | 8.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.8 | 8.8 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh |  |  |  | 1.2 | 0.0 | 29.4 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 1.5 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln |  |  |  | 3.5 | 0.0 | 8.9 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.1 | 3.0 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh |  |  |  | 17.2 | 0.0 | 47.8 | 0.0 | 8.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.2 | 10.2 |
| LnGrp LOS |  |  |  | B | A | D | A | A |  | A | B | B |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  |  |  |  | 1188 |  |  | 674 | A |  | 846 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  | 29.3 |  |  | 8.7 |  |  | 10.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  | C |  |  | A |  |  | B |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 2 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration $(G+Y+R c), ~ s$ | 33.3 | 33.3 | 21.7 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 5.3 | 5.3 | 4.2 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 28.0 | 28.0 | 17.5 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 8.3 | 10.8 | 18.4 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 5.2 | 6.4 | 0.0 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 18.2 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | B |

Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement．
Unsignalized Delay for［NBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |


|  | 4 |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  | 4 | 4 | $p$ |  | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 | \％ | 惺官 |  | ${ }_{1}$ | 个个4 | F |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 223 | 37 | 18 | 22 | 80 | 171 | 39 | 725 | 21 | 131 | 704 | 359 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 223 | 37 | 18 | 22 | 80 | 171 | 39 | 725 | 21 | 131 | 704 | 359 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 0.93 | 1.00 |  | 0.93 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 235 | 39 | 19 | 23 | 84 | 180 | 41 | 763 | 22 | 138 | 741 | 378 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 1 | 1 | 1 | ， | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| Cap，veh／h | 550 | 184 | 90 | 63 | 230 | 233 | 54 | 1940 | 56 | 182 | 2312 | 702 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.03 | 0.38 | 0.38 | 0.10 | 0.45 | 0.45 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 3483 | 1165 | 568 | 404 | 1476 | 1496 | 1795 | 5135 | 148 | 1795 | 5147 | 1563 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 235 | 0 | 58 | 107 | 0 | 180 | 41 | 509 | 276 | 138 | 741 | 378 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／n | 1742 | 0 | 1733 | 1880 | 0 | 1496 | 1795 | 1716 | 1851 | 1795 | 1716 | 1563 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 4.9 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 9.2 | 1.8 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 6.0 | 7.4 | 14.1 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 4.9 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 9.2 | 1.8 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 6.0 | 7.4 | 14.1 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.33 | 0.21 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.08 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 550 | 0 | 273 | 293 | 0 | 233 | 54 | 1296 | 700 | 182 | 2312 | 702 |
| VIC Ratio（X） | 0.43 | 0.00 | 0.21 | 0.37 | 0.00 | 0.77 | 0.76 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.76 | 0.32 | 0.54 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 914 | 0 | 455 | 493 | 0 | 393 | 359 | 1947 | 1050 | 583 | 2920 | 887 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（I） | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 30.4 | 0.0 | 29.4 | 30.2 | 0.0 | 32.4 | 38.5 | 18.2 | 18.2 | 35.0 | 14.2 | 16.0 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 1.9 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 7.5 | 26.7 | 0.9 | 1.7 | 8.9 | 0.4 | 2.9 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％oile BackOfQ $(50 \%$ ），veh／ln | 2.2 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 1.2 | 3.4 | 3.8 | 3.0 | 2.7 | 5.1 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 32.3 | 0.0 | 30.8 | 31.3 | 0.0 | 39.9 | 65.2 | 19.1 | 19.9 | 43.9 | 14.5 | 19.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | C | A | C | C | A | D | E | B | B | D | B | B |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 293 |  |  | 287 |  |  | 826 |  |  | 1257 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 32.0 |  |  | 36.7 |  |  | 21.6 |  |  | 19.1 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration $(G+Y+R c)$ ，s | 6.4 | 40.5 | 16.5 | 12.1 | 34.8 | 16.6 |
| Change Period $(\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc})$ ，s | 4.0 | 4.6 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.6 | 4.0 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 16.0 | 45.4 | 21.0 | 26.0 | 45.4 | 21.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 3.8 | 16.1 | 11.2 | 8.0 | 10.7 | 6.9 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿C），s | 0.1 | 19.9 | 1.2 | 0.5 | 16.7 | 2.5 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 23.2 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | C |

Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green．

| Movement EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | けt |  | ${ }^{*}$ | ¢ ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ |  | ${ }^{1}$ | 虾 |  | 7\％ | 中4 | 「＇ |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） 211 | 123 | 44 | 124 | 246 | 116 | 52 | 487 | 36 | 115 | 424 | 69 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） 211 | 123 | 44 | 124 | 246 | 116 | 52 | 487 | 36 | 115 | 424 | 69 |
| Initial Q（Qb），veh 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 |
| Parking Bus，Adj 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h 130 | 250 | 45 | 128 | 254 | 120 | 54 | 502 | 37 | 119 | 437 | 71 |
| Peak Hour Factor 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Cap，veh／h 336 | 580 | 102 | 383 | 517 | 235 | 71 | 1359 | 99 | 264 | 1126 | 488 |
| Arrive On Green 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.04 | 0.28 | 0.28 | 0.08 | 0.31 | 0.31 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h 1795 | 3099 | 547 | 1810 | 2444 | 1110 | 1795 | 4882 | 356 | 3483 | 3582 | 1552 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h 130 | 150 | 145 | 128 | 195 | 179 | 54 | 351 | 188 | 119 | 437 | 71 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln1795 | 1885 | 1761 | 1810 | 1900 | 1654 | 1795 | 1716 | 1807 | 1742 | 1791 | 1552 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s 4.6 | 5.1 | 5.2 | 4.3 | 6.5 | 6.9 | 2.1 | 5.9 | 6.0 | 2.4 | 6.9 | 2.4 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s 4.6 | 5.1 | 5.2 | 4.3 | 6.5 | 6.9 | 2.1 | 5.9 | 6.0 | 2.4 | 6.9 | 2.4 |
| Prop In Lane 1.00 |  | 0.31 | 1.00 |  | 0.67 | 1.00 |  | 0.20 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h 336 | 353 | 330 | 383 | 402 | 350 | 71 | 955 | 503 | 264 | 1126 | 488 |
| V／C Ratio（X） 0.39 | 0.43 | 0.44 | 0.33 | 0.49 | 0.51 | 0.76 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.45 | 0.39 | 0.15 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h 634 | 666 | 622 | 639 | 671 | 584 | 649 | 2166 | 1140 | 1259 | 2261 | 980 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（I） 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh 25.6 | 25.8 | 25.9 | 24.1 | 24.9 | 25.1 | 34.2 | 20.9 | 20.9 | 31.8 | 19.2 | 17.7 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh 1.0 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 1.3 | 1.6 | 21.0 | 0.9 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 0.8 | 0.5 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／IR2．0 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 1.9 | 3.0 | 2.8 | 1.3 | 2.3 | 2.6 | 1.0 | 2.8 | 0.9 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh 26.7 | 27.0 | 27.2 | 24.8 | 26.2 | 26.7 | 55.2 | 21.7 | 22.6 | 33.5 | 20.0 | 18.2 |
| LnGrp LOS C | C | C | C | C | C | E | C | C | C | C | B |
| Approach Vol，veh／h | 425 |  |  | 502 |  |  | 593 |  |  | 627 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh | 27.0 |  |  | 26.0 |  |  | 25.0 |  |  | 22.4 |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phs Duration（ $G+Y+R \mathrm{c}$ ），s9．4 | 24.6 | 19.8 | 6.8 | 27.2 | 18.1 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s 4.0 | 4.6 | 4.6 | 4.0 | 4.6 | 4.6 |
| Max Green Setting（GmaX¢，© | 45.4 | 25.4 | 26.0 | 45.4 | 25.4 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋l14，¢\％ | 8.0 | 8.9 | 4.1 | 8.9 | 7.2 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s 0.5 | 9.3 | 3.5 | 0.2 | 8.5 | 2.9 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 24.9 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | C |

Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green．
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement．



* HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier.


Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.


Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.

|  | * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | 1 | 中 ${ }^{\text {P }}$ |  | 7 | $\uparrow$ | F |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 14 | 395 | 73 | 85 | 462 | 11 | 120 | 3 | 93 | 19 | 3 | 36 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 14 | 395 | 73 | 85 | 462 | 11 | 120 | 3 | 93 | 19 | 3 | 36 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 14 | 407 | 75 | 88 | 476 | 11 | 124 | 3 | 96 | 20 | 3 | 37 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap, veh/h | 26 | 777 | 142 | 117 | 604 | 490 | 144 | 2 | 627 | 136 | 12 | 647 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.01 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.06 | 0.32 | 0.32 | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.40 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1810 | 3020 | 551 | 1810 | 1900 | 1543 | 0 | 5 | 1553 | 0 | 29 | 1603 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 14 | 241 | 241 | 88 | 476 | 11 | 127 | 0 | 96 | 23 | 0 | 37 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/n | 1810 | 1805 | 1766 | 1810 | 1900 | 1543 | 5 | 0 | 1553 | 29 | 0 | 1603 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.4 | 5.7 | 5.8 | 2.4 | 11.3 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 0.4 | 5.7 | 5.8 | 2.4 | 11.3 | 0.2 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.31 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.98 |  | 1.00 | 0.87 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 26 | 464 | 454 | 117 | 604 | 490 | 145 | 0 | 627 | 147 | 0 | 647 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.55 | 0.52 | 0.53 | 0.75 | 0.79 | 0.02 | 0.87 | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.16 | 0.00 | 0.06 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 950 | 1636 | 1600 | 931 | 1722 | 1398 | 145 | 0 | 627 | 147 | 0 | 647 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 24.3 | 15.8 | 15.8 | 22.8 | 15.4 | 11.6 | 24.5 | 0.0 | 9.4 | 14.8 | 0.0 | 9.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 16.9 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 9.3 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 38.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ( $50 \%$ ),veh//10. 3 |  | 2.1 | 2.1 | 1.2 | 4.4 | 0.1 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh 41LnGrp LOS |  | 16.1 | 16.2 | 32.1 | 16.3 | 11.6 | 63.3 | 0.0 | 9.4 | 15.0 | 0.0 | 9.0 |
|  |  | B | B | C | B | B | E | A | A | B | A | A |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 496 |  |  | 575 |  |  | 223 |  |  | 60 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 16.9 |  |  | 18.6 |  |  | 40.1 |  |  | 11.3 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | D |  |  | B |  |


| Timer - Assigned Phs 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s7.7 | 17.8 | 24.0 | 4.7 | 20.8 | 24.0 |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s 4.5 | 5.1 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.1 | 4.0 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax5, \% ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | 44.9 | 20.0 | 26.0 | 44.9 | 20.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+l14, ¢¢ | 7.8 | 22.0 | 2.4 | 13.3 | 22.0 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s 0.2 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.2 | 0.0 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 21.2 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | C |

Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.




| Lane | NBLn1 EBLn1 EBLn2WBLn1WBLn2 SBLn1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $20 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $20 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $64 \%$ | $89 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $89 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $49 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $15 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $31 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 244 | 256 | 36 | 265 | 42 | 153 |
| LT Vol | 50 | 28 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 30 |
| Through Vol | 157 | 228 | 0 | 236 | 0 | 75 |
| RT Vol | 37 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 42 | 48 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 262 | 275 | 39 | 285 | 45 | 165 |
| Geometry Grp | 2 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 2 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.45 | 0.5 | 0.062 | 0.515 | 0.072 | 0.289 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 6.172 | 6.533 | 5.762 | 6.509 | 5.738 | 6.315 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 585 | 553 | 622 | 556 | 625 | 569 |
| Service Time | 4.202 | 4.26 | 3.489 | 4.236 | 3.465 | 4.359 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.448 | 0.497 | 0.063 | 0.513 | 0.072 | 0.29 |
| HCM Control Delay | 14.2 | 15.6 | 8.9 | 16 | 8.9 | 11.9 |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | C | A | C | A | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 2.3 | 2.8 | 0.2 | 2.9 | 0.2 | 1.2 |



Unsignalized Delay for [EBR, WBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.
Unsignalized Delay for [NBR, EBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 |  | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | 7 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 个个 | 「 | \％ | 个全 |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | ¢ |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 8 | 738 | 462 | 404 | 692 | 2 | 207 | 1 | 675 | 5 | 5 | 9 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 8 | 738 | 462 | 404 | 692 | 2 | 207 | 1 | 675 | 5 | 5 | 9 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.87 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1900 | 1900 | 1737 | 1870 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1856 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 8 | 769 | 0 | 421 | 721 | 2 | 216 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 9 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 0 | 0 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap，veh／h | 14 | 1805 |  | 436 | 2722 | 8 | 240 | 1 |  | 12 | 12 | 21 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.01 | 0.50 | 0.00 | 0.49 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1810 | 3610 | 1472 | 1781 | 3693 | 10 | 1788 | 8 | 1572 | 416 | 416 | 750 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 8 | 769 | 0 | 421 | 352 | 371 | 217 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1810 | 1805 | 1472 | 1781 | 1805 | 1898 | 1796 | 0 | 1572 | 1582 | 0 | 0 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 0.7 | 20.3 | 0.0 | 34.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 17.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 0.7 | 20.3 | 0.0 | 34.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 17.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.01 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.26 |  | 0.47 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 14 | 1805 |  | 436 | 1330 | 1399 | 241 | 0 |  | 44 | 0 | 0 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.58 | 0.43 |  | 0.97 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.90 | 0.00 |  | 0.43 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 48 | 1805 |  | 487 | 1330 | 1399 | 281 | 0 |  | 232 | 0 | 0 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 0.61 | 0.61 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.67 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 74.2 | 23.8 | 0.0 | 37.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 64.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 71.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 8.7 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 30.0 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 18.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 0.3 | 8.8 | 0.0 | 15.7 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 9.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 82.9 | 24.3 | 0.0 | 67.7 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 82.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 76.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | F | C |  | E | A | A | F | A |  | E | A | A |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 777 | A |  | 1144 |  |  | 217 | A |  | 19 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 24.9 |  |  | 25.2 |  |  | 82.5 |  |  | 76.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | F |  |  | E |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration $(G+Y+R c)$ ，s | 39.7 | 79.0 | 7.7 | 4.1 | 114.6 | 23.6 |
| Change Period $(\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc})$ ，s | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 41.0 | 49.5 | 22.0 | 4.0 | 86.5 | 23.5 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 36.3 | 22.3 | 3.8 | 2.7 | 2.0 | 19.9 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.3 | 7.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.7 | 0.3 |

## Intersection Summary

HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 31.3

```
HCM 6th LOS
    C
```

Notes
Unsignalized Delay for［NBR，EBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 个4 | 「 | \％ | 个t |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ | 「 | \％ | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 49 | 972 | 401 | 3 | 1080 | 13 | 518 | 15 | 50 | 117 | 148 | 97 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 49 | 972 | 401 | 3 | 1080 | 13 | 518 | 15 | 50 | 117 | 148 | 97 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1870 | 1856 | 1841 | 1900 | 1841 | 1841 | 1811 | 1870 | 1856 | 1870 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 51 | 1012 | 0 | 3 | 1125 | 14 | 551 | 0 | 0 | 122 | 154 | 101 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap，veh／h | 65 | 1890 |  | 7 | 1779 | 22 | 619 | 0 |  | 286 | 172 | 113 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.05 | 0.71 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.18 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.16 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1781 | 3526 | 1560 | 1810 | 3535 | 44 | 3450 | 0 | 1572 | 1781 | 1068 | 701 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 51 | 1012 | 0 | 3 | 556 | 583 | 551 | 0 | 0 | 122 | 0 | 255 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／n | 1781 | 1763 | 1560 | 1810 | 1749 | 1831 | 1725 | 0 | 1572 | 1781 | 0 | 1769 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 4.2 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 34.8 | 34.8 | 23.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.3 | 0.0 | 21.2 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 4.2 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 34.8 | 34.8 | 23.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.3 | 0.0 | 21.2 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.02 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.40 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 65 | 1890 |  | 7 | 880 | 921 | 619 | 0 |  | 286 | 0 | 284 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.78 | 0.54 |  | 0.42 | 0.63 | 0.63 | 0.89 | 0.00 |  | 0.43 | 0.00 | 0.90 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 101 | 1890 |  | 62 | 880 | 921 | 793 | 0 |  | 338 | 0 | 336 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.33 | 1.33 | 1.33 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 70.7 | 12.9 | 0.0 | 74.5 | 27.1 | 27.1 | 60.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 56.7 | 0.0 | 61.7 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 18.4 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 35.4 | 3.4 | 3.3 | 10.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 23.0 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 2.3 | 6.9 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 15.2 | 15.9 | 11.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 11.4 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 89.1 | 13.9 | 0.0 | 110.0 | 30.6 | 30.4 | 70.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 57.7 | 0.0 | 84.8 |
| LnGrp LOS | F | B |  | F | C | C | E | A |  | E | A | F |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 1063 | A |  | 1142 |  |  | 551 | A |  | 377 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 17.6 |  |  | 30.7 |  |  | 70.3 |  |  | 76.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | E |  |  | E |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 5.1 | 84.9 | 31.4 | 10.0 | 80.0 | 28.6 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 5.1 | 63.9 | 34.5 | 8.5 | 60.5 | 28.5 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 2.2 | 22.0 | 25.4 | 6.2 | 36.8 | 23.2 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.0 | 9.3 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 8.0 | 0.9 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 38.7 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | D |

Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement．
Unsignalized Delay for［NBR，EBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．


Notes

* HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier.

Unsignalized Delay for [SBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.


Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | $\uparrow$ |  |  | - | Mr |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 559 | 6 | 2 | 286 | 7 | 2 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 559 | 6 | 2 | 286 | 7 | 2 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 11 |
| Mvmt Flow | 621 | 7 | 2 | 318 | 8 | 2 |



| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 37.1 |
| Intersection LOS | E |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | * |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | * |  |  | \& |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 3 | 341 | 3 | 3 | 37 | 232 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 500 | 3 | 2 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 3 | 341 | 3 | 3 | 37 | 232 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 500 | 3 | 2 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.58 | 0.58 | 0.58 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Mvmt Flow | 3 | 383 | 3 | 3 | 40 | 252 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 556 | 3 | 2 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 24.7 |  |  | 14.5 |  |  | 10.9 |  |  | 58.2 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | C |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | F |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $29 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $99 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $14 \%$ | $98 \%$ | $93 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $57 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 7 | 347 | 40 | 232 | 505 |
| LT Vol | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 500 |
| Through Vol | 1 | 341 | 37 | 0 | 3 |
| RT Vol | 4 | 3 | 0 | 232 | 2 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 12 | 390 | 43 | 252 | 561 |
| Geometry Grp | 2 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 2 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.025 | 0.716 | 0.089 | 0.466 | 0.982 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 7.604 | 6.612 | 7.41 | 6.652 | 6.303 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 468 | 546 | 482 | 540 | 578 |
| Service Time | 5.7 | 4.671 | 5.18 | 4.421 | 4.303 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.026 | 0.714 | 0.089 | 0.467 | 0.971 |
| HCM Control Delay | 10.9 | 24.7 | 10.9 | 15.1 | 58.2 |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | C | B | C | F |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0.1 | 5.8 | 0.3 | 2.5 | 13.9 |



Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.


| Movement EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  |  | ${ }^{1}$ | $\uparrow$ | F＇ |  | 中4 | 「 |  | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） 0 | 0 | 0 | 854 | 0 | 219 | 0 | 572 | 488 | 0 | 761 | 176 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） 0 | 0 | 0 | 854 | 0 | 219 | 0 | 572 | 488 | 0 | 761 | 176 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 |
| Parking Bus，Adj |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln |  |  | 1885 | 1900 | 1826 | 0 | 1870 | 1900 | 0 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h |  |  | 938 | 0 | 241 | 0 | 629 | 0 | 0 | 836 | 193 |
| Peak Hour Factor |  |  | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ |  |  | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap，veh／h |  |  | 1091 | 0 | 470 | 0 | 1861 |  | 0 | 1491 | 344 |
| Arrive On Green |  |  | 0.30 | 0.00 | 0.30 | 0.00 | 0.52 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.52 | 0.52 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h |  |  | 3591 | 0 | 1547 | 0 | 3647 | 1610 | 0 | 2940 | 657 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h |  |  | 938 | 0 | 241 | 0 | 629 | 0 | 0 | 522 | 507 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln |  |  | 1795 | 0 | 1547 | 0 | 1777 | 1610 | 0 | 1777 | 1727 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s |  |  | 13.5 | 0.0 | 7.1 | 0.0 | 5.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.9 | 10.9 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s |  |  | 13.5 | 0.0 | 7.1 | 0.0 | 5.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.9 | 10.9 |
| Prop In Lane |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.00 |  | 0.38 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h |  |  | 1091 | 0 | 470 | 0 | 1861 |  | 0 | 930 | 904 |
| V／C Ratio（X） |  |  | 0.86 | 0.00 | 0.51 | 0.00 | 0.34 |  | 0.00 | 0.56 | 0.56 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h |  |  | 1143 | 0 | 492 | 0 | 1861 |  | 0 | 930 | 904 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） |  |  | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.88 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh |  |  | 18.0 | 0.0 | 15.8 | 0.0 | 7.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.8 | 8.8 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh |  |  | 6.7 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.2 | 2.3 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln |  |  | 5.8 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 3.9 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh |  |  | 24.8 | 0.0 | 16.8 | 0.0 | 8.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.0 | 11.1 |
| LnGrp LOS |  |  | C | A | B | A | A |  | A | B | B |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  |  |  | 1179 |  |  | 629 | A |  | 1029 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  |  |  | 23.2 |  |  | 8.0 |  |  | 11.1 |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  | C |  |  | A |  |  | B |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 2 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration $(G+Y+R c), ~ s$ | 34.1 | 34.1 | 20.9 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 5.3 | 5.3 | 4.2 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 28.0 | 28.0 | 17.5 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 7.6 | 12.9 | 15.5 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 4.8 | 7.3 | 1.2 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 15.4 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | B |

Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement．
Unsignalized Delay for［NBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\uparrow$ | F |  | $\uparrow$ | F | \% | 惺 |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 檪 |  |
| Traffic Volume (vph) | 620 | 26 | 228 | 47 | 16 | 108 | 61 | 1467 | 18 | 46 | 1081 | 218 |
| Future Volume (vph) | 620 | 26 | 228 | 47 | 16 | 108 | 61 | 1467 | 18 | 46 | 1081 | 218 |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 |  | 4.2 | 4.2 | 3.7 | 4.9 |  | 4.6 | 4.9 |  |
| Lane Util. Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.91 |  | 1.00 | 0.91 |  |
| Frpb, ped/bikes | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.97 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.99 |  |
| Flpb, ped/bikes | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 |  | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.97 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 1625 | 1642 | 1509 |  | 1783 | 1561 | 1745 | 4949 |  | 1745 | 4763 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.95 | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 1625 | 1642 | 1509 |  | 1783 | 1561 | 1745 | 4949 |  | 1745 | 4763 |  |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.86 | 0.61 | 0.80 | 0.85 | 0.44 | 0.79 | 0.66 | 0.86 | 0.61 | 0.67 | 0.94 | 0.85 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 721 | 43 | 285 | 55 | 36 | 137 | 92 | 1706 | 30 | 69 | 1150 | 256 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 0 | 112 | 0 | 0 | 119 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 382 | 382 | 173 | 0 | 91 | 18 | 92 | 1735 | 0 | 69 | 1378 | 0 |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) |  |  | 18 | 18 |  |  | 12 |  | 8 | 8 |  | 12 |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | $2 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| Turn Type | Split | NA | Perm | Split | NA | Perm | Prot | NA |  | Prot | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 4 | 4 |  | 3 | 3 |  | 5 | 1 |  | 2 | 6 |  |


| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Actuated Green, G (s) | 30.0 | 30.0 | 30.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 11.6 | 42.4 | 13.6 | 45.3 |
| Effective Green, g (s) | 30.0 | 30.0 | 30.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 11.6 | 42.4 | 13.6 | 45.3 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.10 | 0.35 | 0.11 | 0.38 |
| Clearance Time (s) | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 3.7 | 4.9 | 4.6 | 4.9 |
| Vehicle Extension (s) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.2 |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) | 406 | 410 | 377 | 237 | 208 | 168 | 1750 | 197 | 1799 |
| v/s Ratio Prot | c0.24 | 0.23 |  | c0.05 |  | c0.05 | c0.35 | 0.04 | c0.29 |
| v/s Ratio Perm |  |  | 0.11 |  | 0.01 |  |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio | 0.94 | 0.93 | 0.46 | 0.38 | 0.09 | 0.55 | 0.99 | 0.35 | 0.77 |
| Uniform Delay, d1 | 44.1 | 43.9 | 38.1 | 47.4 | 45.6 | 51.6 | 38.6 | 49.1 | 32.7 |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.18 | 0.91 |
| Incremental Delay, d2 | 30.0 | 27.9 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 0.2 | 3.6 | 19.5 | 1.0 | 3.1 |
| Delay (s) | 74.1 | 71.8 | 39.0 | 48.5 | 45.7 | 55.3 | 58.1 | 58.8 | 32.9 |
| Level of Service | E | E | D | D | D | E | E | E | C |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 63.7 |  | 46.8 |  |  | 58.0 |  | 34.1 |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  | D |  |  | E |  | C |


| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| HCM 2000 Control Delay | 51.0 | HCM 2000 Level of Service | D |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity ratio | 0.81 |  | 17.9 |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) | 119.9 | Sum of lost time (s) | C |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $69.9 \%$ | ICU Level of Service |  |
| Analysis Period (min) | 15 |  |  |
| c Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 |  | 4 | 4 | 4 | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{*}$ | $\hat{\dagger}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 檪 |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 个44 | F |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 481 | 159 | 35 | 29 | 86 | 113 | 47 | 890 | 68 | 143 | 745 | 331 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 481 | 159 | 35 | 29 | 86 | 113 | 47 | 890 | 68 | 143 | 745 | 331 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 0.94 | 1.00 |  | 0.91 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 506 | 167 | 37 | 31 | 91 | 119 | 49 | 937 | 72 | 151 | 784 | 348 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 1 | 1080 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| Cap，veh／h | 727 | 308 | 68 | 54 | 159 | 166 | 64 | 1878 | 144 | 193 | 2360 | 717 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.04 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.11 | 0.46 | 0.46 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 3483 | 1476 | 327 | 477 | 1399 | 1462 | 1795 | 4859 | 372 | 1795 | 5147 | 1563 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 506 | 0 | 204 | 122 | 0 | 119 | 49 | 661 | 348 | 151 | 784 | 348 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／n | 1742 | 0 | 1803 | 1876 | 0 | 1462 | 1795 | 1716 | 1800 | 1795 | 1716 | 1563 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 12.2 | 0.0 | 9.1 | 5.6 | 0.0 | 7.1 | 2.4 | 13.2 | 13.3 | 7.4 | 8.8 | 14.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 12.2 | 0.0 | 9.1 | 5.6 | 0.0 | 7.1 | 2.4 | 13.2 | 13.3 | 7.4 | 8.8 | 14.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.18 | 0.25 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.21 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 727 | 0 | 376 | 213 | 0 | 166 | 64 | 1326 | 696 | 193 | 2360 | 717 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.70 | 0.00 | 0.54 | 0.57 | 0.00 | 0.72 | 0.77 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.78 | 0.33 | 0.49 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 809 | 0 | 419 | 436 | 0 | 339 | 318 | 1722 | 904 | 516 | 2584 | 785 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（I） | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 33.1 | 0.0 | 31.9 | 38.0 | 0.0 | 38.7 | 43.2 | 21.1 | 21.1 | 39.3 | 15.6 | 17.1 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 4.6 | 0.0 | 4.4 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 7.9 | 23.6 | 1.3 | 2.6 | 9.4 | 0.4 | 2.3 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 5.6 | 0.0 | 4.4 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 1.5 | 5.3 | 5.8 | 3.7 | 3.3 | 5.2 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 37.7 | 0.0 | 36.3 | 41.4 | 0.0 | 46.6 | 66.8 | 22.4 | 23.7 | 48.7 | 16.0 | 19.4 |
| LnGrp LOS | D | A | D | D | A | D | E | C | C | D | B | B |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 710 |  |  | 241 |  |  | 1058 |  |  | 1283 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 37.3 |  |  | 44.0 |  |  | 24.9 |  |  | 20.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 7.2 | 46.1 | 14.3 | 13.7 | 39.6 | 22.9 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 4.0 | 4.6 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.6 | 4.0 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 16.0 | 45.4 | 21.0 | 26.0 | 45.4 | 21.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 4.4 | 16.0 | 9.1 | 9.4 | 15.3 | 14.2 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.1 | 20.2 | 1.2 | 0.5 | 19.6 | 3.8 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 27.4 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | C |

Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green．

| Movement EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations \% | * $\downarrow$ |  | 7 | * $\downarrow$ |  | \% | 性 |  | \% ${ }^{1 *}$ | 性 | F |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) 413 | 532 | 120 | 212 | 241 | 92 | 129 | 541 | 87 | 165 | 470 | 102 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) 413 | 532 | 120 | 212 | 241 | 92 | 129 | 541 | 87 | 165 | 470 | 102 |
| Initial $\mathrm{Q}(\mathrm{Qb})$, veh 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 |
| Parking Bus, Adj 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h 366 | 632 | 124 | 187 | 292 | 95 | 133 | 558 | 90 | 170 | 485 | 105 |
| Peak Hour Factor 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Cap, veh/h 466 | 790 | 155 | 346 | 523 | 166 | 172 | 1253 | 198 | 266 | 937 | 405 |
| Arrive On Green 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.10 | 0.28 | 0.28 | 0.08 | 0.26 | 0.26 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h 1795 | 3046 | 596 | 1810 | 2737 | 867 | 1795 | 4456 | 705 | 3483 | 3582 | 1547 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h 366 | 391 | 365 | 187 | 200 | 187 | 133 | 427 | 221 | 170 | 485 | 105 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/n1795 | 1885 | 1758 | 1810 | 1900 | 1704 | 1795 | 1716 | 1730 | 1742 | 1791 | 1547 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s 17.6 | 17.9 | 18.0 | 8.6 | 8.8 | 9.2 | 6.7 | 9.5 | 9.7 | 4.4 | 10.7 | 5.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear (g_c), s 17.6 | 17.9 | 18.0 | 8.6 | 8.8 | 9.2 | 6.7 | 9.5 | 9.7 | 4.4 | 10.7 | 5.0 |
| Prop In Lane 1.00 |  | 0.34 | 1.00 |  | 0.51 | 1.00 |  | 0.41 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h 466 | 489 | 456 | 346 | 363 | 326 | 172 | 964 | 486 | 266 | 937 | 405 |
| V/C Ratio(X) 0.79 | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.54 | 0.55 | 0.57 | 0.77 | 0.44 | 0.45 | 0.64 | 0.52 | 0.26 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h 492 | 517 | 482 | 496 | 521 | 467 | 504 | 1682 | 848 | 978 | 1756 | 758 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) $\quad 1.00$ | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh 31.9 | 32.0 | 32.1 | 33.8 | 33.9 | 34.0 | 40.9 | 27.3 | 27.4 | 41.5 | 29.2 | 27.1 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh 8.4 | 8.8 | 9.6 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 2.3 | 10.0 | 1.2 | 2.4 | 3.6 | 1.6 | 1.2 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/Ir8. 6 | 9.3 | 8.8 | 4.0 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 3.4 | 3.9 | 4.2 | 2.0 | 4.7 | 1.9 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh 40.3 | 40.9 | 41.7 | 35.7 | 35.7 | 36.3 | 50.9 | 28.5 | 29.8 | 45.1 | 30.8 | 28.3 |
| LnGrp LOS D | D | D | D | D | D | D | C | C | D | C | C |
| Approach Vol, veh/h | 1122 |  |  | 574 |  |  | 781 |  |  | 760 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 41.0 |  |  | 35.9 |  |  | 32.7 |  |  | 33.7 |  |
| Approach LOS | D |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |


| Timer - Assigned Phs 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), \$1.1 | 30.6 | 22.3 | 12.9 | 28.8 | 28.6 |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s 4.0 | 4.6 | 4.6 | 4.0 | 4.6 | 4.6 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmȧ¢. $\mathrm{S}_{\text {S }}$ | 45.4 | 25.4 | 26.0 | 45.4 | 25.4 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c +1 19,4s | 11.7 | 11.2 | 8.7 | 12.7 | 20.0 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s 0.8 | 11.1 | 3.6 | 0.5 | 9.6 | 3.5 |

Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 36.4 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | D |

Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.


| Movement EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 44 | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | F |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） 20 | 924 | 326 | 37 | 456 | 79 | 156 | 178 | 54 | 123 | 264 | 17 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） 20 | 924 | 326 | 37 | 456 | 79 | 156 | 178 | 54 | 123 | 264 | 17 |
| Initial Q（Qb），veh 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 |
| Parking Bus，Adj 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h 22 | 994 | 351 | 40 | 490 | 85 | 168 | 191 | 58 | 132 | 284 | 18 |
| Peak Hour Factor 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Cap，veh／h 43 | 1417 | 611 | 66 | 1242 | 214 | 210 | 460 | 379 | 173 | 369 | 23 |
| Arrive On Green 0.02 | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.04 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.12 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.10 | 0.21 | 0.21 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h 1795 | 3582 | 1544 | 1795 | 3041 | 524 | 1795 | 1885 | 1556 | 1795 | 1751 | 111 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h 22 | 994 | 351 | 40 | 287 | 288 | 168 | 191 | 58 | 132 | 0 | 302 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln1795 | 1791 | 1544 | 1795 | 1791 | 1774 | 1795 | 1885 | 1556 | 1795 | 0 | 1862 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s 1.0 | 18.4 | 8.4 | 1.7 | 9.0 | 9.1 | 7.2 | 6.8 | 2.3 | 5.7 | 0.0 | 12.1 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s 1.0 | 18.4 | 8.4 | 1.7 | 9.0 | 9.1 | 7.2 | 6.8 | 2.3 | 5.7 | 0.0 | 12.1 |
| Prop In Lane 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.30 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.06 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h 43 | 1417 | 611 | 66 | 731 | 725 | 210 | 460 | 379 | 173 | 0 | 392 |
| V／C Ratio（X） 0.51 | 0.70 | 0.57 | 0.60 | 0.39 | 0.40 | 0.80 | 0.42 | 0.15 | 0.76 | 0.00 | 0.77 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h 589 | 2033 | 877 | 589 | 1017 | 1007 | 589 | 713 | 589 | 589 | 0 | 704 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（I） 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh 38.2 | 20.0 | 6.7 | 37.6 | 16.5 | 16.6 | 34.1 | 25.2 | 23.5 | 34.9 | 0.0 | 29.5 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh 8.8 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 8.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 2.6 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 8.1 | 0.0 | 3.9 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／Ir0．5 | 7.2 | 2.6 | 0.9 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 0.8 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 5.7 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh 47.0 | 20.8 | 7.7 | 46.1 | 16.9 | 17.0 | 36.7 | 25.4 | 23.6 | 43.0 | 0.0 | 33.4 |
| LnGrp LOS D | C | A | D | B | B | D | C | C | D | A | C |
| Approach Vol，veh／h | 1367 |  |  | 615 |  |  | 417 |  |  | 434 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh | 17.9 |  |  | 18.9 |  |  | 29.7 |  |  | 36.3 |  |
| Approach LOS | B |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | D |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phs Duration（ $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ）， 55.9 | 37.4 | 11.6 | 24.3 | 6.9 | 36.4 | 14.3 | 21.7 |
| Change Period（ $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ），s 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmadt．，© | 45.0 | 26.0 | 30.0 | 26.0 | 45.0 | 26.0 | 30 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c +110 ， Cs $_{5}$ | 11.1 | 7.7 | 8.8 | 3.7 | 20.4 | 9.2 | 14.1 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s 0.0 | 4.8 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 11.0 | 0.1 | 1.9 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 22.7 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | C |

Notes
＊HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier．


User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.


User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.


Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.


| Intersection |
| :--- |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh55.7 |
| Intersection LOS $\quad$ F |



| Lane | NBLn1 EBLn1 EBLn2WBLn1WBLn2 SBLn1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $20 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $17 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $57 \%$ | $86 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $86 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $54 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $23 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $29 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 155 | 540 | 87 | 345 | 49 | 231 |
| LT Vol | 31 | 75 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 39 |
| Through Vol | 88 | 465 | 0 | 296 | 0 | 125 |
| RT Vol | 36 | 0 | 87 | 0 | 49 | 67 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 167 | 581 | 94 | 371 | 53 | 248 |
| Geometry Grp | 2 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 2 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.359 | 1.144 | 0.164 | 0.752 | 0.095 | 0.508 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 8.173 | 7.093 | 6.303 | 7.611 | 6.815 | 7.755 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 443 | 511 | 569 | 479 | 529 | 467 |
| Service Time | 6.173 | 4.837 | 4.046 | 5.311 | 4.515 | 5.755 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.377 | 1.137 | 0.165 | 0.775 | 0.1 | 0.531 |
| HCM Control Delay | 15.7 | 111 | 10.3 | 29.9 | 10.2 | 18.5 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | F | B | D | B | C |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 1.6 | 19.9 | 0.6 | 6.3 | 0.3 | 2.8 |



Unsignalized Delay for [EBR, WBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.

## Kimley»)Horn

## APPENDIX E. NEAR TERM PLUS PROJECT CONDITIONS SYNCHRO OUTPUT SHEETS

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 个 $\uparrow$ | 「 | \％ | 个t |  | 7 | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 29 | 599 | 460 | 121 | 533 | 65 | 598 | 24 | 108 | 27 | 23 | 12 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 29 | 599 | 460 | 121 | 533 | 65 | 598 | 24 | 108 | 27 | 23 | 12 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 30 | 618 | 0 | 125 | 549 | 67 | 634 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 24 | 12 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap，veh／h | 49 | 2079 |  | 88 | 1929 | 235 | 625 | 0 |  | 53 | 46 | 83 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.03 | 0.58 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.05 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1795 | 3582 | 1598 | 1795 | 3201 | 389 | 3591 | 0 | 1598 | 996 | 854 | 1551 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 30 | 618 | 0 | 125 | 306 | 310 | 634 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 0 | 12 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1795 | 1791 | 1598 | 1795 | 1791 | 1800 | 1795 | 0 | 1598 | 1850 | 0 | 1551 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 1.9 | 9.8 | 0.0 | 5.5 | 9.2 | 9.3 | 19.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 0.8 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 1.9 | 9.8 | 0.0 | 5.5 | 9.2 | 9.3 | 19.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 0.8 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.22 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.54 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 49 | 2079 |  | 88 | 1079 | 1085 | 625 | 0 |  | 99 | 0 | 83 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.62 | 0.30 |  | 1.42 | 0.28 | 0.29 | 1.01 | 0.00 |  | 0.53 | 0.00 | 0.14 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 88 | 2079 |  | 88 | 1079 | 1085 | 625 | 0 |  | 372 | 0 | 312 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（I） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.66 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 53.9 | 11.9 | 0.0 | 53.3 | 10.7 | 10.7 | 46.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 51.6 | 0.0 | 50.6 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 4.6 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 240.1 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 32.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 0.9 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 8.4 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 11.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 58.6 | 12.3 | 0.0 | 293.3 | 11.3 | 11.3 | 79.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 53.2 | 0.0 | 50.9 |
| LnGrp LOS | E | B |  | F | B | B | F | A |  | D | A | D |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 648 | A |  | 741 |  |  | 634 | A |  | 64 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 14.4 |  |  | 58.9 |  |  | 79.0 |  |  | 52.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | E |  |  | E |  |  | D |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 9.5 | 69.0 | 10.0 | 7.0 | 71.5 | 23.5 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 5.5 | 48.5 | 22.5 | 5.5 | 48.5 | 19.5 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 7.5 | 11.8 | 5.1 | 3.9 | 11.3 | 21.5 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.0 | 5.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 0.0 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 51.0 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | $D$ |

Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement．
Unsignalized Delay for［NBR，EBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | \％ | 7 |  | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | 7 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{*}$ | 个个 | 「 | ＊ | 性 |  |  | $\uparrow$ | F＇ |  | \＄ |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | － | 678 | 426 | 328 | 621 | 6 | 248 | 2 | 959 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 6 | 678 | 426 | 328 | 621 | 6 | 248 | 2 | 959 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | － | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.86 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1900 | 1900 | 1737 | 1870 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1856 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 6 | 706 | ， | 342 | 647 | 6 | 258 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 0 | 0 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap，veh／h | 11 | 1917 |  | 360 | 2664 | 25 | 278 | 2 |  | 9 | 0 | 17 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.01 | 0.53 | 0.00 | 0.40 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.02 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1810 | 3610 | 1472 | 1781 | 3665 | 34 | 1782 | 14 | 1572 | 495 | 0 | 990 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 6 | 706 | 0 | 342 | 319 | 334 | 260 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1810 | 1805 | 1472 | 1781 | 1805 | 1894 | 1796 | 0 | 1572 | 1485 | 0 | 0 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 0.5 | 17.1 | 0.0 | 27.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 0.5 | 17.1 | 0.0 | 27.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.02 | 0.99 |  | 1.00 | 0.33 |  | 0.67 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 11 | 1917 |  | 360 | 1312 | 1377 | 281 | 0 |  | 26 | 0 | 0 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.56 | 0.37 |  | 0.95 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.93 | 0.00 |  | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 48 | 1917 |  | 487 | 1312 | 1377 | 281 | 0 |  | 218 | 0 | 0 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 0.70 | 0.70 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.46 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 74.4 | 20.5 | 0.0 | 44.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 62.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 72.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 11.5 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 22.0 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 0.3 | 7.3 | 0.0 | 12.5 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 11.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 85.9 | 20.9 | 0.0 | 66.0 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 82.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 74.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | F | C |  | E | A | A | F | A |  | E | A | A |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 712 | A |  | 995 |  |  | 260 | A |  | 3 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 21.4 |  |  | 23.0 |  |  | 82.4 |  |  | 74.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | F |  |  | E |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 33.3 | 83.6 | 6.1 | 3.9 | 113.0 | 26.9 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 41.0 | 49.5 | 22.0 | 4.0 | 86.5 | 23.5 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 29.9 | 19.1 | 2.3 | 2.5 | 2.0 | 23.4 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.4 | 7.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.7 | 0.0 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 30.3 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | C |

Notes
Unsignalized Delay for［NBR，EBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 个 4 | 「 | \％ | 个 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | F |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 167 | 851 | 615 | 4 | 1085 | 27 | 424 | 92 | 36 | 68 | 83 | 56 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 167 | 851 | 615 | 4 | 1085 | 27 | 424 | 92 | 36 | 68 | 83 | 56 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1870 | 1856 | 1841 | 1900 | 1841 | 1841 | 1811 | 1870 | 1856 | 1870 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 174 | 886 | 0 | 4 | 1130 | 28 | 511 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 86 | 58 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap，veh／h | 101 | 2143 |  | 9 | 1938 | 48 | 580 | 0 |  | 176 | 104 | 70 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.06 | 0.61 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1781 | 3526 | 1560 | 1810 | 3484 | 86 | 3450 | 0 | 1572 | 1781 | 1054 | 711 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 174 | 886 | 0 | 4 | 567 | 591 | 511 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 0 | 144 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／n | 1781 | 1763 | 1560 | 1810 | 1749 | 1821 | 1725 | 0 | 1572 | 1781 | 0 | 1764 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 8.5 | 19.7 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 31.9 | 32.0 | 21.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.6 | 0.0 | 12.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 8.5 | 19.7 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 31.9 | 32.0 | 21.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.6 | 0.0 | 12.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.05 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.40 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 101 | 2143 |  | 9 | 973 | 1013 | 580 | 0 |  | 176 | 0 | 174 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 1.72 | 0.41 |  | 0.43 | 0.58 | 0.58 | 0.88 | 0.00 |  | 0.40 | 0.00 | 0.83 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 101 | 2143 |  | 62 | 973 | 1013 | 793 | 0 |  | 338 | 0 | 335 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 70.7 | 15.4 | 0.0 | 74.4 | 21.8 | 21.8 | 60.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 63.4 | 0.0 | 66.3 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 363.7 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 28.7 | 2.6 | 2.5 | 8.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 9.4 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（ $50 \%$ ），veh／ln | 14.1 | 8.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 13.6 | 14.1 | 10.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 5.9 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 434.5 | 16.0 | 0.0 | 103.1 | 24.4 | 24.3 | 69.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 64.9 | 0.0 | 75.8 |
| LnGrp LOS | F | B |  | F | C | C | E | A |  | E | A | E |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 1060 | A |  | 1162 |  |  | 511 | A |  | 215 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 84.7 |  |  | 24.6 |  |  | 69.7 |  |  | 72.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  | C |  |  | E |  |  | E |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 5.3 | 95.7 | 29.7 | 13.0 | 88.0 | 19.3 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 5.1 | 63.9 | 34.5 | 8.5 | 60.5 | 28.5 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 2.3 | 21.7 | 23.7 | 10.5 | 34.0 | 14.0 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.0 | 7.8 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 8.6 | 0.8 |

## Intersection Summary

HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 57.5

HCM 6th LOS
E

Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement．
Unsignalized Delay for［NBR，EBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．

| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ¢4 | 44 | 「 | \% | 「 |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) 374 | 300 | 604 | 167 | 393 | 589 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) 374 | 300 | 604 | 167 | 393 | 589 |
| Initial Q $(Q b)$, veh 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) 1.00 |  |  | 0.98 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus, Adj 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach | No | No |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln 1885 | 1885 | 1870 | 1870 | 1885 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h 386 | 309 | 623 | 172 | 405 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Cap, veh/h 823 | 821 | 795 | 347 | 524 |  |
| Arrive On Green 0.46 | 0.46 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.15 | 0.00 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h 1795 | 1885 | 3647 | 1551 | 3483 | 1598 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h 386 | 309 | 623 | 172 | 405 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln1795 | 1791 | 1777 | 1551 | 1742 | 1598 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s 11.9 | 9.0 | 13.2 | 7.7 | 8.9 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s 11.9 | 9.0 | 13.2 | 7.7 | 8.9 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h 823 | 821 | 795 | 347 | 524 |  |
| V/C Ratio(X) 0.47 | 0.38 | 0.78 | 0.50 | 0.77 |  |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h 823 | 821 | 795 | 347 | 906 |  |
| HCM Platoon Ratio 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) 0.21 | 0.21 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh 14.9 | 14.2 | 29.2 | 27.1 | 32.7 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh 0.4 | 0.3 | 7.6 | 5.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/Ir4.7 | 3.6 | 6.3 | 3.3 | 3.9 | 0.0 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh 15.4 | 14.5 | 36.8 | 32.1 | 35.1 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS B | B | D | C | D |  |
| Approach Vol, veh/h | 695 | 795 |  | 405 | A |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 15.0 | 35.8 |  | 35.1 |  |
| Approach LOS | B | D |  | D |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs | 2 |  | 4 |  | 6 |
| Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s | 41.3 |  | 16.2 |  | 22.5 |
| Change Period ( $Y+R \mathrm{R}$ ), $s$ | 4.6 |  | * 4.2 |  | 4.6 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 27.9 |  | * 21 |  | 17.9 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s | 13.9 |  | 10.9 |  | 15.2 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 3.9 |  | 1.1 |  | 1.3 |

## Intersection Summary

HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 28.0

HCM 6th LOS C
Notes

* HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier.

Unsignalized Delay for [SBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.


Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 7.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | 4 | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 | ${ }^{*}$ | 「 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 375 | 83 | 99 | 241 | 162 | 181 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 375 | 83 | 99 | 241 | 162 | 181 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control F | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | 25 | 170 | - | 145 | 0 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 391 | 86 | 103 | 251 | 169 | 189 |




| Intersection |
| :--- |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh14.8 |
| Intersection LOS $\quad$ B |


| Movement EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | * |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | \$ |  |  | $\ddagger$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h 13 | 92 | 0 | 5 | 26 | 467 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 283 | 0 | 5 |
| Future Vol, veh/h 13 | 92 | 0 | 5 | 26 | 467 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 283 | 0 | 5 |
| Peak Hour Factor 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Mvmt Flow 14 | 96 | 0 | 5 | 27 | 486 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 295 | 0 | 5 |
| Number of Lanes 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach EB |  |  | WB |  |  |  | NB |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach WB |  |  | EB |  |  |  | SB |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left SB |  |  | NB |  |  |  | EB |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach RighNB |  |  | SB |  |  |  | WB |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay 9.9 |  |  | 16.6 |  |  |  | 8.9 |  | 13.7 |  |  |
| HCM LOS A |  |  | C |  |  |  | A |  | B |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 EBLn1WBLn1WBLn2 SBLn1 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $0 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $98 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $12 \%$ | $88 \%$ | $84 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $88 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 8 | 105 | 31 | 467 | 288 |
| LT Vol | 0 | 13 | 5 | 0 | 283 |
| Through Vol | 1 | 92 | 26 | 0 | 0 |
| RT Vol | 7 | 0 | 0 | 467 | 5 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 8 | 109 | 32 | 486 | 300 |
| Geometry Grp | 2 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 2 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.013 | 0.173 | 0.052 | 0.669 | 0.473 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 5.773 | 5.695 | 5.742 | 4.953 | 5.676 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 618 | 630 | 627 | 735 | 636 |
| Service Time | 3.826 | 3.733 | 3.442 | 2.653 | 3.709 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.013 | 0.173 | 0.051 | 0.661 | 0.472 |
| HCM Control Delay | 8.9 | 9.9 | 8.8 | 17.1 | 13.7 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | A | C | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 5.2 | 2.5 |



Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.


| Movement EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  |  | ${ }^{1}$ | $\uparrow$ | F＇ |  | 中4 | 「 |  | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） 0 | 0 | 0 | 692 | 9 | 428 | 0 | 618 | 374 | 0 | 593 | 194 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） 0 | 0 | 0 | 692 | 9 | 428 | 0 | 618 | 374 | 0 | 593 | 194 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 |
| Parking Bus，Adj |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln |  |  | 1885 | 1900 | 1826 | 0 | 1870 | 1900 | 0 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h |  |  | 767 | 0 | 470 | 0 | 679 | 0 | 0 | 652 | 213 |
| Peak Hour Factor |  |  | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ |  |  | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap，veh／h |  |  | 1143 | 0 | 492 | 0 | 1809 |  | 0 | 1329 | 434 |
| Arrive On Green |  |  | 0.32 | 0.00 | 0.32 | 0.00 | 0.51 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.51 | 0.51 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h |  |  | 3591 | 0 | 1547 | 0 | 3647 | 1610 | 0 | 2703 | 852 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h |  |  | 767 | 0 | 470 | 0 | 679 | 0 | 0 | 444 | 421 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln |  |  | 1795 | 0 | 1547 | 0 | 1777 | 1610 | 0 | 1777 | 1685 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s |  |  | 10.2 | 0.0 | 16.4 | 0.0 | 6.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s |  |  | 10.2 | 0.0 | 16.4 | 0.0 | 6.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| Prop In Lane |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.00 |  | 0.51 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h |  |  | 1143 | 0 | 492 | 0 | 1809 |  | 0 | 905 | 858 |
| V／C Ratio（X） |  |  | 0.67 | 0.00 | 0.95 | 0.00 | 0.38 |  | 0.00 | 0.49 | 0.49 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h |  |  | 1143 | 0 | 492 | 0 | 1809 |  | 0 | 905 | 858 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） |  |  | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.96 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.73 | 0.73 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh |  |  | 16.3 | 0.0 | 18.4 | 0.0 | 8.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.8 | 8.8 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh |  |  | 1.6 | 0.0 | 29.4 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 1.5 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln |  |  | 3.8 | 0.0 | 8.9 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 3.1 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh |  |  | 17.9 | 0.0 | 47.8 | 0.0 | 8.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.2 | 10.3 |
| LnGrp LOS |  |  | B | A | D | A | A |  | A | B | B |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  |  |  | 1237 |  |  | 679 | A |  | 865 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  |  |  | 29.2 |  |  | 8.8 |  |  | 10.3 |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  | C |  |  | A |  |  | B |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 2 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration $(G+Y+R c), ~ s$ | 33.3 | 33.3 | 21.7 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 5.3 | 5.3 | 4.2 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 28.0 | 28.0 | 17.5 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 8.4 | 11.0 | 18.4 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 5.2 | 6.5 | 0.0 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 18.3 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | B |

Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement．
Unsignalized Delay for［NBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 虫\％ |  | ${ }^{1}$ | 䖝 |  |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 272 | 16 | 108 | 15 | 7 | 26 | 137 | 1051 | 23 | 91 | 1118 | 342 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 272 | 16 | 108 | 15 | 7 | 26 | 137 | 1051 | 23 | 91 | 1118 | 342 |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time（s） | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 |  | 4.2 | 4.2 | 3.7 | 4.9 |  | 4.6 | 4.9 |  |
| Lane Util．Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.91 |  | 1.00 | 0.91 |  |
| Frpb，ped／bikes | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.97 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.98 |  |
| Flpb，ped／bikes | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 |  | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.96 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 1625 | 1646 | 1509 |  | 1789 | 1561 | 1745 | 4938 |  | 1745 | 4685 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.95 | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 1625 | 1646 | 1509 |  | 1789 | 1561 | 1745 | 4938 |  | 1745 | 4685 |  |
| Peak－hour factor，PHF | 0.86 | 0.61 | 0.80 | 0.85 | 0.44 | 0.79 | 0.66 | 0.86 | 0.61 | 0.67 | 0.94 | 0.85 |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 316 | 26 | 135 | 18 | 16 | 33 | 208 | 1222 | 38 | 136 | 1189 | 402 |
| RTOR Reduction（vph） | 0 | 0 | 101 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 171 | 171 | 34 | 0 | 34 | 4 | 208 | 1257 | 0 | 136 | 1540 | 0 |
| Confl．Peds．（\＃／hr） |  |  | 18 | 18 |  |  | 12 |  | 8 | 8 |  | 12 |
| Confl．Bikes（\＃／hr） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |


| Heavy Vehicles（\％） | $2 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Turn Type | Split | NA | Perm | Split | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Prot | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 4 | 4 |  | 3 | 3 |  | 5 | 1 | 2 | 6 |  |


| Permitted Phases |  |  | 4 |  | 3 |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Actuated Green，G（s） | 30.0 | 30.0 | 30.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 15.8 | 40.0 | 16.0 |


| Effective Green，g（s） | 30.0 | 30.0 | 30.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 15.8 | 40.0 | 16.0 | 41.1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Actuated g／C Ratio | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.33 | 0.13 | 0.34 |
| Clearance Time（s） | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 3.7 | 4.9 | 4.6 | 4.9 |
| Vehicle Extension（s） | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.2 |
| Lane Grp Cap（vph） | 406 | 411 | 377 | 238 | 208 | 229 | 1647 | 232 | 1605 |
| v／s Ratio Prot | $c 0.11$ | 0.10 |  | $c 0.02$ |  | $c 0.12$ | 0.25 | 0.08 | $c 0.33$ |


| v／s Ratio Perm |  | 0.02 | 0.00 |  | 0.59 | 0.96 |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| v／c Ratio | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.09 | 0.14 | 0.02 | 0.91 | 0.76 | 48.8 | 38.6 |
| Uniform Delay，d1 | 37.7 | 37.6 | 34.5 | 45.9 | 45.1 | 51.3 | 35.7 | 1.08 | 0.87 |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2.9 | 12.3 |
| Incremental Delay，d2 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 35.3 | 3.4 | 55.5 | 46.0 |
| Delay（s） | 38.4 | 38.3 | 34.6 | 46.2 | 45.2 | 86.6 | 39.1 | D | D |
| Level of Service | D | D | C | D | D | F | D | 46.8 |  |
| Approach Delay（s） |  | 37.3 |  | 45.7 |  |  | 45.9 | D | D |
| Approach LOS | D | D |  |  | D |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| HCM 2000 Control Delay | 45.2 | HCM 2000 Level of Service | D |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity ratio | 0.67 |  | 17.9 |
| Actuated Cycle Length（s） | 119.9 | Sum of lost time（s） | C |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $67.3 \%$ | ICU Level of Service |  |

C Critical Lane Group

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.

| Movement EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations＊ | ＊$\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | ＊${ }^{\text {F }}$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | 性中 |  | ${ }^{7 *}$ | 中4 | 「 |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） 212 | 126 | 44 | 124 | 266 | 136 | 52 | 532 | 36 | 123 | 432 | 70 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） 212 | 126 | 44 | 124 | 266 | 136 | 52 | 532 | 36 | 123 | 432 | 70 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 |
| Parking Bus，Adj 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h 131 | 253 | 45 | 128 | 274 | 140 | 54 | 548 | 37 | 127 | 445 | 72 |
| Peak Hour Factor 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Cap，veh／h 332 | 573 | 100 | 395 | 518 | 255 | 71 | 1397 | 93 | 260 | 1144 | 496 |
| Arrive On Green 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.04 | 0.28 | 0.28 | 0.07 | 0.32 | 0.32 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h 1795 | 3105 | 542 | 1810 | 2373 | 1169 | 1795 | 4915 | 329 | 3483 | 3582 | 1553 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h 131 | 152 | 146 | 128 | 217 | 197 | 54 | 381 | 204 | 127 | 445 | 72 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln1795 | 1885 | 1762 | 1810 | 1900 | 1642 | 1795 | 1716 | 1813 | 1742 | 1791 | 1553 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s 4.8 | 5.3 | 5.5 | 4.4 | 7.5 | 7.9 | 2.2 | 6.7 | 6.8 | 2.6 | 7.2 | 2.5 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s 4.8 | 5.3 | 5.5 | 4.4 | 7.5 | 7.9 | 2.2 | 6.7 | 6.8 | 2.6 | 7.2 | 2.5 |
| Prop In Lane 1.00 |  | 0.31 | 1.00 |  | 0.71 | 1.00 |  | 0.18 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h 332 | 348 | 325 | 395 | 415 | 359 | 71 | 975 | 515 | 260 | 1144 | 496 |
| V／C Ratio（X） 0.40 | 0.44 | 0.45 | 0.32 | 0.52 | 0.55 | 0.76 | 0.39 | 0.40 | 0.49 | 0.39 | 0.15 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h 610 | 641 | 599 | 615 | 646 | 558 | 625 | 2084 | 1101 | 1212 | 2176 | 943 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh 26.8 | 27.0 | 27.1 | 24.6 | 25.8 | 25.9 | 35.5 | 21.5 | 21.6 | 33.2 | 19.8 | 18.2 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.4 | 0.7 | 1.5 | 1.9 | 20.8 | 0.9 | 1.8 | 2.0 | 0.8 | 0.5 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／112．1 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 1.9 | 3.5 | 3.2 | 1.3 | 2.6 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 2.9 | 0.9 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh 27.9 | 28.2 | 28.5 | 25.2 | 27.2 | 27.8 | 56.3 | 22.5 | 23.4 | 35.2 | 20.6 | 18.6 |
| LnGrp LOS C | C | C | C | C | C | E | C | C | D | C | B |
| Approach Vol，veh／h | 429 |  |  | 542 |  |  | 639 |  |  | 644 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh | 28.2 |  |  | 27.0 |  |  | 25.6 |  |  | 23.2 |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s9．6 | 25.8 | 20.9 | 7.0 | 28.5 | 18.4 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s 4.0 | 4.6 | 4.6 | 4.0 | 4.6 | 4.6 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmaz¢．¢ | 45.4 | 25.4 | 26.0 | 45.4 | 25.4 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c +1 14，©s | 8.8 | 9.9 | 4.2 | 9.2 | 7.5 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s 0.6 | 10.1 | 3.7 | 0.2 | 8.6 | 2.9 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 25.8 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | C |

Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green．
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement．



* HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier.


User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.


Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.

|  | ， |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | 1 | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | 7 | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 15 | 398 | 74 | 85 | 485 | 11 | 124 | 3 | 93 | 19 | 3 | 38 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 15 | 398 | 74 | 85 | 485 | 11 | 124 | 3 | 93 | 19 | 3 | 38 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 15 | 410 | 76 | 88 | 500 | 11 | 128 | 3 | 96 | 20 | 3 | 39 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap，veh／h | 27 | 810 | 149 | 117 | 623 | 506 | 141 | 2 | 616 | 134 | 11 | 636 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.02 | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.06 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.40 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1810 | 3018 | 553 | 1810 | 1900 | 1544 | 0 | 4 | 1552 | 0 | 29 | 1603 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 15 | 243 | 243 | 88 | 500 | 11 | 131 | 0 | 96 | 23 | 0 | 39 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／n | 1810 | 1805 | 1766 | 1810 | 1900 | 1544 | 4 | 0 | 1552 | 29 | 0 | 1603 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 0.4 | 5.7 | 5.9 | 2.4 | 12.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 0.4 | 5.7 | 5.9 | 2.4 | 12.1 | 0.2 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.31 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.98 |  | 1.00 | 0.87 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 27 | 485 | 474 | 117 | 623 | 506 | 143 | 0 | 616 | 145 | 0 | 636 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.55 | 0.50 | 0.51 | 0.75 | 0.80 | 0.02 | 0.92 | 0.00 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.00 | 0.06 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 934 | 1608 | 1574 | 916 | 1693 | 1376 | 143 | 0 | 616 | 145 | 0 | 636 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 24.6 | 15.6 | 15.6 | 23.2 | 15.4 | 11.5 | 24.9 | 0.0 | 9.8 | 15.4 | 0.0 | 9.4 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 16.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 9.3 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（ $50 \%$ ），veh／／10． 3 |  | 2.1 | 2.1 | 1.3 | 4.7 | 0.1 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／vehLnGrp LOS | 40.9 | 15.9 | 15.9 | 32.5 | 16.4 | 11.5 | 74.9 | 0.0 | 9.8 | 15.6 | 0.0 | 9.4 |
|  | D | B | B | C | B | B | E | A | A | B | A | A |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 501 |  |  | 599 |  |  | 227 |  |  | 62 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／vehApproach LOS |  | 16.7 |  |  | 18.6 |  |  | 47.4 |  |  | 11.7 |  |
|  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | D |  |  | B |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 22.3 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | C |

Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green．


| Intersection |
| :--- |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh14.4 |
| Intersection LOS $\quad$ B |


| Movement EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | \$ |  |  | \$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h 28 | 228 | 36 | 29 | 236 | 42 | 50 | 161 | 37 | 30 | 76 | 48 |
| Future Vol, veh/h 28 | 228 | 36 | 29 | 236 | 42 | 50 | 161 | 37 | 30 | 76 | 48 |
| Peak Hour Factor 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow 30 | 245 | 39 | 31 | 254 | 45 | 54 | 173 | 40 | 32 | 82 | 52 |
| Number of Lanes 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach RighNB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay 14.9 |  |  | 15.1 |  |  | 14.4 |  |  | 12 |  |  |
| HCM LOS B |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  |


|  | NBLn1 EBLn1 EBLn2WBLn1WBLn2 SBLn1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $20 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $19 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, $\%$ | $65 \%$ | $89 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $89 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $49 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $15 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $31 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 248 | 256 | 36 | 265 | 42 | 154 |
| LT Vol | 50 | 28 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 30 |
| Through Vol | 161 | 228 | 0 | 236 | 0 | 76 |
| RT Vol | 37 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 42 | 48 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 267 | 275 | 39 | 285 | 45 | 166 |
| Geometry Grp | 2 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 2 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.458 | 0.501 | 0.062 | 0.517 | 0.072 | 0.291 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 6.181 | 6.557 | 5.786 | 6.531 | 5.761 | 6.334 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 584 | 551 | 620 | 553 | 623 | 566 |
| Service Time | 4.211 | 4.284 | 3.513 | 4.258 | 3.487 | 4.379 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.457 | 0.499 | 0.063 | 0.515 | 0.072 | 0.293 |
| HCM Control Delay | 14.4 | 15.7 | 8.9 | 16.1 | 8.9 | 12 |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | C | A | C | A | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 2.4 | 2.8 | 0.2 | 2.9 | 0.2 | 1.2 |


| Movement EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | 4 | 「 | ${ }^{*}$ | 4 | 「 | ${ }^{1}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） 94 | 164 | 106 | 25 | 371 | 141 | 110 | 57 | 12 | 121 | 66 | 110 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） 94 | 164 | 106 | 25 | 371 | 141 | 110 | 57 | 12 | 121 | 66 | 110 |
| Initial Q（Qb），veh 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.91 | 1.00 |  | 0.91 |
| Parking Bus，Adj 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h 104 | 182 | 0 | 28 | 412 | 0 | 122 | 63 | 13 | 134 | 73 | 122 |
| Peak Hour Factor 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Cap，veh／h 136 | 641 |  | 57 | 558 |  | 159 | 332 | 69 | 174 | 138 | 230 |
| Arrive On Green 0.08 | 0.34 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.30 | 0.00 | 0.09 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.10 | 0.23 | 0.23 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h 1795 | 1885 | 1598 | 1795 | 1885 | 1598 | 1810 | 1498 | 309 | 1795 | 596 | 996 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h 104 | 182 | 0 | 28 | 412 | 0 | 122 | 0 | 76 | 134 | 0 | 195 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln1795 | 1885 | 1598 | 1795 | 1885 | 1598 | 1810 | 0 | 1807 | 1795 | 0 | 1592 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s 3.0 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 10.5 | 0.0 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 5.7 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s 3.0 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 10.5 | 0.0 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 5.7 |
| Prop In Lane 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.17 | 1.00 |  | 0.63 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h 136 | 641 |  | 57 | 558 |  | 159 | 0 | 401 | 174 | 0 | 367 |
| V／C Ratio（X） 0.76 | 0.28 |  | 0.49 | 0.74 |  | 0.77 | 0.00 | 0.19 | 0.77 | 0.00 | 0.53 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h 539 | 1255 |  | 539 | 1255 |  | 543 | 0 | 711 | 539 | 0 | 627 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（I） 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh 24.2 | 12.9 | 0.0 | 25.4 | 16.9 | 0.0 | 23.8 | 0.0 | 16.9 | 23.5 | 0.0 | 18.0 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh 6.4 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 4.8 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 2.7 | 0.0 | 0.9 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／lı1． 5 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 2.0 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh 30.6 | 13.1 | 0.0 | 30.1 | 18.9 | 0.0 | 26.7 | 0.0 | 17.0 | 26.2 | 0.0 | 18.9 |
| LnGrp LOS C | B |  | C | B |  | C | A | B | C | A | B |
| Approach Vol，veh／h | 286 | A |  | 440 | A |  | 198 |  |  | 329 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh | 19.5 |  |  | 19.6 |  |  | 23.0 |  |  | 21.9 |  |
| Approach LOS | B |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s5．7 | 22.6 | 8.7 | 16.3 | 8.1 | 20.3 | 9.2 | 15.8 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax¢，．＠ | 35.5 | 16.0 | 21.0 | 16.0 | 35.5 | 16.0 | 21.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋1迶\＆ | 5.8 | 5.5 | 7.7 | 5.0 | 12.5 | 5.9 | 3.8 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s 0.0 | 1.1 | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 2.6 | 0.1 | 0.2 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 20.7 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | C |

Notes
Unsignalized Delay for［EBR，WBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 个 $\uparrow$ | 「 | \％ | 个t |  | 7 | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 12 | 1027 | 1141 | 104 | 454 | 35 | 581 | 19 | 57 | 56 | 31 | 25 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 12 | 1027 | 1141 | 104 | 454 | 35 | 581 | 19 | 57 | 56 | 31 | 25 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 12 | 1059 | 0 | 107 | 468 | 36 | 613 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 32 | 26 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap，veh／h | 25 | 2006 |  | 88 | 2001 | 153 | 625 | 0 |  | 88 | 48 | 115 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.01 | 0.56 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1795 | 3582 | 1598 | 1795 | 3362 | 258 | 3591 | 0 | 1598 | 1186 | 654 | 1562 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 12 | 1059 | 0 | 107 | 248 | 256 | 613 | 0 | 0 | 90 | 0 | 26 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1795 | 1791 | 1598 | 1795 | 1791 | 1829 | 1795 | 0 | 1598 | 1841 | 0 | 1562 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 0.7 | 20.7 | 0.0 | 5.5 | 7.3 | 7.4 | 19.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.3 | 0.0 | 1.8 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 0.7 | 20.7 | 0.0 | 5.5 | 7.3 | 7.4 | 19.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.3 | 0.0 | 1.8 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.14 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.64 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 25 | 2006 |  | 88 | 1066 | 1089 | 625 | 0 |  | 136 | 0 | 115 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.48 | 0.53 |  | 1.21 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.98 | 0.00 |  | 0.66 | 0.00 | 0.23 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 88 | 2006 |  | 88 | 1066 | 1089 | 625 | 0 |  | 370 | 0 | 314 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（I） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.87 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 54.8 | 15.4 | 0.0 | 53.3 | 10.7 | 10.7 | 46.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.5 | 0.0 | 48.8 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 5.2 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 162.6 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 28.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 0.4 | 8.6 | 0.0 | 6.5 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 10.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 0.7 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 60.0 | 16.4 | 0.0 | 215.9 | 11.1 | 11.2 | 74.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 52.5 | 0.0 | 49.2 |
| LnGrp LOS | E | B |  | F | B | B | E | A |  | D | A | D |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 1071 | A |  | 611 |  |  | 613 | A |  | 116 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 16.9 |  |  | 47.0 |  |  | 74.6 |  |  | 51.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | D |  |  | E |  |  | D |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 9.5 | 66.7 | 12.3 | 5.6 | 70.7 | 23.5 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 5.5 | 48.5 | 22.5 | 5.5 | 48.5 | 19.5 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 7.5 | 22.7 | 7.3 | 2.7 | 9.4 | 21.0 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.0 | 9.1 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 0.0 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 40.9 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | $D$ |

Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement．
Unsignalized Delay for［NBR，EBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | \％ | 7 |  | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | 7 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{4}$ | 个4 | 「 | ＊ | 个 ${ }_{\text {d }}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | F＇ |  | ¢ |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 8 | 738 | 481 | 405 | 692 | 2 | 252 | 1 | 749 | 5 | 5 | 9 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 8 | 738 | 481 | 405 | 692 | 2 | 252 | 1 | 749 | 5 | 5 | 9 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.87 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1900 | 1900 | 1737 | 1870 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1856 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 8 | 769 | 0 | 422 | 721 | 2 | 262 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 9 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 0 | 0 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap，veh／h | 14 | 1722 |  | 437 | 2639 | 7 | 280 | 1 |  | 12 | 12 | 21 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.01 | 0.48 | 0.00 | 0.49 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1810 | 3610 | 1472 | 1781 | 3693 | 10 | 1789 | 7 | 1572 | 416 | 416 | 750 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 8 | 769 | 0 | 422 | 352 | 371 | 263 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1810 | 1805 | 1472 | 1781 | 1805 | 1898 | 1796 | 0 | 1572 | 1582 | 0 | 0 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 0.7 | 21.2 | 0.0 | 34.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 0.7 | 21.2 | 0.0 | 34.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.01 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.26 |  | 0.47 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 14 | 1722 |  | 437 | 1290 | 1356 | 281 | 0 |  | 44 | 0 | 0 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.58 | 0.45 |  | 0.97 | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.93 | 0.00 |  | 0.43 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 48 | 1722 |  | 487 | 1290 | 1356 | 281 | 0 |  | 232 | 0 | 0 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.55 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 74.2 | 26.1 | 0.0 | 37.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 62.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 71.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 8.5 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 30.0 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 24.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 0.3 | 9.3 | 0.0 | 15.7 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 11.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 82.7 | 26.6 | 0.0 | 67.7 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 86.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 76.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | F | C |  | E | A | A | F | A |  | E | A | A |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 777 | A |  | 1145 |  |  | 263 | A |  | 19 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 27.1 |  |  | 25.3 |  |  | 86.8 |  |  | 76.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | F |  |  | E |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration $(G+Y+R c)$ ，s | 39.8 | 75.6 | 7.7 | 4.1 | 111.2 | 27.0 |
| Change Period $(\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc})$ ，s | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 41.0 | 49.5 | 22.0 | 4.0 | 86.5 | 23.5 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 36.4 | 23.2 | 3.8 | 2.7 | 2.0 | 23.7 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.3 | 7.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.7 | 0.0 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 33.7 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | C |

Notes
Unsignalized Delay for［NBR，EBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 个 $\uparrow$ | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 性 |  | 7 | $\uparrow$ | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | F |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 49 | 976 | 471 | 3 | 1081 | 13 | 518 | 15 | 50 | 117 | 148 | 97 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 49 | 976 | 471 | 3 | 1081 | 13 | 518 | 15 | 50 | 117 | 148 | 97 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1870 | 1856 | 1841 | 1900 | 1841 | 1841 | 1811 | 1870 | 1856 | 1870 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 51 | 1017 | 0 | 3 | 1126 | 14 | 551 | 0 | 0 | 122 | 154 | 101 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap，veh／h | 65 | 1890 |  | 7 | 1779 | 22 | 619 | 0 |  | 286 | 172 | 113 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.05 | 0.71 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.18 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.16 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1781 | 3526 | 1560 | 1810 | 3536 | 44 | 3450 | 0 | 1572 | 1781 | 1068 | 701 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 51 | 1017 | 0 | 3 | 557 | 583 | 551 | 0 | 0 | 122 | 0 | 255 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／n | 1781 | 1763 | 1560 | 1810 | 1749 | 1831 | 1725 | 0 | 1572 | 1781 | 0 | 1769 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 4.2 | 20.2 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 34.8 | 34.8 | 23.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.3 | 0.0 | 21.2 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 4.2 | 20.2 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 34.8 | 34.8 | 23.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.3 | 0.0 | 21.2 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.02 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.40 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 65 | 1890 |  | 7 | 880 | 921 | 619 | 0 |  | 286 | 0 | 284 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.78 | 0.54 |  | 0.42 | 0.63 | 0.63 | 0.89 | 0.00 |  | 0.43 | 0.00 | 0.90 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 101 | 1890 |  | 62 | 880 | 921 | 793 | 0 |  | 338 | 0 | 336 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.33 | 1.33 | 1.33 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 70.7 | 12.9 | 0.0 | 74.5 | 27.2 | 27.2 | 60.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 56.7 | 0.0 | 61.7 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 18.4 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 35.4 | 3.5 | 3.3 | 10.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 23.0 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％oile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 2.3 | 7.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 15.2 | 15.9 | 11.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 11.4 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 89.1 | 14.0 | 0.0 | 110.0 | 30.6 | 30.5 | 70.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 57.7 | 0.0 | 84.8 |
| LnGrp LOS | F | B |  | F | C | C | E | A |  | E | A | F |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 1068 | A |  | 1143 |  |  | 551 | A |  | 377 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 17.6 |  |  | 30.7 |  |  | 70.3 |  |  | 76.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | E |  |  | E |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 5.1 | 84.9 | 31.4 | 10.0 | 80.0 | 28.6 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 5.1 | 63.9 | 34.5 | 8.5 | 60.5 | 28.5 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 2.2 | 22.2 | 25.4 | 6.2 | 36.8 | 23.2 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.0 | 9.4 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 8.1 | 0.9 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 38.6 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | D |

Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement．
Unsignalized Delay for［NBR，EBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．


Notes

* HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier.

Unsignalized Delay for [SBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.


Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.




| Intersection |
| :--- |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh78.3 |
| Intersection LOS $\quad$ F |


| Movement EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \& |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\ddagger$ |  |  | \$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h 5 | 341 | 3 | 3 | 37 | 277 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 612 | 3 | 6 |
| Future Vol, veh/h 5 | 341 | 3 | 3 | 37 | 277 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 612 | 3 | 6 |
| Peak Hour Factor 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.58 | 0.58 | 0.58 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Mvmt Flow 6 | 383 | 3 | 3 | 40 | 301 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 680 | 3 | 7 |
| Number of Lanes 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach RighNB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay 27.5 |  |  | 17.9 |  |  | 11.6 |  |  | 138.6 |  |  |
| HCM LOS D |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | F |  |  |


|  | NBLn1 EBLn1WBLn1WBLn2 SBLn1 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $29 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $99 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, $\%$ | $14 \%$ | $98 \%$ | $93 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $57 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 7 | 349 | 40 | 277 | 621 |
| LT Vol | 2 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 612 |
| Through Vol | 1 | 341 | 37 | 0 | 3 |
| RT Vol | 4 | 3 | 0 | 277 | 6 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 12 | 392 | 43 | 301 | 690 |
| Geometry Grp | 2 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 2 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.026 | 0.727 | 0.089 | 0.556 | 1.226 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 8.388 | 7.329 | 8.105 | 7.342 | 6.398 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 429 | 498 | 445 | 494 | 573 |
| Service Time | 6.388 | 5.329 | 5.805 | 5.042 | 4.441 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.028 | 0.787 | 0.097 | 0.609 | 1.204 |
| HCM Control Delay | 11.6 | 27.5 | 11.6 | 18.8 | 138.6 |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | D | B | C | F |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0.1 | 5.9 | 0.3 | 3.3 | 25.8 |



Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.



| Timer - Assigned Phs | 2 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration $(G+Y+R c)$, s | 34.0 | 34.0 | 21.0 |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s | 5.3 | 5.3 | 4.2 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 28.0 | 28.0 | 17.5 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s | 7.8 | 13.0 | 15.8 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 5.0 | 7.3 | 1.0 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 15.7 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | B |

Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.
Unsignalized Delay for [NBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 | ${ }^{*}$ | 性中 |  | ${ }^{*}$ | 种中 |  |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 672 | 26 | 288 | 47 | 16 | 108 | 86 | 1467 | 18 | 46 | 1081 | 238 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 672 | 26 | 288 | 47 | 16 | 108 | 86 | 1467 | 18 | 46 | 1081 | 238 |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time（s） | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 |  | 4.2 | 4.2 | 3.7 | 4.9 |  | 4.6 | 4.9 |  |
| Lane Util．Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.91 |  | 1.00 | 0.91 |  |
| Frpb，ped／bikes | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.97 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.99 |  |
| Flpb，ped／bikes | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 |  | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.97 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 1625 | 1641 | 1509 |  | 1783 | 1561 | 1745 | 4949 |  | 1745 | 4748 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.95 | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 1625 | 1641 | 1509 |  | 1783 | 1561 | 1745 | 4949 |  | 1745 | 4748 |  |
| Peak－hour factor，PHF | 0.86 | 0.61 | 0.80 | 0.85 | 0.44 | 0.79 | 0.66 | 0.86 | 0.61 | 0.67 | 0.94 | 0.85 |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 781 | 43 | 360 | 55 | 36 | 137 | 130 | 1706 | 30 | 69 | 1150 | 280 |
| RTOR Reduction（vph） | 0 | 0 | 132 | 0 | 0 | 119 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 414 | 410 | 228 | 0 | 91 | 18 | 130 | 1735 | 0 | 69 | 1397 | 0 |
| Confl．Peds．（\＃／hr） |  |  | 18 | 18 |  |  | 12 |  | 8 | 8 |  | 12 |
| Confl．Bikes（\＃／hr） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |
| Heavy Vehicles（\％） | 2\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ |  |  | 0\％ | 0\％ | 1\％ |  | 0\％ | 1\％ | 1\％ |


| Heavy Vehicles（\％） | $2 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Turn Type | Split | NA | Perm | Split | NA | Perm | Prot | NA | Prot | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 4 | 4 |  | 3 | 3 |  | 5 | 1 | 2 | 6 |  |


| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Actuated Green，G（s） | 30.0 | 30.0 | 30.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 13.4 | 42.4 | 13.6 | 43.5 |
| Effective Green，g（s） | 30.0 | 30.0 | 30.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 13.4 | 42.4 | 13.6 | 43.5 |
| Actuated g／C Ratio | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.11 | 0.35 | 0.11 | 0.36 |
| Clearance Time（s） | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 3.7 | 4.9 | 4.6 | 4.9 |
| Vehicle Extension（s） | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.2 |
| Lane Grp Cap（vph） | 406 | 410 | 377 | 237 | 208 | 195 | 1750 | 197 | 1722 |
| v／s Ratio Prot | c0．25 | 0.25 |  | c0．05 |  | c0．07 | c0．35 | 0.04 | 0.29 |
| v／s Ratio Perm |  |  | 0.15 |  | 0.01 |  |  |  |  |
| v／c Ratio | 1.02 | 1.00 | 0.60 | 0.38 | 0.09 | 0.67 | 0.99 | 0.35 | 0.81 |
| Uniform Delay，d1 | 45.0 | 45.0 | 39.7 | 47.4 | 45.6 | 51.1 | 38.6 | 49.1 | 34.5 |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.18 | 0.92 |
| Incremental Delay，d2 | 49.8 | 44.4 | 2.7 | 1.0 | 0.2 | 8.3 | 19.5 | 1.0 | 4.1 |
| Delay（s） | 94.7 | 89.4 | 42.4 | 48.5 | 45.7 | 59.4 | 58.1 | 58.8 | 35.7 |
| Level of Service | F | F | D | D | D | E | E | E | D |
| Approach Delay（s） |  | 77.0 |  | 46.8 |  |  | 58.2 |  | 36.8 |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  | D |  |  | E |  | D |


| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| HCM 2000 Control Delay | 55.6 | HCM 2000 Level of Service | E |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity ratio | 0.86 |  | 17.9 |
| Actuated Cycle Length（s） | 119.9 | Sum of lost time（s） | C |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $71.1 \%$ | ICU Level of Service |  |
| Analysis Period（min） | 15 |  |  |
| C Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7} 1$ | t |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 | 7 |  |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 444 | F |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 481 | 159 | 35 | 29 | 86 | 114 | 47 | 913 | 68 | 147 | 798 | 334 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 481 | 159 | 35 | 29 | 86 | 114 | 47 | 913 | 68 | 147 | 798 | 334 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 0.94 | 1.00 |  | 0.91 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 506 | 167 | 37 | 31 | 91 | 120 | 49 | 961 | 72 | 155 | 840 | 352 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Cap, veh/h | 720 | 305 | 68 | 54 | 159 | 166 | 64 | 1892 | 141 | 197 | 2382 | 724 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.04 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.11 | 0.46 | 0.46 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 3483 | 1476 | 327 | 477 | 1399 | 1462 | 1795 | 4869 | 364 | 1795 | 5147 | 1563 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 506 | 0 | 204 | 122 | 0 | 120 | 49 | 676 | 357 | 155 | 840 | 352 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/n | 1742 | 0 | 1803 | 1876 | 0 | 1462 | 1795 | 1716 | 1802 | 1795 | 1716 | 1563 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 12.4 | 0.0 | 9.3 | 5.7 | 0.0 | 7.3 | 2.5 | 13.8 | 13.8 | 7.7 | 9.6 | 14.3 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 12.4 | 0.0 | 9.3 | 5.7 | 0.0 | 7.3 | 2.5 | 13.8 | 13.8 | 7.7 | 9.6 | 14.3 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.18 | 0.25 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.20 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 720 | 0 | 373 | 214 | 0 | 166 | 64 | 1333 | 700 | 197 | 2382 | 724 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.70 | 0.00 | 0.55 | 0.57 | 0.00 | 0.72 | 0.77 | 0.51 | 0.51 | 0.79 | 0.35 | 0.49 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 798 | 0 | 413 | 430 | 0 | 335 | 313 | 1699 | 892 | 509 | 2548 | 774 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 33.8 | 0.0 | 32.5 | 38.5 | 0.0 | 39.2 | 43.8 | 21.4 | 21.4 | 39.8 | 15.8 | 17.1 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 4.8 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 8.1 | 23.5 | 1.4 | 2.6 | 9.4 | 0.4 | 2.3 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 5.7 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 1.5 | 5.5 | 6.1 | 3.8 | 3.6 | 5.3 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 38.6 | 0.0 | 37.0 | 41.9 | 0.0 | 47.3 | 67.4 | 22.7 | 24.0 | 49.2 | 16.2 | 19.4 |
| LnGrp LOS | D | A | D | D | A | D | E | C | C | D | B | B |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 710 |  |  | 242 |  |  | 1082 |  |  | 1347 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 38.1 |  |  | 44.6 |  |  | 25.2 |  |  | 20.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |


| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s | 7.3 | 47.0 | 14.4 | 14.1 | 40.2 | 23.0 |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s | 4.0 | 4.6 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.6 | 4.0 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 16.0 | 45.4 | 21.0 | 26.0 | 45.4 | 21.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s | 4.5 | 16.3 | 9.3 | 9.7 | 15.8 | 14.4 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.1 | 20.9 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 19.8 | 3.7 |

Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 27.6 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | C |

Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.

| Movement EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ¢ ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | * ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 种\% |  | 7\% | 44 | F |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) 413 | 540 | 120 | 212 | 248 | 99 | 129 | 557 | 87 | 190 | 497 | 104 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) 413 | 540 | 120 | 212 | 248 | 99 | 129 | 557 | 87 | 190 | 497 | 104 |
| Initial Q $(Q b)$, veh 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 |
| Parking Bus, Adj 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h 369 | 637 | 124 | 192 | 293 | 102 | 133 | 574 | 90 | 196 | 512 | 107 |
| Peak Hour Factor 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Cap, veh/h 461 | 784 | 152 | 347 | 515 | 174 | 172 | 1240 | 191 | 296 | 955 | 412 |
| Arrive On Green 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.10 | 0.28 | 0.28 | 0.08 | 0.27 | 0.27 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h 1795 | 3051 | 593 | 1810 | 2685 | 909 | 1795 | 4475 | 689 | 3483 | 3582 | 1548 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h 369 | 393 | 368 | 192 | 205 | 190 | 133 | 438 | 226 | 196 | 512 | 107 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln1795 | 1885 | 1758 | 1810 | 1900 | 1694 | 1795 | 1716 | 1733 | 1742 | 1791 | 1548 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s 18.1 | 18.4 | 18.5 | 9.0 | 9.2 | 9.6 | 6.8 | 9.9 | 10.2 | 5.1 | 11.5 | 5.1 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s 18.1 | 18.4 | 18.5 | 9.0 | 9.2 | 9.6 | 6.8 | 9.9 | 10.2 | 5.1 | 11.5 | 5.1 |
| Prop In Lane 1.00 |  | 0.34 | 1.00 |  | 0.54 | 1.00 |  | 0.40 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h 461 | 485 | 452 | 347 | 364 | 325 | 172 | 951 | 480 | 296 | 955 | 412 |
| V/C Ratio(X) 0.80 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.55 | 0.56 | 0.58 | 0.78 | 0.46 | 0.47 | 0.66 | 0.54 | 0.26 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h 485 | 509 | 475 | 488 | 513 | 457 | 496 | 1655 | 836 | 962 | 1728 | 747 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh 32.7 | 32.8 | 32.8 | 34.4 | 34.5 | 34.6 | 41.6 | 28.2 | 28.3 | 41.7 | 29.5 | 27.2 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh 9.4 | 9.8 | 10.6 | 2.0 | 1.9 | 2.4 | 10.1 | 1.3 | 2.6 | 3.6 | 1.7 | 1.2 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/19.0 | 9.7 | 9.1 | 4.2 | 4.4 | 4.2 | 3.4 | 4.1 | 4.5 | 2.3 | 5.0 | 2.0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh 42.1 | 42.6 | 43.5 | 36.3 | 36.4 | 37.0 | 51.7 | 29.4 | 30.9 | 45.3 | 31.2 | 28.4 |
| LnGrp LOS D | D | D | D | D | D | D | C | C | D | C | C |
| Approach Vol, veh/h | 1130 |  |  | 587 |  |  | 797 |  |  | 815 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 42.7 |  |  | 36.6 |  |  | 33.6 |  |  | 34.3 |  |
| Approach LOS | D |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |


| Timer - Assigned Phs 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), \$ $\mathbf{2} .0$ | 30.7 | 22.6 | 13.0 | 29.7 | 28.8 |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s 4.0 | 4.6 | 4.6 | 4.0 | 4.6 | 4.6 |
|  | 45.4 | 25.4 | 26.0 | 45.4 | 25.4 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c l IT), 1 s | 12.2 | 11.6 | 8.8 | 13.5 | 20.5 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s 0.9 | 11.4 | 3.7 | 0.5 | 10.0 | 3.2 |

Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 37.4 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | D |

Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 | \％ | 个的 |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 142 | 187 | 67 | 54 | 85 | 85 | 67 | 526 | 88 | 69 | 509 | 101 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 142 | 187 | 67 | 54 | 85 | 85 | 67 | 526 | 88 | 69 | 509 | 101 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | ， | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／n | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 149 | 197 | 71 | 57 | 89 | 89 | 71 | 554 | 93 | 73 | 536 | 106 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 0 | 0 | ． | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Cap，veh／h | 174 | 230 | 83 | 97 | 152 | 207 | 94 | 992 | 166 | 96 | 967 | 190 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.05 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.05 | 0.33 | 0.33 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 644 | 852 | 307 | 728 | 1136 | 1544 | 1795 | 3046 | 509 | 1795 | 2956 | 582 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 417 | 0 | 0 | 146 | 0 | 89 | 71 | 325 | 322 | 73 | 324 | 318 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／n | 1803 | 0 | 0 | 1864 | 0 | 1544 | 1795 | 1791 | 1764 | 1795 | 1791 | 1746 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 16.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.6 | 0.0 | 4.1 | 3.0 | 11.4 | 11.5 | 3.1 | 11.4 | 11.5 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 16.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.6 | 0.0 | 4.1 | 3.0 | 11.4 | 11.5 | 3.1 | 11.4 | 11.5 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.36 |  | 0.17 | 0.39 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.29 | 1.00 |  | 0.33 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 487 | 0 | 0 | 249 | 0 | 207 | 94 | 583 | 575 | 96 | 586 | 571 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.86 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.59 | 0.00 | 0.43 | 0.76 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.76 | 0.55 | 0.56 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 612 | 0 | 0 | 633 | 0 | 524 | 610 | 1062 | 1046 | 610 | 1062 | 1035 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 26.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 31.2 | 0.0 | 30.5 | 35.8 | 21.3 | 21.3 | 35.7 | 21.2 | 21.2 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 9.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 11.7 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 11.4 | 2.9 | 3.1 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（ $50 \%$ ），veh／ | 118.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 5.1 | 5.1 | 1.6 | 4.9 | 4.9 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay， | ，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 36.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 33.4 | 0.0 | 31.9 | 47.5 | 24.3 | 24.4 | 47.1 | 24.1 | 24.3 |
| LnGrp LOS | D | A | A | C | A | C | D | C | C | D | C | C |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 417 |  |  | 235 |  |  | 718 |  |  | 715 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 36.1 |  |  | 32.8 |  |  | 26.6 |  |  | 26.5 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |
| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration（ $G+Y+R \mathrm{Cc}$ ）， | ， 8.1 | 29.5 |  | 14.2 | 8.0 | 29.7 |  | 24.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period（ $Y+R \mathrm{Rc}$ ），s | s 4.0 | 4.6 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.6 |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting（Gma | 220．6 | 45.4 |  | 26.0 | 26.0 | 45.4 |  | 26.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋ | ＋19， 1 is | 13.5 |  | 7.6 | 5.0 | 13.5 |  | 18.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.1 | 11.4 |  | 1.0 | 0.1 | 10.7 |  | 1.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl DelayHCM 6th LOS |  |  | 29.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | O |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



* HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier.

|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{*}$ | 性 |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 性 |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{6}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 51 | 870 | 124 | 98 | 408 | 49 | 151 | 198 | 85 | 200 | 373 | 48 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 51 | 870 | 124 | 98 | 408 | 49 | 151 | 198 | 85 | 200 | 373 | 48 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/n | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 54 | 916 | 131 | 103 | 429 | 52 | 159 | 208 | 89 | 211 | 393 | 51 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap, veh/h | 70 | 1058 | 151 | 134 | 1196 | 144 | 199 | 302 | 129 | 254 | 447 | 58 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.04 | 0.34 | 0.34 | 0.07 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.11 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.14 | 0.27 | 0.27 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1810 | 3149 | 450 | 1810 | 3225 | 388 | 1810 | 1250 | 535 | 1810 | 1641 | 213 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 54 | 525 | 522 | 103 | 239 | 242 | 159 | 0 | 297 | 211 | 0 | 444 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/n | 1810 | 1805 | 1794 | 1810 | 1805 | 1808 | 1810 | 0 | 1785 | 1810 | 0 | 1854 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 2.6 | 23.5 | 23.5 | 4.8 | 8.3 | 8.4 | 7.4 | 0.0 | 13.1 | 9.8 | 0.0 | 19.8 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 2.6 | 23.5 | 23.5 | 4.8 | 8.3 | 8.4 | 7.4 | 0.0 | 13.1 | 9.8 | 0.0 | 19.8 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.25 | 1.00 |  | 0.21 | 1.00 |  | 0.30 | 1.00 |  | 0.11 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 70 | 606 | 603 | 134 | 670 | 671 | 199 | 0 | 432 | 254 | 0 | 505 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.77 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.77 | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.80 | 0.00 | 0.69 | 0.83 | 0.00 | 0.88 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 429 | 742 | 737 | 429 | 742 | 743 | 429 | 0 | 527 | 429 | 0 | 547 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 41.1 | 26.9 | 26.9 | 39.3 | 19.7 | 19.7 | 37.5 | 0.0 | 29.8 | 36.2 | 0.0 | 30.1 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 12.3 | 7.8 | 7.9 | 6.8 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 7.2 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 7.0 | 0.0 | 14.8 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh 0.0 \%ile BackOfQ( $50 \%$ ),veh/IIII 4 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 11.0 | 10.9 | 2.4 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 5.8 | 4.7 | 0.0 | 10.6 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh LnGrp LOS | 53.4 | 34.7 | 34.8 | 46.1 | 20.1 | 20.1 | 44.8 | 0.0 | 32.2 | 43.1 | 0.0 | 44.9 |
|  | D | C | C | D | C | C | D | A | C | D | A | D |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 1101 |  |  | 584 |  |  | 456 |  |  | 655 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/vehApproach LOS |  | 35.7 |  |  | 24.7 |  |  | 36.6 |  |  | 44.3 |  |
|  |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |


| Timer - Assigned Phs | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), $\mathbf{5 0}^{0} 9$ | 33.5 | 16.6 | 25.4 | 7.9 | 36.6 | 14.0 | 28.0 |
| Change Period ( $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmaz), ${ }^{\text {F }}$ | 35.5 | 20.5 | 25.5 | 20.5 | 35.5 | 20.5 | 25.5 |
|  | 25.5 | 11.8 | 15.1 | 4.6 | 10.4 | 9.4 | 21.8 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s 0.1 | 3.5 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 0.1 | 3.6 | 0.3 | 1.1 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 35.6 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | D |

Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 个 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | \% | 个 ${ }^{\text {P }}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | F |  | ${ }^{7}$ | F |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 45 | 1059 | 56 | 53 | 468 | 85 | 22 | 58 | 65 | 278 | 143 | 55 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 45 | 1059 | 56 | 53 | 468 | 85 | 22 | 58 | 65 | 278 | 143 | 55 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 0.92 | 1.00 |  | 0.93 | 1.00 |  | 0.92 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 47 | 1115 | 59 | 56 | 493 | 89 | 23 | 61 | 68 | 293 | 151 | 58 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap, veh/h | 60 | 1437 | 76 | 73 | 1269 | 227 | 36 | 117 | 131 | 341 | 415 | 159 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.03 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.04 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.02 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.19 | 0.32 | 0.32 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1810 | 3470 | 184 | 1810 | 3016 | 540 | 1795 | 775 | 864 | 1810 | 1295 | 497 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 47 | 580 | 594 | 56 | 294 | 288 | 23 | 0 | 129 | 293 | 0 | 209 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/n | n1810 | 1805 | 1849 | 1810 | 1805 | 1752 | 1795 | 0 | 1640 | 1810 | 0 | 1793 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 2.0 | 21.6 | 21.6 | 2.4 | 8.7 | 8.9 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 5.6 | 12.2 | 0.0 | 7.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear (g_c), s | 2.0 | 21.6 | 21.6 | 2.4 | 8.7 | 8.9 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 5.6 | 12.2 | 0.0 | 7.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.10 | 1.00 |  | 0.31 | 1.00 |  | 0.53 | 1.00 |  | 0.28 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 60 | 747 | 765 | 73 | 760 | 737 | 36 | 0 | 248 | 341 | 0 | 574 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.78 | 0.78 | 0.78 | 0.77 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.64 | 0.00 | 0.52 | 0.86 | 0.00 | 0.36 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 372 | 1067 | 1093 | 372 | 1067 | 1036 | 485 | 0 | 337 | 489 | 0 | 574 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | h37.3 | 19.7 | 19.7 | 37.0 | 15.6 | 15.6 | 37.8 | 0.0 | 30.4 | 30.5 | 0.0 | 20.4 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 19.2 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 15.6 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 17.0 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 10.2 | 0.0 | 0.4 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh | h/lıl 2 | 8.8 | 9.0 | 1.3 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 6.2 | 0.0 | 2.9 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay | , s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay (d),s/veh | 56.5 | 22.0 | 22.0 | 52.6 | 15.9 | 16.0 | 54.9 | 0.0 | 32.1 | 40.8 | 0.0 | 20.7 |
| LnGrp LOS | E | C | C | D | B | B | D | A | C | D | A | C |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 1221 |  |  | 638 |  |  | 152 |  |  | 502 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 23.3 |  |  | 19.1 |  |  | 35.5 |  |  | 32.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), | , 88.7 | 15.8 | 7.1 | 36.2 | 5.6 | 28.9 | 6.6 | 36.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), | s 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gma | 28), 8 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 46.0 | 21.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 46.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+ | +114, 2 s | 7.6 | 4.4 | 23.6 | 3.0 | 9.0 | 4.0 | 10.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | S 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 8.6 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl DelayHCM 6th LOS |  |  | 24.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement E | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 个 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ | F |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | $\stackrel{7}{7}$ |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 34 | 1263 | 107 | 147 | 569 | 21 | 88 | 10 | 115 | 19 | 9 | 16 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 34 | 1263 | 107 | 147 | 569 | 21 | 88 | 10 | 115 | 19 | 9 | 16 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) 1 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 |
| Parking Bus, Adj 1 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln 19 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 35 | 1302 | 110 | 152 | 587 | 22 | 91 | 10 | 119 | 20 | 9 | 16 |
| Peak Hour Factor 0 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap, veh/h | 50 | 1530 | 129 | 196 | 1031 | 845 | 89 | 5 | 401 | 79 | 22 | 415 |
| Arrive On Green 0 | 0.03 | 0.46 | 0.46 | 0.11 | 0.54 | 0.54 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.26 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h 18 | 1810 | 3358 | 283 | 1810 | 1900 | 1557 | 0 | 21 | 1545 | 0 | 86 | 1599 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 35 | 698 | 714 | 152 | 587 | 22 | 101 | 0 | 119 | 29 | 0 | 16 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/n18 | 1810 | 1805 | 1836 | 1810 | 1900 | 1557 | 21 | 0 | 1545 | 86 | 0 | 1599 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 1.5 | 26.4 | 26.7 | 6.3 | 15.7 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 1.5 | 26.4 | 26.7 | 6.3 | 15.7 | 0.5 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 4.8 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
| Prop In Lane $\quad 1$ | 1.00 |  | 0.15 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.90 |  | 1.00 | 0.69 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 50 | 822 | 836 | 196 | 1031 | 845 | 94 | 0 | 401 | 101 | 0 | 415 |
| V/C Ratio (X) 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.78 | 0.57 | 0.03 | 1.07 | 0.00 | 0.30 | 0.29 | 0.00 | 0.04 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 611 | 1052 | 1071 | 599 | 1108 | 908 | 94 | 0 | 401 | 101 | 0 | 415 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio 1 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) 1 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh 3 | 37.1 | 18.6 | 18.7 | 33.4 | 11.6 | 8.2 | 37.4 | 0.0 | 22.9 | 23.8 | 0.0 | 21.3 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh 1 | 16.8 | 4.4 | 4.6 | 6.5 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 113.4 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/Ir | $1 / 10.9$ | 11.0 | 11.3 | 3.1 | 6.1 | 0.2 | 4.7 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s | , s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh 5 | 53.9 | 23.0 | 23.3 | 40.0 | 12.0 | 8.2 | 150.8 | 0.0 | 23.0 | 24.4 | 0.0 | 21.3 |
| LnGrp LOS | D | C | C | D | B | A | F | A | C | C | A | C |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 1447 |  |  | 761 |  |  | 220 |  |  | 45 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 23.9 |  |  | 17.4 |  |  | 81.7 |  |  | 23.3 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | F |  |  | C |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs | , | 2 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s | , 22.8 | 40.2 |  | 24.0 | 6.1 | 46.9 |  | 24.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s | s 4.5 | 5.1 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.1 |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmaz | 225 | 44.9 |  | 20.0 | 26.0 | 44.9 |  | 20.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11 | 118,38 | 28.7 |  | 22.0 | 3.5 | 17.7 |  | 22.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.4 | 6.4 |  | 0.0 | 0.1 | 2.9 |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrr DelayHCM 6th LOS |  |  | 27.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{*}$ | 个 |  | \% | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | \% | F |  | ${ }^{7}$ | F |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 53 | 337 | 126 | 145 | 225 | 34 | 77 | 348 | 115 | 64 | 443 | 41 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 53 | 337 | 126 | 145 | 225 | 34 | 77 | 348 | 115 | 64 | 443 | 41 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 0.94 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 55 | 351 | 131 | 151 | 234 | 35 | 80 | 362 | 120 | 67 | 461 | 43 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap, veh/h | 77 | 402 | 150 | 192 | 603 | 90 | 106 | 438 | 145 | 89 | 542 | 51 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.04 | 0.31 | 0.31 | 0.11 | 0.38 | 0.38 | 0.06 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.05 | 0.32 | 0.32 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1795 | 1282 | 478 | 1810 | 1602 | 240 | 1795 | 1335 | 443 | 1810 | 1703 | 159 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 55 | 0 | 482 | 151 | 0 | 269 | 80 | 0 | 482 | 67 | 0 | 504 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s), veh/h/ln | 1795 | 0 | 1761 | 1810 | 0 | 1842 | 1795 | 0 | 1778 | 1810 | 0 | 1862 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 2.5 | 0.0 | 21.6 | 6.8 | 0.0 | 8.9 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 20.9 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 21.2 |
| Cycle Q Clear (g_c), s | 2.5 | 0.0 | 21.6 | 6.8 | 0.0 | 8.9 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 20.9 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 21.2 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.27 | 1.00 |  | 0.13 | 1.00 |  | 0.25 | 1.00 |  | 0.09 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 77 | 0 | 552 | 192 | 0 | 694 | 106 | 0 | 583 | 89 | 0 | 592 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.71 | 0.00 | 0.87 | 0.78 | 0.00 | 0.39 | 0.76 | 0.00 | 0.83 | 0.76 | 0.00 | 0.85 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 569 | 0 | 737 | 574 | 0 | 771 | 569 | 0 | 745 | 574 | 0 | 780 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 39.5 | 0.0 | 27.1 | 36.4 | 0.0 | 19.0 | 38.7 | 0.0 | 25.9 | 39.2 | 0.0 | 26.6 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 11.3 | 0.0 | 8.9 | 6.9 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 10.4 | 0.0 | 6.9 | 12.2 | 0.0 | 7.9 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh | /111. 4 | 0.0 | 10.2 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 9.5 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 10.3 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, | , s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 50.8 | 0.0 | 36.0 | 43.3 | 0.0 | 19.4 | 49.2 | 0.0 | 32.8 | 51.5 | 0.0 | 34.6 |
| LnGrp LOS | D | A | D | D | A | B | D | A | C | D | A | C |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 537 |  |  | 420 |  |  | 562 |  |  | 571 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 37.6 |  |  | 28.0 |  |  | 35.1 |  |  | 36.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), | , 82.4 | 31.2 | 8.4 | 31.6 | 7.1 | 36.5 | 7.6 | 32.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s | s 3.5 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 5.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gma | 2 2 ¢, 5 | 35.0 | 26.5 | 35.0 | 26.5 | 35.0 | 26.5 | 35.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+ | +19,8 8 | 23.6 | 5.7 | 23.2 | 4.5 | 10.9 | 5.1 | 22.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.4 | 2.6 | 0.2 | 3.4 | 0.1 | 1.7 | 0.1 | 3.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl DelayHCM 6th LOS |  |  | 34.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Intersection

Intersection Delay, s/veh56.5
Intersection LOS
F

| Movement EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | $\uparrow$ | F |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | \$ |  |  | \$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h 75 | 465 | 87 | 49 | 296 | 49 | 31 | 89 | 36 | 39 | 129 | 67 |
| Future Vol, veh/h 75 | 465 | 87 | 49 | 296 | 49 | 31 | 89 | 36 | 39 | 129 | 67 |
| Peak Hour Factor 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow 81 | 500 | 94 | 53 | 318 | 53 | 33 | 96 | 39 | 42 | 139 | 72 |
| Number of Lanes 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach RighNB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay 98.7 |  |  | 27.8 |  |  | 15.8 |  |  | 18.8 |  |  |
| HCM LOS F |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 EBLn1 EBLn2WBLn1WBLn2 SBLn1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $20 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $17 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $57 \%$ | $86 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $86 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $55 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $23 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $29 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 156 | 540 | 87 | 345 | 49 | 235 |
| LT Vol | 31 | 75 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 39 |
| Through Vol | 89 | 465 | 0 | 296 | 0 | 129 |
| RT Vol | 36 | 0 | 87 | 0 | 49 | 67 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 168 | 581 | 94 | 371 | 53 | 253 |
| Geometry Grp | 2 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 2 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.362 | 1.149 | 0.165 | 0.755 | 0.096 | 0.518 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 8.213 | 7.126 | 6.336 | 7.65 | 6.853 | 7.778 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 441 | 511 | 566 | 475 | 526 | 467 |
| Service Time | 6.213 | 4.871 | 4.08 | 5.35 | 4.553 | 5.778 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.381 | 1.137 | 0.166 | 0.781 | 0.101 | 0.542 |
| HCM Control Delay | 15.8 | 112.9 | 10.3 | 30.3 | 10.3 | 18.8 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | F | B | D | B | C |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 1.6 | 20.1 | 0.6 | 6.4 | 0.3 | 2.9 |


| Movement EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | 4 | F | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 | 「 | ${ }^{1}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\dagger$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) 71 | 522 | 242 | 15 | 304 | 131 | 87 | 44 | 7 | 175 | 97 | 110 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) 71 | 522 | 242 | 15 | 304 | 131 | 87 | 44 | 7 | 175 | 97 | 110 |
| Initial Q $(\mathrm{Qb})$, veh 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.89 | 1.00 |  | 0.92 |
| Parking Bus, Adj 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h 79 | 580 | 0 | 17 | 338 | 0 | 97 | 49 | 8 | 194 | 108 | 122 |
| Peak Hour Factor 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Cap, veh/h 110 | 708 |  | 37 | 631 |  | 127 | 295 | 48 | 243 | 195 | 221 |
| Arrive On Green 0.06 | 0.38 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.33 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.14 | 0.25 | 0.25 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h 1795 | 1885 | 1598 | 1795 | 1885 | 1598 | 1810 | 1563 | 255 | 1795 | 769 | 868 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h 79 | 580 | 0 | 17 | 338 | 0 | 97 | 0 | 57 | 194 | 0 | 230 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln1795 | 1885 | 1598 | 1795 | 1885 | 1598 | 1810 | 0 | 1819 | 1795 | 0 | 1637 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s 2.5 | 16.4 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 8.6 | 0.0 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 6.2 | 0.0 | 7.2 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s 2.5 | 16.4 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 8.6 | 0.0 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 6.2 | 0.0 | 7.2 |
| Prop In Lane 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.14 | 1.00 |  | 0.53 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h 110 | 708 |  | 37 | 631 |  | 127 | 0 | 343 | 243 | 0 | 416 |
| V/C Ratio(X) 0.72 | 0.82 |  | 0.46 | 0.54 |  | 0.77 | 0.00 | 0.17 | 0.80 | 0.00 | 0.55 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h 487 | 1134 |  | 487 | 1134 |  | 491 | 0 | 647 | 487 | 0 | 583 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(I) 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh 27.2 | 16.6 | 0.0 | 28.6 | 15.9 | 0.0 | 27.0 | 0.0 | 20.1 | 24.7 | 0.0 | 19.1 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh 6.3 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 6.5 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0.9 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/lı1. 2 | 6.9 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 2.6 | 0.0 | 2.6 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh 33.4 | 19.2 | 0.0 | 35.0 | 16.6 | 0.0 | 30.6 | 0.0 | 20.2 | 27.0 | 0.0 | 19.9 |
| LnGrp LOS C | B |  | D | B |  | C | A | C | C | A | B |
| Approach Vol, veh/h | 659 | A |  | 355 | A |  | 154 |  |  | 424 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 20.9 |  |  | 17.5 |  |  | 26.7 |  |  | 23.2 |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s5.2 | 26.7 | 8.1 | 19.0 | 7.6 | 24.2 | 12.0 | 15.1 |  |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmaxক., \& | 35.5 | 16.0 | 21.0 | 16.0 | 35.5 | 16.0 | 21.0 |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+\|22,Cs | 18.4 | 5.1 | 9.2 | 4.5 | 10.6 | 8.2 | 3.5 |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s 0.0 | 3.8 | 0.1 | 0.9 | 0.1 | 2.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 |  |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 21.3 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | C |

Notes
Unsignalized Delay for [EBR, WBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.

## Kimley»Horn

## APPENDIX F. CUMULATIVE CONDITIONS SYNCHRO OUTPUT SHEETS

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 个 $\uparrow$ | F | \％ | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 28 | 551 | 318 | 80 | 514 | 66 | 623 | 28 | 133 | 28 | 23 | 12 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 28 | 551 | 318 | 80 | 514 | 66 | 623 | 28 | 133 | 28 | 23 | 12 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 29 | 568 | 0 | 82 | 530 | 68 | 663 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 24 | 12 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap，veh／h | 52 | 1715 |  | 105 | 1616 | 207 | 748 | 0 |  | 67 | 55 | 103 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.03 | 0.48 | 0.00 | 0.06 | 0.51 | 0.51 | 0.21 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1795 | 3582 | 1598 | 1795 | 3180 | 406 | 3591 | 0 | 1598 | 1012 | 837 | 1559 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 29 | 568 | 0 | 82 | 298 | 300 | 663 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 0 | 12 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1795 | 1791 | 1598 | 1795 | 1791 | 1795 | 1795 | 0 | 1598 | 1849 | 0 | 1559 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 1.4 | 8.4 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 8.3 | 8.4 | 15.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 1.4 | 8.4 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 8.3 | 8.4 | 15.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.23 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.55 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 52 | 1715 |  | 105 | 910 | 912 | 748 | 0 |  | 122 | 0 | 103 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.55 | 0.33 |  | 0.78 | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.89 | 0.00 |  | 0.43 | 0.00 | 0.12 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 118 | 1715 |  | 137 | 910 | 912 | 824 | 0 |  | 490 | 0 | 413 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.71 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 40.7 | 13.7 | 0.0 | 39.5 | 12.3 | 12.3 | 32.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 38.2 | 0.0 | 37.4 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 3.4 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 13.3 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 7.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／In | 0.6 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 7.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 44.1 | 14.2 | 0.0 | 52.7 | 13.3 | 13.3 | 40.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 39.1 | 0.0 | 37.6 |
| LnGrp LOS | D | B |  | D | B | B | D | A |  | D | A | D |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 597 | A |  | 680 |  |  | 663 | A |  | 65 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 15.7 |  |  | 18.0 |  |  | 40.1 |  |  | 38.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 9.0 | 44.7 | 9.6 | 6.5 | 47.2 | 21.7 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 6.5 | 20.5 | 22.5 | 5.6 | 21.4 | 19.5 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 5.8 | 10.4 | 4.3 | 3.4 | 10.4 | 17.2 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.0 | 2.8 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 0.4 |

Intersection Summary
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 25.3
HCM 6th LOS
C

## Notes

User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement．
Unsignalized Delay for［NBR，EBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\downarrow$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | 个4 | F | ${ }^{7}$ | 性 |  |  | $\uparrow$ | F |  | ¢ |  |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) 6 | 705 | 366 | 313 | 604 | 6 | 240 | 2 | 951 | 1 | 0 | 2 |  |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 705 | 366 | 313 | 604 | 6 | 240 | 2 | 951 | 1 | 0 | 2 |  |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.86 |  |
| Parking Bus, Adj 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Work Zone On Approach | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln 1900 | 1900 | 1737 | 1870 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1856 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |  |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h 6 | 734 | 0 | 326 | 629 | 6 | 250 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |  |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% 0 | 0 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |
| Cap, veh/h 11 | 1963 |  | 344 | 2678 | 26 | 271 | 2 |  | 9 | 0 | 17 |  |
| Arrive On Green 0.01 | 0.54 | 0.00 | 0.39 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.02 |  |
| Sat Flow, veh/h 1810 | 3610 | 1472 | 1781 | 3664 | 35 | 1782 | 14 | 1572 | 495 | 0 | 990 |  |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h 6 | 734 | 0 | 326 | 310 | 325 | 252 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln1810 | 1805 | 1472 | 1781 | 1805 | 1894 | 1796 | 0 | 1572 | 1485 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Q Serve(g_s), s 0.5 | 17.5 | 0.0 | 26.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s 0.5 | 17.5 | 0.0 | 26.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Prop In Lane 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.02 | 0.99 |  | 1.00 | 0.33 |  | 0.67 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h 11 | 1963 |  | 344 | 1319 | 1384 | 273 | 0 |  | 26 | 0 | 0 |  |
| V/C Ratio(X) 0.56 | 0.37 |  | 0.95 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.92 | 0.00 |  | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h 48 | 1963 |  | 487 | 1319 | 1384 | 281 | 0 |  | 218 | 0 | 0 |  |
| HCM Platoon Ratio 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Upstream Filter(l) 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.53 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh 74.4 | 19.6 | 0.0 | 45.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 62.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 72.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh 11.6 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 20.1 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 20.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/1r0. 3 | 7.4 | 0.0 | 11.9 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 11.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh 86.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 65.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 83.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 74.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| LnGrp LOS F | B |  | E | A | A | F | A |  | E | A | A |  |
| Approach Vol, veh/h | 740 | A |  | 961 |  |  | 252 | A |  | 3 |  |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 20.5 |  |  | 22.4 |  |  | 83.5 |  |  | 74.0 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  | C |  |  | F |  |  | E |  |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs 1 | 2 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), 32.0 | 85.6 |  | 6.1 | 3.9 | 113.6 |  | 26.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s 3.0 | 4.0 |  | 3.5 | 3.0 | 4.0 |  | 3.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmaz), © | 49.5 |  | 22.0 | 4.0 | 86.5 |  | 23.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+E8, $\mathrm{Es}^{\text {c }}$ | 19.5 |  | 2.3 | 2.5 | 2.0 |  | 22.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s 0.4 | 7.7 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.5 |  | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrr Delay |  | 29.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Notes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Unsignalized Delay for [NBR, EBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.

| Movement EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | 个4 | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 性 |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ | 「 | ${ }^{*}$ | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） 155 | 909 | 593 | 7 | 1075 | 39 | 419 | 133 | 80 | 80 | 91 | 51 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） 155 | 909 | 593 | 7 | 1075 | 39 | 419 | 133 | 80 | 80 | 91 | 51 |
| Initial Q（Qb），veh 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 |
| Parking Bus，Adj 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln 1870 | 1856 | 1841 | 1900 | 1841 | 1841 | 1811 | 1870 | 1856 | 1870 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h 161 | 947 | 0 | 7 | 1120 | 41 | 288 | 347 | 0 | 83 | 95 | 53 |
| Peak Hour Factor 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap，veh／h 101 | 1996 |  | 15 | 1779 | 65 | 353 | 383 |  | 179 | 115 | 64 |
| Arrive On Green 0.08 | 0.75 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h 1781 | 3526 | 1560 | 1810 | 3435 | 126 | 1725 | 1870 | 1572 | 1781 | 1142 | 637 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h 161 | 947 | 0 | 7 | 570 | 591 | 288 | 347 | 0 | 83 | 0 | 148 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln1781 | 1763 | 1560 | 1810 | 1749 | 1812 | 1725 | 1870 | 1572 | 1781 | 0 | 1779 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s 8.5 | 15.5 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 35.0 | 35.0 | 23.9 | 27.2 | 0.0 | 6.6 | 0.0 | 12.2 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s 8.5 | 15.5 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 35.0 | 35.0 | 23.9 | 27.2 | 0.0 | 6.6 | 0.0 | 12.2 |
| Prop In Lane 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.07 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.36 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h 101 | 1996 |  | 15 | 906 | 939 | 353 | 383 |  | 179 | 0 | 179 |
| V／C Ratio（X） 1.60 | 0.47 |  | 0.46 | 0.63 | 0.63 | 0.82 | 0.91 |  | 0.46 | 0.00 | 0.83 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h 101 | 1996 |  | 62 | 906 | 939 | 397 | 430 |  | 338 | 0 | 338 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio 1.33 | 1.33 | 1.33 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l）$\quad 1.00$ | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh 69.3 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 74.0 | 25.9 | 25.9 | 56.9 | 58.2 | 0.0 | 63.6 | 0.0 | 66.2 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh 309.2 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 3.3 | 3.2 | 11.3 | 21.1 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 9.2 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ilir． 5 | 5.1 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 15.2 | 15.7 | 11.6 | 15.2 | 0.0 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 6.0 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh 378.5 | 10.8 | 0.0 | 94.0 | 29.2 | 29.1 | 68.3 | 79.3 | 0.0 | 65.5 | 0.0 | 75.4 |
| LnGrp LOS F | B |  | F | C | C | E | E |  | E | A | E |
| Approach Vol，veh／h | 1108 | A |  | 1168 |  |  | 635 | A |  | 231 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh | 64.2 |  |  | 29.5 |  |  | 74.3 |  |  | 71.8 |  |
| Approach LOS | E |  |  | C |  |  | E |  |  | E |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s5．8 | 89.4 | 35.2 | 13.0 | 82.2 | 19.6 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s 4．5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax5），\＄ | 63.9 | 34.5 | 8.5 | 60.5 | 28.5 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋｜21，6s | 17.5 | 29.2 | 10.5 | 37.0 | 14.2 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s 0.0 | 8.6 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 8.3 | 0.9 |

Intersection Summary
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 53.9
HCM 6th LOS D
Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement．
Unsignalized Delay for［NBR，EBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．


Notes

* HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier.

Unsignalized Delay for [SBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.


Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 5.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL |  |
| Lane Configurations | 4 | F | ${ }^{*}$ | 4 | ${ }^{1}$ | 「 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 217 | 97 | 75 | 211 | 162 | 96 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 217 | 97 | 75 | 211 | 162 | 96 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | 25 | 170 | - | 145 | 0 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 226 | 101 | 78 | 220 | 169 | 100 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |


| Major/Minor $\quad$ N | Major1 |  | Major2 |  | Minor1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 0 | 0 | 343 | 0 | 698 | 339 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - | - | 339 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 359 | - |
| Critical Hdwy | - | - | 4.12 | - | 6.51 | 6.31 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - | - |  | 5.51 | - |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - | - | - | 5.51 | - |
| Follow-up Hdwy | - |  | 2.218 |  | 3.599 | 3.399 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - | 1216 | - | 393 | 683 |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - |  | 702 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - |  | 687 | - |
| Platoon blocked, \% | - | - |  | - |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - | 1215 | - | 389 | 682 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - | - |  | 493 | - |
| Stage 1 | - | - | - |  | 701 | - |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - |  | 680 | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | EB |  | WB |  | NB |  |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 |  | 0.2 |  | 11.6 |  |
| HCM LOS |  |  |  |  | B |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt |  | NBLn1 | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT |
| Capacity (veh/h) |  | 561 | - | - | 1215 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio |  | 0.032 | - |  | 0.008 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) |  | 11.6 | - | - | 8 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS |  | B | - | - | A | A |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) |  | 0.1 | - | - | 0 | - |


| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 12.3 |
| Intersection LOS | B |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | * |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | * |  |  | * |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 10 | 92 | 0 | 6 | 26 | 393 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 269 | 0 | 5 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 10 | 92 | 0 | 6 | 26 | 393 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 269 | 0 | 5 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Mvmt Flow | 10 | 96 | 0 | 6 | 27 | 409 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 280 | 0 | 5 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |  | NB |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |  | SB |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |  | EB |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |  | WB |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 9.6 |  |  | 12.9 |  |  |  | 8.6 |  | 12.6 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  |  | B |  |  |  | A |  | B |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $0 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $98 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $18 \%$ | $90 \%$ | $81 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $82 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 11 | 102 | 32 | 393 | 274 |
| LT Vol | 0 | 10 | 6 | 0 | 269 |
| Through Vol | 2 | 92 | 26 | 0 | 0 |
| RT Vol | 9 | 0 | 0 | 393 | 5 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 11 | 106 | 33 | 409 | 285 |
| Geometry Grp | 2 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 2 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.018 | 0.163 | 0.052 | 0.543 | 0.434 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 5.522 | 5.507 | 5.579 | 4.778 | 5.48 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 650 | 653 | 635 | 745 | 662 |
| Service Time | 3.539 | 3.527 | 3.374 | 2.572 | 3.48 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.017 | 0.162 | 0.052 | 0.549 | 0.431 |
| HCM Control Delay | 8.6 | 9.6 | 8.7 | 13.2 | 12.6 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | A | B | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 3.3 | 2.2 |



## Notes

User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.


## Notes

User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.
Unsignalized Delay for [NBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.


## Notes

User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.

| Movement EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ＊$\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | ＊$\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 虾 |  | ${ }^{17}$ | 中4 | 「 |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） 471 | 178 | 69 | 124 | 246 | 132 | 49 | 497 | 36 | 110 | 432 | 84 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） 471 | 178 | 69 | 124 | 246 | 132 | 49 | 497 | 36 | 110 | 432 | 84 |
| Initial Q $(\mathrm{Qb})$ ，veh 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 |
| Parking Bus，Adj 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h 486 | 184 | 71 | 128 | 254 | 136 | 51 | 512 | 37 | 113 | 445 | 87 |
| Peak Hour Factor 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Cap，veh／h 840 | 300 | 116 | 374 | 483 | 248 | 67 | 1294 | 92 | 242 | 1064 | 461 |
| Arrive On Green 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.04 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.07 | 0.30 | 0.30 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h 3591 | 1283 | 495 | 1810 | 2335 | 1199 | 1795 | 4889 | 349 | 3483 | 3582 | 1551 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h 486 | 0 | 255 | 128 | 205 | 185 | 51 | 358 | 191 | 113 | 445 | 87 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln1795 | 0 | 1778 | 1810 | 1900 | 1633 | 1795 | 1716 | 1807 | 1742 | 1791 | 1551 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s 9.5 | 0.0 | 10.1 | 4.8 | 7.6 | 8.0 | 2.2 | 6.8 | 6.9 | 2.5 | 7.9 | 3.3 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s 9.5 | 0.0 | 10.1 | 4.8 | 7.6 | 8.0 | 2.2 | 6.8 | 6.9 | 2.5 | 7.9 | 3.3 |
| Prop In Lane 1.00 |  | 0.28 | 1.00 |  | 0.73 | 1.00 |  | 0.19 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h 840 | 0 | 416 | 374 | 393 | 338 | 67 | 908 | 478 | 242 | 1064 | 461 |
| V／C Ratio（X） 0.58 | 0.00 | 0.61 | 0.34 | 0.52 | 0.55 | 0.76 | 0.39 | 0.40 | 0.47 | 0.42 | 0.19 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h 1153 | 0 | 571 | 581 | 610 | 525 | 590 | 1970 | 1038 | 1145 | 2057 | 890 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（I）$\quad 1.00$ | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh 26.8 | 0.0 | 27.1 | 26.8 | 27.9 | 28.1 | 37.7 | 23.9 | 23.9 | 35.4 | 22.3 | 20.7 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh 0.9 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 0.8 | 1.5 | 2.0 | 22.1 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 0.7 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／lı4． 1 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 2.1 | 3.6 | 3.3 | 1.4 | 2.7 | 3.1 | 1.1 | 3.3 | 1.2 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh 27.7 | 0.0 | 29.2 | 27.5 | 29.4 | 30.0 | 59.8 | 24.9 | 25.9 | 37.4 | 23.3 | 21.4 |
| LnGrp LOS C | A | C | C | C | C | E | C | C | D | C | C |
| Approach Vol，veh／h | 741 |  |  | 518 |  |  | 600 |  |  | 645 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh | 28.2 |  |  | 29.2 |  |  | 28.2 |  |  | 25.5 |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s9．5 | 25.5 | 21.0 | 6.9 | 28.1 | 23.1 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s 4.0 | 4.6 | 4.6 | 4.0 | 4.6 | 4.6 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax¢，© | 45.4 | 25.4 | 26.0 | 45.4 | 25.4 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋l14， 5 s | 8.9 | 10.0 | 4.2 | 9.9 | 12.1 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s 0.5 | 9.4 | 3.5 | 0.1 | 8.8 | 4.2 |

Intersection Summary
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 27.7
HCM 6th LOS C
Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green．
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement．



* HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier.


User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.


## Notes

User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.


Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | > |  |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | \% | $\hat{1}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{6}$ |  | \% | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 29 | 127 | 96 | 96 | 176 | 37 | 91 | 469 | 80 | 27 | 318 | 40 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 29 | 127 | 96 | 96 | 176 | 37 | 91 | 469 | 80 | 27 | 318 | 40 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 0.92 | 1.00 |  | 0.94 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln 1 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 30 | 132 | 100 | 100 | 183 | 39 | 95 | 489 | 83 | 28 | 331 | 42 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap, veh/h | 59 | 215 | 163 | 134 | 399 | 85 | 127 | 608 | 103 | 56 | 576 | 73 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.03 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.07 | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.07 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.03 | 0.35 | 0.35 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1795 | 956 | 724 | 1810 | 1498 | 319 | 1795 | 1558 | 264 | 1810 | 1643 | 208 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 30 | 0 | 232 | 100 | 0 | 222 | 95 | 0 | 572 | 28 | 0 | 373 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln1 | 1795 | 0 | 1680 | 1810 | 0 | 1818 | 1795 | 0 | 1823 | 1810 | 0 | 1851 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 1.0 | 0.0 | 7.6 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 6.2 | 3.2 | 0.0 | 17.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 10.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 1.0 | 0.0 | 7.6 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 6.2 | 3.2 | 0.0 | 17.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 10.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.43 | 1.00 |  | 0.18 | 1.00 |  | 0.15 | 1.00 |  | 0.11 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 59 | 0 | 378 | 134 | 0 | 484 | 127 | 0 | 712 | 56 | 0 | 650 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.51 | 0.00 | 0.61 | 0.75 | 0.00 | 0.46 | 0.75 | 0.00 | 0.80 | 0.50 | 0.00 | 0.57 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 782 | 0 | 967 | 788 | 0 | 1046 | 782 | 0 | 1049 | 788 | 0 | 1065 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 28.9 | 0.0 | 21.2 | 27.6 | 0.0 | 18.6 | 27.7 | 0.0 | 16.5 | 29.0 | 0.0 | 16.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 6.7 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 8.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 8.6 | 0.0 | 3.7 | 6.7 | 0.0 | 1.1 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ( $50 \%$ ),veh/ | $1 / 10.5$ | 0.0 | 3.0 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 2.6 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 6.9 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 4.0 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, | , s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 35.7 | 0.0 | 22.8 | 35.6 | 0.0 | 19.3 | 36.3 | 0.0 | 20.2 | 35.7 | 0.0 | 17.2 |
| LnGrp LOS | D | A | C | D | A | B | D | A | C | D | A | B |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 262 |  |  | 322 |  |  | 667 |  |  | 401 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 24.3 |  |  | 24.4 |  |  | 22.5 |  |  | 18.5 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $G+Y+R \mathrm{C})$, | , 88.0 | 18.7 | 7.8 | 26.3 | 5.5 | 21.2 | 5.4 | 28.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s | s 3.5 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 5.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gma | 220.s.s | 35.0 | 26.5 | 35.0 | 26.5 | 35.0 | 26.5 | 35.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+1 | +119,3 | 9.6 | 5.2 | 12.0 | 3.0 | 8.2 | 2.9 | 19.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.2 | 1.5 | 0.2 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 4.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrr DelayHCM 6th LOS |  |  | 22.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Intersection

Intersection Delay, s/veh12.2
Intersection LOS

| Movement EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | F゙ |  | \$ |  |  | \$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h 27 | 186 | 36 | 29 | 176 | 41 | 50 | 159 | 38 | 31 | 76 | 48 |
| Future Vol, veh/h 27 | 186 | 36 | 29 | 176 | 41 | 50 | 159 | 38 | 31 | 76 | 48 |
| Peak Hour Factor 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow 29 | 200 | 39 | 31 | 189 | 44 | 54 | 171 | 41 | 33 | 82 | 52 |
| Number of Lanes 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach RighNB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay 12.4 |  |  | 12.2 |  |  | 12.9 |  |  | 11 |  |  |
| HCM LOS B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 EBLn1 EBLn2WBLn1WBLn2 SBLn1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $20 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $20 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $64 \%$ | $87 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $86 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $49 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $15 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $31 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 247 | 213 | 36 | 205 | 41 | 155 |
| LT Vol | 50 | 27 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 31 |
| Through Vol | 159 | 186 | 0 | 176 | 0 | 76 |
| RT Vol | 38 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 41 | 48 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 266 | 229 | 39 | 220 | 44 | 167 |
| Geometry Grp | 2 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 2 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.42 | 0.398 | 0.059 | 0.384 | 0.067 | 0.268 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 5.69 | 6.256 | 5.479 | 6.271 | 5.486 | 5.797 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 629 | 573 | 650 | 571 | 649 | 615 |
| Service Time | 3.753 | 4.019 | 3.241 | 4.034 | 3.249 | 3.871 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.423 | 0.4 | 0.06 | 0.385 | 0.068 | 0.272 |
| HCM Control Delay | 12.9 | 13.1 | 8.6 | 12.9 | 8.6 | 11 |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | B | A | B | A | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 2.1 | 1.9 | 0.2 | 1.8 | 0.2 | 1.1 |



Notes
Unsignalized Delay for [EBR, WBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.



|  | $\rangle$ |  |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | 4 | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | ${ }^{7}$ | ${ }^{4}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }_{7}$ | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 81 | 5 | 20 | 14 | 4 | 107 | 21 | 300 | 23 | 104 | 314 | 58 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 81 | 5 | 20 | 14 | 4 | 107 | 21 | 300 | 23 | 104 | 314 | 58 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 0.86 | 1.00 |  | 0.87 | 1.00 |  | 0.89 | 1.00 |  | 0.91 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 98 | 6 | 24 | 17 | 5 | 129 | 25 | 361 | 28 | 125 | 378 | 70 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.83 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 218 | 13 | 53 | 259 | 76 | 256 | 52 | 467 | 36 | 162 | 506 | 94 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.03 | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.09 | 0.34 | 0.34 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1292 | 79 | 316 | 1392 | 409 | 1380 | 1795 | 1710 | 133 | 1781 | 1508 | 279 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 128 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 129 | 25 | 0 | 389 | 125 | 0 | 448 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/n | 1687 | 0 | 0 | 1801 | 0 | 1380 | 1795 | 0 | 1842 | 1781 | 0 | 1788 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 10.4 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 11.9 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 10.4 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 11.9 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.77 |  | 0.19 | 0.77 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.07 | 1.00 |  | 0.16 |
| Lane Grp Cap (c), veh/h | 284 | 0 | 0 | 335 | 0 | 256 | 52 | 0 | 503 | 162 | 0 | 599 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.45 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.00 | 0.50 | 0.48 | 0.00 | 0.77 | 0.77 | 0.00 | 0.75 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 1155 | 0 | 0 | 1553 | 0 | 1191 | 556 | 0 | 1244 | 551 | 0 | 1207 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 19.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 17.9 | 0.0 | 19.5 | 25.5 | 0.0 | 17.9 | 23.7 | 0.0 | 15.7 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 0.7 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 4.3 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh     |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay (d),s/veh | 20.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 18.0 | 0.0 | 21.0 | 28.0 | 0.0 | 18.8 | 26.6 | 0.0 | 16.4 |
| LnGrp LOS | C | A | A | B | A | C | C | A | B | C | A | B |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 128 |  |  | 151 |  |  | 414 |  |  | 573 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 20.4 |  |  | 20.6 |  |  | 19.4 |  |  | 18.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $G+Y+R \mathrm{c}$ ), $s$ | 8.4 | 18.6 |  | 12.5 | 5.0 | 21.9 |  | 13.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $Y+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s | 3.5 | 4.0 |  | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 16.5 | 36.0 |  | 36.5 | 16.5 | 36.0 |  | 46.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c +11 ), s | 5.7 | 12.4 |  | 5.6 | 2.7 | 13.9 |  | 6.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.1 | 0.8 |  | 0.3 | 0.0 | 1.0 |  | 0.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl DelayHCM 6th LOS |  |  | 19.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | * |  |  | \& |  |  | \& |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 1 | 131 | 0 | 0 | 123 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 1 | 131 | 0 | 0 | 123 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 | 83 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 1 | 158 | 0 | 0 | 148 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |




|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{1}$ | 44 | 「 | ${ }^{1}$ | 㻢 |  | ${ }^{7}$ | ＊ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 12 | 1108 | 1224 | 132 | 591 | 39 | 613 | 19 | 50 | 56 | 32 | 25 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 12 | 1108 | 1224 | 132 | 591 | 39 | 613 | 19 | 50 | 56 | 32 | 25 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 12 | 1142 | 0 | 136 | 609 | 40 | 646 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 33 | 26 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap，veh／h | 24 | 2000 |  | 136 | 2114 | 139 | 669 | 0 |  | 81 | 46 | 108 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.01 | 0.56 | 0.00 | 0.08 | 0.62 | 0.62 | 0.19 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1795 | 3582 | 1598 | 1795 | 3404 | 223 | 3591 | 0 | 1598 | 1174 | 668 | 1560 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 12 | 1142 | 0 | 136 | 320 | 329 | 646 | 0 | 0 | 91 | 0 | 26 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1795 | 1791 | 1598 | 1795 | 1791 | 1836 | 1795 | 0 | 1598 | 1841 | 0 | 1560 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 1.0 | 30.0 | 0.0 | 11.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 25.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.0 | 0.0 | 2.3 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 1.0 | 30.0 | 0.0 | 11.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 25.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.0 | 0.0 | 2.3 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.12 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.64 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 24 | 2000 |  | 136 | 1112 | 1140 | 669 | 0 |  | 128 | 0 | 108 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.51 | 0.57 |  | 1.00 | 0.29 | 0.29 | 0.97 | 0.00 |  | 0.71 | 0.00 | 0.24 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 68 | 2000 |  | 136 | 1112 | 1140 | 669 | 0 |  | 292 | 0 | 247 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.86 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 71.1 | 20.8 | 0.0 | 67.0 | 12.7 | 12.7 | 58.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 66.1 | 0.0 | 63.9 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 6.0 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 75.1 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 24.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 0.4 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 0.5 | 13.0 | 0.0 | 7.9 | 5.1 | 5.2 | 13.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 0.9 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 77.1 | 22.0 | 0.0 | 142.1 | 13.3 | 13.3 | 82.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 68.8 | 0.0 | 64.3 |
| LnGrp LOS | E | C |  | F | B | B | F | A |  | E | A | E |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 1154 | A |  | 785 |  |  | 646 | A |  | 117 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 22.5 |  |  | 35.6 |  |  | 82.6 |  |  | 67.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | D |  |  | F |  |  | E |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 15.0 | 85.0 | 14.0 | 5.9 | 94.0 | 31.0 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 11.0 | 68.0 | 23.0 | 5.5 | 73.5 | 27.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 13.0 | 32.0 | 9.0 | 3.0 | 14.0 | 27.9 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.0 | 11.3 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 4.9 | 0.0 |

Intersection Summary
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay 42.6
HCM 6th LOS D

## Notes

User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement．
Unsignalized Delay for［NBR，EBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．



Unsignalized Delay for [NBR, EBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.

| Movement EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | 44 | 「 | ${ }^{*}$ | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ | 7 | * | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) 63 | 1215 | 437 | 3 | 1253 | 13 | 502 | 14 | 48 | 114 | 145 | 119 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) 63 | 1215 | 437 | 3 | 1253 | 13 | 502 | 14 | 48 | 114 | 145 | 119 |
| Initial Q $(\mathrm{Qb})$, veh 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 |
| Parking Bus, Adj 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln 1870 | 1856 | 1841 | 1900 | 1841 | 1841 | 1811 | 1870 | 1856 | 1870 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h 66 | 1266 | 0 | 3 | 1305 | 14 | 534 | 0 | 0 | 119 | 151 | 124 |
| Peak Hour Factor 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap, veh/h 83 | 1867 |  | 7 | 1724 | 18 | 603 | 0 |  | 306 | 165 | 136 |
| Arrive On Green 0.06 | 0.70 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.17 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h 1781 | 3526 | 1560 | 1810 | 3543 | 38 | 3450 | 0 | 1572 | 1781 | 962 | 790 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h 66 | 1266 | 0 | 3 | 644 | 675 | 534 | 0 | 0 | 119 | 0 | 275 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln1781 | 1763 | 1560 | 1810 | 1749 | 1832 | 1725 | 0 | 1572 | 1781 | 0 | 1753 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s 5.5 | 30.5 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 44.9 | 44.9 | 22.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.9 | 0.0 | 23.1 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s 5.5 | 30.5 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 44.9 | 44.9 | 22.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.9 | 0.0 | 23.1 |
| Prop In Lane 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.02 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.45 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h 83 | 1867 |  | 7 | 851 | 892 | 603 | 0 |  | 306 | 0 | 301 |
| V/C Ratio(X) 0.79 | 0.68 |  | 0.42 | 0.76 | 0.76 | 0.89 | 0.00 |  | 0.39 | 0.00 | 0.91 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h 101 | 1867 |  | 62 | 851 | 892 | 793 | 0 |  | 338 | 0 | 333 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio 1.33 | 1.33 | 1.33 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(I) 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh 69.6 | 14.9 | 0.0 | 74.5 | 31.3 | 31.3 | 60.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 55.1 | 0.0 | 61.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh 28.8 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 35.4 | 6.2 | 6.0 | 9.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 27.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/IR. 1 | 10.8 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 20.1 | 21.0 | 10.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 12.6 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh 98.5 | 16.9 | 0.0 | 110.0 | 37.5 | 37.3 | 70.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 55.9 | 0.0 | 88.0 |
| LnGrp LOS F | B |  | F | D | D | E | A |  | E | A | F |
| Approach Vol, veh/h | 1332 | A |  | 1322 |  |  | 534 | A |  | 394 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 21.0 |  |  | 37.5 |  |  | 70.0 |  |  | 78.3 |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  | D |  |  | E |  |  | E |  |


| Timer - Assigned Phs 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phs Duration ( $G+Y+R c$ ), s5.1 | 83.9 | 30.7 | 11.5 | 77.5 | 30.3 |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax5, \$ | 63.9 | 34.5 | 8.5 | 60.5 | 28.5 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+l12,2s | 32.5 | 24.7 | 7.5 | 46.9 | 25.1 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s 0.0 | 11.9 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 7.2 | 0.7 |

Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 40.7 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | D |

## Notes

User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.
Unsignalized Delay for [NBR, EBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.


Notes

* HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier.

Unsignalized Delay for [SBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.


Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | 个 | $\mathbf{7}$ |  | 4 | 1 | $\mathbf{T}$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 532 | 204 | 99 | 313 | 72 | 52 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 532 | 204 | 99 | 313 | 72 | 52 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | 25 | 170 | - | 145 | 0 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 554 | 213 | 103 | 326 | 75 | 54 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |


| Major/Minor | Major1 | Major2 |  | Minor1 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | 0 | 0 | 740 | 0 | 1170 | 737 |
| Stage 1 | - | - |  |  | 737 |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - |  |  | 433 |  |
| Critical Hdwy | - | - | 4.12 | - | 6.51 | 6.31 |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 1 | - | - |  | - | 5.51 |  |
| Critical Hdwy Stg 2 | - | - |  |  | 5.51 |  |
| Follow-up Hdwy | - |  | 2.218 |  | 3.599 | 3.399 |
| Pot Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - | 867 | - | 205 | 404 |
| Stage 1 | - | - |  | - | 458 |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - |  | - | 635 |  |
| Platoon blocked, \% | - | - |  |  |  |  |
| Mov Cap-1 Maneuver | - | - | 866 |  | 204 | 404 |
| Mov Cap-2 Maneuver | - | - |  |  | 332 |  |
| Stage 1 | - | - |  |  |  |  |
| Stage 2 | - | - | - | - | 633 |  |


| Approach | EB | WB | NB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 0 | 0 | 15.7 |
| HCM LOS |  |  | C |



| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 54.8 |
| Intersection LOS | F |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | \$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | * |  |  | * |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 8 | 341 | 8 | 3 | 37 | 293 | 8 | 7 | 10 | 522 | 10 | 4 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 8 | 341 | 8 | 3 | 37 | 293 | 8 | 7 | 10 | 522 | 10 | 4 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.58 | 0.58 | 0.58 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Mvmt Flow | 9 | 383 | 9 | 3 | 40 | 318 | 14 | 12 | 17 | 580 | 11 | 4 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 29.8 |  |  | 19.2 |  |  | 12.4 |  |  | 96.3 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | D |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | F |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $32 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $97 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $28 \%$ | $96 \%$ | $93 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $40 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 25 | 357 | 40 | 293 | 536 |
| LT Vol | 8 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 522 |
| Through Vol | 7 | 341 | 37 | 0 | 10 |
| RT Vol | 10 | 8 | 0 | 293 | 4 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 43 | 401 | 43 | 318 | 596 |
| Geometry Grp | 2 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 2 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.097 | 0.761 | 0.091 | 0.6 | 1.107 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 8.486 | 7.264 | 7.99 | 7.228 | 6.689 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 425 | 501 | 451 | 503 | 548 |
| Service Time | 6.486 | 5.264 | 5.69 | 4.928 | 4.691 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.101 | 0.8 | 0.095 | 0.632 | 1.088 |
| HCM Control Delay | 12.4 | 29.8 | 11.5 | 20.2 | 96.3 |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | D | B | C | F |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0.3 | 6.6 | 0.3 | 3.9 | 19 |



User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Notes

User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.
Unsignalized Delay for [NBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.


## Notes

User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.


## Notes

User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.



* HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier.


User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.


User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.


User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.



| Movement E | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 75 | 424 | 86 | 50 | 263 | 51 | 33 | 94 | 37 | 39 | 123 | 65 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 75 | 424 | 86 | 50 | 263 | 51 | 33 | 94 | 37 | 39 | 123 | 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor 0. | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 81 | 456 | 92 | 54 | 283 | 55 | 35 | 101 | 40 | 42 | 132 | 70 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | hNB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay 69 | 69.3 |  |  | 22.5 |  |  | 15.4 |  |  | 17.5 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | F |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 EBLn1 EBLn2WBLn1WBLn2 SBLn1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $20 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $17 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $57 \%$ | $85 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $84 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $54 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $23 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $00 \%$ | $29 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 164 | 499 | 86 | 313 | 51 | 227 |
| LT Vol | 33 | 75 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 39 |
| Through Vol | 94 | 424 | 0 | 263 | 0 | 123 |
| RT Vol | 37 | 0 | 86 | 0 | 51 | 65 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 176 | 537 | 92 | 337 | 55 | 244 |
| Geometry Grp | 2 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 2 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.373 | 1.049 | 0.16 | 0.676 | 0.1 | 0.49 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 7.839 | 7.037 | 6.241 | 7.504 | 6.7 | 7.523 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 462 | 520 | 577 | 485 | 538 | 483 |
| Service Time | 5.839 | 4.749 | 3.954 | 5.204 | 4.4 | 5.523 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.381 | 1.033 | 0.159 | 0.695 | 0.102 | 0.505 |
| HCM Control Delay | 15.4 | 79.5 | 10.1 | 24.5 | 10.1 | 17.5 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | F | B | C | B | C |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 1.7 | 15.8 | 0.6 | 5 | 0.3 | 2.7 |



Unsignalized Delay for [EBR, WBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

## Kimley»)Horn

## APPENDIX G. CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT CONDITIONS SYNCHRO OUTPUT SHEETS

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 个4 | 「 | \％ | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 28 | 607 | 374 | 80 | 530 | 66 | 639 | 28 | 133 | 28 | 23 | 12 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 28 | 607 | 374 | 80 | 530 | 66 | 639 | 28 | 133 | 28 | 23 | 12 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 29 | 626 | 0 | 82 | 546 | 68 | 680 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 24 | 12 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap，veh／h | 52 | 1701 |  | 105 | 1610 | 200 | 763 | 0 |  | 67 | 55 | 103 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.03 | 0.47 | 0.00 | 0.06 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.21 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1795 | 3582 | 1598 | 1795 | 3192 | 396 | 3591 | 0 | 1598 | 1012 | 837 | 1559 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 29 | 626 | 0 | 82 | 305 | 309 | 680 | 0 | 0 | 53 | 0 | 12 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1795 | 1791 | 1598 | 1795 | 1791 | 1797 | 1795 | 0 | 1598 | 1849 | 0 | 1559 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 1.4 | 9.5 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 15.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 1.4 | 9.5 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 15.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.22 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.55 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 52 | 1701 |  | 105 | 903 | 906 | 763 | 0 |  | 122 | 0 | 103 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.55 | 0.37 |  | 0.78 | 0.34 | 0.34 | 0.89 | 0.00 |  | 0.43 | 0.00 | 0.12 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 118 | 1701 |  | 137 | 903 | 906 | 824 | 0 |  | 490 | 0 | 413 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.63 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 40.7 | 14.2 | 0.0 | 39.5 | 12.6 | 12.6 | 32.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 38.2 | 0.0 | 37.4 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 3.4 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 13.1 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 7.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／In | 0.6 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 7.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 44.1 | 14.8 | 0.0 | 52.6 | 13.6 | 13.6 | 39.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 39.1 | 0.0 | 37.6 |
| LnGrp LOS | D | B |  | D | B | B | D | A |  | D | A | D |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 655 | A |  | 696 |  |  | 680 | A |  | 65 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 16.1 |  |  | 18.2 |  |  | 39.8 |  |  | 38.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 9.0 | 44.4 | 9.6 | 6.5 | 46.9 | 22.1 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 6.5 | 20.5 | 22.5 | 5.6 | 21.4 | 19.5 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 5.8 | 11.5 | 4.3 | 3.4 | 10.7 | 17.6 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.0 | 2.9 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 0.4 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 25.2 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | C |

## Notes

User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement．
Unsignalized Delay for［NBR，EBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．



Unsignalized Delay for [NBR, EBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.


| Movement EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations \％ | 个4 | 「 | \％ | 个 ${ }_{\text {P }}$ |  | \％ | $\uparrow$ | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{\dagger}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） 155 | 910 | 615 | 7 | 1079 | 39 | 419 | 133 | 80 | 80 | 91 | 51 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） 155 | 910 | 615 | 7 | 1079 | 39 | 419 | 133 | 80 | 80 | 91 | 51 |
| Initial Q（Qb），veh 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 |
| Parking Bus，Adj 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln 1870 | 1856 | 1841 | 1900 | 1841 | 1841 | 1811 | 1870 | 1856 | 1870 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h 161 | 948 | 0 | 7 | 1124 | 41 | 288 | 347 | 0 | 83 | 95 | 53 |
| Peak Hour Factor 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 |  | 4 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap，veh／h 101 | 1996 |  | 15 | 1779 | 65 | 353 | 383 |  | 179 | 115 | 64 |
| Arrive On Green 0.08 | 0.75 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h 1781 | 3526 | 1560 | 1810 | 3436 | 125 | 1725 | 1870 | 1572 | 1781 | 1142 | 637 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h 161 | 948 | 0 | 7 | 572 | 593 | 288 | 347 | 0 | 83 | 0 | 148 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln1781 | 1763 | 1560 | 1810 | 1749 | 1812 | 1725 | 1870 | 1572 | 1781 | 0 | 1779 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s 8.5 | 15.5 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 35.1 | 35.2 | 23.9 | 27.2 | 0.0 | 6.6 | 0.0 | 12.2 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s 8.5 | 15.5 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 35.1 | 35.2 | 23.9 | 27.2 | 0.0 | 6.6 | 0.0 | 12.2 |
| Prop In Lane 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.07 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.36 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h 101 | 1996 |  | 15 | 906 | 939 | 353 | 383 |  | 179 | 0 | 179 |
| V／C Ratio（X） 1.60 | 0.47 |  | 0.46 | 0.63 | 0.63 | 0.82 | 0.91 |  | 0.46 | 0.00 | 0.83 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h 101 | 1996 |  | 62 | 906 | 939 | 397 | 430 |  | 338 | 0 | 338 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio 1.33 | 1.33 | 1.33 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（I） 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh 69.3 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 74.0 | 25.9 | 25.9 | 56.9 | 58.2 | 0.0 | 63.6 | 0.0 | 66.2 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh 309.2 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 3.3 | 3.2 | 11.3 | 21.1 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 9.2 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／lit2． 5 | 5.1 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 15.3 | 15.8 | 11.6 | 15.2 | 0.0 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 6.0 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh 378.5 | 10.8 | 0.0 | 94.0 | 29.2 | 29.1 | 68.3 | 79.3 | 0.0 | 65.5 | 0.0 | 75.4 |
| LnGrp LOS F | B |  | F | C | C | E | E |  | E | A | E |
| Approach Vol，veh／h | 1109 | A |  | 1172 |  |  | 635 | A |  | 231 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh | 64.2 |  |  | 29.6 |  |  | 74.3 |  |  | 71.8 |  |
| Approach LOS | E |  |  | C |  |  | E |  |  | E |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s5．8 | 89.4 | 35.2 | 13.0 | 82.2 | 19.6 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s 4．5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax5），\＄ | 63.9 | 34.5 | 8.5 | 60.5 | 28.5 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋｜12，6 | 17.5 | 29.2 | 10.5 | 37.2 | 14.2 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s 0.0 | 8.6 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 8.3 | 0.9 |

Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 53.9 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | D |

## Notes

User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement．
Unsignalized Delay for［NBR，EBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．


## Notes

* HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier.

Unsignalized Delay for [SBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.

|  | $\rightarrow$ | 7 |  | 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement EB | EBT EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | 4 ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 | ** |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) 38 | 386264 | 67 | 347 | 412 | 113 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) 38 | 386264 | 67 | 347 | 412 | 113 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus, Adj 1.00 | 1.001 .00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach N | No |  | No | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln 188 | 18851885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h 41 | 411281 | 71 | 369 | 279 | 290 |
| Peak Hour Factor 0.9 | 0.940 .94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Cap, veh/h 667 | 667549 | 90 | 963 | 490 | 440 |
| Arrive On Green 0.3 | 0.350 .35 | 0.05 | 0.51 | 0.27 | 0.27 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h 188 | 18851550 | 1810 | 1900 | 1795 | 1610 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h 411 | 411281 | 71 | 369 | 279 | 290 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s), veh/h/ln188 | 18851550 | 1810 | 1900 | 1795 | 1610 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s 6 | 6.14 .9 | 1.3 | 4.0 | 4.6 | 5.4 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s 6 | 6.14 .9 | 1.3 | 4.0 | 4.6 | 5.4 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h 667 | 667549 | 90 | 963 | 490 | 440 |
| V/C Ratio(X) 0.62 | 0.620 .51 | 0.79 | 0.38 | 0.57 | 0.66 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h 166 | 16611366 | 1595 | 1674 | 1582 | 1419 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio 1.00 | 1.001 .00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(I) 1.00 | 1.001 .00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh 9 | 9.18 .7 | 16.0 | 5.1 | 10.7 | 11.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh 0 | 0.950 .7 | 13.8 | 0.3 | 1.0 | 1.7 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh 0.0 | 0.00 .0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ır2. | //12.0 1.3 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 1.5 | 1.6 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/v | , s/veh |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh 10. | $10.0 \quad 9.4$ | 29.8 | 5.4 | 11.7 | 12.7 |
| LnGrp LOS | B A | C | A | B | B |
| Approach Vol, veh/h 692 | 692 |  | 440 | 569 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh 9. | 9.8 |  | 9.3 | 12.2 |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  | A | B |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs | 12 |  | 4 |  | 6 |
| Phs Duration ( $G+Y+R \mathrm{c}$ ), s5 | , s5.2 16.0 |  | 12.8 |  | 21.2 |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s 3 | s 3.54 .0 |  | 3.5 |  | 4.0 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), | axQ).8 30.0 |  | 30.0 |  | 30.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+113) | +1何,38 8.1 |  | 7.4 |  | 6.0 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s 0 | 0.23 .8 |  | 1.9 |  | 2.2 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl DelayHCM 6th LOS |  | 10.5 |  |  |  |
|  |  | B |  |  |  |

Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 7.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement E | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | 4 | 「 | ${ }^{1}$ | 4 | ${ }^{7}$ | 「 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 433 | 97 | 99 | 267 | 162 | 181 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 433 | 97 | 99 | 267 | 162 | 181 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control F | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | 25 | 170 | - | 145 | 0 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 451 | 101 | 103 | 278 | 169 | 189 |





| Movement EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | \& |  |  | \$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h 17 | 92 | 0 | 6 | 26 | 528 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 305 | 0 | 6 |
| Future Vol, veh/h 17 | 92 | 0 | 6 | 26 | 528 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 305 | 0 | 6 |
| Peak Hour Factor 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Mvmt Flow 18 | 96 | 0 | 6 | 27 | 550 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 318 | 0 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach EB |  |  | WB |  |  |  | NB |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach WB |  |  | EB |  |  |  | SB |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left SB |  |  | NB |  |  |  | EB |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach RighNB |  |  | SB |  |  |  | WB |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay 10.4 |  |  | 22.1 |  |  |  | 9.3 |  | 15.4 |  |  |
| HCM LOS B |  |  | C |  |  |  | A |  | C |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 EBLn1WBLn1WBLn2 SBLn1 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $0 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $98 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $18 \%$ | $84 \%$ | $81 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $82 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 11 | 109 | 32 | 528 | 311 |
| LT Vol | 0 | 17 | 6 | 0 | 305 |
| Through Vol | 2 | 92 | 26 | 0 | 0 |
| RT Vol | 9 | 0 | 0 | 528 | 6 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 11 | 114 | 33 | 550 | 324 |
| Geometry Grp | 2 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 2 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.019 | 0.187 | 0.054 | 0.773 | 0.529 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 6.112 | 5.938 | 5.862 | 5.059 | 5.881 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 583 | 603 | 611 | 715 | 612 |
| Service Time | 4.177 | 3.989 | 3.596 | 2.793 | 3.918 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.019 | 0.189 | 0.054 | 0.769 | 0.529 |
| HCM Control Delay | 9.3 | 10.4 | 8.9 | 22.9 | 15.4 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | B | A | C | C |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 7.4 | 3.1 |



User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.



| Timer - Assigned Phs | 2 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration $(G+Y+R c)$, s | 33.3 | 33.3 | 21.7 |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s | 5.3 | 5.3 | 4.2 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 28.0 | 28.0 | 17.5 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s | 8.6 | 11.7 | 18.4 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 5.3 | 6.9 | 0.0 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 18.2 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | B |

## Notes

User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.
Unsignalized Delay for [NBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.


## Notes

User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.


Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.



* HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier.


User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.


## Notes

User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.


Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.


## Intersection

Intersection Delay, s/veh12.3
Intersection LOS

| Movement EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | $\uparrow$ | F |  | $\uparrow$ | F |  | \$ |  |  | \$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h 27 | 186 | 36 | 29 | 176 | 41 | 50 | 163 | 38 | 31 | 77 | 48 |
| Future Vol, veh/h 27 | 186 | 36 | 29 | 176 | 41 | 50 | 163 | 38 | 31 | 77 | 48 |
| Peak Hour Factor 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow 29 | 200 | 39 | 31 | 189 | 44 | 54 | 175 | 41 | 33 | 83 | 52 |
| Number of Lanes 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach RighNB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay 12.5 |  |  | 12.3 |  |  | 13 |  |  | 11.1 |  |  |
| HCMLOS B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 EBLn1 EBLn2WBLn1WBLn2 SBLn1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $20 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $20 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $65 \%$ | $87 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $86 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $49 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $15 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $31 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 251 | 213 | 36 | 205 | 41 | 156 |
| LT Vol | 50 | 27 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 31 |
| Through Vol | 163 | 186 | 0 | 176 | 0 | 77 |
| RT Vol | 38 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 41 | 48 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 270 | 229 | 39 | 220 | 44 | 168 |
| Geometry Grp | 2 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 2 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.427 | 0.399 | 0.059 | 0.385 | 0.067 | 0.271 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 5.697 | 6.276 | 5.499 | 6.291 | 5.506 | 5.812 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 629 | 570 | 648 | 569 | 647 | 614 |
| Service Time | 3.761 | 4.041 | 3.263 | 4.056 | 3.27 | 3.885 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.429 | 0.402 | 0.06 | 0.387 | 0.068 | 0.274 |
| HCM Control Delay | 13 | 13.2 | 8.6 | 13 | 8.7 | 11.1 |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | B | A | B | A | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 2.1 | 1.9 | 0.2 | 1.8 | 0.2 | 1.1 |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | $\uparrow$ | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ | 「 | ${ }_{1}$ | F |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\hat{\dagger}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 84 | 175 | 109 | 25 | 346 | 109 | 110 | 57 | 12 | 114 | 66 | 96 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 84 | 175 | 109 | 25 | 346 | 109 | 110 | 57 | 12 | 114 | 66 | 96 |
| Initial Q（Qb），veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.91 | 1.00 |  | 0.91 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln 1 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 93 | 194 | 0 | 28 | 384 | 0 | 122 | 63 | 13 | 127 | 73 | 107 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.90 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Cap，veh／h | 129 | 613 |  | 58 | 538 |  | 160 | 337 | 70 | 166 | 149 | 218 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.07 | 0.33 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 0.29 | 0.00 | 0.09 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.09 | 0.23 | 0.23 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h 1 | 1795 | 1885 | 1598 | 1795 | 1885 | 1598 | 1810 | 1498 | 309 | 1795 | 650 | 953 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 93 | 194 | 0 | 28 | 384 | 0 | 122 | 0 | 76 | 127 | 0 | 180 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／nn | 1795 | 1885 | 1598 | 1795 | 1885 | 1598 | 1810 | 0 | 1808 | 1795 | 0 | 1604 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 2.6 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 9.3 | 0.0 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 4.9 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 2.6 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 9.3 | 0.0 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 4.9 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.17 | 1.00 |  | 0.59 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 129 | 613 |  | 58 | 538 |  | 160 | 0 | 407 | 166 | 0 | 367 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.72 | 0.32 |  | 0.49 | 0.71 |  | 0.76 | 0.00 | 0.19 | 0.77 | 0.00 | 0.49 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 567 | 1321 |  | 567 | 1321 |  | 571 | 0 | 749 | 567 | 0 | 665 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 23.0 | 12.9 | 0.0 | 24.1 | 16.3 | 0.0 | 22.6 | 0.0 | 15.9 | 22.5 | 0.0 | 17.0 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 5.5 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 4.6 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 0.8 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／II | ／In 12 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 1.7 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay， | ，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 28.5 | 13.2 | 0.0 | 28.7 | 18.0 | 0.0 | 25.4 | 0.0 | 16.1 | 25.3 | 0.0 | 17.7 |
| LnGrp LOS | C | B |  | C | B |  | C | A | B | C | A | B |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 287 | A |  | 412 | A |  | 198 |  |  | 307 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 18.1 |  |  | 18.8 |  |  | 21.8 |  |  | 20.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |
| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration（ $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ）， | ， 5.6 | 21.0 | 8.5 | 15.6 | 7.6 | 19.0 | 8.7 | 15.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period（ $Y+R \mathrm{R}$ ），s | s 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting（Gma | 146， 8 | 35.5 | 16.0 | 21.0 | 16.0 | 35.5 | 16.0 | 21.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋1 | 1隹， | 5.9 | 5.3 | 6.9 | 4.6 | 11.3 | 5.5 | 3.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 2.4 | 0.1 | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl DelayHCM 6th LOS |  |  | 19.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes

Unsignalized Delay for［EBR，WBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．


|  | 4 |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | 4 | 4 |  |  | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | $\uparrow$ | \＃ |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 性涫 |  | ${ }_{1}$ | 㔼 |  |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 296 | 16 | 101 | 14 | 7 | 27 | 154 | 1318 | 23 | 91 | 1140 | 382 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 296 | 16 | 101 | 14 | 7 | 27 | 154 | 1318 | 23 | 91 | 1140 | 382 |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time（s） | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 |  | 4.2 | 4.2 | 3.7 | 4.9 |  | 4.6 | 4.9 |  |
| Lane Util．Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.91 |  | 1.00 | 0.91 |  |
| Frpb，ped／bikes | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.97 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.98 |  |
| Flpb，ped／bikes | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Frt | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 |  | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.96 |  |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 1625 | 1645 | 1509 |  | 1792 | 1561 | 1745 | 4943 |  | 1745 | 4666 |  |
| Flt Permitted | 0.95 | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 1625 | 1645 | 1509 |  | 1792 | 1561 | 1745 | 4943 |  | 1745 | 4666 |  |
| Peak－hour factor，PHF | 0.86 | 0.61 | 0.80 | 0.85 | 0.44 | 0.79 | 0.66 | 0.86 | 0.61 | 0.67 | 0.94 | 0.85 |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 344 | 26 | 126 | 16 | 16 | 34 | 233 | 1533 | 38 | 136 | 1213 | 449 |
| RTOR Reduction（vph） | 0 | 0 | 94 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 56 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 186 | 184 | 32 | 0 | 32 | 5 | 233 | 1569 | 0 | 136 | 1606 | 0 |
| Confl．Peds．（\＃／hr） |  |  | 18 | 18 |  |  | 12 |  | 8 | 8 |  | 12 |
| Confl．Bikes（\＃／hr） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |
| Heavy Vehicles（\％） | 2\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ | 1\％ | 0\％ | 0\％ | 1\％ | 1\％ |
| Turn Type | Split | NA | Perm | Split | NA | Perm | Prot | NA |  | Prot | NA |  |
| Protected Phases | 4 | 4 |  | 3 | 3 |  | 5 | 1 |  | 2 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  | 4 |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Green，G（s） | 30.0 | 30.0 | 30.0 |  | 16.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 40.0 |  | 16.0 | 40.9 |  |
| Effective Green， $\mathrm{g}(\mathrm{s})$ | 30.0 | 30.0 | 30.0 |  | 16.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 40.0 |  | 16.0 | 40.9 |  |
| Actuated g／C Ratio | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 |  | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.33 |  | 0.13 | 0.34 |  |
| Clearance Time（s） | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 |  | 4.2 | 4.2 | 3.7 | 4.9 |  | 4.6 | 4.9 |  |
| Vehicle Extension（s） | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.2 |  |
| Lane Grp Cap（vph） | 406 | 411 | 377 |  | 239 | 208 | 232 | 1649 |  | 232 | 1591 |  |
| v／s Ratio Prot | c0．11 | 0.11 |  |  | c0．02 |  | c0．13 | 0.32 |  | 0.08 | c0．34 |  |
| v／s Ratio Perm |  |  | 0.02 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| V／c Ratio | 0.46 | 0.45 | 0.08 |  | 0.13 | 0.02 | 1.00 | 0.95 |  | 0.59 | 1.01 |  |
| Uniform Delay，d1 | 38.1 | 38.0 | 34.4 |  | 45.8 | 45.1 | 52.0 | 39.0 |  | 48.8 | 39.5 |  |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.08 | 0.87 |  |
| Incremental Delay，d2 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.1 |  | 0.3 | 0.0 | 60.2 | 13.3 |  | 2.9 | 22.1 |  |
| Delay（s） | 38.9 | 38.7 | 34.5 |  | 46.1 | 45.2 | 112.1 | 52.3 |  | 55.7 | 56.5 |  |
| Level of Service | D | D | C |  | D | D | F | D |  | E | E |  |
| Approach Delay（s） |  | 37.7 |  |  | 45.6 |  |  | 60.0 |  |  | 56.5 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | D |  |  | E |  |  | E |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2000 Control Delay |  |  | 55.6 |  | HCM 2000 | Level of S | Service |  | E |  |  |  |
| HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.72 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length（s） |  |  | 119.9 |  | Sum of los | time（s） |  |  | 17.9 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 70．0\％ |  | CU Level | f Service |  |  | C |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period（min） |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c Critical Lane Group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{*}$ | 44 | 「 | ${ }^{*}$ | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ | F |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 12 | 1127 | 1243 | 132 | 636 | 39 | 658 | 19 | 50 | 56 | 32 | 25 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 12 | 1127 | 1243 | 132 | 636 | 39 | 658 | 19 | 50 | 56 | 32 | 25 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 12 | 1162 | 0 | 136 | 656 | 40 | 692 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 33 | 26 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap，veh／h | 24 | 2000 |  | 136 | 2125 | 129 | 669 | 0 |  | 81 | 46 | 108 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.01 | 0.56 | 0.00 | 0.08 | 0.62 | 0.62 | 0.19 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1795 | 3582 | 1598 | 1795 | 3422 | 208 | 3591 | 0 | 1598 | 1174 | 668 | 1560 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 12 | 1162 | 0 | 136 | 343 | 353 | 692 | 0 | 0 | 91 | 0 | 26 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1795 | 1791 | 1598 | 1795 | 1791 | 1840 | 1795 | 0 | 1598 | 1841 | 0 | 1560 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 1.0 | 30.8 | 0.0 | 11.0 | 13.0 | 13.1 | 27.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.0 | 0.0 | 2.3 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 1.0 | 30.8 | 0.0 | 11.0 | 13.0 | 13.1 | 27.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.0 | 0.0 | 2.3 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.11 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.64 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 24 | 2000 |  | 136 | 1112 | 1142 | 669 | 0 |  | 128 | 0 | 108 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.51 | 0.58 |  | 1.00 | 0.31 | 0.31 | 1.03 | 0.00 |  | 0.71 | 0.00 | 0.24 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 68 | 2000 |  | 136 | 1112 | 1142 | 669 | 0 |  | 292 | 0 | 247 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（I） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.84 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 71.1 | 20.9 | 0.0 | 67.0 | 12.9 | 12.9 | 59.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 66.1 | 0.0 | 63.9 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 6.0 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 74.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 41.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 0.4 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 0.5 | 13.4 | 0.0 | 7.9 | 5.6 | 5.7 | 16.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 0.9 |

Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh

| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 77.1 | 22.2 | 0.0 | 141.7 | 13.6 | 13.6 | 100.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 68.8 | 0.0 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| LnGrp LOS | E | C |  | F | B | B | F | A | E | A | E |
| Approach Vol，veh／h | 1174 | A |  | 832 |  | 692 | A | 117 |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh | 22.7 |  |  | 34.5 |  | 100.3 |  | 67.8 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  | C |  | F |  | E |  |  |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 15.0 | 85.0 | 14.0 | 5.9 | 94.0 | 31.0 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 11.0 | 68.0 | 23.0 | 5.5 | 73.5 | 27.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 13.0 | 32.8 | 9.0 | 3.0 | 15.1 | 29.0 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.0 | 11.5 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 5.4 | 0.0 |

Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 47.1 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | D |

## Notes

User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement．
Unsignalized Delay for［NBR，EBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．



Notes
Unsignalized Delay for [NBR, EBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | 7 | 4 | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 中 ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |  | \％ | $\uparrow$ | 「 | \％ | F |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 63 | 1219 | 507 | 3 | 1254 | 13 | 502 | 14 | 48 | 114 | 145 | 119 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 63 | 1219 | 507 | 3 | 1254 | 13 | 502 | 14 | 48 | 114 | 145 | 119 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1870 | 1856 | 1841 | 1900 | 1841 | 1841 | 1811 | 1870 | 1856 | 1870 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 66 | 1270 | 0 | 3 | 1306 | 14 | 534 | 0 | 0 | 119 | 151 | 124 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap，veh／h | 83 | 1867 |  | 7 | 1724 | 18 | 603 | 0 |  | 306 | 165 | 136 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.06 | 0.70 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.17 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1781 | 3526 | 1560 | 1810 | 3543 | 38 | 3450 | 0 | 1572 | 1781 | 962 | 790 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 66 | 1270 | 0 | 3 | 644 | 676 | 534 | 0 | 0 | 119 | 0 | 275 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／n | 1781 | 1763 | 1560 | 1810 | 1749 | 1832 | 1725 | 0 | 1572 | 1781 | 0 | 1753 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 5.5 | 30.7 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 44.9 | 45.0 | 22.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.9 | 0.0 | 23.1 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 5.5 | 30.7 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 44.9 | 45.0 | 22.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.9 | 0.0 | 23.1 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.02 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.45 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 83 | 1867 |  | 7 | 851 | 892 | 603 | 0 |  | 306 | 0 | 301 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.79 | 0.68 |  | 0.42 | 0.76 | 0.76 | 0.89 | 0.00 |  | 0.39 | 0.00 | 0.91 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 101 | 1867 |  | 62 | 851 | 892 | 793 | 0 |  | 338 | 0 | 333 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.33 | 1.33 | 1.33 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 69.6 | 15.0 | 0.0 | 74.5 | 31.3 | 31.3 | 60.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 55.1 | 0.0 | 61.0 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 28.8 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 35.4 | 6.2 | 6.0 | 9.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 27.0 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh 0.0\％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／13． 1 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  |  | 10.9 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 20.1 | 21.0 | 10.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 12.6 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh 98LnGrp LOS |  | 17.0 | 0.0 | 110.0 | 37.5 | 37.3 | 70.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 55.9 | 0.0 | 88.0 |
|  |  | B |  | F | D | D | ， | A |  | E | A | F |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 1336 | A |  | 1323 |  |  | 534 | A |  | 394 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 21.0 |  |  | 37.6 |  |  | 70.0 |  |  | 78.3 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | D |  |  | E |  |  | E |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Phs Duration（ $G+Y+R c$ ），s5．1 | 83.9 | 30.7 | 11.5 | 77.5 | 30.3 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax5，\＄ | 63.9 | 34.5 | 8.5 | 60.5 | 28.5 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋l12，2s | 32.7 | 24.7 | 7.5 | 47.0 | 25.1 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s 0.0 | 11.9 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 7.2 | 0.7 |

Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 40.7 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | D |

## Notes

User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement．
Unsignalized Delay for［NBR，EBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．


Notes

* HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier.

Unsignalized Delay for [SBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.


Notes
User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.



Intersection
Intersection Delay, s/veh05.9
Intersection LOS $\quad$ F


| Lane | NBLn1 EBLn1WBLn1WBLn2 SBLn1 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $32 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $97 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $28 \%$ | $95 \%$ | $93 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $40 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 25 | 359 | 40 | 338 | 652 |
| LT Vol | 8 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 634 |
| Through Vol | 7 | 341 | 37 | 0 | 10 |
| RT Vol | 10 | 8 | 0 | 338 | 8 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 43 | 403 | 43 | 367 | 724 |
| Geometry Grp | 2 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 2 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.099 | 0.781 | 0.091 | 0.698 | 1.366 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 9.315 | 7.998 | 8.668 | 7.902 | 6.789 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 387 | 456 | 416 | 463 | 536 |
| Service Time | 7.315 | 5.998 | 6.368 | 5.602 | 4.863 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.111 | 0.884 | 0.103 | 0.793 | 1.351 |
| HCM Control Delay | 13.3 | 34.1 | 12.2 | 26.9 | 197.1 |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | D | B | D | F |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0.3 | 6.9 | 0.3 | 5.3 | 32.3 |



## Notes

User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.


| Movement EBL | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | 4 | 「 |  | 性 |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 887 | 0 | 253 | 0 | 596 | 528 | 0 | 785 | 143 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 887 | 0 | 253 | 0 | 596 | 528 | 0 | 785 | 143 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） |  |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 |
| Parking Bus，Adj |  |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  |  |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln |  |  |  | 1885 | 1900 | 1826 | 0 | 1870 | 1900 | 0 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h |  |  |  | 975 | 0 | 278 | 0 | 655 | 0 | 0 | 863 | 157 |
| Peak Hour Factor |  |  |  | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ |  |  |  | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap，veh／h |  |  |  | 1111 | 0 | 479 | 0 | 1840 |  | 0 | 1546 | 281 |
| Arrive On Green |  |  |  | 0.31 | 0.00 | 0.31 | 0.00 | 0.52 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.52 | 0.52 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h |  |  |  | 3591 | 0 | 1547 | 0 | 3647 | 1610 | 0 | 3079 | 543 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h |  |  |  | 975 | 0 | 278 | 0 | 655 | 0 | 0 | 514 | 506 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln |  |  |  | 1795 | 0 | 1547 | 0 | 1777 | 1610 | 0 | 1777 | 1752 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s |  |  |  | 14.2 | 0.0 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 6.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.8 | 10.8 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s |  |  |  | 14.2 | 0.0 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 6.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.8 | 10.8 |
| Prop In Lane |  |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.00 |  | 0.31 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h |  |  |  | 1111 | 0 | 479 | 0 | 1840 |  | 0 | 920 | 907 |
| V／C Ratio（X） |  |  |  | 0.88 | 0.00 | 0.58 | 0.00 | 0.36 |  | 0.00 | 0.56 | 0.56 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h |  |  |  | 1143 | 0 | 492 | 0 | 1840 |  | 0 | 920 | 907 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio |  |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（I） |  |  |  | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.89 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.62 | 0.62 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh |  |  |  | 18.0 | 0.0 | 16.0 | 0.0 | 7.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh |  |  |  | 8.0 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（ $50 \%$ ），veh／ln |  |  |  | 6.2 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 3.8 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh |  |  |  | 26.0 | 0.0 | 17.8 | 0.0 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.5 | 10.5 |
| LnGrp LOS |  |  |  | C | A | B | A | A |  | A | B | B |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  |  |  |  | 1253 |  |  | 655 | A |  | 1020 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  | 24.2 |  |  | 8.3 |  |  | 10.5 |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  | C |  |  | A |  |  | B |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 2 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 33.8 | 33.8 | 21.2 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s | 5.3 | 5.3 | 4.2 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 28.0 | 28.0 | 17.5 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 8.0 | 12.8 | 16.2 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 5.0 | 7.3 | 0.9 |

## Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 15.9 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | B |

## Notes

User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement．
Unsignalized Delay for［NBR］is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay．


| Movement EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | $\uparrow$ |  |  | ${ }_{*}^{*}$ | 「 | ${ }^{1}$ | 种 |  | ${ }^{1 /}$ | 坐束 | 「 |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） 475 | 159 | 34 | 30 | 88 | 116 | 46 | 870 | 67 | 152 | 819 | 341 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） 475 | 159 | 34 | 30 | 88 | 116 | 46 | 870 | 67 | 152 | 819 | 341 |
| Initial Q（Qb），veh 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） 1.00 |  | 0.94 | 1.00 |  | 0.91 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 |
| Parking Bus，Adj 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h 500 | 167 | 36 | 32 | 93 | 122 | 48 | 916 | 71 | 160 | 862 | 359 |
| Peak Hour Factor 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Cap，veh／h 723 | 308 | 66 | 56 | 161 | 169 | 62 | 1847 | 143 | 203 | 2361 | 717 |
| Arrive On Green 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.03 | 0.38 | 0.38 | 0.11 | 0.46 | 0.46 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h 3483 | 1485 | 320 | 480 | 1396 | 1464 | 1795 | 4855 | 375 | 1795 | 5147 | 1563 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h 500 | 0 | 203 | 125 | 0 | 122 | 48 | 646 | 341 | 160 | 862 | 359 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln1742 | 0 | 1805 | 1876 | 0 | 1464 | 1795 | 1716 | 1799 | 1795 | 1716 | 1563 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s 12.0 | 0.0 | 9.1 | 5.7 | 0.0 | 7.3 | 2.4 | 13.0 | 13.1 | 7.9 | 9.9 | 14.6 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s 12.0 | 0.0 | 9.1 | 5.7 | 0.0 | 7.3 | 2.4 | 13.0 | 13.1 | 7.9 | 9.9 | 14.6 |
| Prop In Lane 1.00 |  | 0.18 | 0.26 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.21 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h 723 | 0 | 375 | 217 | 0 | 169 | 62 | 1305 | 684 | 203 | 2361 | 717 |
| V／C Ratio（X） 0.69 | 0.00 | 0.54 | 0.58 | 0.00 | 0.72 | 0.77 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.79 | 0.37 | 0.50 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h 807 | 0 | 418 | 435 | 0 | 339 | 317 | 1719 | 901 | 515 | 2578 | 783 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（I） 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh 33.2 | 0.0 | 32.1 | 38.0 | 0.0 | 38.7 | 43.4 | 21.4 | 21.5 | 39.1 | 15.9 | 17.2 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh 4.5 | 0.0 | 4.4 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 7.9 | 24.1 | 1.3 | 2.6 | 9.2 | 0.4 | 2.5 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／lı5． 5 | 0.0 | 4.4 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 1.5 | 5.2 | 5.7 | 3.9 | 3.7 | 5.4 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh 37.7 | 0.0 | 36.4 | 41.4 | 0.0 | 46.6 | 67.5 | 22.8 | 24.0 | 48.3 | 16.4 | 19.7 |
| LnGrp LOS D | A | D | D | A | D | E | C | C | D | B | B |
| Approach Vol，veh／h | 703 |  |  | 247 |  |  | 1035 |  |  | 1381 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh | 37.4 |  |  | 43.9 |  |  | 25.3 |  |  | 20.9 |  |
| Approach LOS | D |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |


| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s7．1 | 46.2 | 14.5 | 14.3 | 39.1 | 22.8 |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s 4．0 | 4.6 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.6 | 4.0 |
| Max Green Setting（Gmaxф，．s | 45.4 | 21.0 | 26.0 | 45.4 | 21.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋｜14，4s | 16.6 | 9.3 | 9.9 | 15.1 | 14.0 |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s 0.1 | 21.1 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 19.4 | 3.8 |

Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 27.4 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | C |

## Notes

User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green．


User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.



* HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier.


Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.


User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 性 |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\hat{*}$ | F |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 34 | 1347 | 106 | 149 | 679 | 22 | 93 | 10 | 119 | 19 | 9 | 16 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 34 | 1347 | 106 | 149 | 679 | 22 | 93 | 10 | 119 | 19 | 9 | 16 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 0.99 |  | 0.99 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln 1 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 35 | 1389 | 109 | 154 | 700 | 23 | 96 | 10 | 123 | 20 | 9 | 16 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap，veh／h | 49 | 1598 | 125 | 197 | 1065 | 873 | 85 | 5 | 385 | 76 | 21 | 398 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.03 | 0.47 | 0.47 | 0.11 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1810 | 3381 | 264 | 1810 | 1900 | 1558 | 0 | 20 | 1544 | 0 | 86 | 1599 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 35 | 738 | 760 | 154 | 700 | 23 | 106 | 0 | 123 | 29 | 0 | 16 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln1 | 1810 | 1805 | 1840 | 1810 | 1900 | 1558 | 20 | 0 | 1544 | 86 | 0 | 1599 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 1.5 | 29.3 | 29.8 | 6.7 | 20.6 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 1.5 | 29.3 | 29.8 | 6.7 | 20.6 | 0.5 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 5.2 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.14 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.91 |  | 1.00 | 0.69 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 49 | 853 | 870 | 197 | 1065 | 873 | 90 | 0 | 385 | 97 | 0 | 398 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.72 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.78 | 0.66 | 0.03 | 1.17 | 0.00 | 0.32 | 0.30 | 0.00 | 0.04 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 586 | 1010 | 1030 | 575 | 1065 | 873 | 90 | 0 | 385 | 97 | 0 | 398 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 38.7 | 18.9 | 19.0 | 34.8 | 12.3 | 7.9 | 39.0 | 0.0 | 24.6 | 25.8 | 0.0 | 22.8 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 17.7 | 6.2 | 6.6 | 6.7 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 148.5 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ | 110.9 | 12.6 | 13.1 | 3.3 | 8.2 | 0.2 | 5.5 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay， | ，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 56.4 | 25.1 | 25.6 | 41.5 | 13.5 | 7.9 | 187.5 | 0.0 | 24.7 | 26.4 | 0.0 | 22.9 |
| LnGrp LOS | E | C | C | D | B | A | F | A | C | C | A | C |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 1533 |  |  | 877 |  |  | 229 |  |  | 45 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 26.1 |  |  | 18.2 |  |  | 100.1 |  |  | 25.1 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | B |  |  | F |  |  | C |  |
| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration（ $G+Y+R \mathrm{C})$ ， | 83．2 | 43.0 |  | 24.0 | 6.2 | 50.1 |  | 24.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period（ $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ），s | s 4.5 | 5.1 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.1 |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting（Gma | 225， 5 | 44.9 |  | 20.0 | 26.0 | 44.9 |  | 20.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋1 | ＋19，7 | 31.8 |  | 22.0 | 3.5 | 22.6 |  | 22.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.4 | 6.2 |  | 0.0 | 0.1 | 3.5 |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrr DelayHCM 6th LOS |  |  | 29.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green．

Intersection
Intersection Delay, s/veh41.9
Intersection LOS $\quad$ E

| Movement EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | 4 |  |  | ¢ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h 75 | 424 | 86 | 50 | 263 | 51 | 33 | 95 | 37 | 39 | 127 | 65 |
| Future Vol, veh/h 75 | 424 | 86 | 50 | 263 | 51 | 33 | 95 | 37 | 39 | 127 | 65 |
| Peak Hour Factor 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow 81 | 456 | 92 | 54 | 283 | 55 | 35 | 102 | 40 | 42 | 137 | 70 |
| Number of Lanes 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach RighNB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay 70.8 |  |  | 22.8 |  |  | 15.6 |  |  | 17.8 |  |  |
| HCM LOS F |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 EBLn1 EBLn2WBLn1WBLn2 SBLn1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $20 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $17 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $58 \%$ | $85 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $84 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $55 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $22 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $28 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 165 | 499 | 86 | 313 | 51 | 231 |
| LT Vol | 33 | 75 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 39 |
| Through Vol | 95 | 424 | 0 | 263 | 0 | 127 |
| RT Vol | 37 | 0 | 86 | 0 | 51 | 65 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 177 | 537 | 92 | 337 | 55 | 248 |
| Geometry Grp | 2 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 2 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.377 | 1.054 | 0.161 | 0.68 | 0.1 | 0.499 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 7.877 | 7.071 | 6.276 | 7.542 | 6.738 | 7.549 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 460 | 515 | 574 | 481 | 535 | 479 |
| Service Time | 5.877 | 4.783 | 3.987 | 5.242 | 4.438 | 5.549 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.385 | 1.043 | 0.16 | 0.701 | 0.103 | 0.518 |
| HCM Control Delay | 15.6 | 81.2 | 10.2 | 24.8 | 10.2 | 17.8 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | F | B | C | B | C |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 1.7 | 16 | 0.6 | 5 | 0.3 | 2.7 |



Unsignalized Delay for [EBR, WBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

## Kimley»)Horn

## APPENDIX H. IMPROVED CONDITIONS SYNCHRO OUTPUT SHEETS

|  | 4 |  | 7 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | \% | $\pm$ | $\downarrow$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | ${ }_{*} \uparrow$ | 「 |  | ${ }_{*} \uparrow$ | 「' |  | \& |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 26 | 178 | 35 | 29 | 175 | 41 | 49 | 157 | 37 | 30 | 76 | 47 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 26 | 178 | 35 | 29 | 175 | 41 | 49 | 157 | 37 | 30 | 76 | 47 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 0.93 | 1.00 |  | 0.94 | 0.98 |  | 0.95 | 0.99 |  | 0.96 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 28 | 191 | 38 | 31 | 188 | 44 | 53 | 169 | 40 | 32 | 82 | 51 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap, veh/h | 48 | 327 | 297 | 54 | 324 | 302 | 168 | 312 | 66 | 156 | 250 | 132 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 241 | 1647 | 1495 | 267 | 1620 | 1508 | 222 | 1239 | 263 | 178 | 993 | 524 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 219 | 0 | 38 | 219 | 0 | 44 | 262 | 0 | 0 | 165 | 0 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s), veh/h/ln | 1888 | 0 | 1495 | 1887 | 0 | 1508 | 1724 | 0 | 0 | 1694 | 0 | 0 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 4.1 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 4.1 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 5.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.13 |  | 1.00 | 0.14 |  | 1.00 | 0.20 |  | 0.15 | 0.19 |  | 0.31 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 375 | 0 | 297 | 378 | 0 | 302 | 546 | 0 | 0 | 538 | 0 | 0 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.58 | 0.00 | 0.13 | 0.58 | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.48 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.31 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 1343 | 0 | 1064 | 1391 | 0 | 1112 | 1442 | 0 | 0 | 1395 | 0 | 0 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 14.0 | 0.0 | 12.7 | 14.0 | 0.0 | 12.7 | 12.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 15.5 | 0.0 | 12.9 | 15.4 | 0.0 | 13.0 | 13.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 12.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | B | A | B | B | A | B | B | A | A | B | A | A |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 257 |  |  | 263 |  |  | 262 |  |  | 165 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 15.1 |  |  | 15.0 |  |  | 13.3 |  |  | 12.3 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs |  | 2 |  | 4 |  | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $G+Y+R \mathrm{c}$ ), $s$ |  | 14.2 |  | 12.2 |  | 14.2 |  | 12.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s |  | 30.5 |  | 27.5 |  | 30.5 |  | 28.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s |  | 7.0 |  | 6.1 |  | 5.0 |  | 6.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s |  | 1.7 |  | 1.4 |  | 1.0 |  | 1.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay |  |  | 14.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | $\rangle$ | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | 4 | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 74 | 424 | 86 | 49 | 250 | 49 | 31 | 89 | 36 | 39 | 127 | 64 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 74 | 424 | 86 | 49 | 250 | 49 | 31 | 89 | 36 | 39 | 127 | 64 |
| Initial Q (Qb), veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.94 | 0.99 |  | 0.95 | 0.98 |  | 0.95 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 80 | 456 | 92 | 53 | 269 | 53 | 33 | 96 | 39 | 42 | 137 | 69 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap, veh/h | 100 | 567 | 541 | 70 | 358 | 345 | 111 | 231 | 82 | 106 | 211 | 96 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.35 | 0.35 | 0.35 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.20 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 281 | 1604 | 1531 | 310 | 1574 | 1516 | 208 | 1140 | 408 | 188 | 1045 | 475 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 536 | 0 | 92 | 322 | 0 | 53 | 168 | 0 | 0 | 248 | 0 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 1886 | 0 | 1531 | 1884 | 0 | 1516 | 1756 | 0 | 0 | 1707 | 0 | 0 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 16.0 | 0.0 | 2.6 | 9.9 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear (g_c), s | 16.0 | 0.0 | 2.6 | 9.9 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 5.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.15 |  | 1.00 | 0.16 |  | 1.00 | 0.20 |  | 0.23 | 0.17 |  | 0.28 |
| Lane Grp Cap (c), veh/h | 667 | 0 | 541 | 428 | 0 | 345 | 424 | 0 | 0 | 413 | 0 | 0 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.80 | 0.00 | 0.17 | 0.75 | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.40 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.60 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 1167 | 0 | 947 | 772 | 0 | 621 | 681 | 0 | 0 | 675 | 0 | 0 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 18.2 | 0.0 | 13.8 | 22.4 | 0.0 | 19.3 | 21.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 23.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 2.7 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 6.8 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 20.5 | 0.0 | 14.0 | 25.1 | 0.0 | 19.5 | 22.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 24.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | C | A | B | C | A | B | C | A | A | C | A | A |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 628 |  |  | 375 |  |  | 168 |  |  | 248 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 19.5 |  |  | 24.3 |  |  | 22.4 |  |  | 24.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs |  | 2 |  | 4 |  | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s |  | 17.1 |  | 26.5 |  | 17.1 |  | 18.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s |  | 22.5 |  | 38.5 |  | 22.5 |  | 25.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+1), s |  | 7.1 |  | 18.0 |  | 10.3 |  | 11.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s |  | 0.8 |  | 4.0 |  | 1.2 |  | 1.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrr DelayHCM 6th LOS |  |  | 22.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 4 |  |  | 7 | - |  | 4 | 4 | $p$ |  | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | F |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 28 | 228 | 36 | 29 | 236 | 42 | 50 | 161 | 37 | 30 | 76 | 48 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 28 | 228 | 36 | 29 | 236 | 42 | 50 | 161 | 37 | 30 | 76 | 48 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 0.93 | 1.00 |  | 0.94 | 0.98 |  | 0.95 | 0.99 |  | 0.96 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 30 | 245 | 39 | 31 | 254 | 45 | 54 | 173 | 40 | 32 | 82 | 52 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap, veh/h | 46 | 379 | 339 | 48 | 391 | 352 | 151 | 298 | 62 | 140 | 239 | 129 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.24 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 206 | 1684 | 1505 | 206 | 1684 | 1517 | 227 | 1237 | 258 | 181 | 990 | 535 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 275 | 0 | 39 | 285 | 0 | 45 | 267 | 0 | 0 | 166 | 0 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/n | 1890 | 0 | 1505 | 1890 | 0 | 1517 | 1722 | 0 | 0 | 1706 | 0 | 0 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 5.9 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 6.1 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 5.9 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 6.1 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 6.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.11 |  | 1.00 | 0.11 |  | 1.00 | 0.20 |  | 0.15 | 0.19 |  | 0.31 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 425 | 0 | 339 | 439 | 0 | 352 | 512 | 0 | 0 | 507 | 0 | 0 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.65 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.65 | 0.00 | 0.13 | 0.52 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.33 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 1162 | 0 | 925 | 1204 | 0 | 967 | 1247 | 0 | 0 | 1210 | 0 | 0 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(I) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 15.7 | 0.0 | 13.8 | 15.5 | 0.0 | 13.6 | 15.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 14.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 2.4 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay (d),s/veh | 17.4 | 0.0 | 13.9 | 17.1 | 0.0 | 13.7 | 15.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 14.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | B | A | B | B | A | B | B | A | A | B | A | A |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 314 |  |  | 330 |  |  | 267 |  |  | 166 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 16.9 |  |  | 16.7 |  |  | 15.9 |  |  | 14.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs |  | 2 |  | 4 |  | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $G+Y+R \mathrm{c}$ ), $s$ |  | 15.3 |  | 14.6 |  | 15.3 |  | 14.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s |  | 30.5 |  | 27.5 |  | 30.5 |  | 28.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s |  | 8.1 |  | 7.9 |  | 5.5 |  | 8.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s |  | 1.7 |  | 1.7 |  | 1.0 |  | 1.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrr Delay |  |  | 16.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 4 |  |  | 7 | - |  | 4 | 4 | $p$ |  | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | F |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 75 | 465 | 87 | 49 | 296 | 49 | 31 | 89 | 36 | 39 | 129 | 67 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 75 | 465 | 87 | 49 | 296 | 49 | 31 | 89 | 36 | 39 | 129 | 67 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.94 | 0.99 |  | 0.95 | 0.98 |  | 0.95 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 81 | 500 | 94 | 53 | 318 | 53 | 33 | 96 | 39 | 42 | 139 | 72 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cap, veh/h | 97 | 598 | 565 | 65 | 392 | 368 | 103 | 222 | 80 | 97 | 203 | 96 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.37 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.20 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 263 | 1624 | 1533 | 270 | 1617 | 1520 | 211 | 1132 | 406 | 189 | 1036 | 487 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 581 | 0 | 94 | 371 | 0 | 53 | 168 | 0 | 0 | 253 | 0 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/n | 1887 | 0 | 1533 | 1887 | 0 | 1520 | 1749 | 0 | 0 | 1711 | 0 | 0 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 19.7 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 13.0 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 19.7 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 13.0 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 5.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.14 |  | 1.00 | 0.14 |  | 1.00 | 0.20 |  | 0.23 | 0.17 |  | 0.28 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 695 | 0 | 565 | 457 | 0 | 368 | 405 | 0 | 0 | 396 | 0 | 0 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.84 | 0.00 | 0.17 | 0.81 | 0.00 | 0.14 | 0.41 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.64 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 1038 | 0 | 843 | 687 | 0 | 553 | 606 | 0 | 0 | 602 | 0 | 0 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(I) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 20.2 | 0.0 | 14.9 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 20.8 | 24.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 26.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 3.9 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 8.8 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 6.1 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay (d),s/veh | 24.1 | 0.0 | 15.0 | 29.5 | 0.0 | 21.0 | 25.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 28.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | C | A | B | C | A | C | C | A | A | C | A | A |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 675 |  |  | 424 |  |  | 168 |  |  | 253 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 22.8 |  |  | 28.4 |  |  | 25.6 |  |  | 28.1 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs |  | 2 |  | 4 |  | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $G+Y+R \mathrm{c}$ ), $s$ |  | 18.2 |  | 30.3 |  | 18.2 |  | 21.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s |  | 22.5 |  | 38.5 |  | 22.5 |  | 25.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s |  | 7.8 |  | 21.7 |  | 11.6 |  | 15.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s |  | 0.8 |  | 4.1 |  | 1.1 |  | 1.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrr Delay |  |  | 25.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 5.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement EBT | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |
| Lane Configurations | 4 | F | ${ }^{*}$ | 4 | ${ }^{*}$ | F |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 433 | 97 | 99 | 267 | 162 | 181 |
| Future Vol, veh/h 4 | 433 | 97 | 99 | 267 | 162 | 181 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control Fr | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | 25 | 170 | - | 145 | 0 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 | 96 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 451 | 101 | 103 | 278 | 169 | 189 |
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## APPENDIX I. SOQUEL AVENUE STRIPING IMPROVEMENT CONCEPT LAYOUTS
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## APPENDIX J. SIGNAL WARRANT WORKSHEETS

## Traffic Signal Warrant Write-up

Signal warrant analysis was completed for the following intersections:

- Intersection 8: Soquel Avenue \& Project Driveway
- Intersection 24: Brommer Street \& 30 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Avenue

This analysis used methodology provided by Chapter 4 of the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) (2014). The Peak Hour Warrant (Warrant 3) was used to analyze these intersections because 24 -hour counts were not collected near the intersections to complete the Eight-Hour Warrant (Warrant 1) and Four-Hour Warrant (Warrant 2). In addition, future volumes are only analyzed during the peak hour, therefore the Peak Hour Warrant would only be used in the future scenarios.

For Intersection 8, three scenarios were analyzed:

1. One approach lane for both the Major and Minor Street
a. This simulates the geometry present at Intersection 8 in existing conditions.
2. Two approach lanes for the Major and Minor Road
a. This simulates the proposed geometry of Intersection 8 provided in this report.
3. Two approach lanes for the Major and Minor Street with the highest left turning volumes added to the Minor Street approach
a. This is compliant with Paragraph 13 of Chapter 4 of the California MUTCD. The paragraph states that if the intersection has a high volume of left-turn traffic, the higher volume of the Major Street left turn may be added to the Minor Street approach volumes. This analysis was completed to because the MUTCD does not define what a high volume of left-turn traffic means and left-turn volumes in the plus project conditions are relatively high.

In all three scenarios, it was determined that the plus project conditions warrant a traffic signal at Intersection 8.

For Intersection 24, one scenario was analyzed:

1. One approach for both the Major and Minor Road - It is anticipated that the intersection geometry would remain the same in both existing and cumulative conditions.

In this scenario, it was determined that the existing and plus project conditions warrant a traffic signal at Intersection 24.

## TRAFFIC SIGNAL VOLUME WARRANT ANALYSIS (2010 MUTCD)

| MAJOR STREET: | Brommer St | EB | WB | \# OF APPROACH LANES: | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MINOR STREET: | 30th Ave | SB | NB | \# OF APPROACH LANES: | 1 |
| CITY, STATE: | Santa Cruz County, California |  |  |  |  |
| COMMENTS: | Existing Conditions |  |  |  |  |

85TH PERCENTILE SPEED GREATER THAN 40 MPH ON MAJOR STREET (Y OR N)

|  |  |  | MAJOR ST TWO-WAY TRAFFIC | MINOR ST TRAFFIC HEAVY LEG | Ped Count CROSSING MAJOR ST | WARRANT 1 - Condition A, Part 1 |  |  | WARRANT 1 - Condition B, Part 1 |  |  | WARRANT 1 - Condition A, Part 2 |  |  | WARRANT | 1 - Conditi | B, Part 2 | WARRANT 2 Four-Hour | WARRANT 3 Peak Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | MAIN LINE |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { SIDE } \\ \text { STREET } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | BOTH MET | MAIN LINE | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { SIDE } \\ & \text { STREET } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BOTH } \\ & \text { MET } \end{aligned}$ | MAIN LINE | $\begin{gathered} \text { SIDE } \\ \text { STREET } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BOTH } \\ & \text { MET } \end{aligned}$ | MAIN LINE | $\begin{gathered} \text { SIDE } \\ \text { STREET } \end{gathered}$ | BOTH MET |  |  |
| THRESHOLD VALUES |  |  |  |  |  |  | 500 | 150 |  | 750 | 75 |  | 400 | 120 |  | 600 | 60 |  | 60 | 75 |
| 06:30 AM | TO | 07:30 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:30 AM | TO | 08:30 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 08:30 AM | TO | 09:30 AM | 484 | 239 |  |  | Y |  |  | Y |  | Y | Y | Y |  | Y |  |  |  |
| 09:30 AM | TO | 10:30 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10:30 AM | TO | 11:30 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11:00 AM | TO | 12:00 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12:30 PM | TO | 01:30 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:30 PM | TO | 02:30 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:30 PM | TO | 03:30 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:30 PM | TO | 04:30 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:30 PM | TO | 05:30 PM | 932 | 226 |  | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| 05:30 PM | TO | 06:30 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:30 PM | TO | 07:30 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:30 PM | TO | 08:30 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 08:30 PM | TO | 09:30 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 09:30 PM | TO | 10:30 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 1,416 | 465 |  | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 HOURS NEEDED <br> NOT SATISFIED |  |  | 8 HOURS NEEDED <br> NOT SATISFIED |  |  |  | 8 HOURS NEEDED for both Condition A \& B NOT SATISFIED |  |  |  |  | 4 HRS NEEDED NOT SATISFIED | 1 HR NEEDED SATISFIED |

Kimley-Horn and Associates

## TRAFFIC SIGNAL VOLUME WARRANT ANALYSIS (2010 MUTCD)

| MAJOR STREET: | Brommer St | EB | WB | \# OF APPROACH LANES: | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MINOR STREET: | 30th Ave | SB | NB | \# OF APPROACH LANES: | 1 |
| CITY, STATE: | Santa Cruz C |  |  |  |  |
| COMMENTS: | Existing Plus Project Conditions Existing Geometry |  |  |  |  |

ISOLATED COMMUNITY WITH POPULATION LESS THAN 10,000 (Y OR N)
85TH PERCENTILE SPEED GREATER THAN 40 MPH ON MAJOR STREET (Y OR N


Kimley-Horn and Associates

## TRAFFIC SIGNAL VOLUME WARRANT ANALYSIS (2010 MUTCD)



Kimley-Horn and Associates

## TRAFFIC SIGNAL VOLUME WARRANT ANALYSIS (2010 MUTCD)



ISOLATED COMMUNITY WITH POPULATION LESS THAN 10,000 (Y OR N)
85TH PERCENTILE SPEED GREATER THAN 40 MPH ON MAJOR STREET (Y OR N

|  |  |  | MAJOR ST TWO-WAY TRAFFIC | MINOR ST TRAFFIC HEAVY LEG | Ped Count CROSSING MAJOR ST | WARRANT 1 - Condition A, Part 1 |  |  | WARRANT 1 - Condition B, Part 1 |  |  | WARRANT 1 - Condition A, Part 2 |  |  | WARRANT 1 - Condition B, Part 2 |  |  |  | WARRANT 3 <br> Peak Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | MAIN LINE |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { SIDE } \\ & \text { STREET } \end{aligned}$ | BOTH MET | MAIN LINE | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { SIDE } \\ \text { STREET } \end{gathered}$ | BOTH | MAIN LINE | $\begin{gathered} \text { SIDE } \\ \text { STREET } \end{gathered}$ | BOTH | MAIN LINE | SIDE STREET | BOTH MET | Four-Hour |  |
| THRESHOLD VALUES |  |  |  |  |  |  | 500 | 150 |  | 750 | 75 |  | 400 | 120 |  | 600 | 60 |  | 60 | 75 |
| 06:30 AM | TO | 07:30 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:30 AM | TO | 08:30 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 08:30 AM | TO | 09:30 AM | 1,014 | 130 |  | Y |  |  | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |  |
| 09:30 AM | TO | 10:30 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10:30 AM | TO | 11:30 AM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11:00 AM | TO | 12:00 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12:30 PM | TO | 01:30 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:30 PM | TO | 02:30 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:30 PM | TO | 03:30 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:30 PM | TO | 04:30 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:30 PM | TO | 05:30 PM | 997 | 373 |  | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| 05:30 PM | TO | 06:30 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:30 PM | TO | 07:30 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:30 PM | TO | 08:30 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 08:30 PM | TO | 09:30 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 09:30 PM | TO | 10:30 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 2,011 | 503 |  | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 HOURS NEEDED nOT SATISFIED |  |  | 8 HOURS NEEDED NOT SATISFIED |  |  | 8 HOURS NEEDED for both Condition A \& B <br> NOT SATISFIED |  |  |  |  |  | 4 HRS NEEDED NOT SATISFIED | 1 HR NEEDED SATISFIED |

Kimley-Horn and Associates

## Kimley»)Horn

## APPENDIX K. FULL SCCRTP IMPROVEMENT LIST

## Appendix F <br> Project List
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# 2040 Regional Transportation Plan Project List 

## Constrained and Unconstrained Projects - Not Escalated

Projects listed by lead agency, in alphabetical order by project name.

Project IDs without the letter " $p$ " in front of the number have been also included in the Regional Transportatioon Improvement Program. "Constrained" represents amount of project cost that could be funded with revenues anticipated through 2040.
While some projects have secured funding, this amount does not typically represent committed funds. "Unconstrained" represents amount of project cost that would need additional funding in order to be implemented.

All Figures in year 2016, '000s (thousands of dollars)

| Project Title | ID | Project Description/Scope | Est total cost | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Caltrans |  |  |  |  |  |
| Collision Reduction \& Emergency Projects | CT-P46 | Various SHOPP projects that address collision reduction, mandates (including stormwater mandates) and emergency projects. (Constrained $=30 \%$ of total cost). | \$732,380 | \$219,714 | \$512,666 |
| Hwy 1/Harkins Slough Road Interchange: Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge | WAT 01A | Construction of Pedestrian/Bicycle Bridge over Highway 1. Caltrans Project ID 05-1G490 | \$9,900 | \$9,900 | \$0 |
| Hwy 17 Access Management - Laurel Rd/Sugarloaf Rd/Glenwood Cutoff Area Grade Separation Concept | CT-P52 | New structure providing grade-separation to facilitate crossing and turnaround. | \$40,000 | \$0 | \$40,000 |
| Hwy 17 Access Management - Multimodal Improvements | CT-P50 | Multimodal improvements including park and ride improvements, and facilities serving separated bike/ped crossing or express transit route. | \$20,000 | \$0 | \$20,000 |
| Hwy 17 Access Management - Old Santa Cruz Hwy Area Grade Separation Concept | CT-P53 | New structure providing grade-separation to facilitate crossing and turnaround. | \$40,000 | \$0 | \$40,000 |
| Hwy 17 Access Management - Operational Improvements | CT-P49 | Operational improvements to existing facilities including ramp modifications, accel/decel lanes, turning lanes, driveway consolidation, driveway channelization, etc. | \$50,000 | \$0 | \$50,000 |
| Hwy 17 Access Management - Vine Hill Area Grade Separation Concept | CT-P51 | New structure providing grade-separation to facilitate crossing and turnaround. | \$40,000 | \$0 | \$40,000 |
| Hwy 17 Wildlife Habitat Connectivity | CT-P48 | Wildlife Crossing | \$9,198 | \$9,198 | \$0 |
| Measure D Hwy 9 Corridor Projects | CT-P09e | Corridor study is underway to identify need for shoulder widening, turnouts for buses, bicycle and pedestrian improvements, and turn lanes at spot locations in SLV. Capital Cost Est. TBD. | \$10,000 | \$7,349 | \$2,651 |
| Minors | CT-P47 | Various small SHOPP projects (less than $\$ 1$ million) that reduce/enhance maintenance efforts by providing minor operational, pavement rehab, drainage, intersection, electrical upgrades, landscape and barrier improvements. (Constrained=30\% of total cost). | \$8,600 | \$2,580 | \$6,020 |
| State Highway Preservation (bridge, roadway, roadside) | CT-P45 | Various SHOPP projects that address bridge preservation, roadway \& roadside preservation and limited mobility improvements. (Constrained $=30 \%$ of cost to maintain). | \$778,390 | \$467,163 | \$311,227 |
|  |  |  | Caltrans Total \$1,738,468 | \$715,904 \$1,022,564 |  |
| CHP - California Highway Patrol |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hwy 129 Safety Program | CHP-P03 | Additional CHP enforcement and public education campaign on Highway 129. | \$500 | \$0 | \$500 |
| Hwy 17 Safety Program | CHP-P01 | Continuation of Highway 17 Safety Program in Santa Cruz County at $\$ 100 / y e a r$. Includes public education and awareness, California Highway Patrol (CHP) enhancement, pilot cars, electronic speed signs. | \$2,200 | \$2,200 | \$0 |


| Project Title | ID | Project Description/Scope | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Est total } \\ & \text { cost } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Traffic Management | CHP-P02 | Patrol of state route system and unincorporated roadways aimed at minimizing traffic collisions and traffic delays; and provide assistance to motorists. COST EST TBD. | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
|  |  | CHP - California Highway Patrol Total | \$2,700 | \$2,200 | \$500 |
| City of Capitola |  |  |  |  |  |
| 40th Ave (at Deanes Ln)Bike/Ped connection | CAP-P46 | 40th Avenue N/S bike/pedestrian connection at Deanes Lane. | \$10 | \$10 | \$0 |
| 40th Ave/Clares St Intersection Improvements | CAP-P38 | Widen intersection and signalize. | \$1,550 | \$1,050 | \$500 |
| 41st Ave (Soquel to Portola) Crosswalks | CAP-P47 | Evaluate and if found necessary, increase number of crosswalks on 41st to closer to every 300 ft . | \$20 | \$20 | \$0 |
| 41st Ave/Capitola Road Intersection Improvements | CAP-P37 | Widen intersection and reconfigure signal phasing. | \$520 | \$520 | \$0 |
| 46th/47th Ave (Clares to Cliff Dr) Bike Lanes/Traffic Calming | CAP-P40 | 46th/47th from Clares to Portola/Cliff - Add traffic calming and wayfinding signage to connect to Brommer and MBSST. | \$20 | \$20 | \$0 |
| 47th Avenue Traffic Calming and Greenway | CAP-P30 | Traffic calming and traffic dispersion improvements along 47th Ave from Capitola Rd to Portola Drive and implementation of greenway, which gives priority to bicycles and pedestrians on low volume, low speed streets including, pedestrian facilities, way finding and pavement markings, bicycle treatments to connect to MBSST. | \$100 | \$100 | \$0 |
| Auto Plaza Drive Extension to Bay Avenue | CAP-P35 | Extend Auto Plaza Drive over Soquel Creek to Bay Avenue. Includes improvements to Auto Plaza Drive. | \$10,330 | \$0 | \$10,330 |
| Bay Avenue Traffic Calming and Bike/Ped Enhancements | CAP-P29 | Traffic calming features along Bay Avenue from Highway 1 to Monterey Avenue, including left turn pocket, buffered pedestrian facilities and bicycle treatments (such as buffered and/or painted bike lanes, bike boxes, bike signals) to address speed inconsistency between bicyclists and vehicles. | \$410 | \$210 | \$200 |
| Bay Avenue/Capitola Avenue Intersection Modifications/Roundabout | CAP 16 | Multimodal improvements to intersection. Roundabout. | \$1,000 | \$1,000 | \$0 |
| Bay Avenue/Hill Street Intersection | CAP-P07 | Intersection improvements to improve traffic flow. Roundabout. | \$210 | \$210 | \$0 |
| Bay Avenue/Monterey Avenue Intersection Modification | CAP-P32 | Multimodal improvements to the intersection. Include signalization or roundabout along with pedestrian, bicycle treatments (such as buffered and/or painted bike lanes, bike boxes, bike signals) and transit access. | \$310 | \$310 | \$0 |
| Brommer Street Complete Street Improvements (250' west of 38th Ave to 41st Ave) | CAP 18 | Construct complete street roadway improvements on Brommer St. to improve access for vehicles, bikes, and pedestrians. Pavement reconstruction, install ADA driveways and sidewalks, and reconfigure eastbound approach to 41st Ave. for vehicle access. | \$770 | \$770 | \$0 |
| Brommer/Jade/Topaz St Bike Lanes/Traffic Calming (Western City Limit on Brommer to 47thAve) | CAP-P41 | Add buffered bike lanes, traffic calming and wayfinding signage and bike/ped priority crossing at 41st Ave, connecting the two $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{S}$ neighborhood greenways. | \$20 | \$20 | \$0 |
| Capitola Intra-City Rail Trolley | CAP-P18 | Construct \& Operate Weekend Rail Trolley Service. Project includes installation of 3 stations. | \$14,460 | \$0 | \$14,460 |
| Capitola Jitney Transit Service | CAP-P15 | Purchase and operate local transit service. | \$1,030 | \$0 | \$1,030 |
| Capitola Mall (Capitola Rd to Clares) Bike Path | CAP-P48 | Separated bicycle facility through Capitola Mall parking lot to connect 38th Ave bike lanes and 40th Ave. | \$50 | \$50 | \$0 |


| Project Title | ID | Project Description/Scope | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Est total } \\ & \text { cost } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capitola Rd \& 45th Avenue I/S Improvements | CAP-P53 | Signalization or other LOS improvements | \$400 | \$400 | \$0 |
| Capitola Village Enhancements: Capitola Ave | CAP-P34 | Multimodal enhancements along Capitola Avenue. | \$1,030 | \$1,030 | \$0 |
| Capitola Village Multimodal Enhancements Phase 2/3 | CAP-P04b | Multimodal enhancements in Capitola Village along Stockton Ave, Esplanade, San Jose Ave, \& Monterey Av. Includes sidewalks, bike lanes, bike lockers, landscaping, improve transit facilities, parking, pavement rehab and drainage. | \$3,100 | \$3,100 | \$0 |
| Capitola-wide HOV priority | CAP-P50 | Evaluate HOV priority at signals and HOV queue bypass. | \$40 | \$40 | \$0 |
| Citywide Bike Projects | CAP-P52 | Bike projects based on needs identified through the Bicycle Plan. These projects are in addition to projects listed individually in the RTP. | \$1,030 | \$400 | \$630 |
| Citywide General Maintenance and Operations | CAP-P06 | Ongoing maintenance, repair, and operation of road/street system within the City limits. (Const=\$1850K/yr; Unconst=\$150K/yr). | \$44,000 | \$40,666 | \$3,334 |
| Citywide Sidewalk Program | CAP-P51 | Install sidewalks to fill gaps. Annual Cost $\$ 50 \mathrm{k} / \mathrm{yr}$. | \$1,030 | \$520 | \$510 |
| Citywide Traffic Calming | CAP-P17 | Install traffic calming/neighborhood livability improvements. | \$1,450 | \$1,450 | \$0 |
| Clares St Bike Lanes/Sharrows (Capitola Rd to 41st Ave) | CAP-P42 | Evaluate and if found necessary, add bike lanes/sharrows to Clares. | \$100 | \$100 | \$0 |
| Clares St/41st Ave Bicycle Intersection Improvement | CAP-P43 | Bike treatments (such as buffered and/or painted bike lanes, bike boxes, bike signals) at Clares across 41st. | \$10 | \$10 | \$0 |
| Clares Street Pedestrian Crossing west of 40th Ave | CAP-P16 | Construct signalized ped x -ing 0.20 miles west of 40th Ave. | \$520 | \$250 | \$270 |
| Clares Street Traffic Calming | CAP 11 | Implementation of traffic calming measures: chicanes, center island median, new bus stop, and road edge landscape treatments to slow traffic. Construct new safe, accessible ped x-ing at 42nd and 46th Av. | \$750 | \$750 | \$0 |
| Cliff Drive Improvements | CAP-P05 | Installation of sidewalks, pedestrian crossing and slope stabilization of embankment including seawall. | \$1,550 | \$1,550 | \$0 |
| Gross/41st Ave Bicycle Intersection Improvement | CAP-P44 | Bike treatments (such as buffered and/or painted bike lanes, bike boxes, bike signals) from Gross $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{B}$ to 41 st $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{B}$. | \$20 | \$20 | \$0 |
| Hwy 1/41st Avenue Interchange | CAP-P01 | Implement 41st Avenue \& Bay Ave/Porter Ave single interchange improvements as detailed and expensed in Hwy 1 HOV project (RTC 24) as a stand alone project if the RTC project does not proceed. (\$117M) | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Monterey Avenue and Park Avenue I/S Improvements | CAP-P56 | Signalization or other LOS improvements | \$400 | \$400 | \$0 |
| Monterey Avenue at Depot Hill | CAP-P28 | Improve vehicle ingress and egress to Depot Hill along Escalona Ave and improve pedestrian facilities. | \$260 | \$260 | \$0 |
| Monterey Avenue Multimodal Improvements | CAP-P12 | Installation of sidewalks and bike lanes in area near school and parks. | \$360 | \$360 | \$0 |
| Park Avenue Sidewalks | CAP 15 | Installation of sidewalks, plus crosswalks at Cabrillo and Washburn to improve access to transit stops. Links Cliffwood Heights neighborhood to Capitola Village. Currently only 4 short segments of sidewalk exist. | \$650 | \$650 | \$0 |
| Park Avenue/Kennedy Drive Improvements | CAP-P09 | Construct intersection improvements, especially for bikes/peds. May include traffic signal. | \$360 | \$360 | \$0 |


| Project Title | ID | Project Description/Scope | $\begin{gathered} \text { Est total } \\ \text { cost } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Porter Street and Highway 1 I/S Improvements | CAP-P55 | Add additional dedicated right turn lane on Porter St to northbound on ramp | \$250 | \$250 | \$0 |
| Stockton Ave Bridge Rehab | CAP-P07p | Replace bridge with wider facility that includes standard bike lanes and sidewalks. | \$3,000 | \$1,500 | \$1,500 |
| Stockton Avenue and Capitola Avenue I/S Improvements | CAP-P57 | Signalization or other LOS improvements | \$350 | \$350 | \$0 |
| Upper Capitola Avenue Improvements | CAP-P03 | Installation of bike lanes and sidewalks on Capitola Av. (Bay Av.-SR 1) and sidewalks on Hill St. from Bay Av. to Rosedale Av. | \$1,340 | \$1,340 | \$0 |
| Upper Pacific Cove Parking Lot Pedestrian Trail and Depot Park Metro Development | CAP 17 | Construct 4 foot wide pedestrian pathway along City owned Upper Pacific Cove Parking lot, adjacent to rail line ( $680^{\prime}$ ). Includes new signal for ped crossing over Monterey Avenue. Includes a new metro shelter located and landscaped setting along the rail corridor/Park Ave. Part of MBSST. | \$310 | \$310 | \$0 |
| Wharf Road and Stockton Avenue I/S Improvements | CAP-P54 | Signalization or other LOS improvements | \$350 | \$350 | \$0 |
| Wheelchair Access Ramps | CAP-P27 | Install wheelchair access/curb cut ramps on sidewalks citywide. | \$200 | \$200 | \$0 |
|  |  | City of Capitola Total | \$93,670 | \$60,906 | \$32,764 |
| City of Santa Cruz |  |  |  |  |  |
| Almar Ave Sidewalks | SC-P126 | Fill gaps in sidewalks and access ramps to improve pedestrian safety. | \$200 | \$200 | \$0 |
| Arroyo Seco Trail (Medar St to Grandview St) | SC-P107 | Pave existing gravel trail and widen and pave connection to Grandview St. | \$500 | \$0 | \$500 |
| Bay Street Corridor Modifications | SC-P77 | Intersection modifications on Bay St Corridor from Mission St to Escalona Dr, including widening at the Mission St northeast corner and widening on Bay. Improve bike lanes and add sidewalks to west side of Bay. | \$5,100 | \$970 | \$4,130 |
| Bay/California Traffic Signals | SC-P96 | Install traffic signals for safety and capacity improvements. | \$520 | \$0 | \$520 |
| Bay/High Intersection Modification | SC-P109 | Install a roundabout or modify the traffic signal to include protected left-turns and new turn lanes. Revise sidewalks, access ramps and bike lanes as appropriate. | \$2,150 | \$2,150 | \$0 |
| Beach/Cliff Intersection Signalization | SC-P93 | Signalize intersection for pedestrian and train safety. | \$210 | \$210 | \$0 |
| Branciforte Creek Pedestrian Path Connections | SC-P95 | Fill gaps in pedestrian and bike paths along and across Branciforte Creek in the Ocean-Lee-Market-May Streets area. | \$3,410 | \$0 | \$3,410 |
| Brookwood Drive Bike and Pedestrian Path | SC-P21 | Provide 2-way bicycle and pedestrian travel. | \$1,030 | \$0 | \$1,030 |
| Chestnut St. Pathway | SC-P22 | Install a Class 1 bicycle/pedestrian facility to connect the east side of Neary Lagoon Park with the Depot Park path. | \$570 | \$570 | \$0 |
| Chestnut Street Bike Lanes | SC-P47 | Install Class 2 bike lanes to provide connection from existing bike lanes on Laurel Street and upper Chestnut Street to proposed Class 1 bike path connections to Bay Street and Pacific Avenue/Beach Street. | \$100 | \$100 | \$0 |
| Citywide Operations and Maintenance | SC-P07 | Ongoing maintenance, repair, and operation of street system within the City limits. (Const=\$3.0M/yr; Unconst=\$4.2M/yr) | \$163,630 | \$86,249 | \$77,381 |
| Citywide Safe Routes to School Projects ATP | SC-P125 | Projects to improve pedestrian and bicycle safety near schools. | \$8,204 | \$1,404 | \$6,800 |


| Project Title | ID | Project Description/Scope | Est total cost | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Citywide Street Sweeping | SC-P128 | Ongoing street sweeping, funded from City Refuse Enterprise Fund. | \$19,800 | \$19,800 | \$0 |
| Delaware Avenue Complete Streets | SC-P23 | Fill gaps in bicycle lanes, sidewalks and sidewalk access ramps. | \$150 | \$150 | \$0 |
| High St/Moore St Intersection Modification | SC-P90 | Add a protected left turn to existing signalized intersection along High St at city arterial. Project is located in high pedestrian and bicycle use activity area. | \$100 | \$100 | \$0 |
| Hwy 1 - Harvey West Area Alternative Access | SC-P108 | Development of an on/off ramp from NB Highway 1 to Harvey West Boulevard/Evergreen St, to improve access, especially during peak congestion times and emergencies. | \$4,130 | \$0 | \$4,130 |
| Hwy 1 Sound Wall | SC-P03 | Install sound wall on Hwy 1: River to Chestnut. | \$520 | \$0 | \$520 |
| Hwy 1/9 Intersection Modifications | SC 25 | Intersection modifications including new turn lanes, bike lanes, shoulders, lighting, sidewalks and access ramps. Includes adding second left-turn lane on Highway 1 southbound to Highway 9 northbound; second northbound through lane and shoulder on northbound Highway 9, from Highway 1 to Fern Street; a right-turn lane and shoulder on northbound Highway 9; throughleft turn lane on northbound River St; replace channelizers on Highway 9 at the intersection of Coral Street; sufficient lane width along the northbound through/left turn lane on Highway 9 from Fern Street to Encinal Street; new sidewalk along the east side of Highway 9 from Fern Street north to Encinal Street; new through/left turn lane on southbound Highway 9; Traffic Signal interconnect to adjacent signals. (Caltrans project ID - 05-46580) | \$7,850 | \$7,850 | \$0 |
| Hwy 1/Mission St at Chestnut/King/Union Intersection Modification | SC-P81 | Modify design of existing intersections to add lanes and upgrade the traffic signal operations to add capacity, reduce delay and improve safety. Provide access ramps and bike lanes on King and Mission. Includes traffic signal coordination. | \$4,650 | \$4,650 | \$0 |
| Hwy 1/San Lorenzo Bridge Replacement | SC 38 | Replace the Highway 1 bridge over San Lorenzo River to increase capacity, improve safety and improve seismic stability, from Highway 17 to the Junction of $1 / 9$. Reduce flooding potential and improve fish passage. Caltrans Project ID 05-OP460 | \$20,000 | \$20,000 | \$0 |
| Hwy 1/Shaffer Rd Signalization | SC-P92 | Signalization of intersection of Hwy 1 and Shaffer Rd. Project may includes some widening of Hwy 1 to accommodate a left turn lane. | \$520 | \$0 | \$520 |
| King Street Bike Facility (entire length) | SC-P59 | Install Class 2 bike lanes on residential collector street which includes some parking and landscape strip removals, and some drainage inlet modifications. | \$2,070 | \$2,070 | \$0 |
| King/Laurel Intersection Modification | SC-P114 | Modify unsignalized intersection to add eastbound right turn lane. | \$100 | \$0 | \$100 |
| Laurent/High Intersection Improvements | SC-P97 | Install Traffic Signal. | \$410 | \$0 | \$410 |
| Lump Sum Bike Projects | SC-P75 | Bike projects based on needs identified through the Active Transportation Plan and Santa Cruz City Schools Complete Streets Master Plan. These are in addition to projects listed individually in the RTP. | \$6,800 | \$0 | \$6,800 |
| Market Street Sidewalks and Bike Lanes | SC-P105 | Completion of sidewalks and bicycle lanes. Includes retaining walls, right-of-way, tree removals, and a bridge modification. | \$1,030 | \$1,030 | \$0 |
| MBSST (Coastal Rail Trail): Segment 7 (Natural Bridges to Pacific Ave) | TRL 07SC | 2.1 miles of Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSST) Segment 7 along rail line (excluding Moore Creek rail trestle bridge and trail to Natural Bridges Drive). | \$7,400 | \$7,400 | \$0 |
| MBSST (Coastal Rail Trail_ - Segment 8 and 9) | TRL 8-9a | Rail Trail Design, Environmental Clearance and Construction along the rail corridor between Pacific Ave in the City of Santa Cruz to 17th Ave in Santa Cruz County | \$32,934 | \$32,934 | \$0 |
| Measure H Road Projects | SC-P104 | Road rehabilitation and reconstruction projects citywide to address backlog of needs using Measure H sales tax revenues. (Some Measure H funds anticipated to fund specific projects listed in the RTP). | \$41,800 | \$41,800 | \$0 |


| Project Title | ID | Project Description/Scope | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Est total } \\ & \text { cost } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mission St (Hwy 1)/Laurel St Intersection Modification | SC-P112 | Modify traffic signal to add right-turn from Mission St to Laurel St and signal overlap phase. | \$1,030 | \$0 | \$1,030 |
| Mission St (Hwy 1)/Swift St Intersection Modification | SC-P113 | Modify traffic signal to add Swift St right-turn lane and signal overlap phase. | \$500 | \$0 | \$500 |
| Morrissey Blvd. Bike Path over Hwy 1 | SC-P29 | Install a Class 1 bicycle and pedestrian facility on freeway overpass. | \$300 | \$300 | \$0 |
| Morrissey/Poplar/Soquel Intersection Modification | SC-P12 | Modify the roadway configuration in the Morrissey/Poplar/Soquel triangle area to improve traffic circulation and safety for all modes. | \$2,070 | \$0 | \$2,070 |
| Murray St Bridge Retrofit | SC 37 | Seismic retrofit of existing Murray St. bridge (36C0108) over Woods Lagoon at harbor and associated approach roadway improvements and replacement of barrier rail. Includes wider bike lanes and sidewalk on ocean side. Include access paths to harbor if eligible. | \$11,440 | \$11,440 | \$0 |
| Murray St to Harbor Path Connection | SC-P30 | Install a Class 1 bicycle/pedestrian facility. | \$210 | \$210 | \$0 |
| Neighborhood Traffic Management Improvements | SC-P73 | Install traffic control devices and roadway design features to manage neighborhood traffic. | \$2,580 | \$0 | \$2,580 |
| North Branciforte/Water Intersection Modification | SC-P115 | Modify traffic signal and add additional lanes per traffic study. Include signal interconnect if applicable. | \$2,070 | \$0 | \$2,070 |
| Ocean St and San Lorenzo River Levee Bike/Ped Connections (Felker, Kennan, Blain, Barson Streets) | SC-P120 | Improve pedestrian and bicycle facilities on side streets to connect Ocean Street with San Lorenzo River Levee path system. | \$620 | \$0 | \$620 |
| Ocean St Pavement Rehabilitation | SC 48 | Pavement rehabilitation using cold-in-place recycling process; includes new curb ramps, restriping of bicycle lanes and crosswalks. | \$1,030 | \$1,030 | \$0 |
| Ocean St Streetscape and Intersection, Plymouth to Water | SC-P86 | Implement this phase of the Ocean Street plan and modify Plymouth St to provide separate turn lanes and through lanes, widen sidewalks, pedestrian islands/bulbouts, transit improvements, street trees, street lighting and medians landscaping improvements. This includes pedestrian and bicycle crossing improvements and detection and connectivity to the pedestrian and bicycle path on the San Lorenzo River and adjacent neighborhoods. Include Gateway treatment. | \$4,130 | \$2,000 | \$2,130 |
| Ocean St Streetscape and Intersection, Water to Soquel | SC-P84 | Implement this phase of the adopted Ocean Street plan including adding turn lanes on Ocean Street at the Water Street intersections, wider sidewalks, pedestrian crossing islands/bulb outs, transit improvements, street trees, pedestrian scale street lights, and medians improvements, way finding, and pedestrian and bicycle connectivity to San Lorenzo Park and neighborhoods. | \$6,200 | \$0 | \$6,200 |
| Ocean Street Corridor Multiuse Transit Lane | SC-P122 | Consider restricting parking to develop business access and transit (BAT) lane to serve tourism and improving transit facilities. | \$410 | \$0 | \$410 |
| Ocean Street Widening from Soquel to East Cliff | SC-P66 | Implement this phase of the Ocean Street plan that includes utility undergrounding, bike lanes, wider sidewalks, pedestrian crossing islands/bulb outs, transit improvements, pedestrian scale street lights, street trees and left turn lanes at Broadway and a right-turn lane at San Lorenzo Blvd. This includes pedestrian and bicycle crossing improvements and detection and connectivity to the pedestrian and bicycle path on the San Lorenzo River and adjacent neighborhoods. | \$5,170 | \$0 | \$5,170 |
| Ocean Street/San Lorenzo River Levee Area Wayfinding | SC-P124 | Install signage on the bike/ped scale to bike/ped facilities connecting key destinations. | \$150 | \$0 | \$150 |


| Project Title | ID | Project Description/Scope | Est total cost | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pacific Ave. Sidewalk | SC 50 | Construct 200' of new sidewalk on Pacific Avenue between Front Street and 55 Front St, including installation of a new accessible crosswalk at Front and Pacific; 150' bike lane. | \$440 | \$440 | \$0 |
| River (Rte 9)/Fern Intersection Modification | SC-P110 | Install traffic signal, sidewalk and new access ramps. Provide bike lanes on Fern. | \$520 | \$0 | \$520 |
| River St/River Street South Intersection Modification | SC-P116 | Install a roundabout or traffic signal to improve access and safety to the Downtown core, integrating bike and pedestrian facilities. | \$520 | \$0 | \$520 |
| River Street Pavement Rehabilitation (Water St to Potrero Street) | SC 51 | Pavement rehabilitation of River Street between Water Street and Potrero Street. (0.4 mi) | \$2,000 | \$1,000 | \$1,000 |
| Riverside Ave/Second St Intersection Modification. | SC-P13 | Modify intersection to reduce congestion and improve pedestrian crossing. | \$175 | \$175 | \$0 |
| San Lorenzo River Bike/Ped Trail at RR Bridge | TRL 8a | Widen existing four foot walkway that connects the east end of the Beach Street Pathway with East Cliff Drive at the location of the current railroad bridge over the San Lorenzo River and to connect the east and west banks of the San Lorenzo River Pathway. The crossing currently only accommodates pedestrians. | \$1,550 | \$1,550 | \$0 |
| San Lorenzo River Levee Path Connection | SC-P35 | Install a Multi-Use bicycle/pedestrian facility connecting the end of the San Lorenzo River Levee path on the eastern side of the river, up East Cliff Drive near Buena Vista Ave. | \$2,070 | \$2,070 | \$0 |
| Seabright Avenue Bike Lanes (Pine-Soquel) | SC-P69 | Install Class 2 bike lanes on arterial street to complete the Seabright Avenue bike lane corridor and connect to bike lane corridor on Soquel Avenue and Murray. Includes removal of some parking and some landscape strips. | \$2,070 | \$2,070 | \$0 |
| Seabright/Murray Traffic Signal Modifications | SC-P100 | Remove split phasing on Seabright and add right-turn lane northbound. | \$1,030 | \$1,030 | \$0 |
| Seabright/Water Intersection Improvements | SC-P99 | Modify unsignalized intersection to add northbound right and extend left-turn pocket. | \$100 | \$0 | \$100 |
| Shaffer Road Widening and Railroad Crossing | SC-P91 | Construction of a new crossing of the Railroad line at Shaffer Rd. and widening at the southern leg of Shaffer in conjunction with development. Complete sidewalks and bike lanes. | \$1,000 | \$1,000 | \$0 |
| Sidewalk Program | SC-P09 | Install and maintain sidewalks and access ramps. | \$20,660 | \$5,500 | \$15,160 |
| Soquel Ave at Frederick St Intersection Modifications | SC 42 | Widen to improve eastbound through-lane transition on Soquel Ave and lengthen right-turn pocket and bicycle lane on Frederick St. Upgrade access ramps. | \$310 | \$310 | \$0 |
| Soquel Ave Corridor Widening (BranciforteMorrissey) | SC-P87 | Minor widening and signal modifications along Soquel Ave corridor from Branciforte to Morrissey Blvd to widen sidewalks, transit improvements, improve pedestrian and bicycle detection and crossings, add a travel lane, maintain some commercial parking and improve existing bike lanes. Replacing the split phasing with protected left-turns at Branciforte to reduce delays for all modes of travel and GHG. | \$2,320 | \$0 | \$2,320 |
| Soquel/Branciforte/Water (San Lorenzo River to Branciforte) Bike Lane Treatments | SC-P123 | Consider bike treatments (such as buffered and/or painted bike lanes, bike boxes, bike signals) to address speed inconsistency and parking conflicts between bicyclists and vehicles. | \$410 | \$410 | \$0 |
| Soquel/Water (Branciforte to Morrissey) Crosswalks | SC-P119 | Evaluate and if found necessary implement additional crosswalks on Soquel/Water with consideration for safety, and update crosswalks to more visible pattern (block). | \$300 | \$150 | \$150 |
| Storey/King Street Intersection Left-Turn Lane | SC-P76 | Remove parking and modify striping for second southbound left turn lane. | \$100 | \$0 | \$100 |
| Swift/Delaware Intersection Roundabout or Traffic Signal | SC-P101 | Install Traffic Signal or Roundabout at Intersection to improve capacity and safety. | \$500 | \$500 | \$0 |


| Project Title | ID | Project Description/Scope | Est total cost | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Water Street Pavement Rehabilitation(N. Branciforte Ave- Ocean St) | SC 49 | Pavement rehabilitation of Water Street between North Branciforte Avenue and Ocean Street. Grant Condition: Add bicycle and pedestrian treatments at intersections, especially at Branciforte to reduce conflicts between motorized and non-motorized users. | \$1,453 | \$1,453 | \$0 |
| West Cliff Path Minor Widening (David Way Lighthouse to Swanton) | SC 23 | Improve existing path. | \$520 | \$520 | \$0 |
| West Cliff/Bay Street Modifications | SC-P83 | Install signal or roundabout to replace the all-way stop to improve safety and capacity. | \$500 | \$500 | \$0 |
|  |  | City of Santa Cruz Total | \$412,346 | \$263,295 | \$149,051 |
| City of Scotts Valley |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bean Creek Rd Sidewalks (SVMS to Blue Bonnet) | SV-P35 | Fill gaps in sidewalks on Bean Creek Rd. | \$410 | \$410 | \$0 |
| Bean Creek Road Realignment | SV-P16 | Realign Bean Creek Road to intersect Scotts Valley Drive farther North to create a four way intersection. | \$2,840 | \$0 | \$2,840 |
| Bike Rest Stops in Scotts Valley | SV-P38 | Bike rest stops (including racks, water) at Camp Evers Park and Skypark. | \$230 | \$0 | \$230 |
| Citywide Access Ramps | SV-P06 | Place handicap ramps at various locations. Avg annual cost: $\$ 8 \mathrm{~K} / \mathrm{yr}$. | \$210 | \$210 | \$0 |
| Citywide Bike Lanes | SV-P41 | Construction of additional bike lanes and paths citywide (including Green Hills). | \$3,100 | \$0 | \$3,100 |
| Citywide General Maintenance and Operations | SV-P27 | Ongoing maintenance, repairs, and operation of road/street system within the City limits. ( $\$ 400 \mathrm{~K} / \mathrm{yr}$ const; $\$ 250 / \mathrm{yr}$ unconst). | \$14,770 | \$13,459 | \$1,311 |
| Citywide Sidewalk Program | SV-P05 | Install sidewalks to fill gaps. Annual Cost \$50k/yr | \$5,170 | \$2,600 | \$2,570 |
| Civic Center Dr Bike Lanes | SV-P33 | Add bike lanes to narrow road. | \$410 | \$0 | \$410 |
| El Pueblo Rd Ext North | SV-P14 | Connect El Pueblo Road via Janis Way to Victor Square, crossing Carbonero Creek. | \$1,240 | \$0 | \$1,240 |
| El Pueblo Rd Extensions | SV-P15 | Connect El Pueblo Road to Disc Drive. | \$410 | \$0 | \$410 |
| El Rancho Dr Bike Lanes | SV-P36 | Add bike lanes on El Rancho within city limits. | \$340 | \$0 | \$340 |
| Emergency Access Granite Creek/Hwy 17 | SV-P24 | Connect Granite Creek Rd to SR 17 via Navarra Drive to Sucinto Drive, for emergency access. | \$570 | \$0 | \$570 |
| Emergency Access SV DR/Upper Willis Dr | SV-P25 | Connect Scotts Valley Drive to Upper Willis Road for emergency access. | \$1,030 | \$0 | \$1,030 |
| Emergency Access Whispering Pines | SV-P26 | Connect Whispering Pines Drive to Manana Woods for emergency access. | \$50 | \$0 | \$50 |
| Emergency Access-Bethany/Glenwood | SV-P23 | Connect Bethany Drive to Glenwood Drive. | \$210 | \$0 | \$210 |
| Emergency Access-Sundridge/Pueblo | SV-P22 | Connect Sunridge Drive to Disc Drive for emergency access. | \$410 | \$0 | \$410 |
| Erba Lane/Terrace View/SV Drive Realignment | SV-P10 | Realign Terrace View to access Scotts Valley Drive via Erba Lane. | \$520 | \$0 | \$520 |
| Glen Canyon Rd Bike Lanes | SV-P29 | Class 2 Bike lanes from Flora Lane to Green Hills. Oak Creek to Flora Ln are already complete. | \$1,030 | \$0 | \$1,030 |


| Project Title | ID | Project Description/Scope | $\begin{gathered} \text { Est total } \\ \text { cost } \end{gathered}$ | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Glen Canyon Rd/Green Hills Rd/S. Navarra Dr Bike Corridor and Roadway Preservation | SV 28 | Repave two roads, add bike lanes (on Green Hills Rd), and signage. Includes road markings like sharrows and green lane treatments to assist commuters, students, and recreational bikers; and bike/walk education and outreach programs (\$14k). | \$993 | \$993 | \$0 |
| Glenwood Drive Rehabilitation and Bicycle Improvement Project | SV 29 | Pavement rehabilitation of Glenwood Dr. (K Street Way to city limits), drainage repair, and widen to add bike lanes. ( 0.58 mi ) | \$865 | \$865 | \$0 |
| Hwy 17/Midtown Interchange | SV-P01 | Construct new SR17 interchange midway between Mt. Hermon Rd and Granite Creek Rd. Will require right-of-way. | \$30,990 | \$0 | \$30,990 |
| Hwy 17/Mt. Hermon Rd Interchange Operations Improvement | SV-P44 | Add lane to SB off-ramp at Hwy 17/Mt. Hermon Rd interchange. | \$1,030 | \$0 | \$1,030 |
| Kings Village Rd/Town Center Entrance Traffic Signal | SV-P52 | Install new traffic signal at the intersection of Kings Village Rd and new Town Center entrance (near transit center) with protected pedestrian crossings and transit signal priority. New Signalization of the intersection on Kings Village Rd at the transit center exit and future Plan street connection would provide a location for protected pedestrian crossings, and would allow transit operators to easily exit the transit center and maintain operating schedules. | \$210 | \$105 | \$105 |
| Kings Village Road/ Bluebonnet Lane Sidewalk | SV 30 | Construct new, fill gaps, and improve accessibility of sidewalks on both sides of King's Village Rd. (Mt. Hermon to Bluebonnet) and south side of Bluebonnet Lon (KV to Bean Creek). Approx. 0.3 mi . Curb ramp upgrades at Mt. Hermon. | \$306 | \$306 | \$0 |
| Lockhart Gulch Rd Bike Lanes | SV-P37 | Add Class 2 bike lanes to narrow, primarily residential street. | \$720 | \$0 | \$720 |
| Lockwood Ln Pedestrian Signal Near Golf Course | SV-P21 | Construct a pedestrian signal at unprotected ped crossing on Lockwood Lane. | \$50 | \$50 | \$0 |
| Lockwoode Lane Sidewalk and Bike Lanes | SV-P40 | Construct Bike Lanes and add sidewalk on the west side from Mt. Hermon to the City limit. | \$520 | \$520 | \$0 |
| Mt Hermon Rd and Scotts Valley Drive Crosswalks | SV-P49 | Increase number of crosswalks on Mt Hermon/Scotts Valley Dr, update crosswalks to block pattern, add pedestrian treatments where necessary at intersections to decrease distance across using refuge islands. Add crosswalks to all sides of intersections (particularly an issue on Scotts Valley Dr). Add HAWK signals to provide a low delay signalized crossing opportunity at select locations. Examples include the Safeway Driveway on Mt. Hermon Rd, at Victor Square/Scotts Valley Dr., and at Tramell Way/Scotts Valley Dr. | \$1,030 | \$515 | \$515 |
| Mt Hermon Rd to El Rancho Drive Bike/Ped Connection | SV-P53 | New bike/ped connection between Mt Hermon Road and El Rancho Drive which could include improved bike/ped facilities on existing interchange or new bike/ped crossing. | \$1,030 | \$1,030 | \$0 |
| Mt Hermon Rd/ Spring Lakes Dr. Pedestrian Intersection Improvements | SV-P54 | Improve pedestrian crossing at Spring Lakes Drive and Mt. Hermon Road. | \$50 | \$50 | \$0 |
| Mt Hermon Road Sidewalk Connections | SV-P30A | Add sidewalks to fill gaps in business district. | \$520 | \$520 | \$0 |
| Mt Hermon, Lockewood, Springs Lake Widening | SV-P13 | Widen, reconstruct and improve portions of roadway and intersection. | \$4,130 | \$0 | \$4,130 |
| Mt Hermon/King's Village Rd-Transit Signal priority | SV-P46 | Transit signal priority at Kings Village Rd/Mt Hermon Rd. | \$80 | \$80 | \$0 |
| Mt Hermon/Scotts Valley - Transit Queue Jump | SV-P47 | Evaluate and if found to be beneficial, remove right turn islands at Mt Hermon Rd/Scotts Valley Road to add transit queue jump lanes/signals. | \$620 | \$620 | \$0 |
| Mt. Hermon Rd Circulation Master Plan | SV-P09 | Provides various circulation and access improvements to the Mount Herman corridor. | \$3,620 | \$0 | \$3,620 |


| Project Title | ID | Project Description/Scope | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Est total } \\ & \text { cost } \end{aligned}$ | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mt. Hermon Road/Town Center Entrance Traffic Signal | SV-P51 | Install new traffic signal at the intersection of the future Town Center road that will accommodate increased pedestrian travel. Add a right-turn lane on the westbound approach. New signalization of the intersection at the future Town Center's primary access point on Mt. Hermon Road would provide protected pedestrian crossing, ADA accessible curb ramps and detectable surfaces on all intersection corners. Permitted left-turn phasing shall be used for the northbound and southbound approaches, while protected left-turn phasing shall be provided on the eastbound and westbound Mt. Hermon Road approaches. | \$260 | \$130 | \$130 |
| N. Navarra Dr-Sucinto Dr Bike Lanes | SV-P34 | Add bike lanes to developing area behind commercial. | \$620 | \$0 | \$620 |
| Neighborhood Traffic Calming | SV-P28 | Citywide traffic calming devices. | \$770 | \$770 | \$0 |
| Scotts Valley Town Center Bicycle/Pedestrian Facilities | SV-P45 | Bicycle and pedestrian facilities and circulation elements within planned development. | \$4,130 | \$4,130 | \$0 |
| Scotts Valley-wide - Greenway Signage | SV-P48 | Add signage for neighborhood greenways. | \$20 | \$0 | \$20 |
| Sky Park Commercial Area Circulation | SV-P11 | Construct infrastructure improvement for Skypark commercial area. | \$2,070 | \$0 | \$2,070 |
| Synchronize Traffic Signals along Mt. Hermon Road | SV-P42 | Re-time to coordinate traffic signals along Mt. Hermon Road. | \$100 | \$100 | \$0 |
|  |  | City of Scotts Valley Total | \$87,684 | \$27,463 | \$60,221 |
| City of Watsonville |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2nd/Maple Ave (Lincoln to Walker) Traffic Calming and Greenway | WAT-P49 | Evaluate and if found necessary, add traffic calming/bicycle traffic priority with wayfinding signage to provide access to MBSST and create low stress grid around downtown. | \$25 | \$25 | \$0 |
| 5th St (Lincoln to Walker) - Traffic Calming and Greenway | WAT-P50 | Evaluate and if found necessary, add traffic calming/bicycle traffic priority with wayfinding signage to provide access to MBSST and create low stress grid around downtown. | \$25 | \$25 | \$0 |
| Airport Blvd Improvements (Freedom Blvd to City Limits) | WAT 38 | Road widening to accommodate extension of bicycle lane and portion of travel lane, installation of bus pull out, new sidewalks and curb ramps, refuge island, rectangular flashing beacon, striping, and roadway rehab. | \$1,346 | \$1,346 | \$0 |
| Airport Blvd Modifications (Hanger Way to Ross Ave) | WAT-P34 | Reconstruct or repave roadway and bike lanes; repair, replace and install curb, gutter, sidewalk and curb ramps; replace and upgrade signage and striping. | \$600 | \$0 | \$600 |
| Airport Boulevard Improvements: Westgate/Larkin to Hanger Way | WAT 40 | Reconstruct roadway, install new sidewalk, upgrade curb ramps and driveway crossings, install median islands, modify traffic signals to include add'l ped crossing and install rectangular rapid flashing beacon at crosswalk. | \$1,645 | \$1,645 | \$0 |
| Alley Improvements | WAT-P36 | Repair \& reconstruct some alleys. | \$60 | \$60 | \$0 |
| Bicycle Safety Improvements (Various Locations) | WAT 44 | Improve existing bicycle facilities by installing new striping, markings and signage in place of the existing and installing new green bike lanes at the approaches on various streets. Work will be done at the following locations: Beach St from Lee Rd to Rodriguez St ( 1.42 mi ); Bridge St from Beck St to East Lake Ave ( 1.48 mi ); Green Valley Rd from Harkins Slough Rd to Corralitos Creek Bridge ( 1.92 mi ); Harkins Slough Rd/Walker St from Green Valley Rd to Riverside Dr ( 1.73 mi ); Rodriguez St from Riverside Dr to Main St ( 0.92 mi ). | \$525 | \$375 | \$150 |
| Bridge Maintenance | WAT-P35 | Maintenance of bridges | \$115 | \$115 | \$0 |
| Buena Vista/Calabasas/Freedom Connection | WAT-P30 | Construction of roadway connection from Buena Vista area to Freedom Blvd. Reconstruct Via Nicola. | \$5,950 | \$0 | \$5,950 |


| Project Title | ID | Project Description/Scope | Est total cost | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Citywide General Maintenance and Operations | WAT-P06 | Ongoing maintenance, repair, and operation of road/street system, including bicycle and pedestrian facilities. (Total Need $=\$ 2,600 /$ year, constr=\$1500/yr) | \$65,350 | \$41,400 | \$23,950 |
| Citywide Pedestrian Facilities | WAT-P15 | Construct sidewalks and curb ramps where necessary. This work is usually combined with the annual road rehabilitation and maintenance projects. Avg annual cost: $\$ 100 / \mathrm{yr}$. | \$2,380 | \$0 | \$2,380 |
| Citywide Transportation Projects | WAT-P24 | Lump sum of transportation projects to be identified in the future. Including major rehabilitation and operational improvements ( $\$ 1.2 \mathrm{M} / \mathrm{yr}$ ). | \$28,510 | \$0 | \$28,510 |
| Crestview/Wagner Extension | WAT-P29 | Construction of roadway connection from Atkinson Lane area to SR 152. Reconstruct/widen Wagner St. | \$4,750 | \$0 | \$4,750 |
| Downtown Watsonville Universal Streets | WAT-P59 | Evaluate and if feasible, implement universal streets, which are designed for pedestrians and restrict vehicular access, which facilitate new ped access. | \$600 | \$600 | \$0 |
| East Fifth St (Main St to Lincoln St) | WAT-P39 | Repair, replace and install curb, gutter, sidewalk and curb ramps; replace and upgrade signage and striping. | \$300 | \$0 | \$300 |
| East Lake Ave-(Hwy 152) Widening (Martinelli St-Holohan Rd) | CT-P33 | Widen East Lake Ave. (SR 152) from 2 to 4 lanes (Martinelli St-Holohan Rd). | \$1,030 | \$0 | \$1,030 |
| East Lake/Madison - ped crossing | WAT-P57 | Evaluate and if feasible, add pedestrian crossing (HAWK signal if ped volume warrants) at E Lake \& Madison for better access to Hall Middle School. | \$300 | \$300 | \$0 |
| Freedom Blvd (Davis Ave to Green Valley Rd) | WAT-P68 | Repair, reconstruct and/or upgrade pavement, bike lanes, sidewalks, transit facilities, signage and striping | \$1,730 | \$1,730 | \$0 |
| Freedom Blvd (Green Valley Rd to Buena Vista Dr) | WAT-P72 | Repair and resurface damaged roadway and bike lanes, replace damaged sidewalks, add pedestrian facilities where none exist. | \$5,000 | \$5,000 | \$0 |
| Freedom Blvd (Green Valley Rd to Davis) Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements | WAT-P61 | Evaluate and if feasible, install bike treatments (such as buffered and/or painted bike lanes, bike boxes, bike signals) to address speed inconsistency between bicyclists and vehicles. Complete sidewalks, including pedestrian buffer, and pedestrian islands at crossings. | \$300 | \$300 | \$0 |
| Freedom Blvd Pedestrian Crossings (Airport to Lincoln) | WAT-P62 | Evaluate and if feasible, install new and improve existing uncontrolled pedestrian crossings at Roach Road, Davis Avenue, Clifford Lane, Mariposa Avenue, Alta Vista Street, Crestview Drive, Martinelli Street and Marin Street). | \$600 | \$600 | \$0 |
| Freedom Blvd Reconstruction (Alta Vista to Green Valley) | WAT 45 | Remove and replace non-ADA compliant driveways and curb ramps, install high visibility crosswalks, provide sharrows and bicycle signage, upgrade existing bus stop shelter, install new traffic signal at Sydney Ave with pedestrian signal heads, pedestrian actuated traffic signals, audible countdown, pedestrian-level lighting and illumination at crosswalks and reconstruct roadway. | \$3,250 | \$2,000 | \$1,250 |
| Freedom Blvd Undergrounding | WAT-P38 | Underground existing overhead utilities. | \$1,270 | \$1,270 | \$0 |
| Freedom Blvd/Green Valley Rd Neighborhood Bike/Ped Connections | WAT-P64 | Evaluate and if feasible, implement greenway, which gives priority to bicycles and pedestrians on low volume, low speed streets including, pedestrian facilities, way finding and pavement markings, bicycle treatments to connect neighborhoods to goods and services on Freedom Blvd. | \$1,800 | \$0 | \$1,800 |
| Freedom Boulevard Plan Line | WAT 43 | Preparation of a plan line for Freedom Boulevard between Green Valley Road and Buena Vista Drive that delineates multimodal modifications supported by the community. | \$160 | \$160 | \$0 |
| Green Valley Rd Improvement (Freedom Blvd to City Limit) | WAT-P45 | Reconstruct existing roadway, install a median island to encourage safer turning movements, remove and replace existing driveways and curb ramps that do not comply with existing accessibility standards, restripe roadway to provide striping for bike lanes where none exist. | \$2,000 | \$0 | \$2,000 |


| Project Title | ID | Project Description/Scope | Est total cost | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Green Valley Road Reconstruction (Struve Slough-Freedom Blvd) | WAT 42 | Reconstruct existing roadway and bikelanes, remove existing asphalt pedestrian path and replace with concrete curb, gutter and sidewalk, remove and replace non-ADA compliant curb ramps and driveways, remove and replace existing signage, striping and loop detectors for traffic signal detectors. Increase sidewalk width consistent with the Complete Streets Guidebook. City may have to reduce existing roadway lane widths in order to provide wider sidewalks; may repave instead of reconstruct roadway or reduce limits of reconstruction based on allocated funds. | \$1,598 | \$1,598 | \$0 |
| Harkins Slough Rd (Hwy 1 to Green Valley Rd) | WAT-P69 | Repair, reconstruct and/or upgrade pavement, bike lanes, sidewalks, transit facilities, signage and striping | \$1,150 | \$0 | \$1,150 |
| Hillside Ave to Freedom Blvd Ped/Bike Connection | WAT-P60 | Evaluate and if feasible, install new bike/ped connection from Carey Avenue to Freedom Boulevard between Roache Road and Green Valley Road to connect neighborhood to goods, services and transit on Freedom Boulevard. Include new crossing from new bicycle/pedestrian facility to east side of Freedom Boulevard. | \$360 | \$0 | \$360 |
| Kearney/Rodriguez - Ped Crossing | WAT-P53 | Evaluate and if found necessary, add pedestrian crossing at Kearney and Rodriguez with traffic calming for access to Radcliffe Elementary. | \$35 | \$35 | \$0 |
| Lower Watsonville Slough Trail | WAT-P46 | Install bicycle/pedestrian trail | \$770 | \$770 | \$0 |
| Lump Sum Bicycle Projects | WAT-P19 | Update the City Bicycle Plan and construction of additional routes and paths (250k/yr). | \$5,950 | \$0 | \$5,950 |
| Main St - 3 HAWK Signals | WAT-P54 | Evaluate and if found necessary, add Hawk signals in 3 locations on Main St. | \$890 | \$890 | \$0 |
| Main St (Freedom to Riverside) Ped/Bike Enhancements | WAT-P58 | Evaluate and if feasible improve ped facilities and bike treatments (such as buffered and/or painted bike lanes, bike boxes, bike signals) and bike boxes and bicycle priority at intersections on Main Street intersections. | \$890 | \$890 | \$0 |
| Main St Modifications (500 Block: Fifth St to East Lake Ave) | WAT-P40 | Repair, replace and install curb, gutter, and curb ramps; replace and upgrade signage and striping. Evaluate and if feasible, provide bike treatments (such as buffered and/or painted bike lanes, bike boxes, bike signals), and buffered sidewalk. | \$710 | \$710 | \$0 |
| Main St Modifications (City Limit to Lake Ave) | WAT-P47 | Repave roadway and bike lanes; repair, replace and install curb, gutter, sidewalk and curb ramps: replace and upgrade signage and striping. Evaluate and if feasible, provide bike treatments (such as buffered and/or painted bike lanes, bike boxes, bike signals) and buffered sidewalks. | \$1,670 | \$1,670 | \$0 |
| Main St Modifications (East Lake Ave to Freedom Blvd) | WAT-P73 | Provide complete streets improvements including but not limited to pedestrian crossings, bicycle facilities, bus stops, parking, sidewalks and traffic management | \$1,000 | \$1,000 | \$0 |
| Main St. (Hwy 152)/Freedom Blvd Roundabout | WAT 27a | Installation of a roundabout to replace the currently signalized intersection with safety considerations for bike/ped. Caltrans Project ID - 05-0T150. | \$1,500 | \$1,500 | \$0 |
| Main St/Beach St/Lake Ave Bike Facilities | CT-P38 | Bicycle facilities - Main St (GV Rd to Mont Co line), Beach St (Walker to Lincoln) and Lake Ave (Main St to fairgrounds). County/City Project - Cost unknown. | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Main/Rodriguez/Union/Brennan (Freedom to Riverside) - Crosswalks | WAT-P55 | Evaluate and if found necessary, increase the number of crosswalks on Main St, Rodriguez, and Union/Brennan to aim for 300 ft distance between crossings. Update pattern of crosswalks to block pattern. | \$115 | \$115 | \$0 |
| MBSST (Coastal Rail Trail): Lee Road, 4000 feet east to City Slough Trail connection | TRL 18L | Construction of 4000-foot long pathway parallel to the railroad tracks: twelve-foot width asphalt (hma). A 500 ft long retaining wall up to 3 ft tall with fence near Lee Road. A drainage structure east of Ohlone Parkway to be modified.Connection to Lee Road shall require installation of pathway or sidewalk to link to the existing sidewalk. At grade crossing at Ohlone Parkway and at a spur line located between Lee Road and Highway 1. | \$1,540 | \$1,540 | \$0 |


| Project Title | ID | Project Description/Scope | Est total cost | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MBSST Rail Trail: Walker Street to City Slough Trail connection | TRL 18W | Construction of 2400 ft pedestrian and bicycle path parallel to the existing railroad tracks and within the rail right-of-way. Also includes public outreach and training to improve bicycle and pedestrian safety. | \$860 | \$860 | \$0 |
| Neighborhood Traffic Plan | WAT-P04 | Plan to identify and address concerns regarding speeding, bicycle and pedestrian access and safety, and other neighborhood traffic issues ( $\$ 5 \mathrm{k} / \mathrm{yr}$ ). | \$115 | \$115 | \$0 |
| Neighborhood Traffic Plan Implementation | WAT-P13 | Address concerns about traffic complaints through Education, Enforcement, and Engineering solutions. Install traffic calming devices that do not impede bicyclist access ( $\$ 20 \mathrm{k} / \mathrm{yr}$ ). | \$470 | \$470 | \$0 |
| Ohlone Parkway Improvements - Phase 2 (UPRR to West Beach) | WAT-P31 | Roadway, pedestrian, and bicycle facilities. | \$600 | \$600 | \$0 |
| Pajaro Lane to Freedom Blvd Ped/Bike Connection | WAT-P63 | Evaluate and if feasible, new bike/ped connection from Pajaro Lane to Freedom Blvd to connect neighborhood to goods, services and transit on Freedom Boulevard. Include new crossing from new bicycle/pedestrian facility to west side of Freedom Boulevard. | \$360 | \$0 | \$360 |
| Pajaro Valley High School Connector Trail | WAT-P42 | Install bicycle/pedestrian trail (this trail connects Pajaro Valley High School to Airport Blvd). | \$710 | \$710 | \$0 |
| Pennsylvania Dr (Green Valley Rd to Clifford Ave) | WAT-P70 | Repair, reconstruct and/or upgrade pavement, bike lanes, sidewalks, transit facilities, signage and striping | \$4,600 | \$0 | \$4,600 |
| Riverside (Hwy 129) Bike Facilities | CT-P39 | Bicycle facilities - Lee to Lakeview Road. County/City Project -Cost Unknown. | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Rodriguez St (Main St to Riverside)Buffered Bike Lane | WAT-P51 | Evaluate and if found necessary, improve bike lane striping, add buffered lanes on Rodriguez St to delineate bike lane from vehicle parking and traffic. | \$12 | \$12 | \$0 |
| Union/Brennan (Freedom to Riverside) Sharrows | WAT-P52 | Evaluate and if found necessary, add sharrows to Union/Brennan. | \$12 | \$12 | \$0 |
| Upper Struve Slough Trail | WAT-P65 | Construction of 450 foot long pedestrian/bicycle path along upper Struve Slough from Green Valley Road to Pennsylvania Drive. The trail shall consist of a twelve-foot wide by one foot deep aggregate base section with the center eight feet covered with a chip seal. Additional improvements include installing a 130 -length of modular concrete block retaining wall, reinforcing a 160 -foot length of slough embankment with rock slope protection and installing a 175 -foot long by eight foot wide boardwalk. | \$530 | \$530 | \$0 |
| Upper Watsonville Slough Trail | WAT-P43 | Install bicycle/pedestrian trail. | \$770 | \$770 | \$0 |
| Walker St Modifications (Beach St to Watsonville Slough) | WAT-P48 | Repave roadway and bike lanes; repair, replace and install curb, gutter, sidewalk and curb ramps; replace and upgrade signage and striping | \$3,200 | \$0 | \$3,200 |
| Watsonville Shuttle | WAT-P27 | Year round public transit service. | \$300 | \$0 | \$300 |
| Watsonville-wide HOV priority | WAT-P56 | Evaluate HOV priority at signals and HOV queue bypass. | \$60 | \$60 | \$0 |
| West Beach St (Lee Rd to Ohlone Parkway) | WAT-P66 | Repair, reconstruct and/or upgrade pavement, bike lanes, sidewalks, transit facilities, signage and striping | \$2,900 | \$0 | \$2,900 |
| West Beach St (Ohlone Parkway to Walker St ) | WAT-P67 | Repair, reconstruct and/or upgrade pavement, bike lanes, sidewalks, transit facilities, signage and striping | \$4,600 | \$0 | \$4,600 |
| West Lake Ave Modifications (Main St to Rodriguez St) | WAT-P41 | Repair, replace and install curb, gutter, sidewalk and curb ramps; replace and upgrade signage and striping | \$240 | \$0 | \$240 |
|  |  | City of Watsonville Total | \$168,138 | \$71,808 | \$96,330 |


| Project Title | ID | Project Description/Scope | Est total cost | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Consolidated Transportation |  |  |  |  |  |
| Countywide Specialized Transportation | CTSA-P01 | Non-ADA mandated paratransit and other specialized transportation service for seniors and people with disabilities. Includes medical service rides, Elderday, out-of-county rides, Sr. Meal Site, Taxi Script, and same day rides etc. Current avg annual need $\$ 2.58 \mathrm{M}$. Constrained=\$2M. | \$56,700 | \$46,000 | \$10,700 |
| Lift Line Maintenance/Operations Center | CTSA-P02 | Construct a permanent maintenance center/consolidated operations facility for paratransit program (currently Lift Line). | \$15,500 | \$0 | \$15,500 |
| Medical Specialized Transportation for Veterans | CTSA-P06 | Non-emergency medical transportation for veterans | \$6,500 | \$0 | \$6,500 |
| Medically Fragile Specialized Transportation | CTSA-P04 | Non-emergency transportation service for medically fragile individuals. Includes operations and capital. | \$5,000 | \$0 | \$5,000 |
| Non-ADA Paratransit Service Expansion | CTSA-P03 | Expansion of non-ADA paratransit system to meet needs of growing elderly and disabled populations. May include pre/post natal transport to medical appointments. | \$21,700 | \$0 | \$21,700 |
|  |  | Consolidated Transportation Total | \$105,400 | \$46,000 | \$59,400 |
| County Health Services Agency |  |  |  |  |  |
| Santa Cruz County Health Service Agency Traffic Safety Education | CO 50 | Ongoing education program to decrease the risk and severity of collisions. Includes bicycle and pedestrian programs: Community Traffic Safety Coalition, South County coalition, and Ride n' Stride Bicycle/Pedestrian Education Program. | \$6,500 | \$2,200 | \$4,300 |
|  |  | County Health Services Agency Total | \$6,500 | \$2,200 | \$4,300 |
| County of Santa Cruz |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26th Ave Improvements (entire lengthPortola Dr to end) | CO-P31a | Roadway and roadside improvements on various Major Collectors including sidewalks, bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. | \$2,580 | \$0 | \$2,580 |
| 26th to 30th (at Lode/Quartz) Bike/Ped Connection | CO-P78 | New bike/ped connection from Lode and Quartz to Moran Trail, which connects to 30th. | \$520 | \$0 | \$520 |
| 37th/38th Ave (Brommer to Eastcliff) Multimodal Circulation Improvements and Greenway | CO-P27a | Evaluate and if feasible improve vehicle and transit access on 38th Avenue from East Cliff to Brommer and develop greenway on 37th Avenue from East Cliff to Portola. Roadway improvements may include roadway and roadside improvements including sidewalks, bike treatments (such as buffered and/or painted bike lanes, bike boxes, bike signals), transit turnouts, left turn pockets, and intersection improvement. | \$2,070 | \$570 | \$1,500 |
| 41st Ave Improvements Phase 2 (Hwy 1 Interchange to Soquel Dr) | CO-P26a | Roadway and roadside improvements including bike lanes, sidewalks, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. | \$1,240 | \$340 | \$900 |
| Airport Blvd Improvements (City limits to Green Valley Rd) | CO-P02 | Major rehab, addition of bike lanes, transit facilities, merge lanes, intersection improvements, sidewalks, drainage, and landscaping. | \$1,240 | \$1,240 | \$0 |
| Alba Rd Improvements (Empire Grade to State Hwy 9) | CO-P30b | Roadwork includes major rehabilitation and maintenance of the road and roadsides. | \$1,760 | \$0 | \$1,760 |
| Amesti Road Multimodal Improvements (Green Valley to Brown Valley Rd) | CO-P03 | Roadway rehab and reconstruction, left turn pockets at Green Valley Road, Pioneer Road/Varni Road. Add bike lanes, transit turnouts, sidewalks, merge lanes, landscaping, and intersection improvements. | \$6,200 | \$600 | \$5,600 |
| Aptos Beach Dr Improvements (Esplanade to Rio Del Mar Blvd) | CO-P27b | Roadway and roadside improvements on various Major Collectors including bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvement. | \$1,240 | \$0 | \$1,240 |


| Project Title | ID | Project Description/Scope | Est total cost | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aptos Village Plan Improvements | CO 64 | Modifications for ped, bike, bus and auto traffic. Add pedestrian facilities and drainage infrastructure on both sides of Soquel Dr; improve bike lanes; new bike parking; new bus pullout and shelter on north side. Trout Gulch: Replace sidewalks with standard sidewalks on east side, ADA upgrades to west side sidewalks. Install traffic signals at Soquel Dr/Aptos Creek Rd (CO 64c) \& Soquel/Trout Gulch. Left turn lanes on Soquel at new street - Parade St and at Aptos Creek Road. RR crossing modifications - new crossing arms, concrete panels for vehicle and pedestrian crossings. New RR xing at Parade St. Phase 1: Trout Gulch Rd improvements w/traffic signal and upgraded RR xg at Soquel Dr. Pavement overlay of Soquel Dr (Spreckels to Trout Gulch) and a portion of Aptos Creek Road. | \$4,100 | \$4,100 | \$0 |
| Beach Road Improvements (City limits to Pajaro Dunes) | CO-P26b | Roadway and roadside improvements including bike lanes, sidewalks, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. | \$1,240 | \$340 | \$900 |
| Bean Creek Rd Improvements (Scotts Valley City Limits to Glenwood Dr) | CO-P28a | Roadway and roadside improvements on various Minor Arterials including addition of bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. Roadwork includes major rehabilitation and maintenance of the road. | \$1,760 | \$485 | \$1,275 |
| Bear Creek Road Improvements (Hwy 9 to Hwy 35) | CO-P04 | Major rehab, add bike lanes, turnouts, merge lanes, and intersection improvements. Some landscaping and drainage improvements also. | \$4,750 | \$250 | \$4,500 |
| Bonita Dr Improvements (entire length) | CO-P29b | Improvements of roadways and roadsides on various Minor Collectors including addition of bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. Roadwork includes major rehabilitation and maintenance of the road. | \$1,240 | \$0 | \$1,240 |
| Bonny Doon Rd Improvements (Hwy 1 to Pine Flats Rd) | CO-P43 | Construction of a Class 1 bike lane facility, addition of transit stops, intersection improvements, major road rehabilitation, road maintenance, and drainage improvements. | \$8,260 | \$0 | \$8,260 |
| Bowker Rd Improvements (entire lengthBuena Vista Dr to Freedom Blvd) | CO-P33a | Roadway and roadside improvements on various Minor Collectors including addition of bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. Roadwork includes major rehabilitation and maintenance of the road. | \$620 | \$0 | \$620 |
| Branciforte Dr Improvements (City of Santa Cruz to Vine Hill Rd) | CO-P30c | Improvements of roadways and roadsides on various Major Arterials including addition of bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. Roadwork includes major rehabilitation and maintenance of the road and roadsides. | \$1,760 | \$0 | \$1,760 |
| Branciforte Drive Chip Seal Project (Granite Creek Rd to SC city limits - 1.91mi) | CO 82 | Roadway rehabilitation: Digouts, Rubberized Chip Seal, and restriping of a portion of Branciforte Drive | \$433 | \$433 | \$0 |
| Branciforte Drive Road Recycle \& Overlay (PM 2.4 to Granite Ck Rd) | CO 79 | Pavement recycling, asphalt overlay, and restriping of 0.62 miles of Branciforte Drive from Granite Creek to PM 2.4 ( 0.62 mil). To be constructed with CO 81 (Granite Creek). | \$431 | \$431 | \$0 |
| Brown Valley Rd Improvements (Corralitos Rd to Redwood Rd) | CO-P26d | Roadway and roadside improvements including bike lanes, sidewalks, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. | \$1,240 | \$340 | \$900 |
| Buena Vista Rd Improvements (San Andreas to Freedom Blvd) | CO-P26e | Roadway and roadside improvements including bike lanes, sidewalks, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. | \$3,000 | \$825 | \$2,175 |
| Bulb Ave Road Improvements (Garden St to Capitola City Limits) | CO-P65 | Roadway and roadside improvements including curb, gutter, sidewalk, bike lanes, left turn lanes, intersection improvements and roadway rehabilitation. | \$770 | \$0 | \$770 |
| Cabrillo College Dr Improvements (Park Ave to Twin Lakes Church) | CO-P30d | Improvements of roadways and roadsides on various Major Arterials including addition of bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. Roadwork includes major rehabilitation and maintenance of the road and roadsides. | \$1,240 | \$240 | \$1,000 |
| Capital improvement projects consistent with the Sustainable Santa Cruz County Plan | CO-P96 | Construct associated multi-modal infrastructure improvements associated with the Sustainable Santa Cruz County Plan | \$22,000 | \$11,000 | \$11,000 |


| Project Title | ID | Project Description/Scope | $\begin{gathered} \text { Est total } \\ \text { cost } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Capitola Rd Ext Improvements (Capitola Rd to Soquel Ave) | CO-P31b | Roadway and roadside improvements on various Major Collectors including bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. | \$1,240 | \$0 | \$1,240 |
| Carol Way/Lompico Creek Bridge Replacement | CO-P49 | Replace existing single span-two lane bridge construction of steel girders and long deck with new 30 ft wide single span flat sale concrete bridge. Include (2) 11 ft lanes and (2) 4 ft shoulders. | \$1,240 | \$0 | \$1,240 |
| Casserly Rd Improvements (Hwy 152 to Green Valley Rd) | CO-P26g | Roadway and roadside improvements including bike lanes, sidewalks, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. | \$770 | \$208 | \$562 |
| Cathedral Dr Improvements (entire length) | CO-P33b | Roadway and roadside improvements on Minor Collector. Roadwork includes major rehabilitation and maintenance of the road. | \$620 | \$0 | \$620 |
| Center Ave/Seacliff Dr Improvements (Broadway to Aptos Beach Dr) | CO-P26h | Roadway and roadside improvements including bike lanes, sidewalks, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. | \$1,240 | \$340 | \$900 |
| Chanticleer Ave Improvements (Hwy 1 to Soquel Dr) | CO-P26i | Roadway and roadside improvements including bike lanes, sidewalks, drainage and intersection improvements. | \$1,240 | \$340 | \$900 |
| Cliff Dr Improvements (Rio Del Mar to Railroad Crossing) | CO-P29c | Improvements of roadways and roadsides on various Minor Collectors including addition of bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. Roadwork includes major rehabilitation and maintenance of the road. | \$620 | \$0 | \$620 |
| Clubhouse Drive Improvements (Sumner Av to Rio Del Mar Blvd) | CO-P32a | Road rehabilitation and maintenance. Roadside improvements: left lane pockets, sidewalks, bike lanes and transit turnouts. | \$1,450 | \$0 | \$1,450 |
| College Road Improvements (Hwy 152 to Lakeview Rd) | CO-P23 | Major road rehab, add left turn pocket at Cutter Drive. Also add bike lanes, transit turnouts, sidewalks, landscaping. Drainage improvements, merge lanes, and intersection improvements may also be needed. | \$1,760 | \$0 | \$1,760 |
| Commercial Way Improvements (Mission Dr. to Soquel Dr.) | CO-P28c | Roadway and roadside improvements on various Minor Arterials including addition of bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. Roadwork includes major rehabilitation and maintenance of the road. | \$620 | \$170 | \$450 |
| Corcoran Ave Improvements (Alice St to Felt St) | CO-P27c | Roadway and roadside improvements on various Major Collectors including bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvement. | \$620 | \$150 | \$470 |
| Corralitos Road Rehab and Improvements (Freedom Blvd to Hames Rd) | CO-P08 | Major rehab, transit, bike, and ped facilities. May also include drainage, merge lanes, landscaping and intersection improvements. | \$620 | \$620 | \$0 |
| County wide guardrail | CO-P97 | Install guardrail on County roads | \$15,000 | \$15,000 | \$0 |
| Countywide ADA Access Ramps | CO-P37 | Construction of handicapped access ramps countywide. | \$1,240 | \$620 | \$620 |
| Countywide Bike Projects | CO-P71 | Bike projects based on needs identified through the Santa Cruz County Bicycle Plan and plan updates. These are in addition to projects listed individually in the RTP. | \$4,130 | \$0 | \$4,130 |
| Countywide General Road Maintenance and Operations | CO-P35 | Ongoing maintenance, repair, and operation of road/street system within the unincorporated areas of the county. | \$495,000 | \$446,857 | \$48,143 |
| Countywide Sidewalks | CO-P41 | Install sidewalks. | \$72,310 | \$7,000 | \$65,310 |
| Day Valley Rd Improvements (entire lengthFreedom Blvd to Valencia Rd) | CO-P31c | Roadway and roadside improvements on various Major Collectors including bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. | \$1,240 | \$0 | \$1,240 |
| East Cliff (26th to Moran Way) Sidewalk Improvement | CO-P77 | Install sidewalk from 26th south to link to Moran Way. | \$410 | \$0 | \$410 |


| Project Title | ID | Project Description/Scope | $\begin{gathered} \text { Est total } \\ \text { cost } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| East Cliff Dr Pedestrian Pathway (7th-12th Ave) | CO-P50 | Construct pedestrian pathway on East Cliff. | \$1,760 | \$1,760 | \$0 |
| East Cliff Drive Cape Seal (12th-17th) | CO 66 | Pavement maintenance, isolated section digout and asphalt replacement and cape seal on entire roadway. | \$230 | \$230 | \$0 |
| East Cliff Drive Improvements (32nd Ave to Harbor) | CO-P09 | Roadway rehab, add left turn pockets at 26th and 30th Ave, fill gaps in bikeways and sidewalks, add transit turnouts, intersection improvements. Some landscaping and drainage improvements. | \$4,750 | \$1,500 | \$3,250 |
| East Zayante Rd Improvements (Lompico Rd to just before Summit Rd) | CO-P26j | Roadway and roadside improvements including bike lanes, sidewalks, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. | \$1,760 | \$485 | \$1,275 |
| Either Way Ln Bridge Replacement Project | CO-P88 | The project will consist of completely replacing the existing narrow one lane structure and roadway approaches with a two lane clear span precast voided concrete slab bridge and standard bridge approaches. | \$2,180 | \$2,180 | \$0 |
| El Dorado Ave Road Improvements (Capitola Rd to RR) | CO-P67 | Roadway and roadside improvements including curb, gutter, buffered sidewalk, bike treatments (such as buffered and/or painted bike lanes, bike boxes, bike signals), left turn lanes, intersection improvements and roadway rehabilitation. | \$1,810 | \$0 | \$1,810 |
| El Rancho Dr Improvements (Mt. Hermon/Hwy 17 to SC city limits) | CO-P26k | Roadway and roadside improvements including bike lanes, sidewalks, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. | \$2,380 | \$655 | \$1,725 |
| Empire Grade Improvements | CO-P10 | Road rehab and maintenance, left turn pocket at Felton Empire Road, add bike lanes, transit facilities, some sidewalks, landscaping. Drainage improvements, merge lanes, and intersection improvements may also be needed. | \$4,750 | \$1,190 | \$3,560 |
| Eureka Canyon Rd Improvements (Hames Rd to Buzzard Lagoon Rd) | CO-P26I | Roadway and roadside improvements including bike lanes, sidewalks, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. | \$2,380 | \$655 | \$1,725 |
| Felton Empire Road Improvements (entire length to State Hwy 9) | CO-P28d | Roadway and roadside improvements on various Minor Arterials including addition of bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. Roadwork includes major rehabilitation and maintenance of the road. | \$2,380 | \$655 | \$1,725 |
| Fern Dr @ San Lorenzo River Bridge Replacement Project | CO-P90 | The project will consist of completely replacing the existing three span single lane structure and roadway approaches with a new two lane clear span reinforced concrete box girder bridge and standard bridge approaches. | \$2,830 | \$2,830 | \$0 |
| Forest Hill Dr @ Bear Creek Bridge Replacement Project | CO-P86 | The Project will consist of completely replacing existing steel girder bridge crossing Bear Creek with a new precast concrete voided slab bridge. | \$2,050 | \$0 | \$2,050 |
| Freedom Blvd Multimodal Improvements (Bonita Dr to City of Watsonville) | CO-P11 | Add bike lanes, sidewalks on some segments, transit turnouts, signalization. Left turn pockets at Bowker, Day Valley, White Rd, and Corralitos Rd. Also includes merge lanes, intersection improvements, landscaping, major rehabilitation and maintenance, drainage improvements. | \$3,100 | \$775 | \$2,325 |
| Freedom Blvd Pavement Preservation (Hwy 1 to Pleasant Vly Rd) | CO 74 | Rehabilitate the roadway surface. | \$1,430 | \$1,430 | \$0 |
| Glen Arbor Rd Improvements (State Hwy 9 to State Hwy 9) | CO-P30f | Improvements of roadways and roadsides on various Major Arterials including addition of bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. Roadwork includes major rehabilitation and maintenance of the road and roadsides. | \$1,240 | \$0 | \$1,240 |
| Glen Arbor Road Recycle, Overlay, \& Chip Seal (SR 9-Quail Hallow) | CO 80 | Pavement recycling, asphalt overlay, chip seal, and restriping 0.52 miles of Glen Arbor Road from Hwy 9 at bridge to Quail Hollow Rd. The project will also include a subdrain at a point where a natural spring is causing subgrade destabilization and repairs rutting damage adjacent to bus stops. | \$467 | \$467 | \$0 |


| Project Title | ID | Project Description/Scope | Est total cost | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Glen Canyon Rd Improvements (Branciforte Dr to City of Scotts Valley) | CO-P26m | Roadway and roadside improvements including bike lanes, sidewalks, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. | \$5,990 | \$1,640 | \$4,350 |
| Glen Coolidge Drive/Hwy 9 Bike Path | CO-P40 | Class 1 bike facility from Glen Coolidge Dr to Hwy 9 to provide eastern access to UCSC. | \$2,380 | \$0 | \$2,380 |
| Glenwood Cutoff General Improvements (Glenwood Dr to Hwy 17) | CO-P61 | Roadway and roadside improvements including bike lanes, left turn lanes, intersection improvements and roadway rehabilitation. | \$3,100 | \$0 | \$3,100 |
| Glenwood Dr. Improvements (Scotts Valley city limits to State Hwy 17) | CO-P26n | Roadway and roadside improvements including bike lanes, sidewalks, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. | \$3,000 | \$825 | \$2,175 |
| Graham Hill Road Multimodal Improvements (City of SC to Hwy 9) | CO-P12 | Bike lanes, sidewalks, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes, traffic signals. Major rehabilitation and maintenance. Drainage improvements. Signal upgrade at SR9. | \$7,020 | \$1,755 | \$5,265 |
| Granite Creek Rd Improvements (Branciforte Dr to City of Scotts Valley) | CO-P30h | Improvements of roadways and roadsides on various Major Arterials including addition of bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. Roadwork includes major rehabilitation and maintenance of the road and roadsides. | \$1,760 | \$0 | \$1,760 |
| Granite Creek Road Recycle \& Overlay - Part of CO 79B | CO 81 | Pavement recycling, asphalt overlay, and restriping of 1.85 miles of Granite Creek Road from Scotts Valley city limits to PM 0.56 . | \$1,100 | \$1,100 | \$0 |
| Green Valley Rd Bridge Replacement Project | CO-P85 | The project will consist of completely replacing the existing two lane structure and roadway approaches with a two lane clear span concrete slab bridge and standard bridge approaches. | \$2,110 | \$2,110 | \$0 |
| Green Valley Rd Pedestrian Safety Project | CO 42b | Build 6-foot wide sidewalk with some curb and gutter on NW side of Green Valley Rd from Airport Blvd to Amesti Rd (1800 ft). | \$390 | \$390 | \$0 |
| Green Valley Road Improvements | CO-P13 | Add two-way left turn lanes from Mesa Verde to Pinto Lake on Green Valley Rd. Also includes some road rehab and maintenance, bike lanes, sidewalks, transit facilities, landscaping, and merge lanes. | \$4,130 | \$1,030 | \$3,100 |
| Hames Rd Improvements (entire lengthFreedom Blvd to Eureka Canyon Rd) | CO-P32b | Road rehab and maint. Roadside improvements--left lane pockets, sidewalks, bike lanes and transit turnouts. | \$3,620 | \$0 | \$3,620 |
| Harkins Slough Rd. Improvements (entire length-Buena Vista Dr to State Hwy 1) | CO-P32c | Road rehab and maint. Roadside improvements--left lane pockets, sidewalks, bike lanes and transit turnouts. | \$1,760 | \$0 | \$1,760 |
| Harper St Improvements (entire length-El Dorado Ave to ECM) | CO-P33d | Roadway and roadside improvements on various Minor Collectors including addition of bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. Roadwork includes major rehabilitation and maintenance of the road. | \$1,240 | \$310 | \$930 |
| Highway 17 To Soquel Corridor Chip Seal Project | CO 83 | Roadway rehabilitation: Digouts, Chip Seal, and restriping of Vine Hill Rd (Hwy 17 to B40), Branciforte Dr (Vine Hill to PM 0.7), Mt. View Rd (B40-N. Rodeo Gulch), N. Rodeo Gulch Rd (Mt. View-PM 1.97), Laurel Rd (N. Rodeo-Soquel San Jose Rd), and Soquel-San Jose Rd. (Laurel Glen to Dawn Lane) - 9.90 mi . | \$1,881 | \$881 | \$1,000 |
| Huntington Dr Improvements (Monroe Ave to Valencia Rd.) | CO-P32d | Road rehab and maint. Roadside improvements--left lane pockets, sidewalks, bike lanes and transit turnouts. | \$2,380 | \$0 | \$2,380 |
| Hwy 152/Holohan - College Intersection | CO 84 | Intersection capacity enhancements and signal modifications, pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements. Add sidewalks and bicycle lanes on Holohan Rd, an additional left-turn lane from Holohan to EB Hwy 152, sidewalk on north side of Hwy 152 from Holohan to Corralitos Creek bridge, adds crosswalks and speed feedback signs. | \$3,150 | \$3,150 | \$0 |
| Jamison Cr Rd Improvements (entire lengthEmpire Grade to Hwy 236) | CO-P32e | Road rehab and maint. Roadside improvements--left lane pockets, sidewalks, bike lanes and transit turnouts. | \$620 | \$0 | \$620 |


| Project Title | ID | Project Description/Scope | Est total cost | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| La Madrona Dr Improvements (El Rancho Dr to City of Scotts Valley) | CO-P14 | Bike lanes, sidewalks, transit turnouts, left turn pockets at Sims Road, Highway 17, and El Rancho Road), merge lanes, and intersection improvements. Also includes major rehabilitation, drainage and maintenance. | \$3,620 | \$905 | \$2,715 |
| Lakeview Road Improvements | CO-P15 | Major road rehab, add left turn pocket at College Road, intersection improvements at Carlton Rd. Also add bike lanes, new transit facilities, landscaping. Drainage improvements, merge lanes, and intersection improvements may also be needed. | \$1,240 | \$0 | \$1,240 |
| Larkin Valley Rd Improvements (San Andreas Rd to Buena Vista Dr) | CO-P30i | Improvements of roadways and roadsides on various Major Arterials including addition of bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. Roadwork includes major rehabilitation and maintenance of the road and roadsides. | \$620 | \$0 | \$620 |
| Larkspur Bridge @San Lorenzo River | CO-P91 | The project will consist of completely replacing the existing narrow one lane structure and roadway approaches with a two lane bridge and standard bridge approaches. | \$3,930 | \$3,930 | \$0 |
| Laurel Glen Rd Improvements (Soquel-San Jose Rd to Mt. View/Rodeo Gulch Rd) | CO-P30j | Improvements of roadways and roadsides on various Major Arterials including addition of bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. Roadwork includes major rehabilitation and maintenance of the road and roadsides. | \$1,240 | \$0 | \$1,240 |
| Ledyard Way Improvements (entire lengthSoquel Dr to Soquel Dr) | CO-P31d | Roadway and roadside improvements on various Major Collectors including bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. | \$620 | \$0 | \$620 |
| Lockhart Gulch Improvements (Scotts Valley City limits to end) | CO-P31e | Roadway and roadside improvements on various Major Collectors including bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. | \$1,240 | \$0 | \$1,240 |
| Lockwood Lane Improvements (Graham Hill Rd to SV limits) | CO-P24 | Major road rehab, add bicycle lanes, sidewalks, some transit facilities, landscaping, and intersection improvements. | \$881 | \$243 | \$638 |
| Lompico Rd Bridge Replacement | CO-P95 | The project will consist of replacing existing steel stringer bridge with a reinforced concrete slab bridge | \$1,860 | \$0 | \$1,860 |
| Lompico Rd Improvements (E Zayante Rd. to end) | CO-P30k | Improvements of roadways and roadsides on various Major Arterials including addition of bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. Roadwork includes major rehabilitation and maintenance of the road and roadsides. | \$620 | \$0 | \$620 |
| Maciel Ave Improvements (Capitola Rd to Mattison Ln) | CO-P29e | Improvements of roadways and roadsides on various Minor Collectors including addition of bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. Roadwork includes major rehabilitation and maintenance of the road. | \$1,450 | \$400 | \$1,050 |
| Main St Improvements (Porter St to Cherryvale Ave) | CO-P27e | Roadway and roadside improvements on Major Collector including bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvement. | \$1,760 | \$1,760 | \$0 |
| Manfre Rd Improvements (entire lengthLarkin Valley Rd to Buena Vista Dr) | CO-P33e | Roadway and roadside improvements on various Minor Collectors including addition of bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. Roadwork includes major rehabilitation and maintenance of the road. | \$620 | \$0 | \$620 |
| Mar Monte Ave Improvements (San Andreas Rd to State Hwy 1) | CO-P301 | Improvements of roadways and roadsides on various Major Arterials including addition of bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. Roadwork includes major rehabilitation and maintenance of the road and roadsides. | \$620 | \$0 | \$620 |
| Mar Vista Dr Improvements (entire lengthjust before Seacliff Dr to Soquel Dr) | CO-P33f | Roadway and roadside improvements on various Minor Collectors including addition of bike lanes, buffered sidewalks, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. Roadwork includes major rehabilitation and maintenance of the road. | \$300 | \$0 | \$300 |
| Mattison Ln Improvements (Chanticleer Ave to Soquel Ave) | CO-P26p | Roadway and roadside improvements including bike lanes, sidewalks, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. | \$1,450 | \$400 | \$1,050 |


| Project Title | ID | Project Description/Scope | Est total cost | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| McGregor Dr Improvements (Capitola city limits to Searidge Rd) | CO-P33g | Roadway and roadside improvements on various Minor Collectors including addition of bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. Roadwork includes major rehabilitation and maintenance of the road. | \$1,240 | \$0 | \$1,240 |
| Mesa Dr Improvements (Vienna Drive to Ledyard Way) | CO-P31f | Roadway and roadside improvements on various Major Collectors including bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. | \$1,240 | \$0 | \$1,240 |
| Mill St Improvements (entire length) | CO-P27f | Roadway and roadside improvements on various Major Collectors including bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvement. | \$360 | \$360 | \$0 |
| Mountain View Rd Improvements (Branciforte Dr to Rodeo Gulch Rd) | CO-P27g | Roadway and roadside improvements on various Major Collectors including bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvement. | \$1,240 | \$0 | \$1,240 |
| Mt. Hermon Rd. Improvements (Lockhart Gulch to Graham Hill Rd) | CO-P26q | Roadway and roadside improvements including bike lanes, sidewalks, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. | \$3,000 | \$825 | \$2,175 |
| Murphy Crossing Improvements | CO-P39 | Bikeway on Murphy Crossing (Hwy 129 to Monterey Co line), major rehabilitation and maintenance of road, drainage improvements may also be needed. | \$1,240 | \$0 | \$1,240 |
| Opal Cliff Dr Improvements (41st Av to Capitola City Limits) | CO-P31g | Roadway, roadside and intersection improvements including sidewalks, bike treatments (such as buffered and/or painted bike lanes), designed to accommodate the number of users and link to East Cliff Drive. | \$1,240 | \$290 | \$950 |
| Pajaro River Bike Path System | CO-P38 | Construction of a Class 1 bike path along the levees and a Class 2 bikeway on Thurwatcher Road and Beach Road. | \$9,500 | \$2,500 | \$7,000 |
| Paul Minnie Ave. Improvements (Rodriguez St to Soquel Ave) | CO-P29f | Improvements of roadways and roadsides on various Minor Collectors including addition of bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. <br> Roadwork includes major rehabilitation and maintenance of the road. | \$1,240 | \$340 | \$900 |
| Paul Sweet Road Improvements (Soquel Dr to end) | CO-P22 | Major road rehab and maintenance. Also adds bike lanes, sidewalks, landscaping. Drainage improvements, merge lanes, and intersection improvements, and new transit facilities may also be needed. | \$1,240 | \$310 | \$930 |
| Paulsen Rd Improvements (Green Valley Rd to Whiting Rd) | CO-P27h | Roadway and roadside improvements on various Major Collectors including bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvement. | \$1,240 | \$240 | \$1,000 |
| Pine Flat Rd Improvements (Bonny Doon Rd to Empire Grade Rd) | CO-P28f | Roadway and roadside improvements on various Minor Arterials including addition of bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. Roadwork includes major rehabilitation and maintenance of the road. | \$2,380 | \$655 | \$1,725 |
| Pinehurst Dr Improvements (entire length) | CO-P27i | Roadway and roadside improvements on various Major Collectors including bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvement. | \$880 | \$180 | \$700 |
| Pioneer Rd Improvements (Amesti Rd to Green Valley Rd) | CO-P31h | Roadway and roadside improvements on various Major Collectors including bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. | \$880 | \$0 | \$880 |
| Polo Dr Improvements (Soquel Dr to end) | CO-P29g | Improvements of roadways and roadsides on various Minor Collectors including addition of bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. Roadwork includes major rehabilitation and maintenance of the road. | \$1,450 | \$0 | \$1,450 |
| Porter St Improvements (Soquel Dr to Paper Mill Rd) | CO-P26r | Roadway and roadside improvements including buffered sidewalks and bicycle treatments (such as buffered and/or painted bike lanes, bike boxes, bike signals) to address speed inconsistency between bicyclists and vehicles, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. | \$1,240 | \$340 | \$900 |
| Quail Hollow Rd Bridge Replacement Project | CO-P82 | The project will consist of completely replacing the existing two lane structure and roadway approaches with a two lane clear span concrete bridge and standard bridge approaches. | \$2,430 | \$0 | \$2,430 |


| Project Title | ID | Project Description/Scope | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Est total } \\ & \text { cost } \end{aligned}$ | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Quail Hollow Rd Improvements (entire length- East Zayante to Glen Arbor Rd) | CO-P32f | Road rehab and maint. Roadside improvements--left lane pockets, sidewalks, bike lanes and transit turnouts. | \$830 | \$0 | \$830 |
| Rancho Rio Ave @ Newell Creek Bridge Replacement Project | CO-P87 | The project will consist of completely replacing the existing one lane structure and roadway approaches with a two lane clear span concrete slab bridge and standard bridge approaches. | \$1,730 | \$0 | \$1,730 |
| Redwood Lodge Rd (Entire Length) | CO-P51 | Roadway and roadside improvements including curb, gutter, sidewalk, bike lanes, left turn lanes, intersection improvements and roadway rehabilitation. | \$3,100 | \$0 | \$3,100 |
| Redwood Rd Bridge Replacement Project | CO-P89 | The project will consist of completely replacing the existing steel army tread way bridge crossing a tributary of Brown's Creek on Redwood Road with a reinforced concrete slab bridge and standard bridge approaches. | \$1,310 | \$1,310 | \$0 |
| Rio Del Mar Blvd Improvements (Esplanade to Soquel Dr) | CO-P30n | Improvements of roadways and roadsides on various Major Arterials including addition of bike lanes, sidewalks, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. Roadwork includes major rehabilitation and maintenance of the road and roadsides. | \$3,000 | \$725 | \$2,275 |
| Rodeo Gulch Rd Improvements (So \& North: Mt. View/Laurel Glen Rd to Hwy 1) | CO-P31i | Roadway and roadside improvements on various Major Collectors including bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. | \$1,760 | \$0 | \$1,760 |
| Roland Dr Improvements (30th to 35th) | CO-P31j | Roadway and roadside improvements and implementation of greenway, which gives priority to bicycles and pedestrians on low volume, low speed streets including, pedestrian facilities, way finding and pavement markings, bicycle treatments to connect to new bike/ped connection to 41st. | \$880 | \$0 | \$880 |
| San Lorenzo River Valley Trail | CO-P46 | 15 mile, paved multi-use path for bicyclists and pedestrians from Boulder Creek to Santa Cruz. | \$25,830 | \$0 | \$25,830 |
| San Lorenzo Valley Trail: Hwy 9 - Downtown Felton Bike Lanes \& Sidewalks | CO-P46a | Install sidewalks and bicycle lanes on Hwy 9 through downtown Felton. | \$2,270 | \$2,270 | \$0 |
| San Lorenzo Valley Trail: Hwy 9 - North Felton Bike Lanes \& Sidewalks | CO-P46b | Install sidewalk/pedestrian path on west side, shoulder widening to $5^{\prime}$ for bicycle lanes from Felton-Empire/Graham Hill Rd to Glen Arbor Road, Ben Lomond, including frontage of SLV elementary, middle and high schools. Includes new and replacement bike/ped bridges. | \$7,640 | \$7,640 | \$0 |
| San Lorenzo Way Bridge Replacement Project | CO-P83 | The project will consist of completely replacing the existing one lane structure and roadway approaches with a two lane clear span bridge and standard bridge approaches. | \$3,190 | \$3,190 | \$0 |
| Scotts Valley Area Routes Chip Seal Project | CO 85 | Roadway rehabilitation: Digouts, Chip Seal, and restriping Mt. Hermon Rd ( PM 1.31 to SV city limits), Lockewood Ln (GH-SV city limits), and Graham Hill Rd (Sims to Lockewood) - 2.76 mi | \$940 | \$940 | \$0 |
| Seacliff Dr Improvements (entire length) | CO-P27j | Roadway and roadside improvements on various Major Collectors including bike lanes, sidewalks, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvement. | \$1,760 | \$0 | \$1,760 |
| Seacliff Village/State Park Drive Improvements | CO 36 | Construct sidewalks, bike lanes, bus turnouts/stops, central plaza, street lighting, EV charging station, parking, landscaping, drainage and roadway overlay in Seacliff core area- consistent with the Seacliff Village Plan adopted by the BOS in 2003. | \$3,400 | \$3,400 | \$0 |
| Seascape Blvd Improvements (Sumner Ave to San Andreas Rd) | CO-P26s | Roadway improvements and pavement rehabilitation. | \$620 | \$170 | \$450 |
| Sims Road Improvements (Graham Hill Rd to La Madrona Dr) | CO-P17 | Road rehab and maintenance, drainage, intersection improvements, landscaping, add bike, ped, and transit facilities. | \$1,760 | \$440 | \$1,320 |
| Smith Grade Improvements (entire lengthEmpire Grade to Bonny Doon Rd) | CO-P32g | Road rehab and maint. Roadside improvements--left lane pockets, sidewalks, bike lanes and transit turnouts. | \$2,380 | \$0 | \$2,380 |


| Project Title | ID | Project Description/Scope | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Est total } \\ & \text { cost } \end{aligned}$ | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Soquel Ave Improvements (City of SC to Gross Rd) | CO-P18 | Transit turnouts, two way left turn lanes from Chanticleer to Mattison, merge lanes, signalization and intersection improvements. Signals at Chanticleer and Gross Rd. Roadwork: major rehabilitation and maintenance, perhaps drainage improvements. Roadside: sidewalks, landscaping, and new transit facilities. | \$3,310 | \$3,310 | \$0 |
| Soquel Dr Improvements (Soquel Ave to Freedom Blvd) | CO-P19 | Major rehab, merge lanes, intersections improvements, signal coordination, transit turnouts, fill sidewalk and bike facility gaps, some landscaping. | \$7,540 | \$1,885 | \$5,655 |
| Soquel Dr Road Improvements (Robertson St to Daubenbiss) | CO-P62 | Roadway and roadside improvements including curb, gutter, sidewalk, bike treatments (such as buffered and/or painted bike lanes, bike boxes, bike signals), left turn lanes, intersection improvements and roadway rehabilitation. | \$410 | \$410 | \$0 |
| Soquel Dr Traffic Signal and Left Turn Lane (Robertson St) | CO-P58 | Install left turn lane at signalized intersection from Soquel Dr to Robertson St and associated roadside improvements | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$1,000 |
| Soquel-San Jose Rd Improvements (Paper Mill Rd to Summit Rd) | CO-P36 | Roadway and roadside improvements including bike lanes, sidewalks, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. | \$2,580 | \$580 | \$2,000 |
| Soquel-Wharf Rd Improvements (Robertson St to Porter St) | CO-P28g | Roadway and roadside improvements on various Minor Arterials including addition of bike treatments (such as buffered and/or painted bike lanes, bike boxes, bike signals), transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. Roadwork includes major rehabilitation and maintenance of the road. | \$1,030 | \$515 | \$515 |
| Spreckels Dr Improvements (Soquel Dr to Aptos Beach Dr) | CO-P27k | Roadway and roadside improvements on various Major Collectors including bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvement. | \$1,240 | \$340 | \$900 |
| Spreckels Dr/Treasure Island Dr Improvements | CO-P42 | Addition of bike lanes, intersection improvements, major road rehabilitation, road maintenance, and possible drainage improvements. | \$620 | \$0 | \$620 |
| State Park Drive Improvements Phase 2 | CO-P20 | Transit turnouts, two way left turn, merge lanes, intersection improvements, and fill gaps in bike and ped facilities including pedestrian crossing improvements, bike treatments (such as buffered and/or painted bike lanes, bike boxes, bike signals). Plus, major rehabilitation and maintenance, drainage improvements, landscaping. | \$1,340 | \$335 | \$1,005 |
| Summit Rd Improvements | CO-P26u | Roadway and roadside improvements including bike lanes, sidewalks, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. | \$5,580 | \$1,530 | \$4,050 |
| Sumner Ave Improvements (entire lengthRio Del Mar Blvd to end [just past via Novella]) | CO-P32h | Road rehab and maint. Roadside improvements--left lane pockets, sidewalks, bike lanes and transit turnouts. | \$1,450 | \$0 | \$1,450 |
| Swanton Rd Bridge Replacement | CO-P94 | The project will consist of replacing existing 3 span steel girder bridge with a single span concrete box girder bridge | \$2,540 | \$0 | \$2,540 |
| Thompson Ave Improvements (entire lengthCapitola Rd to end) | CO-P33h | Roadway and roadside improvements including major rehabilitation and maintenance of road and includes implementation of greenway, which gives priority to bicycles and pedestrians on low volume, low speed streets including, pedestrian facilities, way finding and pavement markings, bicycle treatments to connect to MBSST. | \$1,240 | \$0 | \$1,240 |
| Thurber Ln Improvements (entire length) | CO-P28h | Roadway and roadside improvements on various Minor Arterials including addition of bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. Roadwork includes major rehabilitation and maintenance of the road. | \$1,760 | \$485 | \$1,275 |
| Thurwachter Road Bike Lanes | CO-P68 | Install bicycle lanes. | \$50 | \$0 | \$50 |


| Project Title | ID | Project Description/Scope | Est total cost | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Trout Gulch Rd Improvements (Soquel Dr. to end) | CO-P30p | Improvements of roadways and roadsides on various Major Arterials including addition of bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. Roadwork includes major rehabilitation and maintenance of the road and roadsides. | \$3,000 | \$0 | \$3,000 |
| Upper Zayante Rd Improvements | CO-P98 | Roadway and roadside improvements including bike lanes, sidewalks, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. | \$1,500 | \$0 | \$1,500 |
| Valencia Rd Improvements (Trout Gulch Rd to Valencia School Rd) | CO-P32j | Road rehab and maint. Roadside improvements--left lane pockets, sidewalks, bike lanes and transit turnouts. | \$1,760 | \$0 | \$1,760 |
| Varni Rd Improvements (Corralitos Rd to Amesti Rd) | CO-P28i | Roadway and roadside improvements on various Minor Arterials including addition of bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. Roadwork includes major rehabilitation and maintenance of the road. | \$1,240 | \$340 | \$900 |
| Vine Hill Rd Improvements (Branciforte/Mt. View Rd to State Hwy 17) | CO-P30q | Improvements of roadways and roadsides on various Major Arterials including addition of bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. Roadwork includes major rehabilitation and maintenance of the road and roadsides. | \$1,450 | \$0 | \$1,450 |
| Wallace Ave Improvements (entire lengthHuntington Dr to end) | CO-P33i | Roadway and roadside improvements on various Minor Collectors including addition of bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. Roadwork includes major rehabilitation and maintenance of the road. | \$880 | \$0 | \$880 |
| Webster St Improvements (Jose Ave to 16th St ) | CO-P29h | Improvements of roadways and roadsides on various Minor Collectors including addition of bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvements. Roadwork includes major rehabilitation and maintenance of the road. | \$1,240 | \$0 | \$1,240 |
| Winkle Ave Improvements (entire length from Soquel Dr) | CO-P271 | Roadway and roadside improvements on various Major Collectors including bike lanes, transit turnouts, left turn pockets, merge lanes and intersection improvement. | \$2,380 | \$655 | \$1,725 |
| Zayante Road Corridor Chip Seal Project | CO 86 | Roadway rehabilitation: Digouts, Chip Seal, and restriping East Zayante \& Upper E. Zayante from Quail Hallow to SR 35 (up to 9.07 mi ). Project to be scaled to match available funds | \$1,725 | \$1,025 | \$700 |
|  |  | County of Santa Cruz Total | \$915,568 | \$565,675 | \$349,893 |
| Ecology Action |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bike To Work/School Program | RTC 26 | Countywide education, promotion, and incentive program to actively encourage bicycle commuting and biking to school. Coordinates efforts with local businesses, schools, and community organizations to promote bicycling on a regular basis. Provides referrals to community resources. Avg annual cost: $\$ 140 \mathrm{~K} / \mathrm{yr}$-includes in-kind donations and staff time. | \$3,870 | \$1,870 | \$2,000 |
| Ecology Action Countywide SRTS Youth Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Education | EA 02 | EA will serve approximately 120 second grade classrooms with 'feet on the ground' pedestrian safety education and 88 fifth grade classrooms with bike safety education and 'rodeos' serving a total of 44 local schools. | \$8,360 | \$440 | \$7,920 |
| Ecology Action Transportation Employer Membership Program | RTC 17 | Community organization that promotes alternative commute choices. Work with employers, incentives for travelers to get out of SOVs including: emergency ride home, interest-free bike loans, discounted bus passes. Avg cost: $\$ 90 \mathrm{~K} / \mathrm{yr}$. Coordinates with Bike to Work program. | \$2,320 | \$1,135 | \$1,185 |
| Every Day is Bike to Work Day | EA 03 | Pilot bike commuter initiative to increase bike commuting at 6 large employers in Santa Cruz, Live Oak, and Watsonville areas; includes bike commute and safety workshops, online tracking apps/systems, support/encouragement | \$3,360 | \$60 | \$3,300 |


| Project Title | ID | Project Description/Scope | Est total cost | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Monterey Bay Electric Vehicle Alliance (MBEVA) | VAR-P22 | Help facilitate this broad collaboration of PEV advocates, businesses, union labor, manufacturers and public agencies to assist the adoption of PEV's in the Monterey Bay region. MBEVA's main goals are to: - Create PEV infrastructure in this region • Educate the public on the benefits of PEV's • Educate gov't agencies on ways to streamline PEV policy, permitting, and implementation and • Help train workforce for PEV related jobs. | \$900 | \$200 | \$700 |
|  |  | Ecology Action Total | \$18,810 | \$3,705 | \$15,105 |
| SCCRTC |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bicycle Route Signage Countywide | RTC 32 | Define routes, develop and install signs directing bicyclists to preferred routes to various destinations countywide. | \$600 | \$600 | \$0 |
| Bike Parking Subsidy Program | RTC 16 | Subsidies for bicycle racks and lockers for businesses, schools, government agencies, and nonprofit organizations are all eligible. Recipients are responsible for installation and maintenance of the equipment. Avg annual cost: $\$ 25 \mathrm{~K} / \mathrm{yr}$. | \$550 | \$210 | \$340 |
| County-wide Bicycle, Pedestrian and Vehicle Occupancy Counts | RTC-P50 | Conduct counts to assess mode split over time and assess impact of new facilities. | \$432 | \$232 | \$200 |
| Cruz511 TDM and Traveler Information | RTC 02a | Transportation demand management including centralized traveler information system and ride matching services. Outreach, education and incentives; multimodal traveler information system on traffic conditions, incidents, road and lane closures; ride matching service for carpools, vanpools, and bicyclists; services and information about availability and benefits of all transportation modes, including sharing rides, transit, walking, bicycling, telecommuting, alternative work schedules, alternative fuel vehicles, and park-n-ride lots. Avg annual cost: \$315k. | \$5,290 | \$2,640 | \$2,650 |
| Environmental Assessment, Economic and Other Analyses of Options for Rail Corridor | RTC-P02a | Environmental assessment, economic and other analyses of a possible future public transit system and other transportation options on the rail corridor right-of-way. | \$8,000 | \$8,000 | \$0 |
| Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) on Hwy 1 and Hwy 17 | RTC 01 | Maintain and expand tow truck patrols on Highways 1 and 17. Work with the CHP to quickly clear collisions, remove debris from travel lanes, and provide assistance to motorists during commute hours to keep incident related congestion to a minimum and keep traffic moving. Avg need: $\$ 300 \mathrm{k} / \mathrm{yr}$ constrained (some from SB1); $\$ 430 \mathrm{k} / \mathrm{yr}$ total cost. | \$9,460 | \$6,600 | \$2,860 |
| MBSST - North Coast Rail Trail | TRL 5 | Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSST) sections ph. 1 Wilder Ranch-Coast Dairies ( 5.1 mi ); ph. 2-Yellow Bank Beach/Panther Beach-Davenport ( 2.1 mi ). | \$20,000 | \$20,000 | \$0 |
| MBSST - Rail and Hwy 1 Bicycle and Pedestrian Crossing at Laguna Creek Beach | RTC 27d | Design, approval of CPUC, environmental clearance, and construction of a bicycle and pedestrian crossing of the rail line and Hwy 1 to provide access between the Coastal Rail Trail at Laguna Creek Beach and the parking area on the inland side of Hwy 1. | \$2,000 | \$0 | \$2,000 |
| Measure D Administration and Implementation | RTC-P59 | SCCRTC administration, implementation and oversight of Measure $D$ and the revenues generated from the 2016 Santa Cruz County Transportation Sales Tax - Measure D. Costs include annual independent fiscal audits, reports to the public, preparation and implementation of state-mandated reports, oversight committee, preparation of implementation, funding and financing plans, and other responsibilities as may be necessary to administer, implement and oversee the Ordinance and the Expenditure Plan. | \$16,500 | \$16,500 | \$0 |
| Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (Coastal Rail Trail) - Trail Management Program | RTC 27c | Coordinate trail implementation as it traverses multiple jurisdictions to ensure uniformity; serve as Project Manager for construction of some segments; handle environmental clearance; coordinate use in respect to other requirements (closures for ag spraying, etc); solicit ongoing funding and distribute funds to implementing entities through MOUs; coordinate with community initiatives; etc. | \$1,030 | \$1,030 | \$0 |


| Project Title | ID | Project Description/Scope | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Est total } \\ & \text { cost } \end{aligned}$ | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network - Design, Environmental Clearance, and Construction | RTC 27a | Design, environmental clearance and construction of the 32-mile rail component of the 50+ mile network of bicycle and pedestrian facilities on or near the coast, with the rail trail as the spine and additional spur trails to connect to key destinations. (Funded segments listed individually.) | \$80,500 | \$41,500 | \$39,000 |
| Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (Coastal Rail Trail) - Maintenance | RTC 27b | Maintenance of the rail trail component of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network ongoing clean-up, trash/recycling removal, graffiti abatement, brush clearance, surface repairs (from drainage issues, tree root intrusion) etc. | \$9,600 | \$4,800 | \$4,800 |
| Performance Monitoring | RTC-P51 | Transportation data collection and compilation to monitor performance of transportation system to advance goals/targets. Includes travel surveys of commuters, Transportation Demand Management plan, a low-stress bicycle network plan and parking standards plan. | \$1,650 | \$220 | \$1,430 |
| Planning, Programming \& Monitoring (PPM) - SB45 | RTC 04 | Development and amendments to state and federally mandated planning and programming documents, monitoring of programmed projects. Avg annual cost: $\$ 250 \mathrm{k} / \mathrm{yr}$. | \$5,680 | \$1,870 | \$3,810 |
| Rail and Trail Corridor Management and Maintenance | RTC-P03 | Operating expenses for rail line oversight. Avg annual cost:\$175K/yr. | \$3,850 | \$3,850 | \$0 |
| Rail Line: Freight Service Upgrades | RTC-P41 | Upgrade rail line to FRA Class 2 to a condition for reasonable ongoing maintenance into the future. Upgrade crossings, replace jointed rail with continuously welded rail, upgrade signals, and replace ties. | \$25,000 | \$0 | \$25,000 |
| Rail Transit: Watsonville-Santa Cruz Corridor | RTC-P02 | Design, construction, and operation of fixed guideway public transit between Santa Cruz and Watsonville. May be a joint project with the SCCRTC, SCMTD, and local jurisdictions. Annual op cost est: $\$ 5-10 \mathrm{M} / \mathrm{yr}$; capital: $\$ 31.5 \mathrm{M}-\$ 133 \mathrm{M}$ depending on service area and frequency (Total cost reflects Scenario G from 2015Rail Transit Study). Cost shown for 15 years of service during RTP period. | \$283,000 | \$0 | \$283,000 |
| Railroad Infrastructure Maintenance and Rehabilitation | RTC 36 | Protect, maintain and rehabilitate the railroad infrastructure on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line including bridges, track, drainage, culverts, signals, etc. | \$22,410 | \$22,410 | \$0 |
| Real-Time Transit Info | RTC-P58 | Develop and maintain distribution channel for disseminating real time transit arrival and departure information to Santa Cruz Metro users. To be developed in coordination with Santa Cruz Metro. | \$520 | \$220 | \$300 |
| Recreational Rail Infrastructure | RTC 25 | Seasonal passenger rail service on Santa Cruz Branch rail line. Infrastructure needed for the service is listed here (e.g. platforms, sidings, pedestrian \& disabled access, rail vehicles). Unsubsidized operations will be provided by a private operator and operating costs are therefore not included here. All costs are estimated. | \$5,340 | \$0 | \$5,340 |
| Regional State Transit Assistance Projects | RTC-P60 | State Transit Assistance (STA) eligible transit projects | \$33,220 | \$33,220 | \$0 |
| RTC Bikeway Map | RTC-P49 | Update, print and distribute free SC County Bikeway Map and update GIS files as needed. | \$320 | \$320 | \$0 |
| SAFE: Call Box System Along Hwys | RTC-P01 | Motorist aid system of telephone call boxes along all highways plus maintenance and upgrades. Call boxes may be used to request assistance or report incidents. Avg annual cost: $\$ 245 / \mathrm{yr}$ | \$5,390 | \$5,390 | \$0 |
| Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Improvements | RTC 03a | Infrastructure preservation for current uses and future transportation purposes. | \$570 | \$570 | \$0 |
| SCCRTC Administration (TDA) | RTC-P07 | SCCRTC as Regional Transportation Planning Agency for Santa Cruz County distributes Transportation Development Act Local Transportation Funds and State Assistance Funds for planning, transit, bicycle facilities and programs, pedestrian facilities and programs and specialized transportation in accordance with state law and the unmet transit needs process. Average annual cost: $\$ 650 \mathrm{~K} / \mathrm{yr}$. | \$14,300 | \$14,300 | \$0 |


| Project Title | ID | Project Description/Scope | Est total cost | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCCRTC Planning | RTC-P08 | SCCRTC Planning Tasks. Includes public outreach, long and short range planning, interagency coordination. Avg annual cost: $\$ 625 \mathrm{k} / \mathrm{yr}$. | \$13,750 | \$13,750 | \$0 |
| School-Based Mobility/TDM Programs | RTC-P54 | Student transportation programs aimed at improving health and well being, transportation safety and sustainability and that facilitate mode shift from driving alone in a motor vehicle to active and group transportation. | \$2,690 | \$1,100 | \$1,590 |
| Shared Parking Program | RTC-P57 | Develop tools to allow adjacent property owners to develop and share parking facilities. | \$150 | \$50 | \$100 |
| Transportation Demand Management Ordinance and User Guide | RTC-P56 | Develop Model TDM Ordinance and User Guide to include provisions for both residential and non-residential projects and address program and facilities improvements in return for reductions in off-street parking requirements. | \$260 | \$0 | \$260 |
| Vanpool Incentive Program | RTC 15 | Assist in start up and retention of vanpools. Includes financial incentives: new rider subsidies, driver bonuses, and empty seat subsidies. Also may include installation of wifi on vans. Avg Annual Cost: $\$ 25 \mathrm{k} / \mathrm{yr}$. | \$670 | \$100 | \$570 |
|  |  | SCCRTC Total | \$572,732 | \$199,482 | \$373,250 |
| SCCRTC/Caltrans |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 - Hwy 1 Corridor Investment Program | RTC 24a | Tier 1 - program level design/environmental analysis to establish a Corridor Investment Program (CIP) to reduce congestion along the 9 mile section of Highway 1 between San Andreas Rd/Larkin Valley Rd (Aptos) and Morrissey Boulevard (Santa Cruz). [Other RTC24_ projects are increments of the Highway 1 CIP.] Caltrans Project ID 05-0C730 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 2 - Hwy 1: Auxiliary Lanes from 41st Ave to Soquel Ave and Chanticleer Bike/Ped Bridge | RTC 24f | Construct auxiliary lanes and a bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing of Hwy 1 at Chanticleer Ave. Caltrans Project ID 05-0C732 | \$32,100 | \$32,100 | \$0 |
| 3 - Hwy 1 Auxiliary Lanes: State Park DrPark Ave and Park Ave-Bay/Porter | RTC 24e | Construct approximately 2.5 miles of auxiliary lanes northbound and southbound between State Park Dr and Park Ave interchange and the Park Ave and Bay/Porter interchange. Includes retaining walls, soundwalls and reconstruction of Capitola Avenue overcrossing with wider sidewalks and bike lanes. [Part of Highway 1 CIP project (RTC 24a)] | \$73,000 | \$73,000 | \$0 |
| 5 - Hwy 1: Reconstruct Morrissey Blvd Interchange | RTC 24h | Reconstruct Morrissey Blvd overcrossing with enhanced pedestrian and bicycle treatments (such as buffered or painted facilities) on both sides of the overcrossing, and/or a bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing at Trevethan Ave, reconfigure ramps and local streets to accommodate the new interchange, and ramp metering.[Part of Highway 1 CIP project (RTC 24a), but listed here as standalone project.] | \$45,800 | \$0 | \$45,800 |
| 6 - Hwy 1: Reconstruct Soquel Avenue Interchange | RTC 24i | Reconstruct the overcrossing with enhanced pedestrian and bicycle facilities on both sides, reconfigure ramps and local streets to accommodate the new interchange, and ramp metering. [Part of Highway 1 CIP project (RTC 24a), but listed here as standalone project.] | \$67,330 | \$0 | \$67,330 |
| 7 - Hwy 1: Reconstruct Bay Ave/Porter St and 41st Avenue Interchange | RTC 24j | Reconstruct highway to operate as a single interchange. Includes construction of a frontage road that includes bike lanes and sidewalks connecting the Bay/Porter and 41st Ave intersections ; reconstruction of the Bay/Porter undercrossing and the 41st Avenue overcrossing with enhanced pedestrian and bicycle treatments on both sides, and reconfiguration of ramps and local streets to accommodate local traffic and ramp metering. [Part of the Highway 1 CIP project (RTC 24a), but is listed here as a standalone project.] | \$113,810 | \$0 | \$113,810 |
| 91 - Hwy 1: Reconstruction of 2 Railroad Crossings in Aptos. | RTC 240 | Reconstruct two railroad crossings over Highway 1 in Aptos. [Part of Highway 1 CIP project (RTC 24a), but listed as a standalone project.] | \$41,100 | \$0 | \$41,100 |


| Project Title | ID | Project Description/Scope | Est total cost | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 92 - Hwy 1: Auxiliary Lanes from Rio Del Mar Blvd to State Park Dr Including Bridge over Aptos Creek | RTC 24p | Construct auxiliary lanes and reconstruct bridge over Aptos Creek. [Part of Highway 1 CIP project (RTC 24a), but listed as a standalone project.] | \$66,800 | \$0 | \$66,800 |
| 93 - Hwy 1: Auxiliary Lanes from Freedom Blvd to Rio Del Mar Blvd | RTC 24 q | Construct auxiliary lanes. [Part of Highway 1 CIP project (RTC 24a), but listed as a standalone project.] | \$16,700 | \$0 | \$16,700 |
| 94-Hwy 1: Northbound Auxiliary Lane from San Andreas Rd/Larkin Valley Rd to Freedom Blvd | RTC 24r | Construct northbound auxiliary lane. [Note: This project was not included as part of Highway 1 CIP project (RTC 24a).] | \$8,800 | \$8,800 | \$0 |
| 95 - Hwy 1: Reconstruct Remaining Interchanges | RTC 24 k | Interchange modifications not identified as separate projects (San Andreas Rd/Larkin Valley Rd, Freedom Blvd, Rio Del Mar Blvd, State Park Dr, and Park Ave), including reconfiguration of ramps and local streets for ramp meters, enhanced pedestrian and bike treatments (such as buffered or painted facilities) in each direction and sufficient width to allow addition of HOV lanes. [Part of the Highway 1 CIP project (RTC 24a), but is listed here as a standalone project.] | \$127,200 | \$0 | \$127,200 |
| 96 - Hwy 1: Construction of HOV Lanes from San Andreas Rd/Larkin Valley Rd to Morrissey Blvd | RTC 24m | Construction of High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV or Carpool) Lanes on Highway 1 from San Andreas Rd/Larkin Valley Rd to Morrissey Blvd. Cost excludes auxiliary lanes, reconstruction of interchanges for ramp metering, over and under crossings, and traffic operation system (TOS) elements on the corridor. [These costs are listed separately (RTC $24 \mathrm{a}, \mathrm{e}, \mathrm{f}, \mathrm{g}, \mathrm{h}, \mathrm{l}, \mathrm{j}, \mathrm{m}, \mathrm{n}, \mathrm{o}, \mathrm{p}, \mathrm{q}, \mathrm{r})$. Could be expensed under a complete Hwy 1 HOV Lane project (RTC 24, \$603,000) but currently expensed as a standalone project.] | \$61,980 | \$0 | \$61,980 |
| 97 - Hwy 1: HOV Lanes from San Andreas Rd/Larkin Valley to Morrissey Blvd | RTC $24 z$ | Construct HOV or Carpool lanes on Highway 1 from San Andreas Rd/Larkin Valley Rd to Morrissey Blvd, including auxiliary lanes, reconstruction of interchanges with enhanced bike and pedestrian facilities, arterial and ramp modifications to allow ramp metering, a new bike/ped crossing at Trevethan, and traffic operation system (TOS) element. [Cost if built in entirety: $\$ 603,000$. See stand alone projects (RTC24f,e $\mathrm{g}, \mathrm{h}, \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{j}, \mathrm{a}, \mathrm{m}$ ) for cost of incremental implementation.] Caltrans Project ID 05-0C730 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 98- Hwy 1: TSM Project from Morrissey to San Andreas Rd. | RTC 24n | Construct the TSM project alternative as described in the Tier 1 environmental study to establish a Highway 1 Corridor Investment Program. Project includes auxiliary lanes, modifications of interchanges with enhanced bike and pedestrian treatment, arterial and ramp modifications to allow ramp metering, a new bike/ped crossing at Trevethan, and traffic operation system (TOS) element. [Cost if built in entirety, rather than incrementally: \$249,100. Assumes RTC 24 f has been completed.] | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Hwy 1 Bicycle/Ped Overcrossing at Mar Vista | RTC 30 | Construct a bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing of Hwy 1 in vicinity of Mar Vista Drive, providing improved access to Seacliff and Aptos neighborhoods and schools. | \$7,800 | \$7,800 | \$0 |
| Hwy 1 Ramp Metering: Northern Sections Between San Andreas Road and Morrissey Blvd | RTC 34 | Reconfiguration of ramps and local streets to allow for ramp metering and installation of ramp meters. Could be expensed under a separate stand alone project (\$6.7 M) | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Hwy 1 Ramp Metering: Southern Sections | CT-P01 | Reconfigurations of ramps and installation of ramp meters at interchanges from Hwy 129/Riverside Dr to Mar Monte Ave. | \$20,600 | \$0 | \$20,600 |
|  |  | SCCRTC/Caltrans Total | \$683,020 | \$121,700 | \$561,320 |
| SCMTD |  |  |  |  |  |
| ADA Access Improvements | MTD-P51 | Add or improve ADA accessibility to all bus stops and METRO facilities. | \$4,222 | \$350 | \$3,872 |
| ADA Paratransit Service - Continuation of Existing Service | MTD-P10C | Operation \& maintenance cost of existing Paratransit service. Avg Annual Cost: $\$ 5.5 \mathrm{M}$. | \$121,000 | \$121,000 | \$0 |


| Project Title | ID | Project Description/Scope | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Est total } \\ & \text { cost } \end{aligned}$ | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ADA Paratransit Vehicle Replacements | MTD 02 | Replace buses/vans for ADA paratransit fleet (including Accessible Taxi program). | \$14,040 | \$6,000 | \$8,040 |
| ADA Service Expansion | MTD-P11 | Add capacity to meet increased trip demand thru 2040. Assumes 2\% increase/year starting in 2019. | \$2,500 | \$1,050 | \$1,450 |
| Automatic Vehicle Locator and Automatic Passenger Counter Systems | MTD 24 | Automatic Vehicle Locator (AVL), Automatic Passenger Counters, and automatic vehicle announcing systems on METRO buses. Provide real time bus arrival/departure displays at bus stops. Necessary IT upgrades and data collectionfor system operations, security, planning and maintenance. | \$3,200 | \$3,200 | \$0 |
| Bike Station at Capitola Mall | MTD-P23 | Establish bike station at Capitola Mall, especially to serve UCSC. Would be joint mall, UCSC, MTD project. | \$1,030 | \$0 | \$1,030 |
| Bikes on Buses Expansion | MTD-P20 | Add additional space for bikes on articulated buses when/if METRO purchases or leases 60 - ft articulated buses. | \$60 | \$0 | \$60 |
| Bus on Shoulder | MTD-P57 | Plan, design, seek Caltrans approvals, and construct improvements to utilize freeway shoulders to bypass congestion on Highway 1 and possibly Highway 17 to speed inter-city bus service | \$12,000 | \$0 | \$12,000 |
| Bus Rapid Transit | MTD-P15 | Construct park \& ride lots, transit centers and grade-separation where feasible to operate bus rapid transit to reduce congestion on Highway 1. | \$26,780 | \$0 | \$26,780 |
| Bus Rebuild and Maintenance | MTD-P31 | Rebuild engines; Fleet maintenance equipment. Avg. cost is $\sim \$ 250 \mathrm{k} / \mathrm{bus}$, increases useful life up to 8 years at $40 \%$ of the cost of new buses. | \$5,250 | \$5,250 | \$0 |
| Bus Replacements | MTD-P04 | Replace fleet at the end of normal bus lifetime (approximately every 12 years; $\$ 675$ each for local fixed route; \$900k each for Hwy 17 Over the Road coaches). | \$142,420 | \$73,000 | \$69,420 |
| Bus Stop and Station Improvements | MTD-P52 | Improve customer access and/or amenities at bus stops; add bus stop pads to preserve pavement. | \$500 | \$500 | \$0 |
| Commuter/Subscription Bus Program | MTD-P18 | Capital and operating for subscription buses to areas not currently served by express buses (similar to large vanpool). | \$2,070 | \$0 | \$2,070 |
| Customer IT amenities | MTD-P55 | Upgrade Hwy 17 Wi-Fi and expand to local routes; real-time bus arrival website. | \$1,010 | \$0 | \$1,010 |
| Deviated Fixed-Route Pilot Program | MTD-P43 | Pilot project allowing buses to make minor route modifications to address needs of senior and disabled riders. | \$100 | \$0 | \$100 |
| Electric Non-Fleet Vehicles | MTD-P47 | Replace non-revenue vehicles to EV. | \$580 | \$0 | \$580 |
| EV Fast Charging Stations | MTD-P48 | Install 5 electric vehicle charging stations at transit centers. | \$1,030 | \$0 | \$1,030 |
| Hwy 1 Express Buses | MTD-P27 | Hwy 1 express bus replacements - 6 Buses @ \$500k ea. Replace every 12 years. | \$6,200 | \$0 | \$6,200 |
| Hwy 17 Express Service - Continuation of Baseline Service Levels | MTD-P10B | Operation \& maintenance cost of existing Highway 17 Express bus service. Avg annual cost: \$4.5M. | \$99,000 | \$99,000 | \$0 |
| Hwy 17 Express Service Restoration and Expansion | MTD-P12 | Restore Hwy 17 Express service to FY16 levels, then expand service 2\% annually. Restore $\$ 300 \mathrm{~K} / \mathrm{yr}$ operating plus $2 \%$ annually plus capital costs (2 buses) | \$10,000 | \$4,000 | \$6,000 |
| Inter-County Paratransit Connection | MTD-P44 | Establish paratransit connection location with Santa Clara County. | \$1,290 | \$0 | \$1,290 |
| Local Transit - Continuation of Baseline Service Levels 2019-2040 | MTD-P10 | Operation \& maintenance cost of existing local fixed route bus service. Avg annual cost: \$38M. | \$836,000 | \$836,000 | \$0 |


| Project Title | ID | Project Description/Scope | Est total cost | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Local Transit Service Restoration and Expansion | MTD-P14 | Restore local service to FY16 levels, then expand service 2\% annually. Restore $\$ 6.2 \mathrm{M} / \mathrm{yr}$ operating plus $2 \%$ annually plus capital costs (16 buses) | \$173,000 | \$72,000 | \$101,000 |
| Maintenance Facility Expansion | MTD-P38 | Property acquisition, design, and construction of maintenance facility expansion. | \$15,850 | \$0 | \$15,850 |
| Metro facilities repair/upgrades | MTD-P36 | Maintain and upgrade facilities. | \$6,270 | \$4,300 | \$1,970 |
| Metro rebranding | MTD-P58 | Develop marketing program and establish consistent brand with uniform signage, letterhead, ads. | \$500 | \$0 | \$500 |
| Non-Revenue Vehicle Replacements | MTD-P32 | Replace support vehicles. | \$3,450 | \$1,200 | \$2,250 |
| Pacific Station- Bike Station | MTD-P49 | Establish bike station at Pacific Station. | \$410 | \$0 | \$410 |
| ParaCruz Mobile Data Terminals; Radios | MTD-P30 | Replace mobile data terminals in vehicles | \$760 | \$400 | \$360 |
| ParaCruz Operating Facility | MTD-P28 | Design, Right-of-Way and construction for new ParaCruz Operating Facility. | \$12,400 | \$0 | \$12,400 |
| Park and Ride Facilities | MTD-P53 | Fund purchase and construction or lease of parking areas for commuter bus patrons, either surface lot or parking structure. | \$29,400 | \$0 | \$29,400 |
| Replacement of Watsonville Transit Center | MTD-P56 | Replacement transit center at existing or new location. | \$25,000 | \$0 | \$25,000 |
| Replacement Transit Fareboxes, Ticket Vending Machines, and Fare System Enhancements | MTD 18 | Upgrade GFI Farebox system to enable fare media loading, tracking, registration, interoperability via internet. Necessary IT upgrade. System Integrator to analyze and propose integrated fare media strategy. Replacement fareboxes at end of useful life. Replacement of Ticket Vending Machines at end of useful life. | \$5,550 | \$1,000 | \$4,550 |
| Santa Cruz Metro Center/Pacific Station Renovation | MTD 13 | Renovate Pacific Station or construct new transit center in alternate location. | \$25,000 | \$0 | \$25,000 |
| Senior/Disabled/Low-Income Fixed-Route Transit Incentives | MTD-P42 | Incentives to encourage fixed-route bus ridership. Includes existing discounts for Seniors and persons with disabilities. May include free/reduced rates for seniors during off-peak hours, free bus passes to ADA eligible persons, bus pass subsidies for low income riders transportation to employment, and other incentives to encourage use of fixed-route system. | \$17,125 | \$0 | \$17,125 |
| Signal Priority/Pre-Emption for Buses | MTD-P21 | Enable coach operators to actuate traffic signals to prolong green or change red lights to improve transit running time. | \$2,070 | \$0 | \$2,070 |
| Small Bus Fleet | MTD-P24 | Purchase smaller buses for travel through residential neighborhoods. Cost currently unknown. | \$1,700 | \$0 | \$1,700 |
| Solar Panels for Souza Operations Facility | MTD-P29 | Energy reduction through installation of solar panels on the new Judy K. Souza Operations Facility | \$2,000 | \$0 | \$2,000 |
| South County Operations and Maintenance Facility | MTD-P54 | Acquisition of property and construction of second operations and maintenance facilities to better serve South County. | \$50,000 | \$0 | \$50,000 |
| Transit Mobility Training Program Expansion | MTD-P19 | Expand public outreach and training to encourage fixed route, rather than Paratransit, use. Outreach may also involve other partners (ex. DMV, doctors, senior centers, etc). Avg annual cost: $\$ 80 \mathrm{~K} / \mathrm{yr}$. | \$1,240 | \$0 | \$1,240 |
| Transit Security and Surveillance Systems | MTD-P33 | Enhance passenger safety and facilities security. Emergency response systems. | \$1,140 | \$0 | \$1,140 |


| Project Title | ID | Project Description/Scope | Est total cost | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Transit System Technology Improvements | MTD-P35 | Automated Data Processing software, telephones, portable computers, servers, Customer Information Kiosks, digital ID processing equipment. Maintain and upgrade office software and hardware, bandwidth, web site, phone network, to enhance productivity, customer service and maintain functionality. | \$5,490 | \$1,000 | \$4,490 |
| Transit Technological Improvements | MTD-P06 | IT software and hardware upgrades for scheduling, customer service, planning systems. Upgrades every 5 years. | \$5,170 | \$2,500 | \$2,670 |
| Transit/Paratransit Driver Emergency Training | MTD-P45 | Provide training equipment for drivers on new mobility devices (scooters, motorized wheelchairs) plus emergency training and biohazard container and clean-up kits for vehicles. | \$260 | \$0 | \$260 |
|  |  | SCMTD Total | \$1,674,067 | \$1,231,750 | \$442,317 |
| Seniors Council |  |  |  |  |  |
| Senior Employment Ride Reimbursement | RTC-P43 | Reimburse low income seniors for transit expenses to/from employer sites. | \$1,600 | \$1,600 | \$0 |
|  |  | Seniors Council Total | \$1,600 | \$1,600 | \$0 |
| UCSC |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alternative Fuel Fleet Vehicles | UC-P64 | Purchase and upgrade fleet vehicles to alt. fueled vehicles (refuse trucks, street sweepers, fleet cars, etc.) | \$3,100 | \$500 | \$2,600 |
| Alternative Fuel/Electric Shuttle Vehicles | UC-P22 | Capital acquisition of vehicles/conversion of shuttles to EV. | \$10,330 | \$0 | \$10,330 |
| Bike Shuttle Vehicle Acquisition | UC-P51 | Acquire more alt fueled vehicles for bike shuttle (and possible expansion). | \$520 | \$0 | \$520 |
| Bus Tracking and AVL Transit Programs | UC-P62 | GPS bus tracking and Automatic Vehicle Locator programs inform travelling population of transit locations so they can make informed mode choices. | \$260 | \$260 | \$0 |
| College Nine/Communications Pedestrian Bridge | UC-P39 | Construct pedestrian bridge. | \$1,030 | \$0 | \$1,030 |
| College Nine/Crown College Pedestrian Bridge | UC-P37 | Construct pedestrian bridge. | \$1,550 | \$0 | \$1,550 |
| Coolidge Overlook | UC-P42 | Improve overlook for parking, benches and signage for Sanctuary. | \$620 | \$0 | \$620 |
| Disability Van Service | UC-P75 | Operate disability van service ( $\$ 240 \mathrm{k} / \mathrm{yr}$ ). | \$5,450 | \$5,450 | \$0 |
| East Collector Transit Hub | UC-P46 | New transit hub at East Collector (East Remote) lot. | \$5,170 | \$0 | \$5,170 |
| Electric Vehicle Charging Stations | UC-P65 | Add additional electrical infrastructure and install electric vehicle charging stations around campus. | \$810 | \$310 | \$500 |
| Great Meadow Bike Path Safety Improvements | UCSC 07 | Bike path safety and maintenance improvements: Reconstruct and widen Class 1 bike path, separate pedestrian improvements northbound to minimize conflicts. | \$1,135 | \$1,135 | \$0 |
| Hagar/McLaughlin Intersection Improvements | UC-P10 | Signal, pedestrian safety improvements(including new crosswalk) and roadway improvements. | \$520 | \$0 | \$520 |
| Hagar/Steinhart Intersection Improvements | UC-P14 | Signal, pedestrian safety improvements, transit, roadway improvements. | \$1,030 | \$0 | \$1,030 |
| Hagar-Coolidge Connector Road/Hagar/East Remote Intersection Improvements | UC-P47 | New roadway connector, including bicycle lanes, between Hagar Drive and Coolidge, plus Hagar/East Remote Intersection Improvements: signal, pedestrian safety improvements and roadway improvements. | \$3,100 | \$0 | \$3,100 |


| Project Title | ID | Project Description/Scope | Est total cost | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Heller Drive Bicycle Lanes (Empire Grade to Porter College) | UC-P56 | Add Class II bicycle lanes in downhill direction as feasible. | \$830 | \$0 | \$830 |
| Kerr/Porter Rd Pedestrian Bridge ADA Upgrades | UC-P72 | Modify bridge to improve access. | \$3,100 | \$0 | \$3,100 |
| Kresge/Core West Pedestrian Bridge: ADA Upgrades | UC-P57 | Modify bridge to enhance ADA access. | \$3,100 | \$3,100 | \$0 |
| McLaughlin Drive Bike Lanes/Pedestrian Enhancements | UC-P30 | Install Class 2 bike lanes and enhance pedestrian circulation on University campus roadway. | \$2,580 | \$0 | \$2,580 |
| Meyer Drive Extension/Jordan Gulch Bridges | UC-P04 | Extension of Meyer Drive from existing Meyer Drive to Hagar Drive. Includes potential construction of two bridges, pedestrian, and bicycle facilities. | \$20,660 | \$0 | \$20,660 |
| Northern Entrance | UC-P08 | Construct new access road including Cave Gulch Bridge to Empire Grade and road and bicycle lanes to Northern Heller Dr. for access and fire safety. | \$10,330 | \$0 | \$10,330 |
| Northern Loop Roadway | UC-P07 | Construct new roadway, including bicycle lanes, on upper campus. Will be phased. Phase I: Chinquapin Extension to support Social Science 3. | \$18,590 | \$0 | \$18,590 |
| Parking Management Technology Improvements | UC-P68 | Updating existing parking management technologies to allow for more effective management, additional parking management at Coastal Marine Campus and 2300 Delaware site. | \$410 | \$410 | \$0 |
| Pedestrian Directional Map/Wayfinding System | UC-P38 | Develop and install signs throughout campus. | \$520 | \$520 | \$0 |
| Porter/Performing Arts Pedestrian Bridge | UC-P36 | Construct pedestrian bridge. | \$1,030 | \$0 | \$1,030 |
| Science Hill/North Academic Core Pedestrian Bridge | UC-P40 | Construct pedestrian bridge. | \$1,030 | \$0 | \$1,030 |
| Sidewalk/Pedestrian Improvements | UC-P50 | Widen sidewalks/improve ped access in areas of campus. | \$5,170 | \$0 | \$5,170 |
| Spring Street Bikeway | UC-P34 | Construct bikeway connecting Spring Street to Hagar Ct. | \$310 | \$0 | \$310 |
| Steinhart Way Multimodal Improvements | UC-P03 | Roadway improvements for shuttles, bikes and pedestrians. | \$520 | \$0 | \$520 |
| Transit Pullouts and Shelters Enhancements | UC-P19 | Construction and installation of transit pullouts and reconstruction of shelters throughout campus. | \$1,550 | \$0 | \$1,550 |
| Transit Vehicles (ongoing) | UC-P23 | Ongoing capital acquisition of transit vehicles for on-campus transit and University shuttles. | \$5,170 | \$5,170 | \$0 |
| Transportation-Related Stormwater Management Projects | UC-P66 | Retrofitting existing transportation facilities and developing new facilities with new stormwater management techniques. | \$1,030 | \$1,030 | \$0 |
| Traveler Safety Education/Information Programs | UC-P61 | Bike/pedestrian safety programs; light and helmet giveaways, safety classes, distracted driver programs, bus etiquette program. | \$660 | \$100 | \$560 |
| UCSC - Metro Station Bus Rapid Transit Improvements | UC-P48 | Bus Rapid Transit Improvements between Metro Station, Bay Street Corridor, and UCSC Roadways. | \$5,170 | \$0 | \$5,170 |
| UCSC Bicycle Facilities | UC-P55 | Add bicycle facilities on campus roadways and paths. Lump sum of projects, including but not limited to UCSC Bicycle Plan that are not listed individually elsewhere in the RTP. | \$1,030 | \$0 | \$1,030 |
| UCSC Bicycle Parking Improvements | UC-P33 | Install bicycle parking facilities to serve bicycle commuters to the University. | \$520 | \$520 | \$0 |
| UCSC Bike Loan Program | UC-P52 | Develop and implement a bike loan program for UC students. | \$1,030 | \$0 | \$1,030 |


| Project Title | ID | Project Description/Scope | Est total cost | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| UCSC Bike Showers/Storage Lockers | UC-P32 | Install showers and storage facilities to serve bicycle commuters to the University. | \$620 | \$0 | \$620 |
| UCSC Commute Counseling Program | UC-P69 | Staffing program development to individually market to UCSC affiliates on more sustainable means of travel to campus. | \$3,100 | \$3,100 | \$0 |
| UCSC Commuter Incentive Programs | UC-P70 | Provide ongoing support and development of new programs to encourage travel to campus via sustainable modes of travel. | \$1,550 | \$1,550 | \$0 |
| UCSC Lump Sum Roadway Maintenance | UC-P59 | Repaving and rehabilitation of roadways on UCSC campus to maintain existing network. | \$10,330 | \$3,100 | \$7,230 |
| UCSC Main Entrance Improvements | UC-P01 | Realign roadway, transit pullout/shelter, relocate bike parking, construct pedestrian path, historic resource analysis. Work may be done in conjunction with City Roundabout project. | \$2,070 | \$2,070 | \$0 |
| UCSC Parking Operations \& Maintenance | UC-P73 | Operate and administer the parking operations for UCSC including planning, TDM, marketing and debt service. | \$70,450 | \$70,450 | \$0 |
| UCSC Pedestrian/Transit Zone | UC-P44 | Pedestrian safety improvements including, colored/textured asphalt and signage at various locations on core campus roadways. | \$1,030 | \$0 | \$1,030 |
| UCSC Traffic Control | UC-P58 | Non-traditional traffic control/crossing guard program at key intersections on UCSC campus to improve pedestrian and vehicle safety, reduce conflicts, improve travel times. | \$2,580 | \$2,580 | \$0 |
| UCSC Transit Service | UC-P74 | Operate the on campus shuttle service and Night Owl (\$3.01m/year). | \$68,410 | \$68,410 | \$0 |
| UCSC Vanpool Program | UC-P63 | Maintain, operate and expand upon UCSC vanpool program. | \$8,680 | \$8,680 | \$0 |
| Zimride Emergency Preparedness Database | UC-P67 | Creating a new database through Zimride to have emergency response evacuation of UCSC campus. | \$310 | \$0 | \$310 |
|  |  | UCSC Total | \$288,095 | \$178,445 | \$109,650 |
| Various Agencies |  |  |  |  |  |
| Active Transportation Plan | VAR-P39 | Prepare Active Transportation Plans that address bicycle, pedestrian, safe routes to schools and complete streets facilities within the jurisdictions of Santa Cruz County as well as the Santa Cruz Harbor Port District. | \$2,380 | \$2,380 | \$0 |
| Bicycle Sharrows | VAR-P03 | Install sharrows (shared roadway marking) designating areas where bicyclists should ride on streets, especially when bicycle lanes are not available. To be implemented by local jurisdictions. | \$520 | \$520 | \$0 |
| Bicycle Treatments for intersection improvements (ADD) | VAR-P32 | Add painted bike treatments (such as buffered and/or painted bike lanes, bike boxes, bike detection and signals), at major intersections. | \$4,130 | \$4,130 | \$0 |
| Bike Share | VAR-P16 | Establish and maintain an urban centered bike share program allowing county residents to access loaner bikes at key locations such as downtowns, transit centers, shopping districts, and tourist destinations. | \$5,170 | \$5,170 | \$0 |
| Bike-Activated Traffic Signal Program | VAR-P05 | Provide traffic signal equipment to ensure that the traffic signals will detect bicycles just as cars are detected and ensure that the appropriate traffic signal phase is activated by the bicycles. | \$1,030 | \$1,030 | \$0 |


| Project Title | ID | Project Description/Scope | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Est total } \\ & \text { cost } \end{aligned}$ | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cabrillo College TDM Programs | RTC 33 | Provide students and employees at all four Cabrillo College campuses with education, promotion, and incentives that support the use of sustainable transportation modes. Develop information, programs and services customized to meet the transportation needs of the Cabrillo College community. 'Provide Sustainable Transportation education, promotion, and Go Green program enrollment to Cabrillo College students and employees. Partner with Cabrillo staff and students to reduce SOV trips to the Aptos, Watsonville and Scotts Valley campuses. Provided targeted information and services to Cabrillo members. | \$1,560 | \$780 | \$780 |
| Carsharing Program | VAR-P06 | Program to assist people in sharing a vehicle for occasional use. Implementing Agency TBD, varies. | \$2,580 | \$1,290 | \$1,290 |
| Climate Action Transportation Programs | RTC-P48 | Projects that reduce greenhouse gas emissions through reducing vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled, increasing fuel efficiency and expanding use of alternatively fueled vehicles. Includes comprehensive outreach and education campaigns, a countywide emergency ride home for those using alternatives, and TDM incentive programs: $\$ 100 \mathrm{k} /$ year. | \$2,580 | \$2,330 | \$250 |
| Complete Streets Implementation | VAR-P27 | Additional projects for complete streets implementation that would fall under the Complete Streets Guidelines. | \$10,330 | \$10,330 | \$0 |
| Coolidge Drive Reconstruction | VAR-P23 | Reconstruction of roadway and bike lane. | \$3,100 | \$0 | \$3,100 |
| Countywide Pedestrian Signal Upgrades | RTC-P26 | Grant program to fund installation of accessible pedestrian equipment with locator tones including rapid flashing beacons and count down times etc. to facilitate roadway crossings by visually and mobility impaired persons. | \$2,070 | \$1,035 | \$1,035 |
| Countywide Senior Driving Training | VAR-P24 | Coordinate and enhance current programs that help maturing drivers maintain their driving skills and provides transitional info about driving alternatives. (Current programs are run by AARP and CHP.) | \$800 | \$80 | \$720 |
| Eco-Tourism - Sustainable Transportation | VAR-P17 | Provide sustainable transportation information, incentives and promotions to the estimated one million visitors to Santa Cruz County. Work with the Santa Cruz County Conference and Visitors Council, local lodgings, and tourist attractions. | \$1,030 | \$515 | \$515 |
| Electric Bicycle Commuter Incentive Program | VAR-P44 | Financial incentives, promotion and/or education to encourage residents to use electric bikes instead of commuting by car. | \$3,400 | \$1,000 | \$2,400 |
| Environmental Mitigation Program | VAR-P38 | Allocate funds to protect, preserve, and restore native habitat that construction of transportation projects listed in SCCRTC's RTP could potentially impact. EMP funds will be for uses such as, but not limited to, purchasing land prior to project development to bank for future mitigation needs, funding habitat improvements in advance of project development to leverage and enhance investments by partner agencies. | \$5,680 | \$5,680 | \$0 |
| Hwy 1 Bike/Ped Bridge (Cabrillo-New Brighton) | CT-P07a | Construction of bike/ped bridge connecting New Brighton State Beach and Cabrillo College as part of larger Nisene SP to the Sea trail concept. Lead agency TBD. | \$8,260 | \$0 | \$8,260 |
| Live Oak Transit Hub | VAR-P46 | Transfer node near rail corridor at 17th Ave - may include transit, rideshare, bicycle, bikeshare, pedestrian to provide regional connections to/from other parts of the county. | \$530 | \$530 | \$0 |
| Local Arterial ITS Infrastructure | VAR-P11 | ITS (Intelligent Transportation Systems): advanced electronics and information technologies to increase the safety and efficiency of the surface transportation system, including vehicle detection devices along major arterials in urbanized areas to alert motorists of incidents. | \$620 | \$0 | \$620 |
| Lump Sum Bridge Preservation | VAR-P14 | Painting, Barrier Rail Replacement, Low Water Crossing, Rehab, and Replacement bridges for SHOPP and Highway Bridge Program (HBP). | \$54,500 | \$54,500 | \$0 |


| Project Title | ID | Project Description/Scope | Est total cost | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lump Sum Emergency Response Local Roads | VAR-P13 | Lump sum for repair of local roads damaged in emergency. (Based on average ER/FEMA/CalEMA funds, storm damage, fire, etc. Costs of repairs assumed under lump sum maintenance and operations within local jurisdiction listings.) | \$23,370 | \$23,370 | \$0 |
| Mission St/Hwy 1 Bike/Truck Safety Campaign | VAR-P18 | Partnership with road safety shareholders including Caltrans, UCSC, City of Santa Cruz, Ecology Action, trucking companies and others to improve bike/truck safety along the Mission Street corridor. Provide safety presentations, videos, brochures, safety equipment, etc. | \$520 | \$520 | \$0 |
| Mobility Management Center | VAR-P04 | Centralized one-stop-shop for information and resources on specialized transportation options. May be combined with 511 and local senior information and assistance efforts. Implementing agency TBD. Est. annual cost: $\$ 100-300 \mathrm{k} / \mathrm{yr}$. | \$7,750 | \$0 | \$7,750 |
| Neighborhood Greenways | VAR-P33 | Implement greenways which gives priority to bicycles and pedestrians on low volume, low speed streets including, way finding and pavement markings, bicycle treatments in areas identified for more intensified development in Sustainable Communities Strategy. | \$5,170 | \$0 | \$5,170 |
| Park and Ride Lot Development | VAR-P26 | Upgrade and maintain existing park and ride lots for commuters countywide. Secure additional park and ride lot spaces for motorized vehicles and bicycles. Long range plan: identify, purchase land, construct Park \& Ride lots. | \$8,260 | \$2,260 | \$6,000 |
| Planning for Transit Oriented Development for Seniors | VAR-P25 | Evaluate opportunities for Transit Oriented Development serving seniors including access to medical facilities. | \$80 | \$80 | \$0 |
| Plug-in Electric Vehicle Access, Education \& Promotion | VAR-P21 | Target motorist looking for a cleaner vehicle by providing access, education and promotion on ever evolving plug-in electric vehicles (PEV). Provide PEV car share, rental and demo drives, educational workshops, online, and hard copy information. Promote through current EA groups, partners, media and other available sources. | \$830 | \$0 | \$830 |
| Public Transit Marketing | VAR-P20 | Initiatives that increase public transit ridership including discount passes, free fare days, commuter clubs, and promotional and marketing campaigns. | \$1,550 | \$775 | \$775 |
| Public/Private Partnership Bicycle and Pedestrian Connection Plan | VAR-P29 | Develop model for assisting local jurisdictions in working with private property owners to allow bicycle and pedestrian access through private property in areas identified for more intensified development in Sustainable Communities Strategy. | \$150 | \$150 | \$0 |
| Public/Private Partnership Transit Stops and Pull Outs Plan | VAR-P30 | Develop model for assisting local jurisdictions in working with businesses to install transit pullouts and shelters on property in areas identified as high quality transit corridors in Sustainable Communities Strategy. | \$150 | \$150 | \$0 |
| Safe Paths of Travel | VAR-P08 | Regional program to construct and/or repair pedestrian facilities adjacent to high frequency use origins and destinations, particularly near transit stops. | \$3,100 | \$3,100 | \$0 |
| Safe Routes to Schools Studies | VAR-P10 | Studies to assess pedestrian and bicycle safety near schools. | \$210 | \$210 | \$0 |
| Safety Plan | VAR-P36 | Develop a safety plan that addresses traffic related injuries and fatalities for all modes of transportation. | \$310 | \$310 | \$0 |
| Santa Cruz County Open Streets | VAR-P40 | Community events promoting alternatives to driving alone as part of a sustainable, healthy, and active life-style. Temporarily opens roadways to bicycle and pedestrian travel only, diverting automobiles to other roadways.(Average annual cost - $\$ 100 \mathrm{k} / \mathrm{yr}$ ) | \$2,000 | \$200 | \$1,800 |
| School Complete Streets Projects | VAR-P35 | Implement ped/bike programs and facilities near schools. | \$10,330 | \$10,330 | \$0 |


| Project Title | ID | Project Description/Scope | Est total cost | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| School Safety Programs | VAR-P19 | Bicycle and walking safety education and encouragement programs targeting K-12 schools in Santa Cruz County including Ecology Action's Safe Routes to School and Bike Smart programs. Provide classroom and on the bike safety training in an age appropriate method. Provide a variety of bicycle, walking, busing and carpooling encouragement projects ranging from bike to school events, to incentive driven tracking, and educational support activities. Est. annual cost $\$ 150 \mathrm{k}$. | \$3,820 | \$1,910 | \$1,910 |
| TDM Individualized Employer/Multiunit Housing Program | RTC-P53 | Implement individualized employer and multiunit housing TDM programs with incentives for existing development. | \$4,650 | \$2,325 | \$2,325 |
| Transit Oriented Development Grant Program | RTC-P25 | Smart growth grant program to fund TODs that encourage land use and transportation system coordination. May include joint child care/PNR/transit centers. | \$5,170 | \$2,570 | \$2,600 |
| Transit Priority | VAR-P34 | Install transit queues at major intersections. | \$5,170 | \$2,585 | \$2,585 |
| Transit Service to San Jose Airport | VAR-P43 | Provide transit service to San Jose airport from Santa Cruz. Current average annual need \$0.5M | \$11,000 | \$0 | \$11,000 |
| Transportation Demand Management Plan | VAR-P37 | Collaborate with other organizations to develop a coordinated plan for transportation demand management program implementation for Santa Cruz County. | \$310 | \$310 | \$0 |
| Transportation for Caregivers of Seniors/People with Disabilities | VAR-P42 | Transportation service for caregivers of seniors or people with disabilities. Including, but not limited to programs such as, volunteer rides, taxi script, ride to work program. Current avg annual need $\$ .5 \mathrm{M}$. Constrained= $=\$ 0 \mathrm{M}$. | \$11 | \$0 | \$11 |
| Transportation for Low Income Youth | VAR-P15 | Safe, reliable transportation services for foster care children to/from school. Avg annual cost: \$100k/yr. | \$2,580 | \$0 | \$2,580 |
| Transportation for Low-Income Families | VAR-P41 | Transportation service for low income families with children. Includes medical service rides, out-of-county rides, volunteer rides, taxi script, ride to work program, etc. Current avg annual need $\$ .5 \mathrm{M}$. Constrained=\$0M. | \$11,000 | \$0 | \$11,000 |
| Transportation System Electrification | VAR-P07 | Partnership with local gov't agencies, electric vehicle manufactures, businesses, and Ecology Action to establish electric vehicle charging stations for EV's, plug-in hybrids, NEV's, as well as ebikes and escooters. Work with manufacturers on developing advanced electric vehicles and educating the public regarding the ease of use and benefits of electric vehicles. | \$51,650 | \$51,650 | \$0 |
| Uncontrolled Pedestrian Crossing Improvements | VAR-P31 | Implement improvements to uncontrolled pedestrian crossing such as painted and/or raised crosswalks, flashing beacons and pedestrian islands. | \$5,170 | \$2,570 | \$2,600 |
| Watsonville Transit Hub | VAR-P47 | Expand transportation mode options at transfer node near rail corridor and current transit center to increase use of transit, rideshare, bicycle, bikeshare, pedestrian to provide regional connections to/from other parts of the county. | \$585 | \$585 | \$0 |
| West Side Transit Hub | VAR-P45 | Transfer node near rail corridor at Natural Bridges Dr - may include transit, rideshare, bicycle, bikeshare, pedestrian to provide regional connections to/from other parts of the county and the university. | \$580 | \$580 | \$0 |
|  |  | Various Agencies Total | \$275,746 | \$197,840 | \$77,906 |
| Volunteer Center |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volunteer Center Transportation Program | VC-P1 | Program providing specialized transportation to seniors and people with disabilities. Constrained=existing TDA allocations. | \$3,750 | \$1,640 | \$2,110 |
|  |  | Volunteer Center Total | \$3,750 | \$1,640 | \$2,110 |


| Project Title | ID | Project Description/Scope | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Est total } \\ & \text { cost } \end{aligned}$ | Constrained | Unconstrained |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Watsonville Airport |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lump Sum Watsonville Municipal Airport Capital Projects | AIR-P01 | Projects from the Watsonville Airport Capital Improvement Program. Includes new hangers, reconstruction of aviation apron, security features, and runway extensions. | \$21,700 | \$21,700 | \$0 |
| Watsonville Municipal Airport Operations | AIR-P02 | Ongoing operations/maintenance. Average \$2M/year. | \$44,000 | \$44,000 | \$0 |
|  |  | Watsonville Airport Total | \$65,700 | \$65,700 | \$0 |

## Total Within Projected Funds (Constrained) \$3,757,313

Minimum New Funds Needed (Unconstrained)
\$3,356,681
*For some projects no cost estinate was available thus was not included in this total
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## APPENDIX L. PENDING PROJECTS LIST

| Name/ APN | Project Type | \# Units/ Comm. S.F. | Status <br> Discretionary <br> Permit App. <br> P pending <br> A approved | App. No. | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RESIDENTIAL |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2340 \text { Harper } \\ & 2917105 \end{aligned}$ | Multi Family (MF) + one SFD | 11 | P | 181094 | GP, Rezone included |
| Wells Fargo Bank LD $2606296$ | Minor Land Division (MLD) | Net 2 | P | 171063 | MLD 1 into $3$ |
| Mattison Lane Brunetti 2521102 | APTS | 22 | P | 161426 |  |
| Bostick Lane 2602113 | MLD | Net 2 | P | 171357 |  |
| Jody Court $2503217$ | MLD | Net 4 | P | 171353 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Paul Minnie LD } \\ & 2607119 \end{aligned}$ | MLD | Net 3 | P | 171077 |  |
| Capitola <br> Extension $2608109$ | MF | Net 4 | P | 171265 | Existing duplex into 6 |
| DeFaymoreau MLD | MLD | Net 1 | P | 151024 | 2015 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Moana Way } \\ & 3212226 \end{aligned}$ | MLD | Net 1 | P | 171151 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MLD, } 2 \text { SFDs } \\ & 2 \text { ADUs } \end{aligned}$ |
| Workbench 3711326 | MF | 16 | P | 181231 | GPA, rezone included |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Maciel RDG } \\ & 2912101 \end{aligned}$ | Residential Dwelling Group (RDG) | Net 1 | P | 181055 |  |
| Roadhouse LD 3218108 | Land Division and SFDs | 8 SFDs | A | 151204 | Building <br> Permits submitted |
| COMMERCIAL, MIXED USE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nissan Dealership | Commercial (C) | $\begin{aligned} & 12,550 \mathrm{SF} \\ & \text { sales } \\ & 10,000 \mathrm{SF} \\ & \text { service } \end{aligned}$ | A | 171179 | EIR completed |
| Paul Minnie 0264314 | Mixed Use (MU) | 15 units 3600 sf office | P | 181171 |  |


| Portola Mixed Use <br> 3205136 | MU | 23 res, 4 live/work, 29710 office | P | 181263 | Amendment to approved MU CUP, check SF office |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lumberyard $3209201,05$ | MU | 8 units, 9600 SF comm | A | 141157 |  |
| Childcare Porter St. $3015320$ | C | Increase by 20 children to 50 total | P | 171078 | Minor variation to existing CUP |
| Animal Shelter addition $2606301$ | C | 2000 SF add cafe | P | 181132 | Amend CUP |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { GSAG LLC } \\ 025-131-20 \end{array}$ | MU | 1, <br> 1800 SF <br> comm | P | 181079 | confirm net $1$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Herbal Cruz } \\ & 3202223 \end{aligned}$ | C | Retail, add 800 SF | P | 181026 |  |
| Case de Montgomery 10016106 | Sanitarium/nursing home | Demolish existing 43 bed, 14,500 SF facility to construct 100 bed, 56,777 SF facility | P | 131266 |  |
| CONSULTATION AND PREAPPLICATION* |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mid Penn Capitola and $17^{\text {th }}$ <br> 2674112 | MU | 58 units 29,696 SF med. clinic and office, 1000 SF retail | NA | PA181013 |  |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 87530^{\text {th }} \\ 2809140 \end{array}$ | MF | 4 | NA | PA181021 | 4 added to existing 9 units |
| Seaview | Attached condo | 15 | NA | PA | Number units in flux |
| Prather Lane MU $02535116$ | MU medical and senior housing | 60 sr. units 20,000 SF med offices | NA | PA181016 |  |



|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dominican <br> parking <br> structure |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

* Treatment of consultations and early projects to be determined
- Includes only pending discretionary apps with net new units and non -residential SF and selected pre-application projects only.
- Confirm boundaries of search area out to Park Avenue
- "Approved not built" may be augmented
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## APPENDIX M. <br> DIAGONAL DIVERTER \& WAYFINDING SIGNAGE CONCEPT LAYOUTS AND TRAVEL TIMES
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$\overline{\text { XX-097XXXXXX } \quad \text { FEBRUARY } 2019}$

| Scenario | Distance <br> (feet) | Travel <br> Time <br> (Minutes) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Existing $\mathrm{PM}^{1}$ | 2050 | 8.15 |

1. Travel time measurement was taken from Soquel Ave (just east of Rodeo Gulch Rd) to HWY 1 SB On-Ramp off of 4 1st Ave.

## Soquel Ave
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## APPENDIX N. HIGHWAY 1 INTERCHANGE LAYOUTS
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## APPENDIX 0. HIGHWAY CAPACITY SOFTWARE (HCS) INPUTS AND RESULTS

| 2018 Exisiting Conditions |  | Highway 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Highway 17 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1. Highway 1Morrissey Blvd to Soquel Dr |  |  |  | 2. Highway 1 <br> Soquel Dr to 41st Ave |  |  |  | 3. Highway 1 <br> 41st Ave to Porter St/Bay Ave |  |  |  | 4. Highway 17Pasatiempo Overcrossing to Highway 1 Interchange |  |  |  |
|  |  | NORTHBOUND |  | SOUTHBOUND |  | NORTHBOUND |  | SOUTHBOUND |  | NORTHBOUND |  | SOUTHBOUND |  | NORTHBOUND |  | SOUTHBOUND |  |
|  |  | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM |
|  | Number of Lanes | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
|  | FF Speed (Measured) | 68.1 | 68.1 | 68.9 | 68.9 | 68.7 | 68.7 | 67.1 | 67.1 | 67.1 | 67.1 | 68.7 | 68.7 | 69.3 | 69.3 | 63.7 | 63.7 |
|  | Terrain Type | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Level | Level | Level | Level | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling |
|  | Driver Population | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix |
|  | Weather Factor | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe |
|  | Incident Type | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident |
|  | Speed Adjustment Factor | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default |
|  | Capacity Adjustment Factor | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default |
|  | Demand Adjustment Factor | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default |
|  | 2018 TDM Flow (veh/3 hour) | 3104 | 4720 | 3895 | 4399 | 3313 | 4384 | 3671 | 4234 | 3667 | 4982 | 3933 | 4982 | 2167 | 3883 | 3317 | 3009 |
|  | Proportion of flow in peak hour | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  | 2018 TDM Hourly Volume | 3104 | 4720 | 3895 | 4399 | 3313 | 4384 | 3671 | 4234 | 3667 | 4982 | 3933 | 4982 | 2167 | 3883 | 3317 | 3009 |
|  | 2018 PeMS Flow (veh/hr) | 3563 | 2193 | 1832 | 1559 | 2429 | 2326 | 1739 | 1775 | 3157 | 2553 | 2754 | 1883 | 3018 | 2996 | 1706 | 1950 |
|  | 2018 PeMS PHF | 0.91 | 0.97 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.99 | 0.96 | 0.89 | 0.93 | 0.92 | 0.97 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.95 | 0.98 | 0.90 | 0.94 |
|  | 2018 PeMS Speed | 59.8 | 42.9 | 57.4 | 19.7 | 52.8 | 57.0 | 54.8 | 9.8 | 39.2 | 61.1 | 61.3 | 10.1 | 51.3 | 52.0 | 62.6 | 61.7 |
|  | PeMs PHF | 0.91 | 0.97 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.99 | 0.96 | 0.89 | 0.93 | 0.92 | 0.97 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.95 | 0.98 | 0.90 | 0.94 |
|  | Oversaturated? (PeMS Speed < $=45 \mathrm{mph}$ ) | F | T | F | T | F | F | F | T | T | F | F | T | F | F | F | F |
|  | Demand (without site trips) | 3563 | 4720 | 1832 | 4399 | 2429 | 2326 | 1739 | 4234 | 3667 | 2553 | 2754 | 4982 | 3018 | 2996 | 1706 | 1950 |
|  | PHF (if oversaturated, min 0.95) | 0.91 | 0.95 | 0.96 | 0.95 | 0.99 | 0.96 | 0.89 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.97 | 0.84 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.98 | 0.90 | 0.94 |
|  | Trip Distribution (\%) | 19\% | 19\% | 19\% | 19\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 11\% | 11\% | 11\% | 11\% |
|  | Site Trips | 22 | 70 | 85 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 15 | 12 | 37 | 13 | 42 | 51 | 17 |
| HCS Vol. Inputs | Coded HCS Demand | 3563 | 4720 | 1832 | 4399 | 2429 | 2326 | 1739 | 4234 | 3667 | 2553 | 2754 | 4982 | 3018 | 2996 | 1706 | 1950 |
|  | Heavy Vehicle Percent (from PeMs, min 0.5\%) | 2.27\% | 0.50\% | 6.33\% | 0.50\% | 0.50\% | 0.50\% | 0.50\% | 1.07\% | 1.71\% | 3.17\% | 1.34\% | 2.23\% | 2.25\% | 2.40\% | 5.51\% | 7.64\% |
|  | PHF | 0.91 | 0.95 | 0.96 | 0.95 | 0.99 | 0.96 | 0.89 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.97 | 0.84 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.98 | 0.90 | 0.94 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { HCS } \\ \text { Outputs } \end{gathered}$ | Volume/capacity ratio | 0.60 | 0.76 | 0.49 | 1.06 | 0.56 | 0.55 | 0.45 | 1.03 | 0.91 | 0.64 | 0.76 | 1.24 | 0.90 | 0.72 | 0.49 | 0.55 |
|  | 2018 Exisiting Plus Conditions | Highway 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Highway 17 |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1. Highway 1Morrissey Blvd to Soquel Dr |  |  |  | 2. Highway 1Soquel Dr to 41st Ave |  |  |  | 3. Highway 141st Ave to Porter St/Bay Ave |  |  |  | 4. Highway 17Pasatiempo Overcrossing to Highway 1 Interchange |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | NORTHBOUND |  | SOUTHBOUND |  | NORTHBOUND |  | SOUTHBOUND |  | NORTHBOUND |  | SOUTHBOUND |  | NORTHBOUND |  | SOUTHBOUND |  |
|  |  | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM |
|  | Number of Lanes | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
|  | FF Speed (Measured) | 68.1 | 68.1 | 68.9 | 68.9 | 68.7 | 68.7 | 67.1 | 67.1 | 67.1 | 67.1 | 68.7 | 68.7 | 69.3 | 69.3 | 63.7 | 63.7 |
|  | Terrain Type | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Level | Level | Level | Level | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling |
|  | Driver Population | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix |
|  | Weather Factor | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe |
|  | Incident Type | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident |
|  | Speed Adjustment Factor | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default |
|  | Capacity Adjustment Factor | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default |
|  | Demand Adjustment Factor | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default |
|  | 2018 TDM Flow (veh/3 hour) | 3104 | 4720 | 3895 | 4399 | 3313 | 4384 | 3671 | 4234 | 3667 | 4982 | 3933 | 4982 | 2167 | 3883 | 3317 | 3009 |
|  | Proportion of flow in peak hour | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  | 2018 TDM Hourly Volume | 3104 | 4720 | 3895 | 4399 | 3313 | 4384 | 3671 | 4234 | 3667 | 4982 | 3933 | 4982 | 2167 | 3883 | 3317 | 3009 |
|  | 2018 PeMS Flow (veh/hr) | 3563 | 2193 | 1832 | 1559 | 2429 | 2326 | 1739 | 1775 | 3157 | 2553 | 2754 | 1883 | 3018 | 2996 | 1706 | 1950 |
|  | 2018 PeMS PHF | 0.91 | 0.97 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.99 | 0.96 | 0.89 | 0.93 | 0.92 | 0.97 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.95 | 0.98 | 0.90 | 0.94 |
|  | 2018 PeMS Speed | 59.8 | 42.9 | 57.4 | 19.7 | 52.8 | 57.0 | 54.8 | 9.8 | 39.2 | 61.1 | 61.3 | 10.1 | 51.3 | 52.0 | 62.6 | 61.7 |
|  | PeMS PHF | 0.91 | 0.97 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.99 | 0.96 | 0.89 | 0.93 | 0.92 | 0.97 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.95 | 0.98 | 0.90 | 0.94 |
|  | Oversaturated? (PeMS Speed < $=45 \mathrm{mph}$ ) | F | T | F | T | F | F | F | T | , | F | F | T | F | F | F | F |
|  | Demand (without site trips) | 3563 | 4720 | 1832 | 4399 | 2429 | 2326 | 1739 | 4234 | 3667 | 2553 | 2754 | 4982 | 3018 | 2996 | 1706 | 1950 |
|  | PHF (if oversaturated, min 0.95) | 0.91 | 0.95 | 0.96 | 0.95 | 0.99 | 0.96 | 0.89 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.97 | 0.84 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.98 | 0.90 | 0.94 |
|  | Trip Distribution (\%) | 19\% | 19\% | 19\% | 19\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 11\% | 11\% | 11\% | 11\% |
|  | Site Trips | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| HCS Vol. Inputs | Coded HCS Demand | 3563 | 4720 | 1832 | 4399 | 2429 | 2326 | 1739 | 4234 | 3667 | 2553 | 2754 | 4982 | 3018 | 2996 | 1706 | 1950 |
|  | Heavy Vehicle Percent (from PeMS, min 0.5\%) | 2.27\% | 0.50\% | 6.33\% | 0.50\% | 0.50\% | 0.50\% | 0.50\% | 1.07\% | 1.71\% | 3.17\% | 1.34\% | 2.23\% | 2.25\% | 2.40\% | 5.51\% | 7.64\% |
|  | PHF | 0.91 | 0.95 | 0.96 | 0.95 | 0.99 | 0.96 | 0.89 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.97 | 0.84 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.98 | 0.90 | 0.94 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { HCS } \\ \text { Outputs } \end{gathered}$ | Volume/capacity ratio | 0.62 | 0.77 | 0.51 | 1.06 | 0.56 | 0.55 | 0.45 | 1.03 | 0.92 | 0.64 | 0.77 | 1.25 | 0.75 | 0.73 | 0.50 | 0.56 |


| 2021 Near Term Conditions |  | Highway 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Highway 17 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1. Highway 1Morrissey Blva to Soquel Dr |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2. Highway } 1 \\ \text { Soquel Dr to 41st Ave } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | 3. Highway 141st Ave to Porter St/Bay Ave |  |  |  | 4. Highway 17Pasatiempo Overcrossing to Highway 1 Interchange |  |  |  |
|  |  | NORTHBOUND |  | SOUTHBOUND |  | NORTHBOUND |  | SOUTHBOUND |  | NORTHBOUND |  | SOUTHBOUND |  | NORTHBOUND |  | SOUTHBOUND |  |
|  |  | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM |
|  | Number of Lanes | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
|  | FF Speed (Measured) | 68.1 | 68.1 | 68.9 | 68.9 | 68.7 | 68.7 | 67.1 | 67.1 | 67.1 | 67.1 | 68.7 | 68.7 | 69.3 | 69.3 | 63.7 | 63.7 |
|  | Terrain Type | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Level | Level | Level | Level | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling |
|  | Driver Population | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix |
|  | Weather Factor | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe |
|  | Incident Type | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident |
|  | Speed Adjustment Factor | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default |
|  | Capacity Adjustment Factor | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default |
|  | Demand Adjustment Factor | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default |
|  | 2021 TDM Flow (veh/3 hour) | 3140 | 4763 | 3955 | 4430 | 3358 | 4397 | 3712 | 4240 | 3694 | 4996 | 4000 | 4991 | 2214 | 3916 | 3358 | 3055 |
|  | Proportion of flow in peak hour | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  | 2021 TDM Hourly Volume | 3140 | 4763 | 3955 | 4430 | 3358 | 4397 | 3712 | 4240 | 3694 | 4996 | 4000 | 4991 | 2214 | 3916 | 3358 | 3055 |
|  | 2018 PeMS Flow (veh/hr) | 3563 | 2193 | 1832 | 1559 | 2429 | 2326 | 1739 | 1775 | 3157 | 2553 | 2754 | 1883 | 3018 | 2996 | 1706 | 1950 |
|  | 2018 PeMS PHF | 0.91 | 0.97 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.99 | 0.96 | 0.89 | 0.93 | 0.92 | 0.97 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.95 | 0.98 | 0.90 | 0.94 |
|  | 2018 PeMS Speed | 59.8 | 42.9 | 57.4 | 19.7 | 52.8 | 57.0 | 54.8 | 9.8 | 39.2 | 61.1 | 61.3 | 10.1 | 51.3 | 52.0 | 62.6 | 61.7 |
|  | PeMS PHF | 0.91 | 0.97 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.99 | 0.96 | 0.89 | 0.93 | 0.92 | 0.97 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.95 | 0.98 | 0.90 | 0.94 |
|  | Oversaturated? (PeMS Speed < $=45 \mathrm{mph}$ ) | F | T | F | T | F | F | F | T | T | F | F | T | F | F | F | F |
|  | Demand (without site trips) | 3563 | 4763 | 1832 | 4430 | 2429 | 2326 | 1739 | 4240 | 3694 | 2553 | 2754 | 4991 | 3018 | 2996 | 1706 | 1950 |
|  | PHF (if oversaturated, min 0.95 ) | 0.91 | 0.95 | 0.96 | 0.95 | 0.99 | 0.96 | 0.89 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.97 | 0.84 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.98 | 0.90 | 0.94 |
|  | Trip Distribution (\%) | 19\% | 19\% | 19\% | 19\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 11\% | 11\% | 11\% | 11\% |
|  | Site Trips | 22 | 70 | 85 | 28 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 15 | 12 | 37 | 13 | 42 | 51 | 17 |
| HCS Vol. Inputs | Coded HCS Demand | 3563 | 4763 | 1832 | 4430 | 2429 | 2326 | 1739 | 4240 | 3694 | 2553 | 2754 | 4991 | 3018 | 2996 | 1706 | 1950 |
|  | Heavy Vehicle Percent (from PeMs, min 0.5\%) | 2.27\% | 0.50\% | 6.33\% | 0.50\% | 0.50\% | 0.50\% | 0.50\% | 1.07\% | 1.71\% | 3.17\% | 1.34\% | 2.23\% | 2.25\% | 2.40\% | 5.51\% | 7.64\% |
|  | PHF (min 0.92) | 0.92 | 0.95 | 0.96 | 0.95 | 0.99 | 0.96 | 0.92 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.97 | 0.92 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.98 | 0.92 | 0.94 |
| HCS Outputs | Volume/capacity ratio | 0.61 | 0.77 | 0.49 | 1.06 | 0.56 | 0.55 | 0.43 | 1.03 | 0.92 | 0.64 | 0.70 | 1.24 | 0.75 | 0.72 | 0.48 | 0.55 |
|  | 2021 Near Term Plus Conditions | Highway 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Highway 17 |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1. Highway 1Morrissey Blvd to Soquel Dr |  |  |  | 2. Highway 1 Soquel Dr to 41st Ave |  |  |  | 3. Highway 141st Ave to Porter St/Bay Ave |  |  |  | 4. Highway 17Pasatiempo Overcrossing to Highway 1 Interchange |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | NORTHBOUND |  | SOUTHBOUND |  | NORTHBOUND |  | SOUTHBOUND |  | NORTHBOUND |  | SOUTHBOUND |  | NORTHBOUND |  | SOUTHBOUND |  |
|  |  | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM |
|  | Number of Lanes | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
|  | FF Speed (Measured) | 68.1 | 68.1 | 68.9 | 68.9 | 68.7 | 68.7 | 67.1 | 67.1 | 67.1 | 67.1 | 68.7 | 68.7 | 69.3 | 69.3 | 63.7 | 63.7 |
|  | Terrain Type | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Level | Level | Level | Level | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling |
|  | Driver Population | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix |
|  | Weather Factor | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe |
|  | Incident Type | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident |
|  | Speed Adjustment Factor | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default |
|  | Capacity Adjustment Factor | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default |
|  | Demand Adjustment Factor | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default |
|  | 2021 TDM Flow (veh/3 hour) | 3140 | 4763 | 3955 | 4430 | 3358 | 4397 | 3712 | 4240 | 3694 | 4996 | 4000 | 4991 | 2214 | 3916 | 3358 | 3055 |
|  | Proportion of flow in peak hour | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  | 2021 TDM Hourly Volume | 3140 | 4763 | 3955 | 4430 | 3358 | 4397 | 3712 | 4240 | 3694 | 4996 | 4000 | 4991 | 2214 | 3916 | 3358 | 3055 |
|  | 2018 PeMs Flow (veh/hr) | 3563 | 2193 | 1832 | 1559 | 2429 | 2326 | 1739 | 1775 | 3157 | 2553 | 2754 | 1883 | 3018 | 2996 | 1706 | 1950 |
|  | 2018 PeMS PHF | 0.91 | 0.97 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.99 | 0.96 | 0.89 | 0.93 | 0.92 | 0.97 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.95 | 0.98 | 0.90 | 0.94 |
|  | 2018 PeMS Speed | 59.8 | 42.9 | 57.4 | 19.7 | 52.8 | 57.0 | 54.8 | 9.8 | 39.2 | 61.1 | 61.3 | 10.1 | 51.3 | 52.0 | 62.6 | 61.7 |
|  | PeMS PHF | 0.91 | 0.97 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.99 | 0.96 | 0.89 | 0.93 | 0.92 | 0.97 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.95 | 0.98 | 0.90 | 0.94 |
|  | Oversaturated? (PeMS Speed < $=45 \mathrm{mph}$ ) | F | T | F | T | F | F | F | T | T | F | F | T | F | F | F | F |
|  | Demand (without site trips) | 3604 | 4763 | 1860 | 4430 | 2462 | 2333 | 1758 | 4240 | 3694 | 2560 | 2801 | 4991 | 3083 | 3022 | 1727 | 1980 |
|  | PHF (if oversaturated, min 0.95 ) | 0.91 | 0.95 | 0.96 | 0.95 | 0.99 | 0.96 | 0.89 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.97 | 0.84 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.98 | 0.90 | 0.94 |
|  | Trip Distribution (\%) | 19\% | 19\% | 19\% | 19\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 11\% | 11\% | 11\% | 11\% |
|  | Site Trips | 22 | 70 | 85 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 15 | 12 | 37 | 13 | 42 | 51 | 17 |
| HCS Vol. <br> Inputs | Coded HCS Demand | 3626 | 4833 | 1945 | 4458 | 2462 | 2333 | 1758 | 4240 | 3739 | 2575 | 2813 | 5028 | 3096 | 3064 | 1778 | 1997 |
|  | Heavy Vehicle Percent (from PeMs, min 0.5\%) | 2.27\% | 0.50\% | 6.33\% | 0.50\% | 0.50\% | 0.50\% | 0.50\% | 1.07\% | 1.71\% | 3.17\% | 1.34\% | 2.23\% | 2.25\% | 2.40\% | 5.51\% | 7.64\% |
|  | PHF (min 0.92) | 0.92 | 0.95 | 0.96 | 0.95 | 0.99 | 0.96 | 0.92 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.97 | 0.92 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.98 | 0.92 | 0.94 |
| HCS Outputs | Volume/capacity ratio | 0.62 | 0.78 | 0.52 | 1.07 | 0.57 | 0.55 | 0.44 | 1.03 | 0.93 | 0.64 | 0.71 | 1.25 | 0.77 | 0.74 | 0.50 | 0.57 |


| 2040 Cumulative Conditions |  | Highway 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | way 17 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1. Highway 1Morrissey Blvd to Soquel Dr |  |  |  | 2. Highway 1 Soquel Dr to 41st Ave |  |  |  | 3. Highway 141st Ave to Porter St/Bay Ave |  |  |  | 4. Highway 17Pasatiempo Overcrossing to Highway 1 Interchange |  |  |  |
|  |  | NORTHBOUND |  | SOUTHBOUND |  | NORTHBOUND |  | SOUTHBOUND |  | NORTHBOUND |  | SOUTHBOUND |  | NORTHBOUND |  | SOUTHBOUND |  |
|  |  | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM |
|  | Number of Lanes | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
|  | FF Speed (Measured) | 68.1 | 68.1 | 68.9 | 68.9 | 68.7 | 68.7 | 67.1 | 67.1 | 67.1 | 67.1 | 68.7 | 68.7 | 69.3 | 69.3 | 63.7 | 63.7 |
|  | Terrain Type | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Level | Level | Level | Level | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling |
|  | Driver Population | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix |
|  | Weather Factor | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe |
|  | Incident Type | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident |
|  | Speed Adjustment Factor | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default |
|  | Capacity Adjustment Factor | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default |
|  | Demand Adjustment Factor | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \frac{0}{5} \\ & \frac{3}{0} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \frac{5}{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 2040 TDM Flow (veh/3 hour) | 3365 | 5034 | 4333 | 4627 | 3641 | 4479 | 3971 | 4275 | 3863 | 5158 | 4424 | 5047 | 2509 | 4126 | 3618 | 3347 |
|  | Proportion of flow in peak hour | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  | 2040 TDM Hourly Volume | 3365 | 5034 | 4333 | 4627 | 3641 | 4479 | 3971 | 4275 | 3863 | 5158 | 4424 | 5047 | 2509 | 4126 | 3618 | 3347 |
|  | 2018 PeMS Flow (veh/hr) | 3563 | 2193 | 1832 | 1559 | 2429 | 2326 | 1739 | 1775 | 3157 | 2553 | 2754 | 1883 | 3018 | 2996 | 1706 | 1950 |
|  | 2018 PeMS PHF | 0.91 | 0.97 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.99 | 0.96 | 0.89 | 0.93 | 0.92 | 0.97 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.95 | 0.98 | 0.90 | 0.94 |
|  | 2018 PeMS Speed | 59.8 | 42.9 | 57.4 | 19.7 | 52.8 | 57.0 | 54.8 | 9.8 | 39.2 | 61.1 | 61.3 | 10.1 | 51.3 | 52.0 | 62.6 | 61.7 |
|  | PeMS PHF | 0.91 | 0.97 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.99 | 0.96 | 0.89 | 0.93 | 0.92 | 0.97 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.95 | 0.98 | 0.90 | 0.94 |
|  | Oversaturated? (PeMS Speed < $=45 \mathrm{mph}$ ) | F | T | F | T | F | F | F | T | T | F | F | T | F | F | F | F |
|  | Demand (without site trips) | 3862 | 5034 | 2038 | 4627 | 2669 | 2377 | 1881 | 4275 | 3863 | 2643 | 3098 | 5047 | 3494 | 3184 | 1861 | 2169 |
|  | PHF (if oversaturated, min 0.95 ) | 0.91 | 0.95 | 0.96 | 0.95 | 0.99 | 0.96 | 0.89 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.97 | 0.84 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.98 | 0.90 | 0.94 |
|  | Trip Distribution (\%) | 19\% | 19\% | 19\% | 19\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 11\% | 11\% | 11\% | 11\% |
|  | Site Trips | 20 | 68 | 86 | 24 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 45 | 13 | 11 | 36 | 12 | 41 | 51 | 14 |
| HCS Vol. Inputs | Coded HCS Demand | 3862 | 5034 | 2038 | 4627 | 2669 | 2377 | 1881 | 4275 | 3863 | 2643 | 3098 | 5047 | 3494 | 3184 | 1861 | 2169 |
|  | Heavy Vehicle Percent (from PeMs, min 0.5\%) | 2.27\% | 0.50\% | 6.33\% | 0.50\% | 0.50\% | 0.50\% | 0.50\% | 1.07\% | 1.71\% | 3.17\% | 1.34\% | 2.23\% | 2.25\% | 2.40\% | 5.51\% | 7.64\% |
|  | PHF (min 0.92) | 0.92 | 0.95 | 0.96 | 0.95 | 0.99 | 0.96 | 0.92 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.97 | 0.92 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.98 | 0.92 | 0.94 |
| HCS Outputs | Volume/capacity ratio | 0.66 | 0.81 | 0.54 | 1.11 | 0.61 | 0.56 | 0.47 | 1.04 | 0.96 | 0.66 | 0.78 | 1.26 | 0.87 | 0.77 | 0.52 | 0.61 |
|  | 2040 Cumulative Plus Conditions | Highway 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Highway 17 |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1. Highway 1Morrissey Blvd to Soquel Dr |  |  |  | 2. Highway 1Soquel Dr to 41st Ave |  |  |  | 3. Highway 141st Ave to Porter St/Bay Ave |  |  |  | 4. Highway 17Pasatiempo Overcrossing to Highway 1 Interchange |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | NORTHBOUND |  | SOUTHBOUND |  | NORTHBOUND |  | SOUTHBOUND |  | NORTHBOUND |  | SOUTHBOUND |  | NORTHBOUND |  | SOUTHBOUND |  |
|  |  | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM | AM | PM |
|  | Number of Lanes | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
|  | FF Speed (Measured) | 68.1 | 68.1 | 68.9 | 68.9 | 68.7 | 68.7 | 67.1 | 67.1 | 67.1 | 67.1 | 68.7 | 68.7 | 69.3 | 69.3 | 63.7 | 63.7 |
|  | Terrain Type | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Level | Level | Level | Level | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling | Rolling |
|  | Driver Population | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix | Balanced Mix |
|  | Weather Factor | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe | Non-Severe |
|  | Incident Type | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident | No Incident |
|  | Speed Adjustment Factor | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default |
|  | Capacity Adjustment Factor | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default |
|  | Demand Adjustment Factor | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default | Default |
|  | 2040 TDM Flow (veh/3 hour) | 3365 | 5034 | 4333 | 4627 | 3641 | 4479 | 3971 | 4275 | 3863 | 5158 | 4424 | 5047 | 2509 | 4126 | 3618 | 3347 |
|  | Proportion of flow in peak hour | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
|  | 2040 TDM Hourly Volume | 3365 | 5034 | 4333 | 4627 | 3641 | 4479 | 3971 | 4275 | 3863 | 5158 | 4424 | 5047 | 2509 | 4126 | 3618 | 3347 |
|  | 2018 PeMS Flow (veh/hr) | 3563 | 2193 | 1832 | 1559 | 2429 | 2326 | 1739 | 1775 | 3157 | 2553 | 2754 | 1883 | 3018 | 2996 | 1706 | 1950 |
|  | 2018 PeMS PHF | 0.91 | 0.97 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.99 | 0.96 | 0.89 | 0.93 | 0.92 | 0.97 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.95 | 0.98 | 0.90 | 0.94 |
|  | 2018 PeMS Speed | 59.8 | 42.9 | 57.4 | 19.7 | 52.8 | 57.0 | 54.8 | 9.8 | 39.2 | 61.1 | 61.3 | 10.1 | 51.3 | 52.0 | 62.6 | 61.7 |
|  | PeMS PHF | 0.91 | 0.97 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.99 | 0.96 | 0.89 | 0.93 | 0.92 | 0.97 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.95 | 0.98 | 0.90 | 0.94 |
|  | Oversaturated? (PeMS Speed < $=45 \mathrm{mph}$ ) | F | T | F | T | F | F | F | T | T | F | F | T | F | F | F | F |
|  | Demand (without site trips) | 3862 | 5034 | 2038 | 4627 | 2669 | 2377 | 1881 | 4275 | 3863 | 2643 | 3098 | 5047 | 3494 | 3184 | 1861 | 2169 |
|  | PHF (if oversaturated, min 0.95 ) | 0.91 | 0.95 | 0.96 | 0.95 | 0.99 | 0.96 | 0.89 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.97 | 0.84 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.98 | 0.90 | 0.94 |
|  | Trip Distribution (\%) | 19\% | 19\% | 19\% | 19\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 11\% | 11\% | 11\% | 11\% |
|  | Site Trips | 20 | 68 | 86 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 13 | 11 | 36 | 12 | 41 | 51 | 14 |
| HCS Vol. Inputs | Coded HCS Demand | 3882 | 5102 | 2124 | 4651 | 2669 | 2377 | 1881 | 4275 | 3908 | 2656 | 3109 | 5083 | 3506 | 3225 | 1912 | 2183 |
|  | Heavy Vehicle Percent (from PeMS, min 0.5\%) | 2.27\% | 0.50\% | 6.33\% | 0.50\% | 0.50\% | 0.50\% | 0.50\% | 1.07\% | 1.71\% | 3.17\% | 1.34\% | 2.23\% | 2.25\% | 2.40\% | 5.51\% | 7.64\% |
|  | PHF | 0.92 | 0.95 | 0.96 | 0.95 | 0.99 | 0.96 | 0.92 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.97 | 0.92 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.98 | 0.92 | 0.94 |
| $\square$ Outputs | Volume/capacity ratio | 0.67 | 0.82 | 0.56 | 1.12 | 0.61 | 0.56 | 0.47 | 1.04 | 0.97 | 0.66 | 0.79 | 1.27 | 0.87 | 0.78 | 0.53 | 0.62 |





## Kimley»)Horn

## APPENDIX P. <br> SR 1 HOV LANE WIDENING PROJECT SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT (MAY 2010)

## DRAFT PROJECT REPORT

## TO AUTHORIZE PUBLIC RELEASE <br> OF <br> THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT <br> FOR <br> OPERATIONAL IMPROVEMENTS

On Route 1 in Santa Cruz County in and near Capitola and Santa Cruz
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## 1. INTRODUCTION

The project site extends approximately 1.4 miles along State Route 1 in Santa Cruz County, between the 41 st Avenue and Soquel Drive interchanges. The "build" alternative proposes to widen State Route 1 by adding auxiliary lanes to the north and southbound sides between the $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue and Soquel Drive Interchanges (PM13.5-PM14.9). A new bike and pedestrian overcrossing is proposed at Chanticleer Avenue to improve bicycle and pedestrian access across State Route 1. The estimated construction cost of this alternative, including right-of-way, is \$17.9 million. Right-of-way would be acquired for the construction of the bike and pedestrian overcrossing approach ramps. The project is proposed to be funded from the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission's Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP), State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), and Regional Improvement Program (RIP) funds over 4 years. PS\&E for this project will be developed under EA 05-0C732.

This is a Project Development Category 4B type project, because it does not require substantial new right of way and does not substantially increase traffic capacity.

Environmental analysis and documentation for this project is found in the Tier I/Tier II Draft Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Assessment (DEIR/EA) (Attachment G) entitled, "Santa Cruz Route 1 HOV Tier I Corridor Analysis of High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lanes and Transportation System Management (TSM) Alternatives and Tier II Build Project Analysis, 41st Avenue to Soquel Avenue/Drive Auxiliary Lanes and Chanticleer Avenue Pedestrian Overcrossing", which will identify a Tier I preferred alternative for a "program" of future construction projects to be implemented within the 8.9 mile corridor over multiple years. This Project Report is for the Tier II project of the title and is analyzed at a project level in the DEIR/EA. Any additional Tier II projects will be cleared environmentally with their own Project Report and Environmental Document when their scope is determined and funds become available.

The two alternatives under consideration are the No Build Alternative and the Auxiliary Lane Alternative. The No Build alternative assumes no major construction on State Route 1 through the project limits other than continued routine maintenance. If the auxiliary lane project is selected, construction is assumed to begin in July 2019.

| Project Limits | $05-\mathrm{SCr}-1$ - PM 13.5/14.9 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Number of Alternatives | 1 build alternative |
| Current Capital Outlay Support <br> Estimate | $\$ 5.4$ million |
| Current Capital Outlay <br> Construction Estimate | $\$ 16.6$ million |
| Current Capital Outlay <br> Right-of-Way Estimate | $\$ 1.3$ million |
| Funding Source |  <br> 400.100 (Local) |
| Funding Year | $2013-2017$ |


| Type of Facility | 4-lane freeway |
| :--- | :--- |
| Number of Structures | 1 bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing |
| Environmental Determination or <br> Document | Tier I/Tier II Draft Environmental Impact Report / <br> Environmental Assessment (DEIR/EA) |
| Legal Description | On Route 1 in Santa Cruz County in and near <br> Capitola and Santa Cruz_between 41st Avenue <br> Overcrossing and Soquel Avenue/Drive <br> Overcrossing |
| Project Development Category | 4B |

## 2. RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Draft Environmental Document (DED) be publicly circulated and a public hearing be scheduled.

It is recommended that a cooperative agreement for the Plan, Specifications and Estimate (PS\&E) phase be negotiated with Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC), and that the County/State cooperative storm drain features be approved and an agreement be negotiated with the County of Santa Cruz during PS\&E phase.

## 3. BACKGROUND

### 3.1 Project History

This project originated as a Santa Cruz County State Route 1 corridor improvement project. The study segment is heavily congested during morning and evening commute times. The congestion has extended the peak operating hours to approximately 4 hours for morning and evening commutes. Summer weekends have been especially impacted as increasing tourist traffic compounds the local congestion.

A Project Study Report - Project Development Support (PSR-PDS) approved August 2002 discussed three "build" alternatives for improvements to the Santa Cruz County State Route 1 corridor between State Park Drive and Morrissey Boulevard:

- High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) striped/separated lanes with standard median width and braided or collector ramps
- HOV striped/separated lanes with non-standard median width
- Two additional mixed-flow lanes with a standard median and ramp meters with HOV bypass lanes on all ramps

Another Caltrans-prepared PSR-PDS, approved October 2002, and a consultant-prepared Supplemental PSR-PDS, approved April 2006, both focused on operational improvements and neither addressed HOV lanes. One of the alternatives in the April 2006 supplemental PSR-PDS was the Morrissey Boulevard to Soquel Avenue Auxiliary Lanes Project (EA 05-0F650, SR1 14.9/15.9).

The State Route 1/State Route 17 Merge Lane Project and the Morrissey Boulevard to Soquel Avenue Auxiliary Lanes Project are both included as part of this project's "No Build" scenario because both of these projects have been completed.

Between 2003 and 2011, two build alternatives were developed from those proposed in the Caltrans-prepared August 2002 and October 2002 PSR-PDSs, which address this project purpose:
"The purpose of the Highway 1 HOV Lane Widening Project is to reduce congestion, improve safety, and encourage carpooling and use of alternative transportation modes as the means to increase transportation system capacity"

The two build alternatives were developed with intent to gain project approval and proceed with final design, taking into account previous project efforts, potential environmental impacts and early public outreach efforts. Local officials were involved via meetings with individuals, boards, and commissions.

The two "build" alternatives previously on the Project Approval / Environmental Documentation (PAED path) were:

HOV Lane Alternative: This alternative proposes to modify or reconstruct all nine interchanges between Larkin Valley Road and Morrissey Boulevard to improve merging operations and to widen the existing four-lane highway to a six-lane facility by adding an HOV lane next to the median in both the northbound and southbound directions. Existing bridge structures, including the two Santa Cruz Branch Line railroad structures and the Capitola Avenue overcrossing, are proposed to be modified or replaced to accommodate highway widening to match the ultimate six-through-lane concept. New and widened highway crossing structures (including the two Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line crossings) are proposed to include shoulder and sidewalk facilities to accommodate pedestrians and bicycles. The HOV Lane Alternative includes new ramp structures at Soquel Creek and Porter Street/Bay Avenue. The HOV Lane Alternative proposes to include three new bicycle/pedestrian overcrossings of State Route 1 and also include ramp metering, HOV by-pass lanes onramps, auxiliary lanes between interchange ramps, and Transportation Operation Systems (electronic equipment such as changeable message signs and vehicle detection systems). No auxiliary lane is proposed to be constructed northbound between San Andreas Road and Freedom Boulevard, nor between State Park Drive and Park Avenue. Bus pads with pedestrian access to local streets are proposed at Park Avenue, Bay Avenue/ Porter Street, and $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue to facilitate faster and easier highway access for buses. Retaining walls are proposed to be constructed to minimize right-of-way acquisition, and to minimize or avoid environmental impacts.

Transportation System Management Alternative: The Transportation System Management Alternative was developed as a minimum footprint alternative, since this project is subject to formal environmental consideration. This alternative proposes ramp metering and HOV by-pass lanes on all onramps within the limits of the project. Construction of auxiliary lanes is proposed between the following interchanges:

1. Freedom Boulevard and Rio Del Mar Boulevard
2. Rio Del Mar Boulevard and State Park Drive
3. State Park Drive and Park Avenue
4. Park Avenue and Bay Avenue-Porter Street.
5. 41st Avenue and Soquel Avenue-Soquel Drive

The Transportation System Management Alternative also proposes to include Transportation Operation Systems. The north and south Santa Cruz Branch Line railroad structures and the State Park Drive, Capitola Avenue, $41{ }^{\text {st }}$ Avenue and Soquel overcrossings are proposed to be reconstructed to allow for standard geometrics on State Route 1. Ramps at all nine interchanges would be improved. The Aptos Creek bridge is proposed to be widened. Pedestrian/bicycle overcrossings are proposed to be constructed across State Route 1 at Mar Vista Drive, Chanticleer Avenue, and Trevethan Avenue. This alternative does not propose HOV lanes or any additional through lanes on the mainline.

Because neither alternative was likely to be funded in the near-term, the Project Development Team proceeded to lay out a phasing plan that both prioritized the proposed auxiliary lane portion of the projects by their operational benefits and effects, and presented a multi-year possible funding plan. The prioritization study is now a chapter of the project's Traffic Operations Report (TOR). However, in May 2011, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) officials reported that they could not approve a final environmental document for either of the corridor alternatives under study in the HOV Lanes and Transportation System Management Alternatives project unless a committed source of funding was identified.

In response to FHWA's decision, the project team and FHWA agreed that a transition to a tiered environmental document would allow full disclosure at a planning level of the HOV Lanes and Transportation System Management Alternatives as they had been defined, including the project's impacts, costs, and benefits (Tier I) and also provide environmental documentation of a project deemed financially feasible from existing funding sources (Tier II). The Tier I/Tier II Draft Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Assessment (DEIR/EA) will be used to identify a preferred alternative for a "program" of future construction projects to be implemented within the 8.5 mile corridor over multiple years. As funding becomes available, projects within the program would become Tier II construction-level projects and would be subject to separate environmental review.

To identify an initial Tier II project, the team used the auxiliary lane prioritization study developed as part of the effort to develop a funding plan for the entire corridor. Through this process the project team recommended designating the $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue/Soquel Avenue/Drive Auxiliary Lanes and the Chanticleer bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing as the Tier II project for environmental analysis and project approval.

### 3.2 Community Interaction

Local jurisdictions' elected representatives have been kept informed about the progress and design features of the 41st Avenue to Soquel Avenue Auxiliary lanes project by their Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC) representative, and through project presentations to their councils, boards or commissions. The most recent presentation of the 41st Avenue to Soquel Avenue Auxiliary lanes project to the SCCRTC board (a public meeting) was May 2, 2013.

The Chanticleer Overcrossing was presented to SCCRTC's Bicycle Committee in February, 2012 and March, 2013.Throughout the design development process of the Tier 1 HOV Lanes and Transportation System Management project alternatives, community involvement has been solicited by Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC) and jurisdictions represented on the Project Development Team (PDT). Upon the initiation of the Tier 1 HOV Lanes and Transportation System Management project study in April 2004, a series of Open Houses were held where the corridor project was presented and comments from the community regarding project scoping were obtained, including discussion of the need for and potential locations of bicycle/pedestrian crossings over State Route 1. Meetings were subsequently held with the public and targeted "special interest" groups on May 19 and 24, 2005, to discuss and refine the design considerations and the locations of three proposed pedestrian/bicycle crossing structures within the Tier 1 HOV Lanes and Transportation System Management, of which only the Chanticleer Avenue overcrossing is part of the Tier II 41st Avenue to Soquel Avenue Auxiliary lanes project. Groups representing cyclists, pedestrians, seniors, neighboring schools, and the disabled were invited to meetings to share their trip routes, their ideas and their concerns.

An SCCRTC representative regularly attends the Bicycle, Interagency, and the Elderly and Disabled Technical Advisory Committees to offer updates on the project.

The CHP is regularly notified of PDT meetings and receives PDT minutes. Discussions occur asneeded between SCCRTC and the CHP, and other emergency response groups.

### 3.3 Existing Facility

State Route 1 in the project area is a four-lane divided freeway. Lanes are $12-\mathrm{ft}$ wide.
The existing median in the project area is a combination of paved and graded shoulder with a thrie beam or concrete barrier, and varies in width from approximately 37 ft to 21 ft . In the southbound direction, the existing inside paved shoulder width varies from approximately 4 ft to 18 ft and in the northbound direction, the existing inside paved shoulder width varies from 18 ft to 7 ft .

In the southbound direction between the project limits, the outside shoulder width varies from 8 ft to 12 ft . In the northbound direction between the project limits, the outside shoulder width varies from 6 ft to 8 ft .

The interchange configuration between $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue and Soquel Drive is shown in Figure 5-1.
The posted speed limit in both directions is 65 mph . The segment alignment is straight except for one $1000-\mathrm{ft}$ curve of radius $4000-\mathrm{ft}$, beginning approximately $1150-\mathrm{ft}$ north of the 41 st Avenue overcrossing. The terrain is relatively level, rising from $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue at a rate of $0.5 \%$ to approximately PM 14.4 and gradually sloping down towards Soquel Avenue at a rate of $1.2 \%$. This segment drains to inlets and ditches at the edge of pavement on both sides as well as to the median, and then through pipes and culverts to adjacent County facilities.

North of the project limits in the northbound direction, State Route 1 has two through lanes and an auxiliary lane between Soquel Drive and Morrissey Boulevard. In the southbound direction,

State Route 1 has two through lanes and an auxiliary lane from Morrissey Boulevard to Soquel Avenue. South of the project limits, State Route 1 is a four-lane divided freeway, with auxiliary lanes between $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue and Bay Avenue/Porter Street.

The existing 41st Avenue and Soquel Drive interchanges have single-lane on- and off ramps. The 41st Avenue interchange is a Type L-9. The Soquel Drive interchange is a Type L-9 in the northbound direction. The northbound diagonal off ramp includes an option to exit onto Commercial Way prior to the ramp terminus at a signalized intersection at Soquel Drive. In the southbound direction, the off ramp passes under the Soquel Drive overcrossing to meet Soquel Avenue at a signalized intersection. Traffic turning right onto Soquel Avenue can merge onto Soquel Avenue at a free right turn. At the same signalized intersection is the entrance to the existing hook-onramp to southbound State Route 1.Right-of-way limits vary from148 ft to 255 ft along this portion of State Route 1.

Existing constraints include low-quality wetlands (see project plans, Attachment C) at the existing edges of pavement on the northbound side, Soquel Avenue on the southbound side, and proposed support piers for the bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing in the median and at the outside shoulder on the northbound side.

The arterials and main local streets in the project area vicinity are described below. Each of the arterials described below feeds into State Route 1. In addition, Soquel Drive, Soquel Avenue, and $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue are striped with Class II bicycle lanes.

Soquel Drive crosses State Route 1 in the project area. It runs south beyond the project area parallel to State Route 1 approximately eight (8) miles, two lanes in each direction, starting at its intersection with Soquel Avenue and ending at Freedom Boulevard.

Soquel Avenue serves the southwestern part of the project area. To the east, it begins at Pacific Avenue and crosses over the San Lorenzo River. Just south of State Route 1, Soquel Avenue turns right and continues along south of the highway to Gross Road. Also at this junction, Soquel Avenue feeds into Soquel Drive, crossing over the highway and paralleling it on the north side. It is a three-and-a-half mile, primarily two-lane road that widens in some sections.

41st Avenue is the most heavily traveled of all of the arterials in the study area. It travels north and south in two directions for two miles between Soquel Drive and East Cliff Drive on the waterfront. It is two lanes in most locations, but it is as wide as six lanes in sections between Soquel Drive and Capitola Road. The City of Capitola's main retail corridor is comprised of $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue.

## 4. NEED AND PURPOSE

### 4.1 Problem, Deficiencies, Justification

The HOV and Transportation System Management alternatives discussed in the "Background" section of this report include auxiliary lanes between the interchanges along the corridor. In April 2010, a traffic operations analysis was performed to prioritize the auxiliary lane improvements, independent of the HOV lanes and ramp metering, on their potential to relieve congestion and at the same time minimize "hot spots" along the corridor. Each auxiliary lane reach was analyzed
independently and ten Measures of Effectiveness were compared. Traffic condition discussion in this section is based upon the April 2010 analysis and Chapter 8 of April 2012 TOR.

The purpose of the 41st Avenue to Soquel Avenue/Drive Auxiliary Lanes and Chanticleer Overcrossing Project is to reduce congestion, improve safety and to promote the use of alternative transportation modes as a means to increase transportation system capacity.

The Tier II project purpose matches that of the Santa Cruz County Route 1 Tier I HOV Lanes and Transportation System Management Alternatives project, that is, reducing congestion and encouraging use of alternative transportation modes as a means to increase system capacity, except that encouraging carpooling is not a part of this Tier II project purpose. State Route 1 in Santa Cruz County is congested in the northbound direction during the AM peak hour, and in the southbound direction during the PM peak hour. During AM peak hour, the mainline segment between the Soquel Drive and $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue interchanges currently operates at LOS F northbound and LOS C southbound. During the PM peak hour, the segment operates at LOS F in both directions.

The 2010 phased implementation analysis that examined ten Measures of Effectiveness (MOE) for auxiliary lanes between the interchanges in Santa Cruz County prioritized the northbound and southbound auxiliary lanes independently.

There are currently auxiliary lanes in both directions in the segments north and south of this proposed project, (between the 41st and Bay Street/Porter Avenue interchanges and between Soquel Drive to Morrissey Boulevard). The implementation of the proposed auxiliary lane along northbound State Route 1 between 41st Avenue and Soquel Drive interchanges would remove the bottleneck located between westbound 41st Avenue on ramp and Soquel Drive off ramp and would relieve the congestion it causes. While it would not create a new bottleneck between the Park Avenue on ramp and the Bay Avenue/Porter Street off ramp, the project would expose and lengthen in duration the bottleneck now hidden under the long queues formed because of the existing bottleneck located between westbound 41 st Avenue on ramp and Soquel Drive off ramp. Although the hidden bottleneck would be exposed, the construction of this auxiliary lane would have operational benefits compared to the No Build scenario during the AM peak period ${ }^{1}$ :

- It would remove the bottleneck located between westbound $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue onramp and Soquel Drive off ramp.
- Of the auxiliary lanes studied, it would provide the most congestion relief in the northbound State Route 1 corridor (Aptos to Santa Cruz) operations by:
- Reducing the average travel time along the corridor by 22 percent during the AM peak hour and 14 percent during the AM peak period.
- Increasing the average travel speed along the corridor by 8 mph to 37 mph during the AM peak hour and by 6 mph to 42 mph during the AM peak period.
- Increasing the overall vehicle and person trips by 5 percent during the AM peak hour and 1 percent during the AM peak period.
- Improving the LOS of the corridor from LOS F to LOS E during the AM peak period.
- Reducing the average travel time along the corridor by 1 percent during the PM peak hour and 6 percent during the PM peak period.

[^36]- Increasing the average travel speed along the corridor by 3 mph to 56 mph during the PM peak period.

In the northbound direction, LOS would be unchanged. Average travel speed during PM peak hour would stay approximately the same, as would person throughput.

The auxiliary lane between $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue and Soquel Drive interchanges would provide the most benefit to the operating conditions of northbound State Route 1 of the auxiliary lanes studied.

In the southbound direction, the Soquel Avenue to $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue auxiliary lane was rated fifth priority. It would not create or expose any bottlenecks.

The study shows that this auxiliary lane would provide negligible improvement in the southbound PM period State Route 1 corridor operations by:

- Reducing the average travel time along the corridor by 8 percent during the PM peak hour and 4 percent during the PM peak period.
- Increasing the overall vehicle and person trips by 1 percent during the PM peak period.

Average speed would be reduced from 15 mph to 14 mph during peak hour and from 25 mph to 24 mph during peak period, and LOS would be the same as No Build: F.

In the northbound direction during the AM peak hour, No-Build travel time along the Santa Cruz County Corridor (Aptos to Santa Cruz) is forecasted be 24 minutes at an average speed of 29 mph .

In the southbound direction during PM peak hour, No-Build travel time is forecasted to be 46 minutes at an average speed of 15 mph , Aptos to Santa Cruz.

Weave analysis results are shown in the table below.
Table 4.1 Weave Analysis

|  |  | LOCATION |  |  | Wemposite <br> SR 1 <br> Direction | Peak <br> Period |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | From | To | Composite <br> LOS | LOS <br> without <br> Aux Lane |  |  |
| Southbound | AM Peak | Soquel <br> Avenue <br> Onramp | 41 st Avenue <br> off ramp | A | D | B |
| Southbound | PM Peak | Soquel <br> Avenue <br> Onramp | 41st Avenue <br> off ramp | A | F | D |
| Northbound | AM Peak | 41 st Avenue <br> Onramp | Soquel <br> Avenue off <br> ramp | A | F | D |
| Northbound | PM Peak | 41st Avenue <br> Onramp | Soquel <br> Avenue off <br> ramp | A | F | D |

Within the project limits, there is no opportunity for vehicles, pedestrians, or cyclists to cross State Route 1 except at 41 st Avenue and Soquel Interchanges - the busiest interchanges in the County serving the most traveled section of State Route 1 in the County. The Soquel Drive overcrossing, just west of the project, has sidewalk only on the north side. The 41st Avenue overcrossing has sidewalks and bike lanes on both sides. At both interchanges, pedestrians and cyclists use crosswalks to navigate high-speed free right turns as vehicles enter and exit the highway.
The Chanticleer Avenue overcrossing is one of three proposed over State Route 1 between Larkin Valley Road/San Andreas Road and Morrissey Boulevard in response to ongoing community requests for safe and convenient non-motorized crossing of State Route 1, and in support of SCCRTC's goal of promoting alternative transportation modes. The overcrossing locations were initially selected based on input received from local agency and project related agency staff on November 18, 2004, to begin to address the needs of the bicycle and pedestrian community related to crossing SR 1 given current and long-range land use plans. On May 16, 2005, prior to holding public meetings, SCCRTC met with planning and redevelopment staff from the City and County of Santa Cruz who were not able to attend the November 18, 2004 meeting. Meetings were subsequently held with the public and targeted "special interest" groups on May 19 and 24, 2005, to discuss and refine the design concepts and the locations of three proposed pedestrian/bicycle crossing structures at Mar Vista Drive, Chanticleer Avenue, and Trevethan Avenue. Groups representing cyclists, pedestrians, seniors, neighboring schools, and the disabled were invited to meetings to share their trip routes, their ideas and their concerns.

Following local agency, community, and stakeholder interest group meetings the recommended bicycle/pedestrian crossing locations were reviewed and approved by the SCCRTC's Board of Directors in September 2005, following presentation before the SCCRTC's advisory bodies, including: the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee, Bicycle Committee, and the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee.

As previously presented, the area around this section of State Route 1 is currently and will, through long range plans, continue to be to be the highest density urban development in the county served by the highest volume interchanges along State Route 1:41st Avenue and Soquel Drive. Recognition of the increasing density has led to local interest in establishing in a safe crossing for non-motorized travelers now and into the future as urban development will adapt and adopt to non-motorized modes of travel. Chanticleer Avenue south of State Route 1 currently has pedestrian facilities and a north/south bike lane that connects to a network of east/west bike lanes on Soquel Avenue, Rodriquez Street, Capitola Road, and Brommer Street. Chanticleer Avenue north of the State Route 1 has pedestrian facilities proximate to Soquel Drive, which is a major east/west pedestrian and bicycle route that connects medical facilities, located along Chanticleer with those clustered around Dominican Hospital, the regional medical center for Santa Cruz County.
Currently there is no credible source for projecting long term bike and pedestrian traffic across State Route 1 at this location. The Association of Monterey Bay Governments (AMBAG) is preparing a bike model, however the model is not yet calibrated for application in this area.
Throughout this area are residential neighborhoods and schools, commercial and recreational destinations on both sides of State Route 1. Destinations within one-half mile of State Route 1 and between Soquel Avenue/Soquel Drive and 41st Avenue include:

- Good Shepherd School
- Green Acres Elementary
- Tierra Pacifica Charter School
- Ocean Alternative Education Center
- Chanticleer Park
- Sutter Hospital
- Dominican Hospital
- Winkle Farm Park
- Coffee Lane Park


### 4.2 Regional \& System Planning

State Route 1 is a High Emphasis Corridor and serves as the primary route connecting communities in the southern and central areas of Santa Cruz County. As the only continuous route through the County, State Route 1 serves as the commuter spine linking Watsonville, Aptos, Santa Cruz and the University of California at Santa Cruz. Approximately one quarter (1/4) of commuters using State Route 1 continue on State Route 17, also a High Emphasis Corridor, to Santa Clara County job sites. State Route 1 is also the southern terminus for State Routes 9 and 17, both of which bring heavy tourist traffic to coastal destinations in Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties.

The study segment is on the National Highway System (NHS), a national network of routes interconnecting the major urban areas of the nation. In addition to serving as the primary route in Santa Cruz County, State Route 1 is also a High Emphasis Route in the Caltrans Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan, and is part of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act (STAA) National Network (Truck Terminal Access). Within the project area, State Route 1 does not intersect any other truck routes, however, State Route 9 just north of Morrissey Boulevard, is a California Legal Advisory Route.

While the August 2006 Ramp Meter Development Plan (RMDP) identifies State Route 1 from Larkin Valley Road to Morrissey Boulevard for the inclusion of ramp meters, this project does not modify or construct a new interchange and thus would not include ramp meters. Widening of State Route 1 was first introduced as a long-range project in the 1986 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The highest priority State Route 1 projects were the Mission Street widening project, which was completed in May 2002, and the State Route $1 / 17$ Merge Lane Project which was completed in December 2008. High occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes on State Route 1 remain listed on SCCRTC's draft project list for the 2014 RTP. SCCRTC recognizes that the cost of completing the entire HOV Lanes and Transportation System Management Alternatives project on State Route 1 is beyond the amount of discretionary funding that is reasonably expected for the region over the life of the 2014 RTP ( 22 years). The approach approved by the SCCRTC is to prioritize funding for the initial phases of the project. Before the HOV lanes can be built, the following work must be completed to provide the width necessary for additional lanes and to ensure motorist safety:

- Construction of auxiliary lanes for most of the distance between Morrissey Rd. and Larkin Valley Rd, which includes this project.
- Reconstructing most of the interchanges
- Replacing the railroad bridges in Aptos

The auxiliary lanes between Morrissey and Soquel are built and three more auxiliary lane projects, including the 41st Avenue to Soquel Avenue Auxiliary Lanes project, are on SCCRTC's priority list for completion over the lifespan of the RTP, based on foreseeable funding. From 1994 to 1998, the SCCRTC conducted a Major Transportation Investment Study (MTIS) on the Watsonville- Santa Cruz- University of California Santa Cruz (UCSC) corridor which encompasses State Route 1. Following public hearings on options identified in the MTIS, the SCCRTC Board adopted a program of projects including a project to widen a segment of the highway for High Occupancy Toll (HOT) Lanes. Subsequently, SCCRTC requested Caltrans to prepare a Project Study Report to explore alternatives that would reduce congestion, including HOT Lane alternatives. The 2001 Regional Transportation Plan identified widening State Route 1 as the highest priority project. The April 2006 Transportation Concept Report (TCR) for this segment proposes a six-through-lane facility to obtain a future LOS D within twenty years. Traffic analysis shows that auxiliary lanes are warranted in this segment in addition to the six through lanes in twenty years. The proposed Chanticleer Avenue bicycle/ pedestrian overcrossing and Retaining walls 2, 3 and 4 would be in their future Transportation Concept locations, and would accommodate six standard through lanes and two auxiliary lanes. Retaining wall 1 is considered "throwaway" and in conflict with ultimate improvements, because it would be demolished when the $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue interchange is rebuilt to accommodate the TCR segment. See Attachment C for location of Retaining Walls 1, 2, 3 and 4.

The operational improvements expected from this project would provide incremental relief for transit, and would not preclude any future transit improvements such as ramp metering, ramp by-pass lanes or HOV lanes.

The District System Management Plan (DSMP) for District 5 is the 20-year vision document for carrying out its responsibilities as owner/operator of the State transportation system. It is a strategic planning document describing how the State corridors will be managed and developed through the
year 2025. While the DSMP is essentially an internal document, it has been developed to incorporate local and regional policies and goals, such as those in the RTP and TCR.

The 2006 DSMP describes six key strategies for transportation system management in District 5. This project considers and supports these strategies:

Strategy 1 - Improve safety and security, all modes: This project conforms to the Highway Design Manual (HDM), addresses weaving and merging operations, includes sidewalk along Soquel Avenue and adds a lighted overcrossing for bikes and pedestrians.

Strategy 2 - Maintain and preserve transportation systems: This operational improvement project would maximize use of existing infrastructure, life cycle cost has been considered.

Strategy 3 - Improve mobility through improved multimodal system: The overcrossing proposed with this project would provide a safe crossing of the highway for bikes and pedestrians.

Strategy 4 -Support economic vitality: This project is part of a plan for a comprehensive transportation system capable of meeting the travel and access needs of the general public, including local business access, commuting, tourism and goods movement.

Strategy 5 - Preserve and enhance the environment: This project's development examines environmental impacts, and proposes mitigations such as landscape replacement and aesthetic treatment of structures.

Strategy 6 - Reflect community values: This project is a part of the larger State Route 1 HOV Lanes and Transportation System Management Alternatives Project, whose progress and design features have been presented to and discussed with elected officials, commissions and the public.

Local planning jurisdictions are members of the PDT. Two of the jurisdictions, the City of Capitola and Santa Cruz County, have adopted general plans with which this project is considered compatible, although the adopted plans do not currently show the proposed geometrics. The traffic analysis was based on the balanced traffic forecasts generated by the Year 2030 Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) Regional Travel Demand Model, which maintains current regional development data. California Coastal Commission staff have been involved in the planning process.

There are Class 2 bike lanes in the project area on Soquel Avenue, west and parallel to State Route 1: on Soquel Drive over the highway; on Chanticleer Avenue, running south of Soquel Avenue to Brommer Street; on $17^{\text {th }}$ Avenue, Commercial Way and Chanticleer Avenue and on $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue south of and across the interchange. The proposal is compatible with Santa Cruz County's regional bike plan. Section 4.1 discusses community involvement in selecting the location of the Chanticleer Avenue pedestrian and bicycle overcrossing.

### 4.3 Traffic

A detailed traffic operations report entitled, "State Route 1 HOV Widening Project, from Morrissey Boulevard to San Andreas Drive Traffic Operations Report" was prepared in July 2007 for the SCCRTC. The July 2007 report was supplemented in May 2010 and August 2011, to address proposed design changes at several locations along the corridor and provide traffic operations analysis of potential Tier II projects. These reports include analysis of the State Route 1 within the project limits. The approved traffic operations report is dated April 2012.

Where this document refers to existing traffic volumes or conditions, it refers to traffic data collected in 2001 and 2003. The project team conducted a series of traffic counts within the study corridor, twice in 2001 and once in 2003. The forecast for opening yearwas estimated using the AMBAG travel demand forecasting model, and included the improvements constructed as part of the State Route 1/17 Widening for Merge Lanes Project and the Soquel to Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes Project. The AMBAG model assumes growth in population, housing and employment based on approved jurisdictional plans. The travel demand model synthesized the land use, socioeconomic/demographic, and roadway networks into future travel patterns as well as traffic volumes.

Based on 2012 data from the Department of Transportation's (DOT) website, Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) along State Route 1 in this segment is approximately 89,000 vehicles per day.

According to Appendix K of SCCRTC’s 2005 RTP, "Truck Traffic and Vehicle Occupancy Counts" two-axle truck volumes are $3 \%$ of morning traffic on State Route 1 in both directions.

An Accident Analysis Summary was generated from the Traffic Accident Surveillance and Analysis System (TASAS) for the highway segment Santa Cruz Route 1, PM 13.5 to 14.9 over the time period of July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2011. 166 collisions were reported during this period. Primary collision factors include: speeding (90), following too closely (21), improper turning (20), driving under the influence of alcohol (12), and 12 were other violations. Types of collisions include: rear ending (113), hitting an object (28), sideswiping (15), overturning (5), broadsiding (1), and 4 were other violations or not stated. $78 \%$ of collisions occurred during daylight and $87 \%$ occurred in dry conditions. Weave length can be a factor in the incidence of rear-ending and sideswiping, which represent $77 \%$ of the collisions in the three years reported. Increasing weave length by adding an auxiliary lane can be expected to reduce the rate of rearend and sideswipe collisions.

The fatal and injury accident rate is higher than average for facilities of this type based on accident data for the years 2008 through 2011.

Table 4.2: Three-Year Accident Data - State Route 1 PM 13.5 to 14.9 (07/01/2008 - 06/30/2011)(Accidents per Million Vehicle Miles)

|  | FATAL | FATAL + INJURY | TOTAL |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ACTUAL | 0.007 | 0.38 | $\mathbf{1 . 1 8}$ |
| AVERAGE | 0.008 | 0.30 | 0.82 |

An Accident Analysis Summary was generated from the Traffic Accident Surveillance and Analysis System (TASAS) for the Santa Cruz Route 1 southbound off ramp to $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue, PM 13.8 over the time period of July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2011. 14 collisions were reported during this time period. Primary collision factors include: speeding (3), driving under the influence of alcohol (1), and 10 were other violations. Types of collision include: broadsiding (7), sideswiping (4), rear ending (2), and one was not stated. $79 \%$ of collisions occurred during daylight and $57 \%$ occurred in dry conditions. 11 of these accidents were on $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue near the ramp terminus, two were at the ramp terminus, and one occurred in the middle of the ramp. The southbound off ramp to $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue meets the standards specified in the Caltrans Highway Design Manual $6^{\text {th }}$ edition. The project would provide speed-reduction warning signage at this ramp.

The fatal and injury accident rate is higher than average for facilities of this type based on accident data for the years 2008 through 2011.

Table 4.3: Three-Year Accident Data - SB Off Ramp to 41st Ave (07/01/2008 - 06/30/2011)(Accidents per Million Vehicles)

|  | FATAL | FATAL + INJURY | TOTAL |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ACTUAL | 0.000 | 0.30 | $\mathbf{1 . 4 1}$ |
| AVERAGE | 0.003 | 0.35 | 1.01 |

An Accident Analysis Summary was generated from the Traffic Accident Surveillance and Analysis System (TASAS) for the Santa Cruz Route 1 northbound off ramp to Soquel Drive, PM 14.7 over the time period of July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2011 and is included in Attachment L. 7 collisions were reported during this time period. Primary collision factors were speeding (6) and one was other violation. Types of collision include: rear ending (3), hitting an object (3), and one was a sideswipe. $86 \%$ of collisions occurred during daylight and $43 \%$ occurred in dry conditions. Three of these accidents were at the off ramp gore, two were in the middle of the ramp, one was at the ramp terminus, and one was on Soquel Drive near the ramp terminus. The northbound off ramp to Soquel Drive is a non-standard design with a curve beginning at the start of the gore pavement and access to a local street from the ramp. Although ramp realignment is beyond the project scope, the project would provide speed-reduction and curve warning signage at this ramp.

The fatal and injury accident rate is higher than average for facilities of this type based on accident data for the years 2008 through 2011.

Table 4.4: Three-Year Accident Data - NB Offramp to Soquel Drive (07/01/2008-06/30/2011)(Accidents per Million Vehicles)

|  | FATAL | FATAL + INJURY | TOTAL |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ACTUAL | 0.000 | 0.10 | $\mathbf{0 . 7 2}$ |
| AVERAGE | 0.001 | 0.17 | 0.54 |

The Accident Analysis Summary generated from the Traffic Accident Surveillance and Analysis System (TASAS), over the time period of July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2011 shows collision rates below state average at the following ramp locations: the Santa Cruz Route 1 southbound onramp from Soquel Drive, the Santa Cruz Route 1 northbound onramp from northbound $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue, and the Santa Cruz Route 1 northbound onramp from southbound $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue.

Table 4.5: Three-Year Accident Data - SB Onramp from Soquel Drive (07/01/2008 - 06/30/2011)(Accidents per Million Vehicles)

|  | FATAL | FATAL + INJURY | TOTAL |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ACTUAL | 0.000 | 0.13 | 0.26 |
| AVERAGE | 0.001 | 0.13 | 0.46 |

Table 4.6: Three-Year Accident Data - NB Onramp from NB 41st Ave (07/01/2008-06/30/2011)(Accidents per Million Vehicles)

|  | FATAL | FATAL + INJURY | TOTAL |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ACTUAL | 0.000 | 0.00 | 0.15 |
| AVERAGE | 0.002 | 0.21 | 0.73 |

Table 4.7: Three-Year Accident Data - NB Onramp from SB 41st Ave (07/01/2008-06/30/2011)(Accidents per Million Vehicles)

|  | FATAL | FATAL + INJURY | TOTAL |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ACTUAL | 0.000 | 0.00 | 0.36 |
| AVERAGE | 0.003 | 0.18 | 0.57 |

To improve safety, this project proposes to improve the weave/merge geometry by adding speed reduction signage, auxiliary lanes, and to standardize shoulder widths to 10 - ft allowing for evasive movements and better refuge for disabled vehicles.

| 2008 ADT: | 92,000 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2035 ADT: | 124,300 |
| DHV: | 9,950 |
| ESAL: | $8,302,900$ |
| D: | $60 \%$ |
| T: | $3 \%$ |
| V: | 65 mph |
| T1 120 | 11.5 |
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## STATE ROUTE 1 FREEWAY AND RAMP VOLUMES YEAR 2015 NO BUILD CONDITIONS (AM PEAK)

Figure 4-1: State Route 1 Freeway and Ramp Volumes Year 2015 No Build Conditions (AM Peak)
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Figure 4-2: State Route 1 Freeway and Ramp Volumes Year 2015 No Build Conditions (PM Peak)
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Figure 4-3: State Route 1 Freeway and Ramp Volumes Year 2015 with Project (AM Peak)
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Figure 4-4: State Route 1 Freeway and Ramp Volumes Year 2015 with Project (PM Peak)

## 5. ALTERNATIVES

### 5.1 Viable Alternatives

### 5.1.1 No-Build Alternative

The No-build Alternative would not address the project purpose and need, but offers a basis for comparison with the Build Alternative. It assumes no major construction on Highway 1 through the project limits other than planned and programmed improvements and continued routine maintenance. The only planned and programmed improvements accounted for are the recently completed Soquel to Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes Project and the Highway 1/17 Merge Lanes Project.


Figure 5-1: No Build Alternative (Existing condition)

### 5.1.2 Auxiliary Lane Alternative

## General Description:

This alternative proposes to add a standard $12-\mathrm{ft}$ auxiliary lane with standard $10-\mathrm{ft}$ shoulders between $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue and Soquel Avenue/Drive in each direction. Figure 5-2 shows the proposed lane configuration. Attachments B and C show the proposed typical sections and horizontal layout. The southbound auxiliary lane would be 0.9 mile long, and the northbound would be 1.1 mile long. To achieve a standard section of $10-\mathrm{ft}$ median shoulder, $12-\mathrm{ft}$ lanes, and $10-\mathrm{ft}$ outside shoulders, and to allow for three through lanes in each direction per the Transportation Concept Report, the existing centerline of State Route 1 would be shifted 5 - ft to the north. The taper of the centerline shift would begin just north of the $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue interchange and end just south of the Soquel Drive interchange. The balance of the new lane and increased shoulder width would come from widening the northbound side of State Route 1. Except near the on- and off ramps, this alternative would maintain the existing outside shoulder for the majority of the southbound side. The ramps on the southbound side would not be altered; the ramps on the northbound side
would be shifted to accommodate a widened State Route 1 alignment. A new concrete median barrier would be constructed.


Watsonville
Santa Cruz
Figure 5-2: $\mathbf{4 1}^{\text {st }}$ Ave to Soquel Drive/Avenue Auxiliary Lane Project Build Alternative

Soquel Avenue frontage road parallels State Route 1 along the southbound side and is separated from the highway by landscaping, elevation grade change, and chain link fence. The separation between the traveled ways varies from $35-\mathrm{ft}$ to $50-\mathrm{ft}$. Shifting the centerline of State Route 1 five ft to the northbound side would reduce the need for retaining walls and right-of-way acquisition for State Route 1 both for this project and in the future, for the Transportation Concept section.

The existing profile is generally flat and would be maintained. Between access ramps, existing right of way width varies from 150 ft to 210 ft , with the prevailing width approximately 160 ft .

This project is an operational improvement and would not increase capacity. Forecast Levels of Service are discussed in Section 4.1.

Cut slopes for this alternative have been designed at a 2:1 slope to the proposed edge of pavement. Fill slopes for this alternative have been designed at a $4: 1$ slope with a 3 ft graded shoulder to the edge of pavement.

The widened section would require modification of the existing storm drain system at Sta. $490+00$, as well as extension of a 36 in . culvert at Sta. $520+00$ and a 4 ft x 4 ft culvert at Sta. $535+00$. Treatment BMPs would be installed as part of the project.

Right of way acquisition would be required to accommodate the new overcrossing ramps along the opposite side of Soquel Avenue and at the Chanticleer Avenue cul-de-sac north of State Route 1. Access fencing would be modified at the Chanticleer Avenue cul-de-sac ramp landing.

Retaining walls are proposed at several key locations to reduce the amount of earthwork required, keep the improvements within the existing highway right-of-way and minimize impacts to wetlands and other waters of the U.S. Retaining walls would range in height up to $18-\mathrm{ft}$ above grade in fill sections of the roadway and 5 - ft above grade in the cut section. Retaining walls constructed in fill areas would be located to accommodate the Transportation Concept section for State Route 1 in this area. The wall at northbound Sta $493+50$ to Sta $495+00$ would be demolished along with the 41st/SR 1 interchange for the future Transportation Concept section.

Table 5-1 below shows the wall locations, the slopes behind them, and accompanying descriptions of use.

Table 5-1 Retaining Wall Locations

| Wall <br> Number | Location/STA | Length <br> (ft) | Wall <br> Ht | Slope <br> behind <br> wall | Cut/Fill <br> Section | Retaining Wall notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | NB Sta 493+50 to Sta <br> $495+00$ | 150 | $2-5 \mathrm{ft}$ | $2: 1$ | Cut <br> Section | Throw-away wall |
| 2 | NB Sta 504+13 to Sta <br> $507+88$ | 375 | $2-18 \mathrm{ft}$ | na | Fill <br> Section | Minimizes wetland <br> impact at Rodeo Gulch |
| 3 | SB Sta. 504+00 to <br> Sta. 507+50 | 350 | $2-7 \mathrm{ft}$ | na | Fill <br> section | Avoids impact to <br> Soquel Avenue |
| 4 | NB Sta. 519+42 to <br> Sta. 523+50 | 408 | $2-7 \mathrm{ft}$ | na | Fill <br> section | Minimizes wetland <br> impact |

$\mathrm{NB}=$ northbound; $\mathrm{SB}=$ southbound
In addition to improvements on State Route 1, a bicycle and pedestrian overcrossing would be built across State Route 1 and Soquel Avenue connecting Chanticleer Avenue on each side of State Route 1. Right of way acquisition would be required along the south side of Soquel Avenue to accommodate the overcrossing ramp. The horseshoe-shaped bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing outside width would vary from 14 ft along the ramps to 16 ft around the curves(12-14-ft clear path) The ramps grades would be $4.95 \%$ with landings, and would be constructed on fill up to a height of approximately 10 ft , beyond which the overcrossing would be supported by columns. On the northbound side of State Route 1, the walls retaining the portion of the ramp on fill and the overcrossing columns would be positioned to accommodate the future Transportation Concept facility width, including a safety-shape barrier at the base of the retaining walls. The footprint of the existing Chanticleer cul-de-sac would be adjusted to accommodate the bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing ramp on the north side of the highway. A new 6 - ft sidewalk would be constructed along Soquel Avenue adjacent and parallel to the new bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing, connecting existing sidewalk at the corner of Chanticleer and Soquel Avenues and at the commercial development north of the bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing. A Conceptual Layout of the overcrossing is included in Appendix J.

The structure itself would drain to State drainage facilities via pier and abutment down drains; the ramps would drain to the Santa Cruz County's storm drainage system.

As a part of this project, landscaping would be installed to the extent feasible in unpaved areas where existing vegetation has been removed or disturbed.

As discussed in the Section 8, Programming, SCCRTC may elect to construct the project in three construction contracts: Northbound auxiliary lane, bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing, and southbound auxiliary lanes.

### 5.2 Non-standard Mandatory and Advisory Design Features

A mandatory design exception is required for the proposed Chanticleer Avenue bicycle/ pedestrian overcrossing stopping sight distance based on a design speed of 10 miles per hour. Section 1003.1(10) states the minimum stopping sight distance based on design speed shall be $\mathbf{1 2 5}$ feet for $\mathbf{2 0}$ miles per hour. The proposed stopping sight distance is $\mathbf{6 6} \mathbf{f t}$.

The non-standard stopping sight distance reduces right of way acquisition, visual impact, and project cost.

An advisory design exception is required for the proposed median width of $22-\mathrm{ft}$. Section 305.1(1) (a) of the HDM states: Where managed lanes (HOV, Express, etc) or transit facilities are planned, the minimum median width should be 62 feet.

The $22-\mathrm{ft}$ median width minimizes wetland, right-of-way and community impacts and tree removal. A 22 ft wide median would also avoid reconstruction of Soquel Avenue, avoid retaining walls in cut sections and would continue the median width constructed under the $1 / 17$ Merge Lane and Soquel to Morrissey Auxiliary Lane projects.
An advisory design exception is required for proposed Chanticleer Avenue overcrossing columns and retaining walls at the locations in the Table 5-2. Section 309.1(2) of the HDM states that on freeways and expressways, a Clear Recovery Zone (CRZ) width of $30-f t$ is the minimum desirable and that consideration should be given to increasing this width based on traffic volumes, operating speeds, terrain, and cost.

Fixed objects including bridge piers, abutments, retaining walls, and noise barriers closer to the edge of traveled way than the distances listed above should be eliminated, moved, or redesigned to be made yielding.
The proposed retaining wall locations would avoid impacts to the wetlands, avoid reconstruction of Soquel Avenue, avoid additional right-of-way take and reduce construction costs. Where the CRZ is proposed to be less than $30-\mathrm{ft}$ at columns or retaining walls, concrete barrier at 7 - ft from edge of pavement would be included in the project to shield the proposed obstruction and to meet the traffic safety recommendation of a 17 ft CRZ.

A mandatory design exception fact sheet was approved on 2/13/2014 and an advisory design exception fact sheet was approved on $2 / 13 / 2014$.

Table 5-2 Retaining Wall Location and Clear Recovery Zone Distances

| Wall No. | Location | Length <br> (ft) | CRZ Distance | Cut/Fill Section | Comments | Remove for Transportation Concept? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NB Sta } 493+50 \\ & \text { to Sta } 495+00 \end{aligned}$ | 150 | 10-ft from ETW | Cut Section | Minimizes ROW take. Construction of an additional lane would require removal of this wall. | Yes |
| 2 | NB Sta $504+13$ <br> to Sta $507+88$ | 375 | 22-ft from ETW | Fill <br> Section | Inside Rodeo Gulch wetland area. This wall location meets mandatory standards for clearance to fixed objects for the future transportation concept section. | No |
| 3 | SB Sta. $504+00$ to Sta. $507+50$ | 350 | 22-ft from ETW | Fill section | Avoids impact to Soquel Avenue. This wall location meets mandatory standards for clearance to fixed objects for the future transportation concept section. | No |
| 4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NB Sta. } 519+42 \\ & \text { to Sta. } 523+50 \end{aligned}$ | 408 | 22-ft from ETW | $\begin{gathered} \text { Fill } \\ \text { section } \end{gathered}$ | Inside wetland area. This wall location meets mandatory standards for clearance to fixed objects for the future transportation concept section. | No |

### 5.3 High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) (Bus and Carpool) Lanes

There are no special features for bus and carpool lanes proposed in this project. The proposed bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing and retaining walls 2,3 , and 4 are designed to accommodate the future addition of a through lane in each direction and maintain standard lane and shoulder widths. See Table 5-2, above, for a tabulation of which of the walls would be removed if State Route 1 were widened for additional through lanes.

### 5.4 Ramp Metering

No ramp metering is proposed with this project.

### 5.5 Park and Ride Facilities

There are no new park and ride facilities proposed as part of this project. There is an existing park and ride lot at Soquel Drive, just north of State Route 1.

### 5.6 Utility and Other Owner Involvement

There are approximately 19 utility lines within the project area that include overhead electrical and transmission, underground gas, sanitary sewer, storm drain, TV/cable, telephone, and fiber optic lines. Pacific Gas \& Electric (PG\&E) provides gas and electricity service in the project area. SBC/AT\&T maintains the local telephone service and Comcast provides cable service.

No longitudinal encroachments are proposed.
It is expected that the project will impact two 18 -in and one 36 -in reinforced concrete storm drains, one 48 -in box culvert, one 108 -in concrete arch culvert, three 10 -in sanitary sewer lines, five electrical facilities, including both poles and lines ( 21 kV transmission), one high pressure gas facility (to be potholed and protected in place), and one cable facility. Utility relocation may require scheduled short-term interruption of electrical service. See utility impact plans in Attachment H.

The project would pay only for temporary relocations required for construction phase, if any, and owners would be liable for permanent relocation costs. An example of a temporary relocation would be a pole that would interfere with construction of the Chanticleer Avenue Pedestrian Overcrossing (POC) but that could return to its original location post-construction. Owners would be liable for permanent relocation cost.

The PG\&E poles in conflict with the Chanticleer Avenue overcrossing are in Santa Cruz County right of way, and their relocation would follow Santa Cruz County utility protocol. The relocation of the existing underground cable line just south of Chanticleer Avenue that encroaches on State right of way both transversely and longitudinally would follow Caltrans relocation procedures. No cost would be borne by the State.

Project would comply with high/low risk procedures.

### 5.7 Highway Planting

Highway planting is proposed to be a part of this project. Retaining walls would be used to preserve existing vegetation in fill areas. Native plants that are identified to be beneficial to erosion control would be protected as much as possible. Fencing would also be used during construction to protect native vegetation and wetlands during construction.

All areas with existing vegetation that are disturbed by construction would be replanted, if feasible. Replacement planting would include ground covers, large shrubs and trees, including large plants where immediate size is desired. Wood chip mulch would be included to provide an attractive surface treatment, suppress weed growth and improve soil conditions in landscaped areas. Plant species would be selected that are low maintenance, pest resistant and water thrifty.

An automated irrigation system would be installed to water plants individually, conserving water and discouraging invasive weeds.

Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) type fencing would be used during construction to protect native vegetation and wetlands during construction.

### 5.8 Erosion Control

Cut slopes on the project would be $2: 1$ or flatter and fill slopes would be $4: 1$ or flatter. All disturbed areas would be stabilized with fiber rolls, compost and native plant seeding. Existing slopes are generally $2: 1$ or flatter, and are vegetated. To minimize retaining wall height, slopes behind proposed retaining walls would be regraded at approximately a $2: 1$ slope. Slope maintenance is discussed in Section 7.9, "Maintenance Issues".

Where concentrated surface flow is expected, hydraulic conveyance systems would be constructed and the outlets of these systems would be treated to provide energy dissipation and to reduce erosion potential. Concentrated flow conveyance systems include ditches, berms, dikes, and swales.

Existing vegetation that is beneficial to erosion prevention would be identified and would be preserved as much as possible. Retaining walls and fences would help preserve vegetation after and during construction.

Erosion control issues are addressed in more detail in the Storm Water Data Report.

### 5.9 Storm Water Compliance

The project would discharge to Arana Gulch, Rodeo Gulch, and Soquel Creek.
The project's design goal is to treat $95 \%$ of water quality volume (WQV)/Water Quality Flow (WQF) of the added impervious area by metering or detaining flow prior to discharge into receiving waters. Increased roadway runoff will be addressed by outlet protection, velocity dissipation devices, and possible peak flow attenuation basins. Most of the runoff flows to Monterey Bay and eventually into the Pacific Ocean.

Disturbed Areas Within Project

| Total Disturbed Area | 18.5 acres |
| :--- | :---: |
| Additional Impervious Surface | 4.9 acres |
| Estimated Treated Area | 4.7 acres |

Treatment Best Management Practices( BMPs) are anticipated to include biofiltration swales and strips, Austin sand filters, detention devices and/or infiltration devices.

Construction phase BMPs to be included in plans and specifications are expected to include temporary erosion control (move-in/move-out) and covers, fiber rolls, silt fence, inlet protection, concrete washout facility, gravel construction entrances, dewatering discharge treatment, ESA fencing around jurisdictional areas.

A Stormwater Data Report (SWDR) (see Attachment F for signed cover) was prepared for this project that specifies which Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be incorporated into the project plans and specifications.

Since this project proposes to add more than 1 acre of new impervious surfaces, permanent storm water treatment BMPs will be incorporated into this project to the maximum extent practicable.

A preliminary project risk level assessment, as required by the Construction General Permit Order 2009-0009-DWQ, has determined that this project is a Risk Level 2 project. A final risk level determination will be made at PS\&E.

Preliminary calculations of Net New Impervious Surfaces (NNI) have shown that the existing impervious surfaces will be increased $14 \%$ by this project. Since the project proposes to add less than $50 \%$ of the existing impervious surfaces, all new impervious surfaces will be evaluated for storm water treatment BMPs.

### 5.10 Noise Barriers

Due to constrained right of way, no berms for reducing noise levels are proposed. The Noise Abatement Decision Report (NADR) under Section 6.8 indicates that there were no reasonable cost effective sound walls within the limits of the project.

Additionally, there is one severe receptor identified within the project that the NADR references. Building acoustic treatment is recommended for this residence preliminarily pending reevaluation of conditions and costs during final design.

### 5.11 Non-Motorized and Pedestrian features

A bicycle and pedestrian overcrossing would be built across State Route 1 and Soquel Avenue frontage road connecting Chanticleer Avenue on each side of State Route 1. The bicycle/ pedestrian overcrossing would be $12-\mathrm{ft}$ wide ( $10-\mathrm{ft}$ clear path) on the ramp and two feet wider along the horseshoe curve. The footprint of the existing cul-de-sac would be adjusted to accommodate the bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing ramps on the north side of the highway. $400-\mathrm{ft}$ of 6 - ft wide sidewalk would be constructed along Soquel Avenue adjacent and parallel to the new bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing, connecting existing sidewalk at the corner of Chanticleer and Soquel Avenues and at the commercial development north of the bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing. The bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing would require City and State right-of-way acquisition to construct and maintain.

The bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing and new sidewalk would be American with Disability Act (ADA) compliant. An extensive outreach program as well as a bicycle and pedestrian study were performed to identify and prioritize needed and desired facilities within the State Route 1 corridor. As a result of this effort, three bike and pedestrian crossings at Mar Vista Drive, Chanticleer Avenue, and Trevethan Avenue have been identified to provide more bike access for local residents. These new crossings would also serve to mitigate some roadway conflicts by reducing non-motorized volumes traveling through the interchange areas. Only the Chanticleer Avenue bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing is within the Tier II project limits, and is proposed as part of this project.

### 5.12 Needed Roadway Rehabilitation and Upgrading

The project proposes to determine and correct the cause of the pavement failure at Rodeo Gulch in the northbound direction. It is anticipated that a portion of the subgrade would be replaced at the failure site. Correction of this failure may include a new roadway drainage system at this location. Proposed Retaining Wall 2 will help prevent loss of subgrade.

The proposed widening would use the same roadbed structural section as used in the Soquel to Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project. The existing pavement was overlaid with asphalt under Caltrans maintenance program in 2007.

An overlay $0.10^{\prime}$ thick has been assumed for rehabilitation of existing adjacent lanes. During the design phase, the pavement condition will be assessed to determine the appropriate rehabilitation strategy to be included in the proposed construction.

### 5.13 Needed Structure Rehabilitation and Upgrading

No significant existing structure rehabilitation or upgrading is anticipated for this project.

### 5.14 Cost Estimate

The preliminary cost for the Auxiliary Lane alternative is $\$ 16.6$ million which includes $\$ 13.9$ million in roadway items, $\$ 2.7$ million for the bike and pedestrian overcrossing, and $\$ 1.3$ million in utility relocations and right-of-way acquisitions. The Project Report Cost Estimate is included in Attachment D.

### 5.15 Effect of Projects-Funded-by-Others on State Highway

Effects of the build alternative on highway operations are discussed in section 4.1. A summary of impacts and mitigations is included in section 6.5.

### 5.16 Rejected Alternatives

The Tier II build alternative is the only alternative considered by the Project Design Team to be viable for comparison to No Build, and for environmental evaluation. There were no rejected alternatives.

## 6. CONSIDERATIONS REQUIRING DISCUSSIONS

### 6.1 Hazardous Waste

A Phase I Initial Site Assessment was prepared by Parsons Group for State Route 1 including the project area, in late 2006 and early 2007. No hazardous waste sites with potential to affect the Soquel to Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project were identified in the Initial Site Assessment.

Aerially deposited lead (ADL) conditions for this project are assumed to be similar to the segment of State Route 1 immediately north of this project, between Soquel Avenue and Morrissey Boulevard. In late 2008, the soil was tested in the Soquel Avenue to Morrissey

Boulevard segment and a Limited Site Investigation Report prepared. Borings indicate that in general, there is ADL contamination extending from the existing edge of pavement to 20-22-ft out on both sides of the roadway, and up to $4-\mathrm{ft}$ deep on the northbound side and $2-\mathrm{ft}$ deep on the southbound side. The ADL material was characterized as reuseable under the terms of the Variance issued to Caltrans by the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), although it was not reused. Assuming a similar contamination pattern, little ADL-contaminated material would be generated along the southbound side of the project area because most of the excavation is in the median and on the northbound side. Assuming that the median area is also contaminated to a depth of 2 - ft along the superelevated curve, there would be approximately 3300 cubic yards of ADL-contaminated roadway excavation. Although the material is likely to be characterized as reusable, there is little fill on the project. The cost estimate assumes that all of the contaminated material must be offhauled at $\$ 200$ per cubic yard, because as was the case on the adjacent project, much of the required fill would be inside sensitive jurisdictional areas and the Class 1 landfill may be out of state. In the cost estimate, the cost for roadway excavation of ADLcontaminated material is part of the Environmental Mitigation line item.

Additional soil testing would be a part of the Plans, Specifications and Estimate (PS\&E) phase, in order to quantify the volume to be removed and determine disposal or reuse requirements. It is expected that additional soil testing would be a part of the construction contract, to verify ADL concentrations and confirm that excavated soil is correctly characterized and disposed of. A lead compliance plan would be required to minimize worker exposure to lead-impacted soil.

All existing paint in the project area, including traffic striping, would be treated as leadcontaining, based on the fact that lead was a common paint ingredient in pre-1978 paints. The February 2013 Draft Phase I Initial Site Assessment (Parsons) recommends testing for Asbestos Containing Material in the abandoned house to be demolished to make way for the Chanticleer Avenue Bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing. Such testing would take place during PS\&E phase.

If any dewatering is to be performed during project construction activities, then prior consultation with representatives of the Soquel Creek Water District, Santa Cruz Environmental Health Department, and Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board is recommended. This consultation would be helpful in determining the degree of water treatment and water disposal options during dewatering activities, as well as groundwater investigation/sampling requirements prior to dewatering activities.

During construction, unknown hazardous materials could be encountered, or materials could be accidentally spilled. Best Management Practices would minimize or avoid these risks.

### 6.2 Value Analysis

Value analysis of this project will take place as a first order of work following PAED.

### 6.3 Resource Conservation

The proposed project would minimize the use of energy and nonrenewable resources. No major facilities can be salvaged or relocated from this project. However, whenever possible, existing roadway items such as signs, light standards, guardrails, and other associated hardware would be relocated or stockpiled for future use. Asphalt concrete pavement and concrete removed from
existing roadways and structures may be reused as either base material or embankment material on this project. Measures to conserve energy and nonrenewable resources during construction would be assessed during the design phase of the project and would include materials, solar features, views, and construction operations.

The potential for using recycled asphalt concrete would be determined during the design phase. Climatic conditions in Santa Cruz County do not allow successful installation of rubberized asphalt concrete.

The following measures would be investigated and incorporated into the project as much as feasible:

1. Use of reclaimed water-currently 30 percent of the electricity used in California is used for the treatment and delivery of water. Use of reclaimed water helps conserve this energy, which reduces greenhouse gas emissions from electricity production.
2. Landscaping-reduces surface warming and through photosynthesis decreases carbon dioxide. Landscaping concepts for the project are currently being investigated.
3. Use of energy efficient lighting.
4. Idling restrictions for trucks and equipment during construction.

### 6.4 Right-of-way Issues

The project is in an area of mixed zoning and uses. The predominant uses are low to medium density residential, commercial, and some industrial. There are a total of 5 privately owned and 1 publically owned parcels impacted by the project. No temporary construction easements would be required. The project requires acquisition of a total of 0.31 acres of public and privately owned property. The property would be acquired in fee for the project. The impacted parcels are improved with typical residential and commercial site improvements and one abandoned house would require demolition. This alternative has minimal impact on adjacent properties.

Right-of-way costs include environmental mitigation costs incurred prior to construction, such as off-site compensatory mitigation and permit fees. Right-of-way cost is estimated to be $\$ 1,276,000$ including utilities, compensatory environmental mitigation and permit fees.

The SCCRTC would fund right-of-way work along with construction and other project support costs.

The Right-of-way Data Sheets, and the Right-of-way Impact and Utility Impact Plans are included in Attachment H.

### 6.5 Environmental Issues

The TIER I and TIER II Draft Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Assessment has been prepared in accordance with Caltrans' environmental procedures, as well as State and Federal environmental regulations. The attached DEIR/EA is the appropriate document for the proposal. The following table contains a summary of the major environmental impacts of the project.
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Table 6.1: Summary of Environmental Impacts Tier II Auxiliary Lane Alternative

| Potential Impact |  | Tier II Auxiliary Lane Alternative | No Build Alternative |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Permanent Impacts |  |  |  |
| Land Use |  | Would convert 0.28 -acre of land from one commercial parcel and from one residential parcel to transportation use. | No Impacts. |
| Consistency with State, Regional, and Local Plans |  | Project would be consistent with local planning goals and policies. | No Impacts. |
| Coastal Zone |  | The Tier II project is located outside of coastal zone jurisdiction; no coastal zone determinations will be required. | No Impacts. |
| Growth |  | Proposed project would serve existing growth already planned and projected for the corridor and would not stimulate unplanned residential or related commercial growth. | No Impacts. |
| Environmental Justice |  | Tier II Auxiliary Lane Alternative would not cause disproportionately high and adverse effects on any minority or low-income populations per Executive Order 12898 regarding Environmental Justice. | No Impacts. |
| Relocations | Business | One partial acquisition of a commercial parcel would be required. | No Impacts. |
|  | Residential | No relocations. | No Impacts. |
| Utilities |  | Fifteen utility lines would likely require relocation. Utility relocations may require shortterm, limited interruptions of service. Potential for emergency service delays during construction. <br> Coordination with providers would avoid unscheduled interruptions in service. | No Impacts. |
| Emergency Services |  | Would improve the capacity of Route 1 within this segment, allowing emergency service providers to improve response times. | No Impacts. |
| Traffic and Transportation |  | The addition of auxiliary lanes on Route 1 between Soquel Avenue and $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue would improve the ability of Route 1 to meet future demand within the traffic study area. When compared to the No Build Alternative, traffic conditions would improve substantially in the northbound direction during the morning peak hour and marginally in the reverse commute directions (southbound in the morning peak hour and northbound in | No improvements would occur on the facility, resulting in worsening traffic conditions. |


|  | the evening peak hour); however, additional traffic along with the already-congested <br> conditions in the southbound direction during the evening peak hour would lead to a <br> slight decline in traffic operating condition. |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pedestrian and Bicycle <br> Facilities | The new pedestrian and bicycle overcrossing at Chanticleer Avenue would have a <br> positive impact on multimodal connectivity by providing a new dedicated crossing of the <br> freeway between Soquel Avenue and 41 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Avenue. | No improvements would occur <br> on the facility, resulting in <br> worsening traffic conditions. |
| Parking | No parking impacts. | Incremental relief would be provided for transit due to improvement of highway <br> operations under the Tier II Auxiliary Lane Alternative. |
| Transit | Substantial visual changes from highway widening/addition of lanes and removal of trees <br> and mature vegetation, as well as increase in hardscape such as pavement, overcrossing <br> structure and walls | No Impacts. <br> area. |
| Visual/Aesthetics | No anticipated adverse effect to historic or archaeological resources. | The lack of improvements <br> would worsen travel conditions <br> and would depress transit <br> ridership throughout the study |
| Cultural Resources | See construction impact for Tier II Auxiliary Lane Alternative below. | No Impacts. |
| Hazardous Materials | Would result in reduction in most criteria pollutants and a negligible increase in one <br> criteria pollutant. | Reductions in most criteria <br> pollutants, with a minor increase <br> in PM ${ }_{10}$ and PM 2.5 emissions. |
| Air Quality | Portions of the project are located within the fringe of the 100-year floodplain, with resulting | No Impacts. |
| unavoidable impacts to the floodplain. Impact is minor with no increase in flood risk. |  |  |


| Paleontology | High potential for fossil remains that could be scientifically important to be uncovered by <br> excavations during project construction. | No Impacts. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Noise | Five receivers approach noise abatement criteria for which it has been determined <br> abatement in the form of soundwalls is feasible, but not reasonable and is therefore not <br> recommended. Abatement in the form of noise insulation is recommended for the one <br> residence that will realize a severe noise increase, | No Impacts. |
| Natural Communities | Permanent effects to the following natural communities would occur: Riverine/ <br> Freshwater Marsh (0.02-acre), Riparian Forest (0.13-acre), Coast Live Oak Woodland <br> (0.001-acre), Ruderal/Disturbed (0.19-acre) and Landscaped/ Developed communities <br> (5.55 acres). Impact avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures are proposed. | No Impacts. |
| Wetlands and other Waters | Project would permanently impact 0.02-acre of United States Army Corps of Engineers <br> other waters at Rodeo Gulch, and $0.13-a c r e ~ o f ~ C a l i f o r n i a ~ D e p a r t m e n t ~ o f ~ F i s h ~ a n d ~$ <br> Wildlife jurisdiction wetland area at the Drive-in roadside ditch. Proposed permanent and <br> temporary impact areas at the Drive-in roadside ditch consist of roadway widening and <br> retaining wall construction that would encroach into the active channel of this seasonal <br> roadside ditch. Proposed permanent and temporary impact areas at the Rodeo Gulch <br> consist of roadway widening and retaining wall construction on existing road berm areas <br> directly above and draining into the channel of Rodeo Gulch. No project work is <br> proposed in the active channel. | No Impacts. |
| Special-Status Species | No impacts on special-status plant species are anticipated; however, there is a potential <br> that special-status species could become established before project construction and <br> additional surveys may be required. <br> Potential impacts to California red-legged frog and tidewater goby could result, as <br> discussed under Threatened and Endangered Species. | No Impacts. |
| Threatened and | Permanent impacts to California red-legged frog could occur due to habitat loss at Rodeo <br> Gulch and the Drive-in ditch. Potential impacts to tidewater goby would occur due to <br> habitat loss at Rodeo Gulch. Formal consultation with the United States Fish and Wildlife <br> Service will be required for these species. | No Impacts. |


| Traffic and Transportation/ <br> Pedestrian and Bicycle <br> Facilities | Short term and intermittent delays in traffic due to construction. Bicycle and pedestrian <br> access to be maintained. | No Impacts. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Visual/Aesthetics | Construction activities would involve use of equipment, stockpiling of soils and <br> materials, and other visual signs of construction. | No Impacts. |
| Hydrology, Water Quality <br> and Stormwater Runoff | Construction activities will have a temporary impact on water quality and stormwater <br> runoff. | No Impacts. |
| Hazardous Waste/ <br> Materials | High potential of encountering aerially deposited lead in soils. Existing structures may <br> have asbestos-containing materials and lead-based paint. | No Impacts. |
| Air Quality | Standard Caltrans construction management practices will ensure that air quality impacts <br> associated with construction will be minimal. These include requiring emission controls <br> on construction equipment and spraying water on exposed surfaces to minimize dust. | No Impacts. |
| Emergency Services | Project would have the potential for emergency service delays during construction. <br> Implementation of the Traffic Management Plan in compliance with Caltrans and local <br> policies would involve planning with emergency service providers throughout the project <br> construction to avoid emergency service delays. | No Impacts. |
| Noise | There would be short-term and intermittent increases in noise levels due to construction <br> activities. | No Impacts. |
| Natural Communities | Temporary effects to the following natural communities would occur: Riverine/ <br> Freshwater Marsh (0.06-acre), Riparian Forest (0.09-acre), Coast Live Oak Woodland <br> $(0.012-a c r e), ~ R u d e r a l / D i s t u r b e d ~(0.07-a c r e) ~ a n d ~ L a n d s c a p e d / D e v e l o p e d ~ c o m m u n i t i e s ~$ |  |
| $(5.22$ acres). Impact avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures are proposed. |  |  |$\quad$ No Impacts. $\quad . \quad$| No Impacts. |
| :--- |
| Wetlands and other Waters |
| Project would temporarily impact 0.06-acre of United States Army Corps of Engineers <br> other waters at Rodeo Gulch, and 1.5 acres of California Department of Fish and Wildlife <br> jurisdiction wetland area at the Drive-in ditch. <br> Proposed permanent and temporary impact areas at the Drive-in roadside ditch consist of <br> roadway widening and retaining wall construction that would encroach into the active <br> channel of this seasonal roadside ditch. Proposed permanent and temporary impact areas <br> at the Rodeo Gulch consist of roadway widening and retaining wall construction on |


|  | existing road berm areas directly above and draining into the channel of Rodeo Gulch. No <br> construction work is proposed in the active channel. |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Special-Status Species | Construction noise, movement of workers, and tree/vegetation removal could disturb <br> nesting birds. Construction activities at the Drive-in roadside ditch and Rodeo Gulch have <br> the potential to affect tidewater goby and California red-legged frog. | No Impacts. |
| Threatened and <br> Endangered Species | Construction noise, movement of workers, and tree/vegetation removal could disturb <br> nesting birds. Construction activities at the Drive-in roadside ditch and Rodeo Gulch have <br> the potential to affect tidewater goby and California red-legged frog. Potential Impacts to <br> the California red legged frog and tidewater goby will require consultation with the <br> United States Fish and Wildlife Service. | No Impacts. |

Impact to jurisdictional areas (Rodeo Gulch, STA 504+00 to 508+00 and narrow ditch at Sta $520+00$ to $523+00$ ) would be minimized by construction of retaining walls, and ESA fencing would be installed to protect sensitive area during construction.

Visual impacts due to the improvements proposed as part of the Build Alternative include loss of vegetation and increase in hardscape such as pavement, overcrossing structure and walls. Measures recommended for visual impacts, include:

- Developing the specifics of aesthetic enhancements, including texture and color, with community involvement during final design.
- Including architectural treatment, such as texture and/or color, shadow lines for caps, and other aesthetic enhancements on retaining walls and Chanticleer Bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing
- Preserving existing desirable vegetation would be preserved to the greatest extent feasible, and plant new landscaping in all plantable areas.
- Designing treatment features so that they appear to be a natural part of the landscape

Drainage systems would be modified to connect to MS4 areas in order to meter and detain flows so that pre-construction storm water discharge is maintained. Stainless steel markers are proposed for new inlets needing stenciling.

Storm water treatment measures include biofiltration strips, biofiltration swales, and detention devices. Strips and swales filter pollutants via vegetation; they are mainly effective at removing debris and solid particles, and together with Austin sand filters are most feasible for the project. Detention devices are basins or tanks that temporarily detain runoff under quiescent conditions; they are not as cost-effective as strips and swales, but are still being considered until more geotechnical information for the project is obtained.

The attached DEIR/EA detailed mitigation measures for both temporary (construction) and permanent impacts.

### 6.6 Air Quality Conformity

The project area is in the North Central Coast Air Basin under the jurisdiction of the Monterey Bay Unified Area Air Pollution Control District.

Because the project is located in an attainment/unclassified area for all current federal air quality standards, regional conformity requirements do not apply.

### 6.7 Noise Abatement Decision

This Noise Abatement Decision Report (NADR) (section 6.7 of the Draft Project Report) is an evaluation of the reasonableness and feasibility of incorporating noise abatement measures into this project; Constitutes the preliminary decision on noise abatement measures to be incorporated into the DED (if applicable); and is required for Caltrans to meet Title 23, Code of Federal Regulation, Part 772 of the Federal Highway Administration noise standards.

The NADR does not present the final decision regarding noise abatement; rather, it presents key information on abatement to be considered throughout the environmental review process, based
on the best available information at the time the DED is published. If a project is subject to federal review, but does not have a circulated ED, the NADR section documents the final noise abatement decision.

The NADR does not address noise barriers or other noise-reducing treatments required as mitigation for significant adverse environmental effects identified under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The tables included here show the sound walls that have been identified to be acoustically feasible, and whether they are considered to be reasonable to construct as part of the project.

## Results of the Noise Study Report

The Noise Study Report for this project was prepared by Parsons Transportation Group in April 2013 and approved by Vladimir Timofet, District 5 Environmental Engineering-Oversight on May 23, 2013.

The Noise Study Report evaluated noise impacts at various frequent outdoor use areas in the project area and identified feasible abatement for noise impacts in two locations. North of Route 1, between Rodeo Gulch Creek and Mattison Lane, two masonry block soundwalls with a combined length of $1145-\mathrm{ft}$ (soundwalls S154 and S158) would work as a system to provide noise abatement for the outdoor use areas of three single-family residences. South of Route 1, between $17^{\text {th }}$ Avenue and the Soquel interchange, a masonry block soundwall with a length of 178 - ft (soundwall S165) would provide noise abatement for the outdoor use areas of two singlefamily residences.

Table 6.2 - Summary of Barrier Evaluation from Noise Study Report

| Barrier | Location | Station | Height <br> (ft) | Acoustically <br> Feasible? | Number of <br> Benefited <br> Residences | Reasonable <br> Allowance <br> per <br> Residence | Total <br> Reasonable <br> Allowance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  <br> S158 | Shoulder <br> \& R/W | Sta 506+54 <br> to $520+00$ | 8 | Yes | 1 | $\$ 55,000$ | $\$ 55,000$ |
|  |  |  | 10 | Yes | 1 | $\$ 55,000$ | $\$ 55,000$ |
|  |  |  | 12 | Yes | 2 | $\$ 57,000$ | $\$ 114,000$ |
|  |  |  | 14 | Yes | 5 | $\$ 57,000$ | $\$ 285,000$ |
| S165 | R/W | Sta 539+50 <br> to $546+06$ | 8 | Yes | 1 | $\$ 45,000$ | $\$ 45,000$ |
|  |  |  | 10 | Yes | 2 | $\$ 45,000$ | $\$ 90,000$ |
|  |  |  | 12 | Yes | 2 | $\$ 47,000$ | $\$ 94,000$ |
|  |  |  | 14 | Yes | 2 | $\$ 47,000$ | $\$ 94,000$ |
|  |  | 16 | Yes | 2 | $\$ 47,000$ | $\$ 94,000$ |  |

## Factors in the Noise Abatement Decision Report

Key information used in making the preliminary noise abatement decision is summarized below in Table 2 - Summary of Abatement Key Information.

Table 6.3 - Summary of Abatement Key Information

| Barrier | Height <br> (ft) | Acoustically <br> Feasible? | Number of <br> Benefited <br> Residences | Total <br> Reasonable <br> Allowance | Estimated <br> Construction <br> Cost | Cost Less <br> than <br> Allowance? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  <br> S158 | 8 | Yes | 1 | $\$ 55,000$ | $\$ 368,000$ | No |
|  | 10 | Yes | 1 | $\$ 55,000$ | $\$ 459,000$ | No |
|  | 12 | Yes | 2 | $\$ 114,000$ | $\$ 551,000$ | No |
|  | 14 | Yes | 5 | $\$ 285,000$ | $\$ 643,000$ | No |
| S165 | 8 | Yes | 5 | $\$ 285,000$ | $\$ 735,000$ | No |
|  | 10 | Yes | 1 | $\$ 45,000$ | $\$ 210,000$ | No |
|  | 12 | Yes | 2 | $\$ 90,000$ | $\$ 262,000$ | No |
|  | 14 | Yes | 2 | $\$ 94,000$ | $\$ 314,000$ | No |
|  | 16 | Yes | 2 | $\$ 94,000$ | $\$ 367,000$ | No |
|  |  | $\$ 94,000$ | $\$ 419,000$ | No |  |  |

## Nonacoustical Factors Relating to Feasibility

There are no apparent nonacoustical factors relating to the feasibility of the above mentioned sound walls. The feasible walls are proposed to be located at either the edge of pavement or the right-of-way line and have no effect on the geometry of State Route 1, are under no geotechnical restrictions, and do not affect any utilities.

## Preliminary Noise Abatement Decision

There are no reasonable cost effective sound walls within the limits of the project.
Soundwall S158 is feasible, but does not appear to meet reasonableness criteria. Model data indicate that with no barrier, one single-family residence would experience a traffic noise level of 76 dBA ; therefore, it is considered to be severely impacted. Where severe impacts are identified, unusual and extraordinary abatement must be considered. If a noise barrier is determined to be unreasonable based on cost, or cannot be constructed for some reason, or is unable to provide feasible traffic noise abatement, it should still be considered or alternative noise abatement measures such as building acoustic treatment may be provided. Partial construction of an $8-\mathrm{ft}$ high soundwall from Station $514+90$ to $518+00(310-\mathrm{ft})$ would provide feasible noise abatement only for this severely impacted house, but it would be short $\$ 44,200$ between the estimated construction cost and the total reasonable allowance of Soundwall S158.

Building acoustic treatment is recommended for this residence preliminarily pending reevaluation of conditions and costs during final design.

The preliminary noise abatement decision presented in this report is based on preliminary project alignments and profiles, which may be subject to change. As such, the physical characteristics of noise abatement described herein also may be subject to change. If pertinent parameters change substantially during the final project design, the preliminary noise abatement decision may be changed or eliminated from the final project design. A final decision to construct noise abatement will be made upon completion of the project design.

The preliminary noise abatement decision presented here will be included in the DED, which will be circulated for public review.

## Secondary Effects of Abatement

There are no secondary effects of abatement as no feasible walls within the project limits are reasonable to construct, and thus are not recommended for the project.

## 7. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS AS APPROPRIATE

### 7.1 Public Hearing Process

A public hearing shall be scheduled to present the developed viable alternatives for public comment. The SCCRTC has already held multiple public outreach efforts to discuss improvements along the State Route 1 corridor, including open houses in Spring 2004 and Fall 2006.

### 7.2 Route Matters

A superseding freeway agreement with Santa Cruz County would be required to cover the addition of the Chanticleer Avenue Bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing.

### 7.3 Permits

Permits from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (404), State Department of Fish and Game (1602), and the Regional Water Quality Control Board (401) would be required. Additional permits for the materials site and disposal site may be required.

### 7.4 Cooperative Agreements

Caltrans and the Regional Transportation Commission have a cooperative agreement for the PA/ED phase for this project, executed in October 2002. This agreement would be updated for future phases of the project and is expected that responsibilities would be assigned similarly to the Soquel to Morrissey Auxiliary Lane project. The PS\&E phase agreement would stipulate that:

- SCCRTC or its consultants will prepare project plans, specifications and estimates at SCCRTC's expense.
- The SCCRTC or its consultants will develop utility relocation plans, perform right-ofway engineering and prepare plats and legal maps and other right-of-way submittals at the SCCRTC's expense.
- The State will prepare the utility relocation agreements and right-of-way appraisals and perform acquisition as required for obtaining the property rights necessary for the construction of this project.
- SCCRTC and Caltrans will share responsibility for coordinating with a resource agency such as Resource Conservation District of Santa Cruz to develop an environmental mitigation plan which SCCRTC will fund.
- SCCRTC will prepare permit applications and pay permit fees.

A separate, future cooperative agreement will be required to cover responsibilities for the construction phase of the project, as well as for maintenance of the Chanticleer Avenue Bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing, its right-of-way, and its drainage facilities.

### 7.5 Transportation Management Plan for Use During Construction

A Transportation Management Plan (TMP) has been prepared and is included here as Attachment E. The TMP provides advance notice to transportation and emergency service providers of construction activities and durations, detours, and access issues during each stage of construction. The TMP identifies strategies to facilitate safe implementation of traffic handling during construction, such as increased California Highway Patrol presence during critical construction operations, and increased Freeway Service Patrol during peak travel periods. It also includes a public information program to provide motorists with advance notice of construction activities and durations, temporary closures and detours.

### 7.6 Stage Construction

If completed as one construction contract, the Route 1 41st to Soquel Auxiliary Lane Project would be constructed in three major stages: widening on the northbound side and shifting of the centerline 5 - ft to the north; the Chanticleer Avenue Bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing; and the southbound median paving and lane shifting.

Most of the work would be done during the daytime, but some night work is likely, to permit temporary closures for tasks that could interfere with mainline traffic or create safety hazards. Such tasks include placing and removing temporary construction barriers, erecting structure falsework over the mainline or Soquel, striping, or connecting or conforming ramps to the mainline or local streets.

After the bridge work in the median is complete, and when most of the new retaining walls have been installed, traffic in both directions would be shifted toward the median to allow the widening work north and south of the new overcrossing. Four traffic lanes would be open during the day.

### 7.7 Graffiti Control

State Route 1 in the project area is graffiti-prone. Graffiti abatement is expected to consist of prompt painting-over of graffiti by State maintenance crews, which discourages tagging by demonstrating vigilance and attentive maintenance. Graffiti-resistant coating is considered
undesirable because of cost and effort in application, re-application and power-washing. In PS\&E phase, access control design would consider graffiti prevention.

### 7.8 Oversize Loads

The project area is bounded by the 41 st Avenue and Soquel Avenue overcrossings, with vertical clearances of 17 ft 6 in and 15 ft 10 in , respectively, which prevent unrestricted height loads from reaching the project area via State Route 1.

The proposed Chanticleer Avenue bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing would have standard vertical clearance. If the POC were constructed, a vehicle approaching State Route 1 from local streets (Soquel Avenue or 41 st Avenue) requiring more than standard vertical clearance would have to avoid State Route 1 and travel parallel to State Route 1 along Soquel Avenue through the project area. A vehicle of unrestricted height moving in and out of Santa Cruz County on local roads is likely to require special accommodations such as temporary relocation of overhead utilities to reach the project area.

### 7.9 Life Cycle Cost Analysis

A Life Cycle Cost Analysis (LCCA) was performed to determine the most cost effective structural section for this project. The LCCA was performed for the 9-mile HOV Lanes and Transportation System Management Alternatives Project, and it was based on Caltrans LCCA Procedures Manual (Updated August 2010) and using RealCost 2.2 software downloaded from Caltrans website.

Because the Tier 2 Auxiliary Lanes Project is encompassed within the limits of the 9-mile HOV Lanes and Transportation System Management Alternatives project, it is assumed that the majority of the assumptions and the overall results of the analysis would be the same. Although the cost estimates for the two projects are different, the relative scale of the estimates will also be the same. Thus, the results of the analyses would match between the two projects.

The LCCA was performed for the auxiliary lane and for the maintenance/rehabilitation on the existing two lanes. A summary of the LCCA for the different pavement structure alternatives considered for the auxiliary lanes and the maintenance/rehabilitation can be seen in Attachment K . The following is a summary of these two different analyses.

Two different pavement structure (PS) alternatives were considered in the analyses:
Alternative 1 consists of 0.65 ft Rubberized Hot Mix Asphalt (RHMA), 0.55 ft Aggregate Base (AB) and 1.15 ft Aggregate Subbase (AS) - 20 year design life.

Alternative 2 consists of $0.10 \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{RHMA} \mathrm{Open} \mathrm{Graded} \mathrm{Friction} \mathrm{Course} \mathrm{(OGFC)}$,0.50 ft RHMA, 0.50 ft Lean Concrete Base (LCB) and 1.15 ft AS - 20 year design life.

A 40 year design life alternative was not considered as the basis of the analyses was determined from Table 1 of the LCCA Manual (Updated August 2010). For the type of pavement project (Widening) and the document being submitted (Project Report), the analysis was limited to the 20 year design life.

Cost calculations resulted in the following overall life-cycle costs (for HOV Lanes and Transportation System Management Alternatives Project):

Table 7.1-Life-cycle Cost Summary

| PS Alternative <br> Number | Total Agency Cost | User Cost | Life-cycle Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $\$ 170,068$ | $\$ 1,431$ | $\$ 171,499$ |
| 2 | $\$ 168,806$ | $\$ 8,436$ | $\$ 177,242$ |

Even though PS Alternative \#1 has an initial agency cost higher than PS Alternative \#2, it is considered the preferred alternative for the following reasons: a) the overall life-cycle cost is lower for Alternative \#1, b) the user cost is over $80 \%$ lower than Alternative \#2 and c) future maintenance costs are lower, minimizing the exposure of maintenance crews to traffic hazards.

## 8. FUNDING/PROGRAMMING

The Santa Cruz Highway 1 HOV Lanes and Transportation System Management Alternatives Project discussed in the Introduction and Project History section of this report is included in the 2010 Regional Transportation Plan as a financially constrained project, reflecting SCCRTC's commitment to this project as one of the County's highest transportation priorities. A combination of federal, state, and local funds, including a future local tax and/or fee measure dedicated to transportation improvements, is identified in the Regional Transportation Plan to fund the HOV Lanes and Transportation System Management Alternatives project. To facilitate project phasing, the RTP also identifies separate phases that are shown in the Project Implementation Plan. Consistent with this approach the Tiered environmental document allows the SCCRTC to make incremental improvements in the corridor as future funding opportunities allow.

## Tier I (EA 05- 0C730) - Funding Scenarios for Incremental Development of the Highway 1 Corridor

Projections of available future funding for transportation projects are difficult to make given uncertainties associated with State and federal legislation and economic conditions. With the Tiered environmental approach, the Tier I environmental document will be used as a planning level study of cumulative impacts from which smaller future projects (Tier II projects, of which the Highway 1 41st/Soquel Auxiliary Lanes and Chanticleer Overcrossing Project is one) may be identified and analyzed within available resources. Following is an overview of potential revenue sources projected over a 25 -year period for incremental development of the Tier I improvement program for Highway 1 Corridor.

## Existing Revenue Sources

This projection is based on historical revenues from funding sources currently available. California State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds, made up primarily of revenues from the State excise tax on gasoline, are generally considered most appropriate for
larger, regional projects on the State highway system. STIP funds are programmed every two years and can vary from approximately \$3.0-5.0 million per year, which means that 25 years (approximately 12 STIP cycles) would yield about \$75.0-125.00 million (unescalated).

The SCCRTC has also historically received \$2.5-3.0 million annually in federal Regional Surface Transportation (RSTP) funds. These funds are more flexible than STIP funds, and have traditionally been applied to a wide range of project types including local road improvements, bike and pedestrian projects, State highway projects, rail and transit projects. Because the demand on these funds is great and not likely to diminish soon, this scenario assumes that no RSTP funds will be directed to any Tier II projects on the Route 1 corridor.

## Local Sales Tax and other Revenue Generating Measures

In November 2004, SCCRTC sponsored a local $1 / 2$-cent sales tax ballot measure dedicated to certain transportation projects. That measure failed to get the $2 / 3$ majority vote needed to pass. In 2007, SCCRTC sponsored outreach efforts to generate community support for another sales tax measure, but in early 2008, those plans were put on hold due to a weakening economy. The SCCRTC is monitoring legislative proposals to lower the voter threshold to 55 percent for new local revenues, including vehicle registration fees and sales tax measures to address the backlog of transportation needs in Santa Cruz County, as was done successfully for education purposes. For this discussion, it is assumed that this measure will be taken to the voters in 2016. Based on past polling of likely county voters, the expenditure plan for such a measure would include a mix of transportation projects and programs to gain sufficient broad-based voter support. For this analysis only, a future hypothetical expenditure plan would include some funds for Route 1.

A $1 / 2$-cent sales tax in Santa Cruz County would currently generate approximately $\$ 15$ million annually. Although this amount might grow with inflation, so would the costs for projects and programs. For simplicity, this analysis does not include inflation in this estimate or assume any economic growth. If one-third of revenues from the measure were dedicated to Route 1, available funds would be $\$ 5$ million per year, or $\$ 125$ million over a 25 -year period. This revenue is added to the estimated yield from the State Transportation Improvement Program (\$75 million to $\$ 125$ million), resulting in a total of approximately $\$ 200$ million to $\$ 250$ million available for incremental development of the Capital Investment Program for the Route 1 corridor.

Other potential local revenue sources include a vehicle registration fee, which might generate approximately $\$ 2.3$ million per year, and a regional traffic impact fee, which might generate $\$ 4$ million annually.

## Other Potential Funding

From time to time opportunities arise to fund projects that are essentially "one time" events. California Proposition 1B passed in 2006 is an example, which provided $\$ 4.5$ billion in funding for transportation projects statewide that could be delivered quickly, including $\$ 13.8$ million from the Prop 1B Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) for the Highway 1 SoquelMorrissey Auxiliary Lanes project, now under construction. Another example would include federal sources such as the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009, which provided over $\$ 12.0$ million for transportation projects in Santa Cruz county. Additionally, federal earmarks and special grant programs have historically provided funds for highway projects nationwide.

## Tier II (EA 05- 0C732) - Funding for Highway 1 41st/Soquel Auxiliary Lanes and Chanticleer Overcrossing Project

In December 2011, the SCCRTC designated $\$ 4.0$ million of the region's share of 2012 STIP funds for final design and right-of-way phases of the Highway 141 st Ave/Soquel Ave Auxiliary Lanes and Chanticleer Overcrossing project, subsequently approved by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) in the adopted 2012 State Transportation Improvement Program. Work on the final design and right-of-way phase of the project development process is anticipated to begin in winter 2017, following state and federal approval of the Tiered Environmental Document, and is anticipated to take one year to complete.
Funding the construction phase of the Tier II project will be considered by the SCCRTC in forthcoming funding cycles. Preliminary construction cost estimates for the Tier II project total approximately $\$ 23.0$ million (including construction management and support). Given the historic level of transportation revenue streams summarized above it may be necessary to build the Tier II project in phases. Below is a breakout of the Tier II project into individual project elements and preliminary cost estimates.

Table 8.1 Highway 1 41st Ave/Soquel Ave Auxiliary Lanes and Chanticleer Overcrossing Project Funding

| PROJECT ELEMENTS | CONSTRUCTION <br>  <br> support) |
| :--- | :---: |
| Northbound Auxiliary Lane between $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue and Soquel <br> Avenue | $\$ 11,000,000$ |
| Southbound Auxiliary Lane between $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue and Soquel <br> Avenue | $\$ 7,000,000$ |
| Bicycle/Pedestrian Overcrossing of Hwy 1 at Chanticleer <br> Avenue | $\$ 5,000,000$ |
| Estimated Total | $\mathbf{\$ 2 3 , 0 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ |

The northbound auxiliary lane construction must precede the bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing and the southbound auxiliary lane because the northbound work shifts the route centerline and allows room for the bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing center pier and the southbound widening.
It has been determined that this project is eligible for federal-aid funding.

Table 8.2 Capital Outlay Support and Project Estimates

| Fund Source |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20.XX.075.600 (STIP <br> RIP) | Prior | FY 16/17 | FY 18/19 | Total |
| Component |  |  |  |  |
| PA\&ED Support* | $\$ 12,709$ |  |  | $\$ 12,709$ |
| PS\&E Support |  | $\$ 2,538$ |  | $\$ 2,538$ |
| Right-of-Way Support |  | $\$ 133$ |  | $\$ 133$ |
| Construction Support |  |  | $\$ 3,000$ | $\$ 3,000$ |
| Right-of-Way |  | $\$ 1,376$ |  | $\$ 1,376$ |
| Construction |  |  | $\$ 18,119$ | $\$ 18,119$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{\$ 1 2 , 7 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 4 , 0 4 7}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 2 1 , 1 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 3 7 , 8 7 5}$ |

*For tiered environmental documentation of entire State Route 1 corridor
The PS\&E, right-of-way, and construction support cost ratios are $14 \%, 10 \%$ and $15 \%$. Construction cost escalation assumed as $3 \%$.
Note: Project Support and Capital Costs prepared by Consultant

## 9. SCHEDULE

| Project Milestones |  | Scheduled Delivery <br> Date <br> (Month/Day/Year) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| PROGRAM PROJECT | M015 | 2002 |
| BEGIN ENVIRONMENTAL | M020 | June 23, 2003 |
| CIRCULATE DED EXTERNALLY | M120 | November, 2015 |
| PA \& ED | M200 | October, 2016 |
| PROJECT PS\&E | M380 | October, 2018 |
| RIGHT OF WAY CERTIFICATION | M410 | October, 2018 |
| READY TO LIST | M460 | December, 2018 |
| AWARD | M495 | February, 2019 |
| APPROVE CONTRACT | M500 | March1, 2019 |
| CONTRACT ACCEPTANCE | M600 | December, 2019 |
| END PROJECT | M800 | May 30, 2020 |

## 10. RISKS

Project risks are summarized in the Risk Register in Attachment I, and have been collected from PDT members throughout the PAED process. They span the planning, design and construction phases and are of varying impacts. Risk control strategies include transference, acceptance and avoidance. In general the risks would impact project cost and schedule if they were realized.
The only risk with impact rated "high" is related to project funding, and the fact that this project is not fully programmed. RTC's strategies for avoiding this risk are described Section 8 "Programming".
Two "moderate" risks are related to highway maintenance, with acceptance strategies that recommend involvement of maintenance staff early in PS\&E phase so that maintenance requirements can be incorporated.
Two "moderate" risks are related to utility relocation, with avoidance strategies that recommend careful adherence to owner notification, involvement and milestones.
While the project cost estimate includes a conservative estimate for ADL-contaminated soil, it is accepted that future testing during PS\&E and construction may identify additional contamination. ADL handling costs trends will be tracked, and additional funding or cost-trade-offs would be sought if this risk were realized.
The only risk considered to affect project quality is related to project aesthetics, and the possibility of community input leading to aesthetic treatment that exceeds project budget. RTC plans to control this risk by guiding visual mitigation via an aesthetics review board, formed as part of the HOV Lanes and Transportation System Management Alternatives project planning.

## 11. FHWA COORDINATION

This project is considered to be a High Profile Project (HPP) in accordance with the current Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Joint Stewardship and Oversight Agreement.

## 12. PROJECT REVIEWS

Scoping team field review $\qquad$ N/A Date $\qquad$ Scoping team field review attendance roster attached. District Program Advisor $\qquad$ Date $\qquad$ Headquarters SHOPP Program Advisor N/A Date District Maintenance

Tom Barnett Date 2/13/2014 $\qquad$
Headquarters Design Coordinator Christine Inouye Date 2/13/2014 Project Manager Luis Duazo Date 08/27/2015 $\qquad$

|  | Gary Sweeten, Dominic Hoang | Date $08 / 27 / 2015$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| FHWA | Scott Morris | Date $2 / 13 / 2014$ |
| District Safety Review | Mike Dubin | Date $5 / 25 / 2012$ |
| Constructability Review N/A Date <br> Other   |  |  |

## 13. PROJECT PERSONNEL

Table 10.1: Project Personnel Information

| NAME | ROLE | PHONE |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Luis Duazo | Caltrans Project Manager | $(805) 542-4678$ |
| John Fouche | Oversight Design Manager/Oversight Engineer | $(805) 549-3330$ |
| Matt Fowler | Caltrans Environmental Unit Supervisor | $(805) 542-4603$ |
| Lara Bertaina | Caltrans Senior Environmental Planner | $(805) 542-4610$ |
| Nick Dumas | Caltrans Right-of-Way Manager | $(559) 445-6195$ |
| George Dondero | SCCRTC Executive Director | $(831) 460-3202$ |
| Kim Shultz | SCCRTC Senior Transportation Planner | $(831) 460-3208$ |
| Parag Mehta | Kimley-Horn, Project Manager | $(925) 965-7703$ |

## 14. LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A - Vicinity Map<br>Attachment B - Typical Cross Sections<br>Attachment C - Layouts<br>Attachment D - Draft Project Report Cost Estimate<br>Attachment E - TMP and TMP Checklist<br>Attachment F - SWDR Cover<br>Attachment G - DED<br>Attachment H - Right-of-way and Utility Plans<br>Attachment I - Risk Management Plan<br>Attachment J - Chanticleer Bicycle/Pedestrian Overcrossing Advance Planning Study<br>Attachment K - Life Cycle Cost Analysis<br>Attachment L - Accident Summary<br>Attachment M - District Distribution List
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## ATTACHMENT D

## DRAFT PROJECT REPORT COST ESTIMATE

## PRELIMINARY PROJECT COST ESTIMATE SUMMARY

|  | DIST-CO-RTE | 05-SCr-1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PM: | 13.5/14.9 |
|  | EA: | 05-0C7300 |
|  | PROG CODE: $20 . X \times .075 .600$ (STIP RIP) | 400.100 (Local) |
|  | PI: | 05-0000-0023 |
|  | OVERSIGHT UNIT: | 06-1449 |
| Project Description: |  |  |

Limits: In Santa Cruz County, on SR 1, from 41st Avenue IC to Soquel Drive IC

Proposed Improvement: Tier 2 Project: Auxiliary Lanes from 41st Avenue to Soquel Drive
(Scope) Pave median and widen outside to add auxiliary lanes
to improve highway operations

| SUMMARY OF PROJECT COST ESTIMATE |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| TOTAL ROADWAY ITEMS | $2015 \$$ |
| TOTAL STRUCTURE ITEMS | $\$ 13,911,000$ |
| SUBTOTAL CONSTRUCTION COSTS | $\$ 2,670,000$ |
| TOTAL RIGHT OF WAY ITEMS | $\$ 16,581,000$ |
| TOTAL ALTERNATIVE CAPITAL OUTLAY COSTS | $\$ 1,276,000$ |
|  | $\$ 17,857,000$ |
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## PRELIMINARY PROJECT COST ESTIMATE SUMMARY

|  | DIST - CO-RTE | 05-SCr-1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PM: | 13.5/14.9 |
|  | EA: | 05-0C7300 |
| PROG CODE: | 20.XX.075.600 (STIP RIP) | 400.100 (Local) |
|  | PI: | 05-0000-0023 |
|  | OVERSIGHT UNIT: | 06-1449 |



| Rubberized Hot Mix Asphalt (Type A) | 16,800 | TON | \$105 | \$1,764,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lean Concrete Base | 5,060 | CY | \$105 | \$531,300 |
| Aggregate Base (Class 2) | 1,000 | CY | \$35 | \$35,000 |
| Aggregate Subbase (Class 1) | 13,100 | CY | \$35 | \$458,500 |

Subtotal Pavement Structural Section $\quad \$ 2,788,800$
Section 3 - Drainage
Drainage
Subtotal Sections 1-2, 4, \& 5
Stormwater management
Subtotal Sections 1-2, 4, 5 \& II.

| 7,162,840 | X | 10\% | \$716,284 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9,832,840 | X | 9\% | \$884,956 |

Subtotal Drainage $\qquad$

SUBTOTAL SECTIONS 1-3: $\qquad$
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## PRELIMINARY PROJECT COST ESTIMATE SUMMARY

|  | DIST - CO-RTE | 05-SCr-1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PM: | 13.5/14.9 |
|  | EA: | 05-0C7300 |
| PROG CODE: | 20.XX.075.600 (STIP RIP) | 400.100 (Local) |
|  | PI: | 05-0000-0023 |
|  | OVERSIGHT UNIT: | 06-1449 |

Section 4 - Specialty Items
Retaining Wall
Concrete Barrier
Temporary Barrier (K-Rail)
Environmental Mitigation (ADL+)
Noise abatement/building acoustics Erosion Control
Lead Compliance Plan
Planting/Irrigation
Rodeo Gulch roadway repair


| $\$ 648,000$ |
| ---: |
| $\$ 385,000$ |
| $\$ 375,000$ |
| $\$ 1,009,000$ |
| $\$ 5,000$ |
| $\$ 85,000$ |
| $\$ 5,000$ |
| $\$ 225,000$ |
| $\$ 200,000$ |

Total Specialty Items \$2,937,000

Section 5 - Traffic Items
Pavement Delineation Modify Signals/Lighting Electrical
TMS Elements
CCTV System
Traffic Management Plan
Traffic Items (5\% of Section 2)

| 58,000 | LF | \$0.50 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | LS | \$300,000 |
| 1 | LS | \$175,000 |
| 1 | LS | \$100,000 |
| 1 | LS | \$100,000 |
| 1 | LS | \$650,000 |
| 1 | LS | \$139,400 |


| $\$ 29,000$ |
| ---: |
| $\$ 300,000$ |
| $\$ 175,000$ |
| $\$ 100,000$ |
| $\$ 100,000$ |
| $\$ 650,000$ |
| $\$ 139,400$ |

Total Traffic Items $\qquad$
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# PRELIMINARY PROJECT COST ESTIMATE SUMMARY 

|  | DIST - CO-RTE | 05-SCr-1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PM: | 13.5/14.9 |
|  | EA: | 05-0C7300 |
| PROG CODE: | 20.XX.075.600 (STIP RIP) | \& 400.100 (Local) |
|  | PI: | 05-0000-0023 |
|  | OVERSIGHT UNIT: | 06-1449 |


|  |  |  |  | $\underline{\text { Unit Cost }}$ | Section Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section 6 - Minor Items |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal Sections 1-5 | \$9,024,080 | X | 10\% | \$902,408 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Subtotal Minor Items: | \$903,000 |
| Section 7 - Roadway Mobilization |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal Sections 1-5 | \$9,024,080 |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Items | \$903,000 |  |  |  |  |
|  | \$9,927,080 | X | 10\% | \$992,708 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Subtotal Mobilization: | \$993,000 |
| Section 8 - Roadway Additions |  |  |  |  |  |
| Supplemental Work |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal Sections 1-6 | \$9,927,080 | X | 10\% | \$992,708 |  |
| Contingencies |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal Sections 1-6 | \$9,927,080 | X | 20\% | \$1,985,416 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Subtotal Additions: | \$2,979,000 |
|  |  |  |  | TOTAL ROADWAY ITEMS (Total of Sections 1-6) | \$13,911,000 |
| Estimate Prepared by: | Charmaine Zamora | (408) 392-7200 |  |  | 09/22/15 |
|  | (Print Name) | (Phone) |  |  | (Date) |
| Estimate Approved by: | Parag Mehta | (925) 965-7703 |  |  | 09/22/15 |
|  | (Print Name) | (Phone) |  |  | (Date) |

## PRELIMINARY PROJECT COST ESTIMATE SUMMARY

\author{

| DIST - CO - RTE | $05-\mathrm{SCr}-1$ |
| ---: | :---: |
| EA: | $\frac{13.5 / 14.9}{05-0 \mathrm{C} 7300}$ | <br> PROG CODE: $20 . X X .075 .600$ (STIP RIP) \& 400.100 (Local) <br> PI: 05-0000-0023 <br> OVERSIGHT UNIT: 06-1449

}

## II. STRUCTURES ITEMS

| Bridge Name | Chanticleer POC |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | (New) |
| Structure Type | CIP Box |
| Additional Width (FT) | 16.00 |
| Span Lengths (FT) | 979.00 |
| Total Area (SQ FT) | 15664 |
| Footing Type (pile/spread) | pile |
| Cost per Sq. Ft.Including:$\quad$ Mobilization: $10 \%$Contingency: $25 \%$ |  |
|  |  |
| Other* |  |
| Total Cost For Structure | \$2,670,000 |

SUBTOTAL THIS PAGE | $\$ 2,670,000$ |
| :---: |

COMMENTS:

| Estimate Prepared By: | Charmaine Zamora | (408) 392-7200 | (Phone) |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| (Print Name) | (Date) |  |  |
| Estimate Approved By: | Parag Mehta | $(925) 965-7703$ | (Phone) |
|  | (Print Name) | 9/22/2015 |  |

## PRELIMINARY PROJECT COST ESTIMATE SUMMARY

|  | DIST - CO-RTE | 05-SCr-1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PM: | 13.5/14.9 |
|  | EA: | 05-0C7300 |
|  | PROG CODE: 20.XX. 075.600 (STIP RIP) | 400.100 (Local) |
|  | PI: | 05-0000-0023 |
|  | OVERSIGHT UNIT: | 06-1449 |
| Project Description: |  |  |

Limits: In Santa Cruz County, on SR 1, from 41st Avenue IC to Soquel Drive IC
Proposed Improvement: Tier 2 Project: Auxiliary Lanes from 41st Avenue to Soquel Drive
(Scope) Pave median and widen outside to add auxiliary lanes to improve highway operations

| SUMMARY OF PROJECT COST ESTIMATE |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| TOTAL ROADWAY ITEMS | $2015 \$$ |
| TOTAL STRUCTURE ITEMS | $\$ 13,911,000$ |
| SUBTOTAL CONSTRUCTION COSTS | $\$ 2,670,000$ |
| TOTAL RIGHT OF WAY ITEMS | $\$ 16,581,000$ |
| TOTAL ALTERNATIVE CAPITAL OUTLAY COSTS | $\$ 1,276,000$ |
| $17,857,000$ |  |


| Reviewed by |  | $(408) 392-7200$ | $9 / 22 / 2015$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Engineer | Charmaine Zamora | (Phone) | (Date) |
| Approved by |  | $(925) 965-7703$ | (Date) |
| Project Manager | Parag Mehta | (Phone) |  |
| Approved by |  | $831-460-3208$ | (Phone) |
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## PRELIMINARY PROJECT COST ESTIMATE SUMMARY

DIST - CO - RTE 05-SCr-1<br>PM: 13.5/14.9<br>EA: 05-0C7300<br>PROG CODE: 20.XX. 075.600 (STIP RIP) $\& \overline{400.100 \text { (LOCal) }}$<br>PI: 05-0000-0023<br>OVERSIGHT UNIT: 06-1449

## III. RIGHT OF WAY

Right-of-Way estimates should consider the probable highest and best use and type and intent of improvements at the time of acquisition. Assume acquisition including utility relocation occurs at the right of way certification milestone as shown in the Funding and Scheduling Section of the PSR. For further guidance see Chapter 1, Caltrans Right of Way Procedural Handbook.

|  | Current Values (Future Use) | Escalation Rate (\%/yr) | Escalated Value * |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acquisition, including excess lands and damages to remainders *** | \$824,000 | 3\% | \$902,000 |
| Environmental Mitigation \& Permit Fees | \$200,000 | 1\% | \$206,000 |
| Utility Relocation | \$176,000 | 2\% | \$187,000 |
| Relocation Assistance | \$20,000 | 3\% | \$22,000 |
| Clearance / Demolition | \$25,000 | 2\% | \$28,000 |
| Title and Escrow | \$6,000 | 0\% | \$6,000 |
| SB 1210 Costs | \$25,000 | 0\% | \$25,000 |

TOTAL RIGHT OF WAY ** $\$ 1,276,000$
(CURRENT VALUE)
TOTAL ESCALATED $\quad \$ 1,376,000$
RIGHT OF WAY

*     - Escalated to assumed year of ROW Acquisition: $\qquad$
** - Current total value for use on sheet 1 of 6 , does not include value enhancement cost

| Estimate Prepared by: | Michael Lahodny/Charmaine Zamora | (408) 392-7200 | 09/22/15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (Print Name) | (Phone) | (Date) |
| Estimate Approved by: | Parag Mehta | (925) 965-7703 | 9/22/2015 |
|  | (Print Name) | (Phone) | (Date) |
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## TRANSPORTATION <br> MANAGEMENT <br> PLAN

State Route 1
State Route 1 HOV - Tier 2 Project $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue to Soquel Drive Auxiliary Lanes

Santa Cruz County
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Santa Cruz Regional Transportation Commission
DISTRICT 5
July 2013
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## List of Attachments

$\qquad$1. Closure ChartsPS\&E

### 1.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

### 1.1 Overview

a. Purpose: Improve traffic conditions for weaving and merging movements on Highway 1 (designated State Route 1) between $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue and Soquel Drive and improve pedestrian and bicycle access and safety.
b. Scope: Add auxiliary lanes for approximately 1.4 mile of Highway 1 from the $41^{\text {st }}$ Avenue Interchange to the Soquel Drive Interchange in the City and County of Santa Cruz; construct a pedestrian overcrossing connecting Chanticleer Avenue on both sides of the highway; construct retaining walls.
c. Process: Construct retaining walls in fill areas; widen roadway to the outside; then construct center column for Chanticleer OC in median and construct new concrete median barrier, shoulders and roadway section in median.
d. Cost: $\$ 16.6$ million construction cost ( $\$ 13.9$ million in roadway items, $\$ 2.7$ million for the Chanticleer OC, and $\$ 1.3$ million in utility relocations
e. Status: Construction to begin no earlier than 2015.
f. Duration: 18 to 24 months

### 1.2 Proposed Traffic Handling During Stage Construction

a. It is expected that like on the Soquel to Morrissey Auxiliary Lane Project and the $1 / 17$ Merge Lane project, traffic counts would show that traffic volumes are such that two lanes of traffic must be open in both directions all day during construction. Striping operations, traffic control set-up, installation of a storm drain crossing, HMA-OG overlay, and short-term overcrossing falsework erection would occur at night, using lane and mainline closures, as allowed on the closure charts that would be prepared during PS\&E.
b. Temporary ramp closures would be limited to hours where traffic volumes show closure is acceptable. Ramp closures are expected during striping operations.
c. Lane and ramp closure charts would be included in the final TMP and in the project specifications..
d. In Stage 1 of construction, the two through lanes would be shifted toward the median barrier, in both directions, and Type K concrete railing would be installed along the edge of the traveled way, around the construction zone. During Stage 1, roadway widening and retaining wall construction would occur, as would clearing and grubbing.
e. In Stage 2 of construction, traffic would be shifted away from the median barrier onto the newly widened Route 1 , to allow for construction of the center OC pier and the concrete median barrier, shoulder and roadway section. Type K railing would be installed around the median work zone, but none would be required to the outside. Erection of OC falsework requiring a lane closure would occur at night.
f. At the end of Stage 2, the landscaping work would require shoulder closure.
g. The final HMA-OC overlay would require a nighttime mainline closure.

It is anticipated that project construction would take 18 to 24 months. The planting work would be followed by a 1 to 3 year plant establishment period.

### 1.3 Effects on Traffic During Construction

a. Traffic volumes would be collected during PS\&E for use in refining lane closure charts for the project. It is anticipated that during the day, two lanes in the northbound direction, two lanes in the southbound direction would be open except during nighttime striping, traffic control set-up and short-term bridge construction operations. Ramps are expected to remain open except during striping operations.
b. During lane closures, changeable message signs would display alternate routes on arterials in order to relieve congestion on the mainline. Some delays can be expected due to:

- Narrowed lanes and no shoulders around bridge construction zones - increase in non-recurring congestion from stalls, debris, slow moving vehicles and accidents
- Reduced speed--longer travel time through the project limits
- New lane shifts may cause braking--drivers need time initially to adjust to the temporary traffic condition.


### 2.0 TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT PLAN (TMP) SUMMARY

This plan is a comprehensive strategy for reducing traffic demand and disruption and assuring the safe movement of vehicles through and around the proposed project area during construction. This would be accomplished through public information campaign in advance of construction, and effective signage for the safe passage of the motoring public. Strategies for providing safe passage with minimum delays would include a combination of portable changeable message signs (PCMS), construction area signs, and other appropriate signage and traffic control devices. Lastly, to maintain continuous traffic flow through the project area, the TMP includes a plan for dealing with incidents such as traffic accidents, vehicle stalls, or equipment failure. Establishing a protocol for immediate incident response can be accomplished with construction zone enforcement with CHP (COZEEP) and providing standby personnel to monitor and respond to traffic emergency situations.

### 2.1 TMP Team: Members, Roles and Responsibilities

The implementation of this plan must be a team effort and its success lies in consensus between Caltrans and Santa Cruz County agencies. Although this TMP proposes various strategies that are independent of each other, no one or two strategies alone would achieve the overall TMP goals. A combination of all TMP measures, along with teamwork and cooperation of member agencies, would help to ensure that the goals of the TMP are met. See Work Plan below for roles and responsibilities for the development and the implementation of this TMP.
a. The TMP Team should develop general working guidelines related to cooperation, communication channels, and coordination;
b. The TMP Team should evaluate the proposed elements under this TMP and agree upon member responsibilities of individual TMP elements;
c. Various proposed TMP elements may already be in place, however, the team should identify the program expansion requirements or provide redirection to meet the needs proposed under this TMP;
d. Prior to actual construction, the TMP Team should verify the need for any refinement to the proposed TMP elements as a result of late changes;
e. At all times, the TMP team should maintain effective communication channels with employers, motorists, residents, public and law enforcement officials;
f. The TMP should be continuously monitored and updated during all stages of construction.

TMP Team Member List:

| Project Manager: | Luis Duazo |
| :--- | :--- |
| Construction Resident Engineer: | TBD |
| District Traffic Manager (DTM): | TBD |
| Public Information Officer (PIO): | Karena Pushnik, RTC and TBD, Caltrans |
| Project Engineer: | Parag Mehta |
| TMP Coordinator: | TBD |
| Safety and Signing: | TBD |
| Traffic Reviewer: | TBD |
| CHP: | TBD |
| RTC Contact: | Kim Shultz |
| County of Santa Cruz Contact: | John Presleigh |
| Traffic Management Center Contact: | TBD |
| Santa Cruz City Schools (SCCS): | Alvaro Meza |

TMP Work Plan
Roles and Responsibilities / Cost Estimate

|  | Transportation Management Measure | Responsible Party | Action Required | Cost (Est) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) | Caltrans/RTC/ CHP | Extended service hours from 6 hours to 15 hours per day | \$120K | To supplement existing RTC FSP program. |
| 2 | COZEEP | CHP, RE | Increase CHP presence during roadway closures | \$150K | RE to contact CHP to request COZEEP |
| 3 | Ground Mounted Signs | RE | Provide project and warning information to motorists. | \$50K | Included in PS\&E |
| 4 | Changeable Message Signs | RE | Install portable CMS's announcing reduced speed, delays, detours, and upcoming construction. | \$100K | Included in PS\&E |
| 5 | Traffic Control System | RE | Establish closures, signing, detours | \$200K | Included in PS\&E |
| 6 | Press releases | PIO | Provide project and construction information through media. | \$30K | Scope and frequency determined by PIO |
| 7 | Telephone Hotline, Website | RE, PIO | Construction provides real time information. | -- | Public Affairs provide assistance in setting up hotline. |
| 8 | Website | Caltrans PIO | Provide real time traffic information on Caltrans' and RTC's websites. | -- | PIO in-house effort |
| 9 | Contingency Plan | RE, CHP, PIO, TMC, RTC, SCC, FSP | Incident Response Protocol | -- | RE to report Incidents to TMC, CHP and FSP |
| 10 | Traffic Monitoring | RE, RTC, SCC, <br> FSP, CHP | Observe traffic, provide travel information feedback and contingency | -- | TMP team members to update TMP based on monitoring |
| Total Estimated Costs |  |  |  | \$650K |  |

### 3.0 TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT PLAN STRATEGIES

The TMP proposes a program of public information, incident management, motorist information, and contingency plans. The public information program would consist of media notification, a telephone hotline, press releases, a website updates and 511 updates for information dissemination and travel time. The incident detection and response program would initiate the COZEEP and a roving tow truck patrol that would promptly remove minor incidents and alert the California Highway Patrol of accidents. The motorist information program would notify drivers of changing conditions ahead using existing changeable message signs (CMS), portable CMS, and construction area signs.

This section describes possible TMP strategies to mitigate construction-related traffic delays and driver safety issues. The TMP strategies proposed here are of a general nature and address the overall concerns caused by construction. The strategies are grouped into four broad transportation management strategies:
A. Public Information
B. Motorist Information Strategies

## C. Incident Management <br> D. Contingency Plan

Traffic management strategies that require action by the construction contractor are described briefly in the TMP and presented in detail in the Project Plans and Special Provisions. Traffic management strategies that are to be implemented by Caltrans and Santa Cruz County agencies appear only in the TMP and are not included in the contract specifications.

### 3.1 Public Information

### 3.1.1 Internet Website: PIO

a. Post link to construction update on SCCRTC website and keep current.
b. Post links to webpage on Caltrans District 5 website
c. Provide webpage link to local internet site, including 511.org

### 3.1.2 Flyers, Mailers or Brochures

a. Develop email list
b. Develop and distribute flyers and mailers to public agencies for public distribution.

### 3.1.3 Press Release

a. Develop press releases and distribute to local media with project and construction information
b. Send updates to media as needed

### 3.1.4 Telephone Hotlines

At a minimum, hotline recordings should include a brief description of ongoing or imminent construction activity hours of impact and detours. Bilingual recordings should be considered.

Telephone information hotline messages should announce the following events:
a. Start of construction
b. Safe travel tips through project site
c. Ramp or lane closures

### 3.2 Motorist Information

The motorist information system provides advance warning regarding changing roadway conditions ahead, potential delays and/or available detours during construction. The strategies include two measures: Changeable Message Signs (CMS) and Ground Mounted Signs for contingencies.

### 3.2.1 Changeable Message Signs (Portable and Fixed CMS)

The function of Changeable Message Signs (CMS) is to alert drivers of changing travel conditions in the construction zone (such as congestion and lane shifts) and to improve their opportunity to stop or adjust travel speeds. CMS can also be used to announce upcoming freeway or ramp closures. Messages should conform to Caltrans guidelines.

- The RE is responsible for monitoring message content and PCMS deployment. At least 3 PCMS would be used in each direction on Route 1 for advance warning of roadway conditions. PCMS may be deployed on $41^{\text {st }}$ or Soquel Ave in advance of Route 1 on-ramps. When traffic is detoured, additional CMS would be provided.


### 3.2.2 Ground Mounted Signs

Ground mounted construction and warning signs provide information about immediate road hazards to motorists. Plans and specification would include the quantity and type of signs.

### 3.3 Incident Management

The incident detection and response system includes the Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) and Construction Zone Enhanced Enforcement Program (COZEEP).

### 3.3.1 Freeway Service Patrol (FSP)

Extend existing service (6-9 AM and 3:30-6:30 PM) from 6 to 15 hours per day (from 6 AM to 9 PM) during the first three days of a new temporary lane shift. Program also proposes to provide weekend service during the summer months (Memorial Day to Labor Day) from 1PM to 7 PM in recognition of out-of- town tourist travelers.

### 3.3.2 Construction Zone Enhanced Enforcement Program (COZEEP)

This program involves continuous and a more visible presence of the California Highway Patrol (CHP) in the construction zone, provides enforcement of speed restrictions, and faster incident response. It is recommended that a COZEEP program be established for the entire construction period.

### 3.3.3 Traffic Monitoring

Continuous traffic monitoring would be required even when no roadwork is being done. The RE is to ensure a proper level of personnel is provided to monitor traffic, report incidents to TMC and CHP, and help pick up fallen cones. Santa Cruz County agencies may consider modification of signal timing at adjacent intersections during construction.

### 3.4 Contingency Plans

The project specifications would require the Contractor to submit a traffic control plan at least one week prior to any ramp or lane closures. The traffic control plan shall contain a detailed contingency plan addressing equipment standby, emergency detours and emergency notification, in the event problems arise in opening the ramp or lane by the designated time. During construction activities requiring lane closures at night or traffic splits, the contractor shall provide appropriate personnel to monitor activities and make decisions regarding activation of contingency plans.
a. The contingency plan shall identify key operational decision points with a schedule listing the expected completion time of each critical path activity. Clearly defined trigger points shall be identified with each critical path activity to establish when the contingency plan would be activated.
b. A communication plan shall include a decision tree with clearly defined lines of communication. The names, telephone numbers and pager numbers of the Contractor's Project Manager, Caltrans TMC, Resident Engineer, Caltrans Permit and/or Construction Inspector, CHP Area Commander, and other applicable personnel shall be provided.
c. When a major lane-blocking incident occurs and severe congestion is about to develop, TMC should receive a report from CHP, Caltrans or the Contractor field personnel. TMC staff shall take the following incident response actions.

## Beginning of the Report:

1. Notify Communication Center (DOTCC)
2. Verify details with CCTV or CHP unit
3. Activate CMS
4. Notify Caltrans Traffic Management Team (TMT)
5. Notify media, 511 and management via Sigalert and/or pager notification
6. Notify/coordinate with adjacent districts' TMCs, if applicable
7. Notify/coordinate with local TMCs, if applicable
8. Activate EMS
9. Make an entry on the CHP CAD bulletin board and route to the media, if applicable
10. Coordinate with DTM to have lane closures picked up on alternate routes, if applicable
11. Notify locally affected transit, city police, and traffic engineers for city street congestion, if applicable

## During Incident

1. Update incident status notifications, if applicable
2. Update DOTCC and TMT

## End of Incident

1. Notify DOTCC and TMT when incident is over
2. Deactivate CMS, and EMS
3. Send final Sigalert and/or pager notification
4. Delete CHP CAD bulletin board entry and route to the media, if applicable
5. Notify adjacent districts' TMCs, local TMCs, Signal Operations, local transit, city police, and city traffic engineers when incident is over, if applicable
6. Update shift briefing binder, if applicable

This Transportation Management Plan has been prepared under the direction of the following registered engineers. The registered Civil Engineers attest to the technical information contained herein and have judged the qualifications of any technical specialists providing engineering data upon which recommendations, conclusions and decisions are based.

## Prepared By:



Suzanne Sarro, PE

Nolte Associates, Inc.

## ATTACHMENT F

## STORM WATER DATA REPORT COVER



Dist-County-Route: 05-SCR-01

| Post Mile Limits: Tier I: PM R7.24/16.13 (KP R11.64/25.96); <br> Tier II: PM 13.5/14.9 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Type: Highway Widening |  |  |
| Project ID (or EA): 05000000230 (05-0C7300) |  |  |
| Program Identification: STIP |  |  |
| Phase: | $\square$ | PID |
|  | 区 | PA/ED |
|  | $\square$ | PS\&E |

Regional Water Quality Control Board(s): Central Coast (Region 3)
Is the Project required to consider Treatment BMPs?
If yes, can Treatment BMPs be incorporated into the project?
Yes $\boxtimes$ No
Yes $\boxtimes \quad$ No
If No, a Technical Data Report must be submitted to the RWQCB at least 30 days prior to the projects RTL date. List RTL Date: $\qquad$

Total Disturbed Soil Area: Tier I Project: 250 ac (101 ha) for HOV Lane Alternative and 101 ac (41 ha) for TSM Alternative; Tier II Project: 18.5 ac
Risk Level: 2 \& 3
Estimated: Construction Start Date: Tier I Project: TBD; Construction Completion Date: Tier I Project: TBD;
Tier II Project: March 2019
Tier II Project: May 2020
Notification of Construction (NOC) Date to be submitted: TBD (At least one month prior to the start of construction)
Erosivity Waiver
Notification of ADL reuse (if Yes, provide date)
Separate Dewatering Permit (if yes, permit number)

| Yes $\square$ | Date: | No $\boxtimes$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Yes $\square$ | Date: | No $\boxtimes$ |
| Yes $\square$ | Permit \#_no | No $\boxtimes$ |

This Report has been prepared under the direction of the following Licensed Person. The Licensed Person attests to the technical information contained herein and the date upon which recommendations, conclusions, and decisions are based. Professional Engineer or Landscape Architect stamp required at PS\&E.


## ATTACHMENT G

## DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT COVER

## ATTACHMENT H

## RIGHT OF WAY AND UTILTIY PLANS

## [Right of Way Impact and Utility Impact Plans included for reference only]

## RIGHT OF WAY DATA SHEET

## Right of Way Cost Estimate

|  | Current <br> Value | Escalation <br> Rate | Escalated <br> Value |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1. Right of Way Cost Estimate |  |  |  |

2. Current Date of Right of Way Certification: October 2018

## 3. Parcel Data:

Type Number Dual/Appr Utilities RR involvement Misc. R/W Work
X U4-1 0 None $x$ RAP Displ 0

A 0
B 1
C 5
D 0
Total 6

U4-1 0
-2 0 C\&M Agmt -3 0 Svc Contract -4 5 Design
U5-7 0 Const. -8 0 Lic/RE/Clauses $-95$

Area: In R/W 0.31 Acres
No. of Excess Parcels: 0
4. Are there any major items of construction contract work?

During the period of construction, temporary fencing may be required to maintain the integrity and security of some of the parcels.

## 5. Provide a general description of the right of way and excess lands required

 (zoning, use, major improvements, critical or sensitive parcels, etc.).The project is in an area of mixed zoning and uses. The predominant uses are low to medium density residential, commercial and some industrial. There are a total of 5 privately owned and 1 publicly owned parcels impacted by the project. Additionally, 1 parcel requires an encroachment permit for work on the city street. The project requires a total of 0.31 acres of public and privately owned property from 6 parcels. The property will be acquired in fee for the project except for the public street area. The acquisition areas are improved with typical residential and commercial site improvements. This alternative has minimal impact on adjacent properties. Abutters' rights will be required from the parcels acquired in fee for the Department of Transportation. Total costs include $\$ 200,000$ to purchase environmental mitigation credits (if required) and pay for required fees.

## 6. Is there an effect on assessed valuation?

No significant impact.
7. Are utility facilities or rights of way affected?

Yes, several involvements are anticipated. See Utility Information Sheet for details.
8. Are Railroad facilities or rights of way affected?

No.
9. Were any previously unidentified sites with hazardous waste and /or material found?
None evident.

## 10. Are RAP displacements required? <br> Relocation of personal property from storage shed and yard.

11. Are material or borrow and/or disposal sites required?

No.
12. Are there any potential relinquishments and/or abandonments? No
13. Are there any existing and/or potential airspace sites? No

## 14. Indicate the anticipated Right of Way schedule and lead-time requirements.

 Right of way lead time should be twenty months.15. Is it anticipated that Caltrans staff will perform all Right of Way Work. Yes.

Data for evaluation prepared and revised by:
Right of Way: Michael Lahodny
Date: April 17, 2013, rev Sept 1, 2015
Railroad: Michael Lahodny
Date: April 17, 2013, rev Sept 1, 2015
Utilities: Note Associates, Inc. \& Michael Lahodny

Date: February 25, 2013, updated Sept 1, 2015

## Recommended for Approval:



$$
9-22-2015
$$

Bender Rosenthal, Inc.
California Certified General
Appraiser [No. 044258]

## UTILITY INFORMATION SHEET

1. Name of utility companies involved in Project:

Pacific Gas and Electric - electricity and natural gas
County of Santa Cruz - sanitary sewer and storm drain Comcast Communications-cable TV
2. Types of facilities and agreements required:

PG\&E 21 kv transmission and OH power poles - Notice \& Agreement
PG\&E standard/high pressure UG gas lines - Notice \& Agreement
Comcast Communications- OH Cable - Notice \& Agreement
County of Santa Cruz -10 12 inch VCP UG sanitary sewer- Notice \& Agreement
County of Santa Cruz- 18 \& 36 inch RCP, $4 x 4$ RCB culvert and 9 foot concrete arch storm drain facilities - Notice \& Agreement
2. Is any facility a longitudinal encroachment in existing or proposed access controlled right of way?

No.
4. Additional Information concerning utility involvements on this project, i.e., long lead time materials, growing or species seasons, customer service seasons:

None observed.
5. Total estimated cost of State's obligation for utility relocation on this project:

The nature of the work includes costs to extend, relocate and protect in place existing utilities.
The total estimated cost (before escalation) to the project is $\$ 176,000$. A cost to Utility Owners is estimated at $\$ 424,000$. It is anticipated that when verifications and liability determinations are completed, these costs will need to be adjusted.

Prepared By: Nolte Associates \&
Michael Lahodny, Bender Rosenthal Inc.


# Right of Way Data Sheet Premise, Assumptions, Limiting Conditions and Extra Ordinary Assumptions 

## Estimate Premise

1. Estimates are forecasts of anticipated costs for properties that will be acquired at a future date. The Current Value was escalated to the Right of Way Certification date based on market observations.
2. Estimate requires looking into the future and projecting the anticipated highest and best use of the properties at the time they are required for the project. The estimate will not consider increases in real estate value due to changes in land use resulting from anticipation of the proposed project.
3. The estimate will be developed using appraisal principles without the depth of investigation and verification. The estimate may consider indicators of value which may not be acceptable in appraising under USPAP provisions.
4. The estimate will consider costs known as Construction Contract Work (CCW) as severance damages and included as compensation to the owner.
5. The estimator has based the estimate on the highest supported anticipated costs and a "worst case" scenario.
6 When in doubt because of inadequate or marginal requirement information, a full acquisition will be assumed.

## Assumptions

1. Estimate mapping is assumed to adequately provided information on which partial acquisition and damages are based.
2. The right of way area calculations are assumed to reflect the needs for the project or alternative. Changes in the areas may dramatically impact the estimated right of way costs.

## Limiting Conditions

1. Utility locations and information of property rights have not been fully researched and utility costs are based on field observations and cost information provided by others. More accurate costs will be developed as the project approaches selection of final alignment and design. Rights and obligations of parties will be verified and a liability determination will be established. Master agreements with Utility Companies may establish the costs to the owners and project.

## Extraordinary Assumptions

1. A contingency factor was previously applied at the observed rate of $15 \%$ then $20 \%$. The Department of Transportation Reviewer cited that it should be at $25 \%$ and the value was adjusted. This additional estimated cost provides for possible business goodwill claims, outdoor advertising signs, administrative settlements, condemnation awards, utility overruns and interest payments. This adjustment was applied to the Acquisition and Utility Relocation costs. The Relocation and Demolition costs already reflect an appropriate contingency adjustment around $23 \%$.
2. Environmental permitting fees will also be estimated as they are generally paid at the right of way acquisition phase. The Department of Transportation Reviewer cited that Caltrans Environmental Units require some escalation. The mitigation place holder for this project $\$ 200,000$ exceeds the current fee requirements for agencies identified as requiring payments. A nominal escalation factor will be used. There are no requirements to purchase land or credits at this time.
3. Lead time has been adjusted from eighteen to twenty months pursuant to Caltrans review.









## ATTACHMENT I

Co-Rte-PM (SCr-1 PM 13.5/14.9)
Date 9/23/2015
Proj Mngr Parag Mehta Telephone Number 408-392-7200

|  | PROJECT RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Identification |  |  |  |  |  | Qualitative Analysis |  |  |  | Response Strategy |  | Monitoring and Control |  |
| $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \frac{2}{2} \\ & \frac{0}{2} \\ & \frac{2}{2} \\ & \hline 1010 \end{aligned}\right.$ | Status | $\begin{array}{\|} \hline \text { ID } \\ \# \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Date Identified Project Phase | Functional <br> Assignment | ThreatOpportunity Event | Risk Trigger | Type | Probability | Impact | Risk Matrix | Strategy | Response Actions including advantages and disadvantages | Responsibilty <br> (Task Manager) | Last date changes made to risk and Comments |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (15) | (16) | (17) | (18) |
|  | Active |  | 9/15/2011 <br> PA\&ED | Design | Aesthetic Features identified by community exceed scope or monetary allocation of visual impact mitigation | Preliminary Cost Estimate of desirable features shows cost significantly exceeds cost budgeted | Quality | Low | Moderate |  | Transference | An Aesthetics Review Board, to be formed as part of the HOV Project, will prepare a visual plan for the corridor, including Aux Area. Cost is in HOV Prjct. | Parag Mehta | 10/1/2411 |
|  | Active |  | 9/15/2011 <br> PA\&ED | Design | ADL removal budget exceeds estimate | Additional ADL testing during PS\&E shows more ADL to be removed than budget allows | Cost | Low | Moderate |  | Acceptance | Track cost impact; adjust budget up to programmed amount. Look for other funding or cost trade-offs if ADL estimate exceeds expectations. | Parag Mehta | 10/1/2411 |
|  | Active |  | 9/15/2011 <br> PA\&ED | Planning | Project Funding not identified, delaying project | SCCRTC CIP does not identify Tier 2 project construction funding | Schedule | Moderate | High |  | Avoidance | Identify possible construction funding in next few years' CIP | SCCRTC | 10/25/2011 |
|  | Active |  | 9/15/2011 <br> PA\&ED | Design | Caltrans maintenance requirements increase project costs | Maintenance review of PS\&E | Cost | Low | Moderate |  | Acceptance | Get early review by Caltrans Maintenance | Parag Mehta | 10/25/2011 |
|  | Active |  | 3/24/2012 <br> PA\&ED | Design | Caltrans maintenance requirements conflict with stormwater treatment commitments | Maintenance disallows retention | Schedule | Moderate | Moderate |  | Acceptance | Get early review by Caltrans Maintenance | Parag Mehta | 4/5/2012 |
|  | Dormant |  | 6/20/2012 <br> PA\&ED | Construction | Utility relocation delays construction | Utility relocation lags schedule | Schedule | Moderate | Moderate |  | Avoidance | Work with PG\&E to keep schedule--confirm early the PG\&E has what it needs to move forward-correct forms, agreements, letters, etc. | Parag Mehta | 5/30/2013 |
|  | Dormant |  | 6/20/2012 <br> PA\&ED | Design | Utility agreements fall behind schedule | Utility agreements not finished for RTL checklist | Schedule | Moderate | Moderate |  | Avoidance | Work with PG\&E to keep schedule--confirm early the PG\&E has what it needs to move forward-correct forms, agreements, letters, etc. | Parag Mehta | 5/30/2013 |

## ATTACHMENT J

## CHANTICLEER BIKE/PED OVERCROSSING ADVANCE PLANNING STUDY



## ATTACHMENT K

## LIFECYCLE COST ANALYSIS

## ROUTE 1 HOV PROJECT <br> 6-Lane Alternatives

## Life Cycle Cost Analysis Form

Alternative 1 (Pavement-alternative-identified-to-program-project cost):
6-lane, 20 year Flexible - Option 3: $0.10^{\prime}$ HMA OGFC, 0.50 ' HMA, 0.50 ' LCB, 1.15 ' AS

| Pavement Design Life: 20 Years |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Initial Construction Costs: | \$ | 134,664 |  |  |
| Initial Project Support Costs: | \$ | 33,666 |  |  |
| Future Maintenance \& Rehabilitation Costs:** | \$ | 1,738 |  |  |
| TOTAL AGENCY COSTS: |  |  | \$ | 170,068 |
| USER COSTS: |  |  | \$ | 1,431 |
| TOTAL LIFE-CYCLE COSTS: |  |  | \$ | 171,499 |

Alternative 2:*
6-lane, 20 year Flexible - Option 2: $0.65^{\prime}$ HMA, $0.55^{\prime}$ AB, 1.15 ' AS

Pavement Design Life: $\quad 20$ Years
Initial Project Support Costs:

| $\$$ | 133,093 |
| :--- | ---: |
| $\$$ | 33,273 |

Future Maintenance \& Rehabilitation
Costs:**
$\$ \quad 2,440$

TOTAL AGENCY COSTS:
USER COSTS:
TOTAL LIFE-CYCLE COSTS:

| $\$$ | 168,806 |
| :--- | ---: |
| $\$$ | 8,436 |
| $\$$ | 177,242 |

Reason that this is not Alternative 1:
This alternative has total Life-Cycle Costs $3.35 \%$ greater than Alternative 1. Alternative 2 has lower initial construction and project support costs but the overall life-cycle cost is larger.

[^37]
## RealCost Input Data

| 1. Economic Variables |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Value of Time for Passenger Cars (\$/hour) | $\$ 11.51$ |
| Value of Time for Single Unit Trucks (\$/hour) | $\$ 27.83$ |
| Value of Time for Combination Trucks (\$/hour) | $\$ 27.83$ |


| 2. Analysis Options |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Include User Costs in Analysis | Yes |
| Include User Cost Remaining Service Life Value | Yes |
| Use Differential User Costs | Yes |
| User Cost Computation Method | Calculated |
| Include Agency Cost Remaining Service Life Value | Yes |
| Traffic Direction | Both |
| Analysis Period (Years) |  |
| Beginning of Analysis Period |  |
| Discount Rate (\%) |  |


| 3. Project Details and Quantity Calculations |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| State Route | Route 1 |
| Project Name | Route 1 HOV Project |
| Region | Central Coast |
| County | Santa Cruz |
| Analyzed By | CZ |
| Mileposts |  |
| Begin |  |
| End | Compare Flexible Pavement <br> Sections - 20 year design life (3 <br> lanes in each direction) |
| Length of Project (miles) | 7.30 |
| Comments |  |


| 4. Traffic Data |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| AADT Construction Year (total for both directions) | 97,000 |
| Cars as Percentage of AADT (\%) | 96.6 |
| Single Unit Trucks as Percentage of AADT (\%) | 2.2 |
| Combination Trucks as Percentage of AADT (\%) | 1.2 |
| Annual Growth Rate of Traffic (\%) | 2.3 |
| Speed Limit Under Normal Operating Conditions (mph) | 65 |
| No of Lanes in Each Direction During Normal Conditions | 3 |
| Free Flow Capacity (vphpl) | 1950 |
| Rural or Urban Hourly Traffic Distribution | Urban |
| Queue Dissipation Capacity (vphpl) | 1530 |
| Maximum AADT (total for both directions) | 289,830 |
| Maximum Queue Length (miles) | 5.0 |

Alternative 1

| Initial Construction | Construct Hot Mix AC HOV <br> Lane/Aux Lane |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Agency Construction Cost (\$1000) | $\$ 166,367.00$ |  |
| User Work Zone Costs (\$1000) | 400 |  |
| Work Zone Duration (days) | 3 |  |
| No of Lanes Open in Each Direction During Work Zone | 20.0 | 1 |
| Activity Service Life (years) | 35.4 |  |
| Maintenance Frequency (years) | 1.25 |  |
| Agency Maintenance Cost (\$1000) | 55 |  |
| Work Zone Length (miles) | 1360 |  |
| Work Zone Speed Limit (mph) |  |  |
| Work Zone Capacity (vphpl) |  | End |
| Time of Day of Lane Closures (use whole numbers based on |  |  |
| a 24-hour clock) |  |  |
| Inbound | Start |  |
| First period of lane closure |  |  |
| Second period of lane closure |  |  |
| Third period of lane closure |  |  |
| Outbound | Start |  |
| First period of lane closure |  |  |
| Second period of lane closure |  |  |
| Third period of lane closure |  |  |


| Rehabilitation \#1 | Year 20-5 year CapM HMA |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agency Construction Cost (\$1000) | \$1,508.10 |  |
| User Work Zone Costs (\$1000) |  |  |
| Work Zone Duration (days) | 40 |  |
| No of Lanes Open in Each Direction During Work Zone | 2 |  |
| Activity Service Life (years) | 5.0 |  |
| Maintenance Frequency (years) | 1 |  |
| Agency Maintenance Cost (\$1000) | 11.8 |  |
| Work Zone Length (miles) | 1.25 |  |
| Work Zone Speed Limit (mph) | 55 |  |
| Work Zone Capacity (vphpl) | 1360 |  |
| Time of Day of Lane Closures (use whole numbers based on a 24-hour clock) |  |  |
| Inbound | Start | End |
| First period of lane closure | 0 | 5 |
| Second period of lane closure | 22 | 24 |
| Third period of lane closure |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Outbound | Start | End |
| First period of lane closure | 0 | 5 |
| Second period of lane closure | 22 | 24 |
| Third period of lane closure |  |  |

## Page 2

| Rehabilitation \#2 | Year 25-20 year Rehab HMA |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Agency Construction Cost (\$1000) | $\$ 4,749.90$ |  |
| User Work Zone Costs (\$1000) |  |  |
| Work Zone Duration (days) | 43 |  |
| No of Lanes Open in Each Direction During Work Zone | 20.0 |  |
| Activity Service Life (years) | 1 |  |
| Maintenance Frequency (years) | 31.1 |  |
| Agency Maintenance Cost (\$1000) | 1.25 | 55 |
| Work Zone Length (miles) | 1360 |  |
| Work Zone Speed Limit (mph) |  |  |
| Work Zone Capacity (vphpl) | Start | End |
| Time of Day of Lane Closures (use whole numbers based on |  |  |
| a 24-hour clock) |  |  |
| Inbound |  |  |
| First period of lane closure |  |  |
| Second period of lane closure |  |  |
| Third period of lane closure |  |  |
| Outbound |  |  |
| First period of lane closure |  |  |
| Second period of lane closure |  |  |
| Third period of lane closure |  |  |


| Rehabilitation \#3 | Year 45-5 year CapM HMA |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agency Construction Cost (\$1000) | \$1,508.10 |  |
| User Work Zone Costs (\$1000) |  |  |
| Work Zone Duration (days) | 40 |  |
| No of Lanes Open in Each Direction During Work Zone | 2 |  |
| Activity Service Life (years) | 5.0 |  |
| Maintenance Frequency (years) | 1 |  |
| Agency Maintenance Cost (\$1000) | 11.8 |  |
| Work Zone Length (miles) | 1.25 |  |
| Work Zone Speed Limit (mph) | 55 |  |
| Work Zone Capacity (vphpl) | 1360 |  |
| Time of Day of Lane Closures (use whole numbers based on a 24 -hour clock) |  |  |
| Inbound | Start | End |
| First period of lane closure | 0 | 5 |
| Second period of lane closure | 22 | 24 |
| Third period of lane closure |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Outbound | Start | End |
| First period of lane closure | 0 | 5 |
| Second period of lane closure | 22 | 24 |
| Third period of lane closure |  |  |


| Rehabilitation \#4 | Year 50-20 year Rehab HMA |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Agency Construction Cost (\$1000) | $\$ 4,749.90$ |  |
| User Work Zone Costs (\$1000) | 43 |  |
| Work Zone Duration (days) | 2 |  |
| No of Lanes Open in Each Direction During Work Zone | 20.0 |  |
| Activity Service Life (years) | 1 |  |
| Maintenance Frequency (years) | 31.1 |  |
| Agency Maintenance Cost (\$1000) | 1.25 | 55 |
| Work Zone Length (miles) | 1360 |  |
| Work Zone Speed Limit (mph) |  |  |
| Work Zone Capacity (vphpl) | Start | End |
| Time of Day of Lane Closures (use whole numbers based on |  |  |
| a 24-hour clock) |  |  |
| Inbound |  |  |
| First period of lane closure |  |  |
| Second period of lane closure | Start |  |
| Third period of lane closure |  |  |
| Outbound |  |  |
| First period of lane closure |  |  |
| Second period of lane closure |  |  |
| Third period of lane closure |  |  |


| Rehabilitation \#5 |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Agency Construction Cost (\$1000) | $\$ 0.00$ |  |
| User Work Zone Costs (\$1000) | 0 |  |
| Work Zone Duration (days) | 3 |  |
| No of Lanes Open in Each Direction During Work Zone | 1.0 | 1 |
| Activity Service Life (years) | 0 |  |
| Maintenance Frequency (years) | 1.25 |  |
| Agency Maintenance Cost (\$1000) | 55 |  |
| Work Zone Length (miles) | 1360 |  |
| Work Zone Speed Limit (mph) |  |  |
| Work Zone Capacity (vphpl) |  | End |
| Time of Day of Lane Closures (use whole numbers based on |  |  |
| a 24-hour clock) |  |  |
| Inbound |  |  |
| First period of lane closure |  |  |
| Second period of lane closure |  | End |
| Third period of lane closure |  |  |
| Outbound |  |  |
| First period of lane closure |  |  |
| Second period of lane closure |  |  |
| Third period of lane closure |  |  |


| Rehabilitation \#6 |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Agency Construction Cost (\$1000) | $\$ 0.00$ |  |
| User Work Zone Costs (\$1000) |  |  |
| Work Zone Duration (days) | 0 |  |
| No of Lanes Open in Each Direction During Work Zone | 1.0 |  |
| Activity Service Life (years) | 1 |  |
| Maintenance Frequency (years) | 0 |  |
| Agency Maintenance Cost (\$1000) | 1.25 |  |
| Work Zone Length (miles) | 55 |  |
| Work Zone Speed Limit (mph) | 1360 |  |
| Work Zone Capacity (vphpl) |  |  |
| Time of Day of Lane Closures (use whole numbers based on |  | End |
| a 24-hour clock) |  |  |
| Inbound | Start |  |
| First period of lane closure |  |  |
| Second period of lane closure |  |  |
| Third period of lane closure | Start |  |
| Outbound |  |  |
| First period of lane closure |  |  |
| Second period of lane closure |  |  |
| Third period of lane closure |  |  |

Alternative 2

| Initial Construction | Construct Hot Mix AC HOV <br> Lane/Aux Lane w/ OGFC |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Agency Construction Cost (\$1000) | $\$ 168,330.00$ |  |
| User Work Zone Costs (\$1000) | 400 |  |
| Work Zone Duration (days) | 3 |  |
| No of Lanes Open in Each Direction During Work Zone | 22.0 |  |
| Activity Service Life (years) | 1 |  |
| Maintenance Frequency (years) | 24.7 |  |
| Agency Maintenance Cost (\$1000) | 1.25 |  |
| Work Zone Length (miles) | 55 |  |
| Work Zone Speed Limit (mph) | 1360 |  |
| Work Zone Capacity (vphpl) |  |  |
| Time of Day of Lane Closures (use whole numbers based on |  | End |
| a 24-hour clock) |  |  |
| Inbound | Start |  |
| First period of lane closure |  |  |
| Second period of lane closure |  |  |
| Third period of lane closure |  |  |
| Outbound | Start |  |
| First period of lane closure |  |  |
| Second period of lane closure |  |  |
| Third period of lane closure |  |  |


| Rehabilitation \#1 | Year 22-10 year CapM HMA w/ OGFC |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agency Construction Cost (\$1000) | \$2,108.80 |  |
| User Work Zone Costs (\$1000) |  |  |
| Work Zone Duration (days) | 49 |  |
| No of Lanes Open in Each Direction During Work Zone | 2 |  |
| Activity Service Life (years) | 10.0 |  |
| Maintenance Frequency (years) | 1 |  |
| Agency Maintenance Cost (\$1000) | 39.7 |  |
| Work Zone Length (miles) | 1.25 |  |
| Work Zone Speed Limit (mph) | 55 |  |
| Work Zone Capacity (vphpl) | 1360 |  |
| Time of Day of Lane Closures (use whole numbers based on a 24 -hour clock) |  |  |
| Inbound | Start | End |
| First period of lane closure | 0 | 5 |
| Second period of lane closure | 22 | 24 |
| Third period of lane closure |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Outbound | Start | End |
| First period of lane closure | 0 | 5 |
| Second period of lane closure | 22 | 24 |
| Third period of lane closure |  |  |


| Rehabilitation \#2 | Year 32-22 year Rehab HMA w/ OGFC |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agency Construction Cost (\$1000) | \$5,385.90 |  |
| User Work Zone Costs (\$1000) |  |  |
| Work Zone Duration (days) | 27 |  |
| No of Lanes Open in Each Direction During Work Zone | 2 |  |
| Activity Service Life (years) | 22.0 |  |
| Maintenance Frequency (years) | 1 |  |
| Agency Maintenance Cost (\$1000) | 38.7 |  |
| Work Zone Length (miles) | 1.25 |  |
| Work Zone Speed Limit (mph) | 55 |  |
| Work Zone Capacity (vphpl) | 1360 |  |
| Time of Day of Lane Closures (use whole numbers based on a 24-hour clock) |  |  |
| Inbound | Start | End |
| First period of lane closure | 0 | 24 |
| Second period of lane closure |  |  |
| Third period of lane closure |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Outbound | Start | End |
| First period of lane closure | 0 | 24 |
| Second period of lane closure |  |  |
| Third period of lane closure |  |  |


| Rehabilitation \#3 | Year 54-10 year CapM HMA w/ OGFC |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agency Construction Cost (\$1000) | \$2,108.80 |  |
| User Work Zone Costs (\$1000) |  |  |
| Work Zone Duration (days) | 49 |  |
| No of Lanes Open in Each Direction During Work Zone | 2 |  |
| Activity Service Life (years) | 10.0 |  |
| Maintenance Frequency (years) | 1 |  |
| Agency Maintenance Cost (\$1000) | 39.7 |  |
| Work Zone Length (miles) | 1.25 |  |
| Work Zone Speed Limit (mph) | 55 |  |
| Work Zone Capacity (vphpl) | 1360 |  |
| Time of Day of Lane Closures (use whole numbers based on a 24-hour clock) |  |  |
| Inbound | Start | End |
| First period of lane closure | 0 | 5 |
| Second period of lane closure | 22 | 24 |
| Third period of lane closure |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Outbound | Start | End |
| First period of lane closure | 0 | 5 |
| Second period of lane closure | 22 | 24 |
| Third period of lane closure |  |  |


| Rehabilitation \#4 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agency Construction Cost (\$1000) | \$0.00 |  |
| User Work Zone Costs (\$1000) |  |  |
| Work Zone Duration (days) | 0 |  |
| No of Lanes Open in Each Direction During Work Zone | 3 |  |
| Activity Service Life (years) | 1.0 |  |
| Maintenance Frequency (years) | 1 |  |
| Agency Maintenance Cost (\$1000) | 0 |  |
| Work Zone Length (miles) | 1.25 |  |
| Work Zone Speed Limit (mph) | 55 |  |
| Work Zone Capacity (vphpl) | 1360 |  |
| Time of Day of Lane Closures (use whole numbers based on a 24-hour clock) |  |  |
| Inbound | Start | End |
| First period of lane closure |  |  |
| Second period of lane closure |  |  |
| Third period of lane closure |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Outbound | Start | End |
| First period of lane closure |  |  |
| Second period of lane closure |  |  |
| Third period of lane closure |  |  |


| Rehabilitation \#5 |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Agency Construction Cost (\$1000) | $\$ 0.00$ |  |
| User Work Zone Costs (\$1000) | 0 |  |
| Work Zone Duration (days) | 3 |  |
| No of Lanes Open in Each Direction During Work Zone | 1.0 | 1 |
| Activity Service Life (years) | 0 |  |
| Maintenance Frequency (years) | 1.25 |  |
| Agency Maintenance Cost (\$1000) | 55 |  |
| Work Zone Length (miles) | 1360 |  |
| Work Zone Speed Limit (mph) |  |  |
| Work Zone Capacity (vphpl) | Start | End |
| Time of Day of Lane Closures (use whole numbers based on |  |  |
| a 24-hour clock) |  |  |
| Inbound |  |  |
| First period of lane closure |  | End |
| Second period of lane closure |  |  |
| Third period of lane closure |  |  |
| Outbound |  |  |
| First period of lane closure |  |  |
| Second period of lane closure |  |  |
| Third period of lane closure |  |  |


| Rehabilitation \#6 |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Agency Construction Cost (\$1000) | $\$ 0.00$ |  |
| User Work Zone Costs (\$1000) |  |  |
| Work Zone Duration (days) | 0 |  |
| No of Lanes Open in Each Direction During Work Zone | 1.0 |  |
| Activity Service Life (years) | 1 |  |
| Maintenance Frequency (years) | 0 |  |
| Agency Maintenance Cost (\$1000) | 1.25 |  |
| Work Zone Length (miles) | 55 |  |
| Work Zone Speed Limit (mph) | 1360 |  |
| Work Zone Capacity (vphpl) |  |  |
| Time of Day of Lane Closures (use whole numbers based on |  | End |
| a 24-hour clock) |  |  |
| Inbound | Start |  |
| First period of lane closure |  |  |
| Second period of lane closure |  |  |
| Third period of lane closure | Start |  |
| Outbound |  |  |
| First period of lane closure |  |  |
| Second period of lane closure |  |  |
| Third period of lane closure |  |  |

## Deterministic Results

| Total Cost |  | Alternative 1: Route 1 <br> Rehabilitation - 20 year design |  | Alternative 2: Route 1 <br> Rehabilitation - 20 year design <br> HMA w/ OGFC |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  |  | Ogency Cost <br> $(\$ 1000)$ |  | User Cost <br> $(\$ 1000)$ | Agency Cost <br> $(\$ 1000)$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Undiscounted Sum | $\$ 171,249.80$ | $\$ 16,983.79$ | $\$ 172,126.75$ | $\$ 2,955.73$ |  |
| Present Value | $\$ 168,806.45$ | $\$ 8,436.13$ | $\$ 170,068.20$ | $\$ 1,431.42$ |  |
| EUAC | $\$ 9,044.20$ | $\$ 451.99$ | $\$ 9,111.80$ | $\$ 76.69$ |  |



ROUTE 1 - HOV PROJECT
Pavement Design for 20 year life
Pavement Area for 6-Lane Roadway $=62,208 \mathbf{m 2}=669,600$ SF

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ITEM } \\ & \text { NO. } \end{aligned}$ |  | DESCRIPTION | TOTAL QUANTITY | UNIT | $\begin{aligned} & \text { UNIT } \\ & \text { COST } \end{aligned}$ | AMOUNT / \$1,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20 Year Flexible - Option 2 (0.65' HMA, 0.55' AB, 1.15' AS) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | HMA OGFC (0.1') |  | 0 | TON | 95 | - |
| 2 | HOT MIX ASPHALT |  | 32,643 | TON | 80 | 2,611 |
| 3 | AGGREGATE BASE |  | 13,640 | CY | 35 | 477 |
| 4 | LEAN CONCRETE BASE |  | 0 | CY | 140 | - |
| 5 | AGGREGATE SUBBASE |  | 28,520 | CY | 20 | 570 |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  |  | 3,659 |
| TOTAL DIRECT CONSTRUCTION COST = |  |  |  |  |  | 96,027 |
| CONSTRUCTION + MOBILIZATION (10\%), TRO (5\%) \& CONTINGENCY (20\%) COST = |  |  |  |  |  | 133,093 |
| INITIAL SUPPORT COST (25\%) = |  |  |  |  |  | 33,273 |
| TOTAL INITIAL AGENCY COST = |  |  |  |  |  | 166,367 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 Year Flexible - Option 3 (0.10' HMA OGFC, 0.50' HMA, 0.50' LCB, 1.15' AS) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | HMA OGFC (0.1') |  | 5,022 | TON | 95 | 477 |
| 2 | HOT MIX ASPHALT |  | 25,110 | TON | 80 | 2,009 |
| 3 | AGGREGATE BASE |  | 0 | CY | 35 | - |
| 4 | LEAN CONCRETE BASE |  | 12,400 | CY | 140 | 1,736 |
| 5 | AGGREGATE SUBBASE |  | 28,520 | CY | 20 | 570 |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  |  | 4,792 |
| TOTAL DIRECT CONSTRUCTION COST = |  |  |  |  |  | 97,160 |
| CONSTRUCTION + MOBILIZATION (10\%), TRO (5\%) \& CONTINGENCY (20\%) COST = |  |  |  |  |  | 134,664 |
| INITIAL SUPPORT COST (25\%) = |  |  |  |  |  | 33,666 |
| TOTAL INITIAL AGENCY COST = |  |  |  |  |  | 168,330 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## ROUTE 1 - HOV PROJECT

## Alternatives for 6-Lane Roadway, 20 year design life

| Work Zone Length (miles) $=$ | 1.25 |  | Total LaneMiles = |  | 10.74 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20 Year Flexible - Option 2, Maintenance Service Level = 1 (HMA) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Initial Cost, } \$ 1000 \\ = \end{gathered}$ | \$166,367 | Service Life $=20$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Initial Maint, <br> $\$ 1000=$ $\$ 35.4$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Table 4 Rehab Cost, \$ | Multiplier Table 3 | Total Future Cost, in $\$ 1000$ | Maintenance Cost | Future Maintenance Cost, in \$1000 | Productivity Estimate, Table 8 | Work Zone Duration, Days | Time of Day of Lane Closure |
| Rehab 1 = | Year 20 | 5 yr CapM HMA | \$1,267,320 | 0.19 | \$1,508.1 | \$1,100 | \$11.8 | 0.27 | 40 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0-5 \\ 22-24 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Rehab 2 = | Year 25 | 20 yr Rehab <br> HMA | \$3,769,740 | 0.26 | \$4,749.9 | \$2,900 | \$31.1 | 0.25 | 43 | 0-24 |
| Rehab 3 = | Year 45 | 5 yr CapM HMA | \$1,267,320 | 0.19 | \$1,508.1 | \$1,100 | \$11.8 | 0.27 | 40 | $\begin{gathered} 0-5 \\ 22-24 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Rehab 4 = | Year 50 | $\begin{gathered} 20 \text { yr Rehab } \\ \text { HMA } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | \$3,769,740 | 0.26 | \$4,749.9 | \$2,900 | \$31.1 | 0.25 | 43 | 0-24 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 Year Flexible - Option 3, Maintenance Service Level = 1 (HMA w/ OGFC) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Initial Cost, } \$ 1000 \\ = \end{gathered}$ | \$168,330 | Service Life $=22$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Initial Maint, $\$ 1000=$ | \$24.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Rehab Cost, } \\ \$ \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Multiplier | Total Future Cost, in $\$ 1000$ | Maintenance Cost | Future Maintenance Cost, in \$1000 | Productivity Estimate, Table 8 | Work Zone Duration, Days | Time of Day of Lane Closure |
| Rehab 1 = | Year 22 | 10 yr CapM HMA w/ OGFC | \$1,772,100 | 0.19 | \$2,108.8 | \$3,700 | \$39.7 | 0.22 | 49 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0-5 \\ 22-24 \end{gathered}$ |
| Rehab 2 = | Year 32 | 22 yr Rehab HMA w/ OGFC | \$4,274,520 | 0.26 | \$5,385.9 | \$3,600 | \$38.7 | 0.4 | 27 | 0-24 |
| Rehab 3 = | Year 54 | 10 yr CapM HMA w/ OGFC | \$1,772,100 | 0.19 | \$2,108.8 | \$3,700 | \$39.7 | 0.22 | 49 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0-5 \\ 22-24 \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## ATTACHMENT L

## ACCIDENT SUMMARY

## California Department of Transportation

## OTM22130

## Table B - Selective Accident Rate Calculation

Policy controlling the use of Traffic Accident Surveillance and Analysis System (TASAS) - Transportation Systems Network (TSN) Reports

1. TASAS - TSN has officially replaced the TASAS - "Legacy" database.
2. Reports from TSN are to be used and interpreted by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) officials or authorized representative.
3. Electronic versions of these reports may be emailed between Caltrans' employees only using the State computer system.
4. The contents of these reports shall be considered confidential and may be privileged pursuant to 23 U.S.C. Section 409, and are for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message. Do not print, copy or forward.

OTM22130

## Table B - Selective Accident Rate Calculation

Report Parameters-
Event ID: 3510554
Request Name: 0c730
Ref Date: 01/29/2013

| Request\& Line |  | Route/Location |  | Begin Date | End Date | Rate Type | Out <br> Seq | Override Rates |  |  | Override ADT |  | Req. Type | Combine? | Excl Ramp? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Rate | Inj\% | Fat\% | Main | Cross |  |  |  |
| 11 | H T I | 05 SCR 001013.500 05 SCR 001014.900 | - | 01-JUL-08 | 30-JUN-11 | N | L |  |  |  |  |  | N | N | Y |
| 12 | R T I | $\begin{array}{ll} 05 \text { SCR } 001 & 013.801 \\ 05 & \text { SCR } 001 \\ 013.802 \end{array}$ | - | 01-JUL-08 | $30-J U N-11$ | N | L |  |  |  |  |  | N | N | N |
| 13 | R T I | $\begin{array}{ll} 05 \text { SCR } 001014.734 \\ 05 \text { SCR } 001 & 014.735 \end{array}$ | - | 01-JUL-08 | 30-JUN-11 | N | L |  |  |  |  |  | N | N | N |
| 14 | R T I | $\begin{array}{ll} 05 \text { SCR } 001 & 014.821 \\ 05 & \text { SCR } 001 \\ 014.822 \end{array}$ | - | 01-JUL-08 | 30-JUN-11 | N | L |  |  |  |  |  | N | N | N |
| 15 | R T I | $\begin{array}{ll} 05 \text { SCR } 001013.594 \\ 05 \text { SCR } 001 & 013.595 \end{array}$ | - | 01-JUL-08 | $30-J U N-11$ | N | L |  |  |  |  |  | N | N | N |
| 16 | R T I | $\begin{array}{ll} 05 \text { SCR } 001 & 013.774 \\ 05 \text { SCR } 001 & 013.775 \end{array}$ | - | 01-JUL-08 | 30-JUN-11 | N | L |  |  |  |  |  | N | N | N |

## Event Log:

Job id is : 487135 Accidents Table B Request Oc730 Submitted by T5SCADEN
05 SCR 001 13.5-05 SCR 001 14.9 07/01/2008 TO 06/30/2011
05 SCR 001 13.801-05 SCR 001 13.802 07/01/2008 TO 06/30/2011 05 SCR 001 14.734-05 SCR 001 14.735 07/01/2008 TO 06/30/2011 05 SCR 001 14.821-05 SCR 001 14.822 07/01/2008 TO 06/30/2011 05 SCR 001 13.594-05 SCR 001 13.595 07/01/2008 TO 06/30/2011 05 SCR 001 13.774-05 SCR 001 13.775 07/01/2008 TO 06/30/2011

```
OTM22130
01/29/2013
10:53 AM
```

Page\#
Event ID: 3510554

| Location Description |  |  |  | Rate Group (RUS) | Tot | No. of Accidents / Significance |  |  |  |  |  | Pers Kld Inj | ADT <br> Main <br> X-St | Total MV+ or MVM | Accident Rates |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Fat | Inj | F+I |  | Wet | Dark |  |  |  | Fat | $\mathrm{F}+\mathrm{l}$ | Tot | Fat | F+l | Tot |
| 05 SCR $001013.500-05$ SCR 001014.899 |  |  | 1.400 MI H |  | 166 | 1 | $\begin{array}{r} 53 \\ \mathrm{H} 95 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 54 \\ \mathrm{H} 95 \end{array}$ | 137 | 21 | 34 | $\begin{array}{r} 1 \\ 76 \end{array}$ | 91.6 | 140.38 | 0.007 | . 38 | 1.18 | 0.008 | . 30 | . 82 |
| 0001-0001 | 2008-07-01 | 2011-06-30 | 36 mo. | NA | H99 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05 SCR 001 | . 801 001/SB | 41ST AVE |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { R } 10 \\ U \end{gathered}$ | 14 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 14 | $\begin{array}{r} 6 \\ \text { H97 } \end{array}$ | 3 | 0 3 | 9.1 | $9.96+$ | 0.000 | . 30 | 1.41 | 0.003 | . 35 | 1.01 |
| 0001-0002 | 2008-07-01 | 2011-06-30 | 36 mo. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | . 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05 SCR 001 014.734 001/NB OFF TO SOQUEL/COMMER |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { R } 30 \\ U \end{gathered}$ | 7 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | $\begin{array}{r} 4 \\ \mathrm{H} 95 \end{array}$ | 1 | 01 | $\begin{array}{r} 8.9 \\ .0 \end{array}$ | $9.71+$ | 0.000 | . 10 | . 72 | 0.001 | . 17 | . 54 |
| 0001-0003 | 2008-07-01 | 2011-06-30 | 36 mo. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05 SCR 001014.821 001/SB ON FR SOQUEL DR |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { R } 28 \\ U \end{gathered}$ | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 01 | $\begin{array}{r} 7.1 \\ .0 \end{array}$ | 7.81 + | 0.000 | . 13 | . 26 | 0.001 | . 13 | . 46 |
| 0001-0004 | 2008-07-01 | 2011-06-30 | 36 mo. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05 SCR 001013.594 001/NB ON FR NB 41ST AVE |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { R } 40 \\ U \end{gathered}$ | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 00 | $\begin{array}{r} 6.2 \\ .0 \end{array}$ | $6.79+$ | 0.000 | . 00 | . 15 | 0.002 | . 21 | . 73 |
| 0001-0005 | 2008-07-01 | 2011-06-30 | 36 mo. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05 SCR 001013.774 001/NB ON FR SB 41ST AVE |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { R } 20 \\ \mathrm{U} \end{gathered}$ | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2.6 | $2.79+$ | 0.000 | . 00 | . 36 | 0.003 | . 18 | . 57 |
| 0001-0006 | 2008-07-01 | 2011-06-30 | 36 mo. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | . 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Accident Rates expressed as: \# of accidents / Million vehicle miles

+ denotes that Million Vehicles (MV) used in accident rates instead (for intersections and ramps).
For Ramps RUS only considers R(Rural) U(Urban)


## ATTACHMENT M

## DISTRICT DISTRIBUTION LIST

| Division / Program / Office | Project Type | D5 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FHWA |  | Gary Sweeten/Dominic Hoang | 1 |
| HQ Division of Design | All Projects | Design Report Routing | 1 |
| HQ Division of Engineering Serv | All Projects | Division of Engineering Services (electronic copy OK) | 1 |
| HQ Environmental | All Projects | Chris Flynn | 1 |
| HQ Maintenance | STIP | Patti-jo Dickinson | 1 |
| Project Manager | All Projects | Luis Duazo | 1 |
| Design Manager | All Projects | John Fouche | 2 |
| Resident Engineer | All Projects | Jennifer Wilson | 1 |
| District Maintenance | All Projects | Lance Gorman | 1 |
| District Traffic Management | All Projects | Jacques Van Zeventer | 1 |
| District Traffic Safety | Mon/SCr | Scott Morris | 1 |
| Region Materials | All Projects | Doug Lambert | 1 |
| Region Environmental | All Projects | Susan Schilder | 1 |
| Region Right of Way | All Projects | Marshall Garcia | 1 |
| District Planning | All Projects | Claudia Espino | 1 |
| District SFP | All Projects | No Copy | 0 |
| PPM | All Projects | Linda Araujo | 1 |
| District Surveys | All Projects | Hanna Kassis (electronic copy only) | 0 |
|  | All Projects | Jeremy Villegas | 1 |
| HQ DES/OPPM | Proj w/ Structures | Andrew T S Tan | 1 |
| District Records (send electronic copy only) | All Projects | Kristina Jaime | 0 |
| TOTAL COPIES |  | District 5 = | 19 |

## Kimley»)Horn

## APPENDIX Q.

## SIMILAR KAISER MEDICAL OFFICE TRIP GENERATION COUNT DATA

## Kimley»)Horn

## MEMORANDUM

From: Frederik Venter, P.E., Kimley-Horn and Associates<br>Jacob M irabella, Kimley-Horn and Associates<br>To: Matt M achado, P.E., L.S., Public Works, County of Santa Cruz<br>Rodolfo Rivas, P.E., Public Works, County of Santa Cruz<br>Kathleen M olloy, P.E., Planning Department, County of Santa Cruz

Date: January 20, 2020

## Re: Kaiser Medical Office Building Similar Sites Trip Generation Summary

This memorandum summarizes the results of a trip generation data collection effort at the driveways of four medical facilities and calculates trip generation rates for each site. This memo then compares these observed trip generation rates to the rate used for a proposed Kaiser M edical Office Building (MOB) in Santa Cruz County, California.

As requested by Santa Cruz County, traffic at four similar medical sites were observed to determine their existing trip generation. The following two (non-Kaiser) medical facilities (located in Santa Cruz County), and two existing Kaiser medical facilities (located in San Jose and Dublin, California) were selected in consultation with Santa Cruz County staff:

- Sutter Health Palo Alto Medical Foundation (PAMF) Urgent Care: Located at 2025 Soquel Ave, Santa Cruz, CA, this facility is a 67,000 square foot medical clinic and urgent care.
- Sutter Health Maternity and Surgery Center: Located at 2900 Chanticleer Avenue Santa Cruz CA, this 63,306 square foot facility has no emergency room supporting only scheduled and walk-in patients
- Kaiser Permanente Skyport Medical Offices: Located at 1721 Technology Drive, San Jose CA, this 143,700 square foot facility is a similar medical office building to the proposed M OB in Santa Cruz.
- Kaiser Permanente Dublin M edical Offices and Cancer Center: Located at 3100 Dublin Boulevard, Dublin CA, this 215,000 square foot facility provides a full suite of medical offices housed in a central building including emergency medical personnel.

Driveway counts (attached) at each of these four similar sites was collected on Tuesday October 22, 2019 to determine the daily and peak hours of trip generation for each location. The proposed new Kaiser M OB will be constructed in the southwest quadrant of the intersection of Soquel Avenue \& M attison Lane in Santa Cruz County, California. The M OB will have approximately 160,000 square feet of gross floor area and is anticipated to construct one driveway onto Soquel Avenue, at the north side of the site. Table 1 shows the assumed trip generation of the proposed project (based on data from the ITE Trip Generation Manual $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition) as well as the observed trip generation of the four similar sites.

## Kimley»Horn

Table 1: Trip Generation Rate Comparison for the Medical Office Buildings

|  |  | Indep Var |  | Daily | Trips |  |  | M PEAK H | HOUR TRIP |  |  |  |  | M PEAK | OUR TRIP |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Development | Data Source | Size ${ }^{4}$ | Unit | Rate | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { TOTAL } \\ \text { DAILY } \end{array}$ | Rate | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { Entering } \end{gathered}$ | \% Exiting | Trips Entering | Trips Exiting | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { TOTAL } \\ \text { AM } \end{array}$ | Rate | \% Entering | \% Exiting | Trips Entering | Trips Exiting | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { TOTAL } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Proposed Project |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kaiser MOB | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { ITE LUC } 630 \\ \text { (Clinic) }^{1} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 160.000 | KSF | 38.16 | 6,106 | 3.69 | 78\% | 22\% | 461 | 130 | 591 | 3.28 | 29\% | 71\% | 152 | 373 | 525 |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { ITE LUC } 720 \\ (\mathrm{MOB})^{2} \end{gathered}$ | 160.000 | KSF | 34.80 | 5,568 | 2.78 | 78\% | 22\% | 347 | 98 | 445 | 4.10 | 39\% | 61\% | 256 | 400 | 656 |
| Similar Sites (2019) ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sutter/PAMF (Urgent Care) | Counts | 67.000 | KSF | 46.03 | 3,084 | 4.51 | 57\% | 43\% | 172 | 130 | 302 | 3.51 | 36\% | 64\% | 84 | 151 | 235 |
| Sutter/PAMF (OB Office) | Counts | 63.306 | KSF | 16.85 | 1,067 | 1.04 | 50\% | 50\% | 33 | 33 | 66 | 1.44 | 32\% | 68\% | 29 | 62 | 91 |
| SkyportMOB (Kaiser) | Counts | 143.700 | KSF | 17.65 | 2,537 | 1.54 | 68\% | 32\% | 150 | 71 | 221 | 1.52 | 23\% | 77\% | 51 | 167 | 218 |
| Dublin MOB (Kaiser) | Counts | 215.000 | KSF | 16.28 | 3,501 | 1.41 | 83\% | 17\% | 251 | 53 | 304 | 1.46 | 30\% | 70\% | 93 | 220 | 313 |
| Similar Sites Average: |  | 122.252 | KSF | 24.21 | -- | 2.13 | 64\% | 36\% | -- | -- | -- | 1.98 | 30\% | 70\% | -- | -- | -- |

Notes:
2. ITE Land Use Code 720 (M edical Office Building) was used in the Santa Cruz Assumptions Memo based on ITE 10th Edition Data.
3. Similar sites driveway counts were performed on October 22, 2019 and used to determine trip generation characteristics.
4. Building size information provided by developer.

## Kimley»)Horn

## Findings

Based on average trip generation rates for ITE $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition LUC 630 (Clinic), the proposed Kaiser M OB generates 38.16 daily trips per 1,000 square feet, 3.69 AM peak hour trips per 1,000 square feet, and 3.28 PM peak hour trips per 1,000 square feet. Based on LUC 720 (M edical Office Building), the proposed Kaiser MOB generates $34.80,2.78$, and 4.1 daily, AM peak hour, and PM peak hour trips per 1,000 square feet respectively.

The average size of the similar sites counted is 122,252 square feet compared to the proposed Kaiser M OB size of 160,000 square feet. The average daily trip generation rate for the similar sites is 24.21 trips per 1,000 square feet, AM peak hour trip generation rate is 2.13 trips per 1,000 square feet, and PM peak hour trip generation rate is 1.98 trips per 1,000 square feet.

These observed generation rates are significantly smaller (ranging from $23 \%$ to $52 \%$ smaller) than the ITE LUC 630 and LUC 720 trip generation rates. As a result, the trip generation rates used in the Santa Cruz Kaiser M OB present a conservative estimate of trip generation for the proposed M OB.

IDAX Data Solutions
Project: 19464 - Bay Area - MOB Driveway Counts
Date: 10/22/2019
Driveway In/Out @ Bay Area Driveways

|  | UC Dwy 1 |  |  |  |  |  | UC Dwy 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | IN |  |  | OUT |  |  | IN |  |  | OUT |  |  |
|  | EB Left | NB Thru | WB Right | SB Right | SB Thru | SB Left | NB Right | WB Thru | SB Left | WB Right | EB Thru | WB Left |
| 12:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1:15 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 3:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 6:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6:15 AM | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 6:30 AM | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 6:45 AM | 5 | 1 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 7:00 AM | 4 | 2 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 7:15 AM | 1 | 4 | 9 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 7:30 AM | 4 | 6 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 7:45 AM | 3 | 11 | 12 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 8:00 AM | 3 | 5 | 16 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 5 |
| 8:15 AM | 3 | 11 | 22 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 8:30 AM | 7 | 10 | 18 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 5 |
| 8:45 AM | 6 | 7 | 24 | 9 | 5 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 6 |
| 9:00 AM | 8 | 9 | 18 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 7 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| 9:15 AM | 6 | 8 | 22 | 8 | 9 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 7 |
| 9:30 AM | 4 | 7 | 15 | 8 | 3 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| 9:45 AM | 5 | 4 | 25 | 10 | 12 | 12 | 7 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 3 |
| 10:00 AM | 2 | 7 | 19 | 8 | 6 | 15 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 11 |
| 10:15 AM | 3 | 7 | 21 | 7 | 7 | 10 | 7 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 12 |
| 10:30 AM | 8 | 4 | 27 | 13 | 6 | 14 | 8 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 10 |
| 10:45 AM | 10 | 5 | 19 | 11 | 4 | 14 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 13 |
| 11:00 AM | 1 | 5 | 18 | 4 | 2 | 16 | 6 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 10 |
| 11:15 AM | 3 | 3 | 14 | 9 | 7 | 19 | 9 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 6 |
| 11:30 AM | 6 | 9 | 11 | 8 | 4 | 13 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 10 |
| 11:45 AM | 4 | 5 | 14 | 11 | 6 | 19 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 9 |
| 12:00 PM | 7 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 5 |
| 12:15 PM | 4 | 5 | 9 | 5 | 6 | 13 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 11 |
| 12:30 PM | 5 | 1 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 17 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 13 |
| 12:45 PM | 2 | 7 | 17 | 9 | 4 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 6 |
| 1:00 PM | 7 | 2 | 13 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5 |
| 1:15 PM | 6 | 7 | 13 | 5 | 3 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 6 |
| 1:30 PM | 9 | 6 | 14 | 6 | 2 | 10 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 5 |
| 1:45 PM | 5 | 11 | 10 | 4 | 4 | 13 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 7 |
| 2:00 PM | 8 | 4 | 13 | 1 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 8 |
| 2:15 PM | 5 | 4 | 19 | 9 | 8 | 16 | 7 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 6 |
| 2:30 PM | 3 | 5 | 17 | 4 | 4 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 10 |
| 2:45 PM | 1 | 4 | 17 | 6 | 9 | 16 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| 3:00 PM | 11 | 4 | 18 | 3 | 6 | 15 | 6 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 15 |
| 3:15 PM | 3 | 5 | 16 | 6 | 10 | 14 | 5 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 6 |
| 3:30 PM | 4 | 7 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 12 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 9 |
| 3:45 PM | 8 | 3 | 14 | 4 | 12 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 4:00 PM | 4 | 1 | 15 | 5 | 11 | 15 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 12 |
| 4:15 PM | 2 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 5 |
| 4:30 PM | 1 | 0 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 16 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 7 |
| 4:45 PM | 2 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 6 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 4 | 10 | 5 | 9 | 15 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 4 |
| 5:15 PM | 3 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 5 |
| 5:30 PM | 1 | 1 | 7 | 9 | 7 | 13 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 2 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 4 |
| 6:00 PM | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 |


| 6:15 PM | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6:30 PM | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 6:45 PM | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| 7:00 PM | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 7:15 PM | 1 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 PM | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| 7:45 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 8:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 8:45 PM | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 9:15 PM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 9:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 10:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10:15 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 10:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11:15 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 11:45 PM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 212 | 243 | 673 | 290 | 260 | 557 | 239 | 0 | 184 | 94 | 2 | 330 |


| OB Dwy 1 |  |  |  |  |  | OB Dwy 2 |  |  |  |  |  | OB Dwy 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| IN |  |  | OUT |  |  | IN |  |  | OUT |  |  | IN |  |  | OUT |  |  |
| EB Right | SB Thru | NB Right | NB Left | NB Thru | WB Left | NB Right | WB Thru | SB Left | WB Right | EB Thru | WB Left | NB Right | WB Thru | SB Left | WB Right | EB Thru | WB Left |
| 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 2 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 0 | 2 |
| 2 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 |
| 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 |
| 4 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 18 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 |


| 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 79 | 0 | 74 | 50 | 0 | 60 | 6 | 10 | 239 | 190 | 11 | 3 | 11 | 1 | 107 | 209 | 0 | 17 |


| KS Dwy 1 |  |  |  |  |  | KS Dwy 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| IN |  |  | OUT |  |  | IN |  |  | OUT |  |  |
| NB Left | WB Thru | SB Right | EB Right | EB Thru | EB Left | SB Right | WB Thru | NB Left | EB Left | EB Thru | EB Right |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 33 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 1 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 39 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 1 | 1 |
| 0 | 1 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 40 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 1 |
| 1 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 56 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 1 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 1 | 0 |
| 0 | 1 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 18 | 2 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 1 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 32 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 1 | 0 |
| 0 | 1 | 33 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 | 1 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 39 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 1 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 1 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 |


| 1 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 6 | 1151 | 17 | 0 | 1 | 98 | 2 | 6 | 1226 | 12 | 12 |


| KD Dwy 1 |  |  |  |  |  | KD Dwy 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| IN |  |  | OUT |  |  | IN |  |  | OUT |  |  |
| EB Right | SB Thru | WB Left | NB Right | NB Thru | NB Left | EB Right | SB Thru | WB Left | NB Right | NB Thru | NB Left |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 18 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 21 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| 26 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 30 | 4 | 0 | 2 |
| 23 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 26 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| 37 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 0 | 32 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 30 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 5 | 2 | 19 | 6 | 0 | 3 |
| 24 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 13 | 7 | 0 | 14 | 4 | 0 | 2 |
| 20 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 2 | 1 | 13 | 8 | 0 | 4 |
| 13 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 3 | 1 | 15 | 8 | 0 | 4 |
| 15 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 15 | 9 | 0 | 20 | 10 | 0 | 3 |
| 22 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 16 | 2 | 0 | 23 | 13 | 0 | 3 |
| 19 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 10 | 7 | 0 | 16 | 14 | 0 | 1 |
| 17 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 15 | 4 | 0 | 17 | 7 | 0 | 6 |
| 15 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 13 | 10 | 0 | 5 |
| 16 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 25 | 4 | 0 | 16 | 16 | 0 | 6 |
| 10 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 15 | 10 | 2 | 2 |
| 9 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 17 | 2 | 1 | 12 | 15 | 0 | 4 |
| 9 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 14 | 2 | 0 | 15 | 16 | 0 | 9 |
| 22 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 13 | 0 | 6 |
| 9 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 18 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 22 | 1 | 6 |
| 13 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 36 | 0 | 4 |
| 11 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 15 | 2 | 0 | 14 | 29 | 0 | 1 |
| 16 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 18 | 14 | 0 | 6 |
| 16 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 17 | 11 | 0 | 2 |
| 26 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 35 | 7 | 0 | 0 |
| 30 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 16 | 2 | 2 | 18 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| 25 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 15 | 4 | 0 | 11 | 10 | 0 | 0 |
| 16 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 16 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 14 | 0 | 2 |
| 27 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 21 | 3 | 0 | 14 | 14 | 1 | 4 |
| 17 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 11 | 17 | 0 | 2 |
| 18 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 15 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 17 | 0 | 4 |
| 16 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 16 | 6 | 0 | 7 | 22 | 0 | 3 |
| 17 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 25 | 5 | 1 | 14 | 17 | 0 | 3 |
| 16 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 14 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 29 | 1 | 2 |
| 15 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 15 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 22 | 0 | 5 |
| 10 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 22 | 2 | 0 | 10 | 23 | 1 | 3 |
| 17 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 23 | 0 | 3 |
| 16 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 21 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 37 | 1 | 3 |
| 9 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 31 | 0 | 6 |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 26 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 32 | 1 | 7 |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 20 | 1 | 4 |
| 13 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 21 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 16 | 1 | 3 |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 19 | 0 | 0 |


| 6 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 16 | 0 | 1 |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 1 |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 841 | 13 | 44 | 127 | 21 | 675 | 164 | 23 | 675 | 761 | 12 | 145 |

## Kimley»)Horn

## APPENDIX R. PIVOTAL MARKET DATA



|  | Total | Other Healthcare System B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| in your Neighborhoo d |  | Aptos Center | Aptos WalkIn Care | Capitola Center Lab | Commercial Crossing Center | Freedom PAMF | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { Santa Cruz } \\ \text { Allergy } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Santa Cruz Cardiothoraci c Surgery | Santa Cruz Center | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Santa Cruz } \\ \text { Chanticleer } \\ \text { Center (2907) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Santa Cruz } \\ \text { Chanticleer } \\ \text { Center (2911) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Santa Cruz <br> Gastroentero <br> logy | Santa Cruz Neurology | Santa Cruz Physical Therapy | Scotts Valley Center | Scotts Valley El Rancho Drive Center | Soquel Center | Watsonville PAMF | Westside Center |  |
| 0 |  | P | Q | R | S | T | U | V | w | X | Y | z | AA | AB | AC | AD | AE | AF | AG |  |
| 223 Mt . Hermon Road |  | 7600 Old Dominion Court | 26 Rancho Del Mar | 815 Bay Ave | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 2850 \\ \text { Commercial } \\ \text { Crossing } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 160 Green <br> Valley Road | 3035 North <br> Main Street | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 1575 \text { Soquel } \\ \text { Drive } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 2025 Soquel Ave | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2907 \\ \text { Chanticleer } \\ \text { Ave } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2911 \\ \text { Chanticleer } \\ \text { Ave } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\qquad$ | $\begin{gathered} 1661 \text { Soquel } \\ \text { Drive } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1529 \\ \text { Seabright } \\ \text { Ave } \end{gathered}$ | 4663 Scotts Valley Drive | $\begin{array}{c\|} 2980 \text { El } \\ \text { Rancho Drive } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2950 \\ \text { Research } \\ \text { Park Drive } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 550 \text { S Green } \\ & \text { Valley Rd } \end{aligned}$ | 1301 Mission <br> Street |  |
| Scotts Valley |  | Aptos | Aptos | Capitola | Santa Cruz | Freedom | Soquel | Santa Cruz | Santa Cruz | Santa Cruz | Santa Cruz | Santa Cruz | Santa Cruz | Santa Cruz | 95066 | 95060 | 95073 | 95076 | Santa Cruz |  |
| 95066 |  | 95003 | 95003 | 95010 | 95065 | 94539 | 95073 | 95065 | 95062 | 95065 | 95065 | 95065 | 95065 | 95062 | AC | AD | AE | AF | 95060 |  |
| 15.3 |  | 11.4 | 11.3 | 10.6 | 10.7 | 16.5 | 11 | 10.7 | 10.7 | 11 | 11 | 11.1 | 11 | 11.1 | 14.1 | 12.9 | 10.9 | 15.5 | 12 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 4,292 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,269 | 4 | 46 | 7,077 | 7 | 48 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 30 | 16 | 8,528 |
| 0 | 573 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 425 | 96 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 | 139 | 10,430 | 157 | 244 | 11,677 |
| 0 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 869 |  | 40 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 219 | 0 | 1,138 |
| 0 | 835 | 145 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 307 | 0 | 75 | 27 | 102 | 0 | 107 | 10 | 3,674 | 104 | 62 | 4,621 |
| 1,825 | 46,814 | 15,582 | 243 | 4,543 | 9,462 | 2,467 | 723 | 705 | 59,532 | 10,339 | 16,880 | 4,328 | 5,019 | 0 | 11,052 | 6,888 | 13,772 | 9,763 | 10,002 | 181,300 |
| 0 | 1,136 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88 | 0 | 40 | 5,784 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 6,004 |
| 0 | 117 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 133 | 9 | 1,046 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 108 | 0 | 3 | 1,332 |
| 0 | 1,562 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 111 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1,043 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 23 | 0 | 28 | 51 | 1,344 |
| 0 | 8,832 | 749 | 0 | 696 | 707 | 97 | 57 | 33 | 4,558 | 898 | 1,478 | 2,197 | 178 | 0 | 393 | 242 | 148 | 592 | 619 | 13,642 |
| 0 | 6,941 | 2,227 | 0 | 553 | 3,338 | 67 | 2,334 | 26 | 7,433 | 134 | 418 | 56 | 119 | 0 | 2,146 | 758 | 5 | 1,619 | 1,849 | 23,082 |
| 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,244 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,244 |
| 0 | 113 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 87 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 835 | 0 | 12 | 6 | 73 | 27 | 6 | 1,067 |
| 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 268 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 288 |
| 0 | 450 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,396 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 109 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,522 |
| 0 | 469 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7,448 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 25 | 14 | 205 | 22 | 7,836 |
| 0 | 697 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 8 | 485 | 3,579 | 69 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 25 | 20 | 1,350 | 27 | 71 | 5,666 |
| 0 | 207 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 1,757 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 44 | 1,847 |
| 0 | 2,547 | 586 | 0 | 0 | 123 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 824 | 333 | 321 | 4 | 477 | 9,525 | 195 | 156 | 405 | 221 | 585 | 13,788 |
| 0 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 422 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 446 |
| 0 | 5 | 380 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7,358 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 690 | 0 | 8,428 |
| 0 | 870 | 57 | 0 | 0 | O | 3 | 160 | 39 | 722 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 93 |  | 55 | 12 | 1,152 |
| 0 | 4,965 | 102 | 0 | 17 | 111 | 24 | 19 | 165 | 46,592 | 419 | 476 | 24 | 81 | 0 | 39 | 13 | 14 | 252 | 52 | 48,400 |
| 0 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 126 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 147 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 277 |
| 0 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 21 | 14 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 |
| 0 | 905 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 375 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 3 | 6 | 441 |
| 0 | 1,016 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 26 | 4,065 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 4,158 |
| 0 | 610 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 849 | 4 | 103 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1,047 |
| 1,825 | 84,236 | 20,135 | $\underline{243}$ | 6,678 | $\underline{15,224}$ | 4,091 | 3,477 | 1,060 | 145,218 | 17,699 | $\underline{27,214}$ | $\underline{12,468}$ | 6,992 | 9,525 | 14,151 | 8,401 | 30,165 | 14,004 | $\underline{13,668}$ | 350,413 |



| Provider <br> Location Location Letter |  | Total Visits | Kaiser Santa Cruz County |  |  |  |  |  | Total | Potential Kaiser Redistributed Visits as a Result of the Project |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\underline{\text { Total }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Downtown |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Santa Cruz Facility | Scotts Valley | Scotts Valley | Watsonville | Watsonville | Kaiser Santa Cruz County |  | Watsonville | Santa Clara | Giroy | San Jose | Dominican Hospital | Campbell | Skyport |  |
|  |  |  | AW | Al | AJ | AK | AL | AQ |  | AM | AN | AO | AP | AS | AU | AV |  |
| Distribution <br> Address of Total Visits |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 110 \text { Cooper } \\ \text { St } \end{gathered}$ | 5615 Scotts Valley Dr | 5617 Scotts Valley Dr | 1927-1951 | $\begin{gathered} 180 \\ \text { Westgate Dr } \end{gathered}$ | 5940 Soquel |  | 75 Nielson St | $\begin{gathered} 700 \\ \text { Lawrence } \end{gathered}$ Expy | 7520 Arroyo Cir | 250 Hospital Pkwy | 1555 Soquel | $\begin{gathered} 200 \mathrm{E.} \\ \text { Hacienda Ave } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 1721 \\ \text { Technology } \end{array}$ <br> Dr |  |
| ${ }_{\text {city }}^{\text {City }}$ |  |  | Santa Cruz | Scotts Valley | Scotts Valley | Watsonville | Watsonville | Capitola |  | Watsonville | Santa Clara | Gilroy | San Jose | Santa Cruz | Campbell | San Jose |  |
|  |  | 95060 | 95066 | 95066 | 95035 | 95076 | 95062 | 95076 |  | 95051 | 95020 | 95119 | 95065 | 95008 | 95110 |  |
| Weighted Distance <br> Pivotal Service |  |  | 8.4 | 14.8 | 14.7 | 15.2 | 15 | 10.6 |  | 14.8 | 37.8 | 43.4 | 40 | 10.6 | 31.9 | 39 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cardiology - Outpatient Cosmetic Procedures - Outpatient | 2.35\% |  | 3,254 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,239 | 3,239 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
|  | 0.82\% |  | 1,138 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 894 | 894 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 244 | 0 | 244 |
| Dermatology - Outpatient | 2.78\% | 3,848 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,848 | 3,848 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Endocrinology - Outpatient | 0.31\% | 424 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 424 | 424 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Evaluation and Management - Outpatient | 1.10\% | 1,524 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,524 | 1,524 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 41.19\% | 57,931 | 22,806 | 17,185 | 0 | 15,095 | 0 | 797 | 55,883 | 0 | 932 | 28 | 1,024 | 0 | 52 | 12 | 2,048 |
| Gastroenterology - OutpatientGeneral Surgery - Outpatient | 0.46\% | 644 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 644 | 644 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 1.01\% | 1,396 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,396 | 1,396 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Gynecology \& Obstetrics | 5.43\% | 7,637 | 3,416 | 1,629 | 0 | 2,455 | 0 | 53 | 7,553 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84 |
| Lab - Outpatient <br> Miscellaneous Services - Outpatient | 0.68\% | 936 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 936 | 936 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 1.57\% | 2,183 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,183 | 2,183 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nephrology - OutpatientNeurology - Outpatient | 0.12\% | 173 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 173 | 173 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 1.72\% | 2,387 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,285 | 2,285 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 102 |
| Neurosurgery - Outpatient | 0.01\% | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Oncology - Outpatient Ophthalmology - Outpatient | 1.60\% | 2,211 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,107 | 2,107 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 104 |
|  | 4.72\% | 6,541 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6,302 | 6,302 | 0 | 173 | 0 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 239 |
| Ophthaimology- - Outpatient <br> Orthopedics - Outpatient <br> Pain Management - Outpatient | 2.90\% | 4,026 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4,026 | 4,026 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 1.48\% | 2,052 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,660 | 1,660 | 0 | 47 | 0 | 345 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 392 |
| Physical Therapy/Rehabilitation - Outpatient | 1.03\% | 1,434 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,434 | 1,434 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 1.05\% | 1,458 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,458 | 1,458 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Podiatry - Outpatient Psychiatry- Outpatient | 10.35\% | 14,537 | 6,389 | 0 | 3,115 | 3,369 | 1,638 | 21 | 14,532 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Pulmonology - Outpatient | 0.17\% | 237 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 237 | 237 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Radiology - Outpatient | 5.64\% | 7,822 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7,822 | 7,822 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spine - Outpatient <br> Thoracic Surgery - Outpatient | 0.10\% | 132 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 132 | 132 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 0.00\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Thoracic Surgery - Outpatient Trauma- Outpatient | 10.65\% | 14,759 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14,759 | 14,759 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Urology - Outpatient Vascular - Outpatient | 0.64\% | 881 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 881 | 881 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 0.13\% | 186 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 182 | 182 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
|  | 100\% | 139,759 | 32,611 | 18,814 | 3,115 | 20,919 | 1,638 | 59,425 | 136,522 | $\underline{0}$ | 1,225 | $\underline{28}$ | 1,676 | $\underline{0}$ | $\underline{296}$ | 12 | 3,237 |

## Kimley»)Horn

## APPENDIX S. PROPOSED TENANT MEMBERSHIP FORECASTS

## Santa Cruz Residence Area Membership Long Range Forecast and Projection

2020-2034 Forecast
2020-2034 Forecast
2035-2041 Projection

| CSA |  |  | Membership Long Range Forecast |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Projection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | MAJOR | FACAREA | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 | 2026 | -2027 | 2028 | 2029 | 2030 | 2031 | 2032 | 2033 | 2034 | 2035 | 2036 | 2037 | 2038 | 2039 | 2040 | 2041 |
| SAN JOSE | SANTA CRUZ | SANTA CRUZ | 18,353 | 19,281 | 20,589 | 22,657 | 25,165 | 27,428 | 29,126 | 30,382 | 31,400 | 32,367 | 33,489 | 34,636 | 35,798 | 36,989 | 38,187 | 39,424 | 40,701 | 42,019 | 43,380 | 44,785 | 46,236 | 47,733 |
| SAN JOSE | SANTA CRUZ | WATSONVILLE | 8,115 | 8,492 | 9,106 | 10,078 | 11,259 | 12,328 | 13,126 | 13,713 | 14,190 | 14,646 | 15,172 | 15,712 | 16,267 | 16,833 | 17,421 | 18,030 | 18,659 | 19,311 | 19,986 | 20,684 | 21,406 | 22,154 |
| SAN JOSE | SANTA CRUZ | SCOTTS VALLEY | 8,603 | 9,028 | 9,603 | 10,512 | 11,615 | 12,608 | 13,345 | 13,884 | 14,317 | 14,726 | 15,194 | 15,656 | 16,119 | 16,575 | 17,037 | 17,511 | 17,998 | 18,499 | 19,014 | 19,543 | 20,086 | 20,645 |
|  |  | Total | 35,071 | 36,801 | 39,298 | 43,247 | 48,039 | 52,364 | 55,597 | 57,978 | 59,907 | 61,739 | 63,855 | 66,003 | 68,184 | 70,398 | 72,645 | 74,965 | 77,359 | 79,829 | 82,380 | 85,012 | 87,729 |  |

## Kimley»)Horn

## APPENDIX T. PROJECT AND NO PROJECT MEMBERSHIP BASIS

## Project Membership Basis

| Plus Project |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Member Type | Members | Member Share |
| Existing Members | 35,071 | $40.0 \%$ |
| Organic Growth | 4,394 | $5.0 \%$ |
| Other Members | 48,264 | $55.0 \%$ |
| Total Members | $\mathbf{8 7 , 7 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 \%}$ |

Kimley»"Horn

APPENDIX U.
SOUTHBOUND HIGHWAY 1 \& SOQUEL AVENUE IMPROVEMENTS SYNCHRO OUTPUT SHEETS


## Notes

* HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier.

Unsignalized Delay for [SBR] is excluded from calculations of the approach delay and intersection delay.


## Notes
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|  | 4 |  | $\leftarrow$ | 4 |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | * | $\uparrow$ | 性 | 「 | \% ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ | F |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 364 | 289 | 604 | 167 | 393 | 588 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 364 | 289 | 604 | 167 | 393 | 588 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  |  | 0.98 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No | No |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1885 | 1885 | 1870 | 1870 | 1885 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 375 | 298 | 623 | 172 | 405 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Cap, veh/h | 498 | 1358 | 1341 | 585 | 537 |  |
| Arrive On Green | 0.28 | 0.72 | 0.38 | 0.38 | 0.15 | 0.00 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1795 | 1885 | 3647 | 1552 | 3483 | 1598 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 375 | 298 | 623 | 172 | 405 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 1795 | 1885 | 1777 | 1552 | 1742 | 1598 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 13.4 | 3.7 | 9.3 | 5.4 | 7.8 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 13.4 | 3.7 | 9.3 | 5.4 | 7.8 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 498 | 1358 | 1341 | 585 | 537 |  |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.75 | 0.22 | 0.46 | 0.29 | 0.75 |  |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 498 | 1358 | 1341 | 585 | 911 |  |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 0.72 | 0.72 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 23.1 | 3.3 | 16.5 | 15.3 | 28.3 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 7.5 | 0.3 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 2.2 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 6.4 | 1.1 | 3.8 | 2.0 | 3.3 | 0.0 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay (d),s/veh | 30.6 | 3.5 | 17.6 | 16.5 | 30.5 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | C | A | B | B | C |  |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 673 | 795 |  | 405 | A |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 18.6 | 17.4 |  | 30.5 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B | B |  | C |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs |  | 2 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), $s$ |  | 55.0 |  | 15.0 | 24.0 | 31.0 |
| Change Period ( $Y+R \mathrm{R}$ ), s |  | 4.6 |  | * 4.2 | 4.6 | 4.6 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s |  | 42.9 |  | * 18 | 19.4 | 18.9 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s |  | 5.7 |  | 9.8 | 15.4 | 11.3 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s |  | 2.0 |  | 1.0 | 0.5 | 3.0 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl DelayHCM 6th LOS |  |  | 20.7 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | C |  |  |  |
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## Kimley»)Horn

## APPENDIX V. TRUCK TURNING TEMPLATE



Kimley»)Horn
$\overline{\text { xx-097XXXXXX JUNE } 2020}$
FIGURE 1

## Kimley»)Horn

## APPENDIX W. VIRTUAL CARE BACKUP

## KP Santa Cruz County Virtual Care back up

| Santa Cruz County |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Exam Room Visits |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017-2019 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AGE2GRP | (All) | $\cdots$ |  |  |  |  |
| REGULAR_APPT_HOUR | R | T |  |  |  |  |
| MEMFL | (All) | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |
| PROV | (All) | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |
| CLASS | (All) | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |
| PROCEDURE | (All) | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |
| GROUP | (All) | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |
| FAC_ID (Multiple Items) - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SERVICE TYPE $\bar{T}$ | I VISIT TYPE | $\checkmark$ | DEPARTMENTS $\boldsymbol{T}$ | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| $\bullet$ PRIMARY CARE | EIN PERSON |  | MEDICINE PRIMARY | 33,219 | 51,076 | 64,661 |
| PRIMARY CARE | IN PERSON |  | PEDIATRICS | 4,812 | 6,915 | 7,330 |
| PRIMARY CARE | IN PERSON |  | OB/GYN | 3,459 | 5,653 | 6,506 |
| PRIMARY CARE | IN PERSON Total |  |  | 41,490 | 63,644 | 78,497 |
| PRIMARY CARE | - VIRTUAL |  | MEDICINE PRIMARY | 11,237 | 20,801 | 21,524 |
| PRIMARY CARE | VIRTUAL |  | PEDIATRICS | 470 | 759 | 1,035 |
| PRIMARY CARE | VIRTUAL |  | OB/GYN | 608 | 1,016 | 1,069 |
| PRIMARY CARE | VIRTUAL Total |  |  | 12,315 | 22,576 | 23,628 |
| PRIMARY CARE SUm |  |  |  | 53,805 | 86,220 | 102,125 |
| ©SPECIALTY CARE | EIN PERSON |  | ALLERGY | 471 | 1,136 | 1,800 |
| SPECIALTY CARE | IN PERSON |  | DERMATOLOGY | 576 | 1,121 | 3,157 |
| SPECIALTY CARE | IN PERSON |  | HEAD/NECK SUR | 670 | 1,000 | 1,205 |
| SPECIALTY CARE | IN PERSON |  | MEDICINE SPECIALTY | 690 | 2,033 | 2,555 |
| SPECIALTY CARE | IN PERSON |  | NEUROLOGY | 120 | 84 |  |
| SPECIALTY CARE | IN PERSON |  | OPHTHALMOLOGY | 978 | 1,470 | 1,673 |
| SPECIALTY CARE | IN PERSON |  | OPTOMETRY | 1,420 | 1,797 | 2,445 |
| SPECIALTY CARE | IN PERSON |  | ORTHOPEDICS | 2,165 | 3,634 | 4,369 |
| SPECIALTY CARE | IN PERSON |  | SURGERY | 208 | 380 | 514 |
| SPECIALTY CARE | IN PERSON |  | UROLOGY | 62 | 191 | 217 |
| SPECIALTY CARE | IN PERSON Total |  |  | 7,360 | 12,846 | 17,935 |
| SPECIALTY CARE | $\bullet$ VIRTUAL |  | ALLERGY | 55 | 229 | 277 |
| SPECIALTY CARE | VIRTUAL |  | DERMATOLOGY |  | 41 | 434 |
| SPECIALTY CARE | VIRTUAL |  | HEAD/NECK SUR | 31 | 40 | 67 |
| SPECIALTY CARE | VIRTUAL |  | MEDICINE SPECIALTY | 410 | 462 | 753 |
| SPECIALTY CARE | VIRTUAL |  | NEUROLOGY | 12 | 11 |  |
| SPECIALTY CARE | VIRTUAL |  | OPHTHALMOLOGY |  | 3 | 1 |
| SPECIALTY CARE | VIRTUAL |  | ORTHOPEDICS | 186 | 453 | 449 |
| SPECIALTY CARE | VIRTUAL |  | SURGERY | 86 | 106 | 101 |
| SPECIALTY CARE | VIRTUAL |  | UROLOGY | 104 | 189 | 312 |
| SPECIALTY CARE | VIRTUAL Total |  |  | 884 | 1,534 | 2,394 |
| SPECIALTY CARE Sum |  |  |  | 8,244 | 14,380 | 20,329 |
| Grand Total |  |  |  | 62,049 | 100,600 | 122,454 |


| Primary Care | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| In Person | $77 \%$ | $\mathbf{7 4} \%$ | $77 \%$ |
| Virtual | $23 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $23 \%$ |
| Specialty Care | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ |
| In Person | $89 \%$ | $89 \%$ | $88 \%$ |
| Virtual | $11 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $12 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| ALL SERVICE TYPES | $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 9}$ |
| In Person | $79 \%$ | $76 \%$ | $79 \%$ |
| Virtual | $21 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $21 \%$ |

Notes:

1) It is expected that more visits will be offered virtually with social distancing due to COVID 19
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## APPENDIX X. $17^{\text {TH }}$ AVENUE OVERCROSSING MODEL RESULTS
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## APPENDIX Y. COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ VMT/TDM POLICY



##  and Watsonville regarding Senate Bill (SB) 743 analysis and tool development; and adopt resolution accepting unanticipated revenue in the amount of $\$ 45,491$ from the four cities for

 implementation of SB 743 , relating to Transportation Impacts of CEQA requirements, as recommended by the Planning Director
## Attachments

Board Memo
Resolution 146-2020 Vehicle Mileage Threshold (eSign)

## Board Letter

## Recommended Action(s):

 meeting Senate Bill (SB) 743 and the California Environmental Quality Act, as recommended by the Planning Director.

## Executive Summary

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) law now requires that Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) instead of Level of Service (LOS) be used for determining the significance of


 residential, and no net increase in VMT for retail.

## Background

Governor Brown signed SB 743 (Steinberg) in 2013, which changed the way transportation impacts were to be analyzed under CEQA. Lead agencies had historically used LOS (a measure of vehicle delay) as the metric for determining transportation impacts. Calculated LOS impacts of a project then influenced the type of CEQA document and/or mitigations required for a proposed project (exemption, negative declaration with or without mitigations, or environmental impact report). Mitigation measures needed to address LOS impacts are often capacity-increasing, and the resultant transportation improvements typically facilitate increases in driving by residents and employees, but do not address improvements needed to support alternate modes such as transit, walking, and biking.


 greenhouse gas emissions.


 impact.

OPR's recommendations for the threshold-setting process and for the methodology to screen projects required an analysis of VMT by land use type at a local level. Working with a
 agencies must be in compliance with SB 743 by July 1, 2020.

## Analysis





 requirements of SB 743:

> - Residential Projects: $15 \%$ below the countywide per capita average VMT
> - Office and Service Projects: $15 \%$ below the countywide per employee average VMT
> - Retail: no net increase in the countywide average
> - All other land uses: no net increase in VMT


 VMT, and the availability of new data.




 purposes, and thus the type of CEQA documentation required of projects will change.

 Environment.

## Financial Impact

 studies accepted by the County that are prepared for proposed development projects.

## Body

## Strategic Plan Element(s)

This action supports Strategic Plan Elements of Reliable Transportation and Sustainable Environment, specifically meeting the goals of Community Mobility and Climate Change.

## Meeting History

Jun 16, 2020 9:00 AM Video Board of
Resolution No. 146-2020
RESULT:
MOVER:
SECONDER:

AYES:
APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
John Leopold, First District Supervisor
Ryan Coonerty, Third District Supervisor
John Leopold, Zach Friend, Ryan Coonerty, Greg Caput, Bruce McPherson

Discussion
8 Add Comment

# BEFORE THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ, STATE OF CALIFORNIA 

RESOLUTION NO. 146-2020

On the motion of Supervisor: Coonerty Duly seconded by Supervisor: Friend The following Resolution is adopted:

# RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE USE OF VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED AS THE NEW TRANSPORTATION MEASURE OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS FOR THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT 

WHEREAS, Governor Edmund G. Brown signed Senate Bill (SB) 743 in 2013, which directed the Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to develop updated criteria for measuring transportation impacts using alternative metrics that promote a reduction in greenhouse gases, the development of multimodal transportation, and a diversity of land uses; and

WHEREAS, in November 2017, OPR released its proposed updates to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines that stated vehicle miles traveled (VMT) shall be the new metric for measuring transportation impacts instead of using the level of service metric; and

WHEREAS, in November 2018, the California Natural Resources Agency released its Final Statement of Reasons for Regulatory Action that amended the State CEQA Guidelines; and

WHEREAS, on December 28, 2018, the Office of Administrative Law approved the amended CEQA Guidelines; and

WHEREAS, all lead agencies are required to comply with the updated CEQA Guidelines, which means using VMT to measure transportation impacts by July 1, 2020; and

WHEREAS, CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.7(b) allows lead agencies to adopt thresholds of significance for the lead agency's general use in its environmental review process; and

WHEREAS, the County of Santa Cruz intends to update VMT thresholds of significance, based on a data-driven evaluation, to meet the intent of SB 743.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors for the County of Santa Cruz adopts VMT as the County's thresholds of significance for transportation-related environmental impacts pursuant to CEQA as follows:

- Residential Projects: $15 \%$ below the countywide per capita average VMT;
- Office and Service Projects: $15 \%$ below the countywide per employee average VMT;
- Retail: no net increase in the countywide average; and
- All other land uses: no net increase in VMT.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors authorizes the Planning Director to update the VMT thresholds of significance for land use projects and plans, as necessary and appropriate to reflect current conditions, provided any update is consistent with the intent of SB 743 and in compliance with procedural and substantive requirements of CEQA and all other applicable state and local laws.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Cruz, State of California, this 16th day of $\qquad$ 2020 by the following vote:

AYES: SUPERVISORS Leopold, Friend, Coonerty, McPherson, Caput
NOES: SUPERVISORS None
ABSENT: SUPERVISORS None
ABSTAIN: SUPERVISORS None


Greg Caput
Chairperson, Board of Supervisors
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## Kimley»)Horn

## APPENDIX Z. DETAILED VMT ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

## Appendix Z

To determine the distance each Member travels to the closest facility, the Geographical Information System ("GIS") and Planning functions in the TransCAD software modeling package were used. TransCAD is the most used travel demand modeling/routing software package by Metropolitan Planning Organizations ("MPOs") in the United States. As part of this analysis, each Traffic Analysis Zone ("TAZ") within the model was converted to a centroid, which was subsequently associated to the nearest point feature on the closest roadway as the basis of its start point. TAZs are the smallest spatial area that a Travel Demand Model represents and are used as the basis for aggregating localized household and employment data for analysis purposes.

Subsequently, this dataset was used as the basis for a multi-path analysis utilizing TransCAD to identify logical paths and estimate trip lengths for calculating VMT. The roadway network used for this analysis is the statewide streets layer provided by Caltrans that contains functional classification (e.g. freeway, arterial, local) and speed information for the roadways throughout California. The speed and length information were converted into time in minutes it takes a vehicle to travel the length of the roadway segment, which was then used as the basis of impedance for route choices. It should be noted that many trips will not occur during the peak periods of daily travel within the region because medical services are provided predominantly throughout the day, and as a result, individual travel times on roadway segments will be closer to this calculation than during peak commute times. The resultant shortest path to each facility, both inside and outside of the County from each TAZ, was summarized in a matrix for use in subsequent analysis steps.

To determine the VMT for each of the Scenario A and Scenario B No Project and Plus Project conditions (Existing and 2040), the distribution of visits to each facility were separated into twentyeight distinct services, as shown in Appendix R. 'The distribution was apportioned among the services as not all services are provided at every facility and to provide the most accurate analysis. The distribution of visits is based on both information provided by the Proposed Tenant and a market analysis produced by Pivotal Analytics for specific medical services. The market analysis is based on Healthcare Consumer information for the County, while the information provided by the Proposed Tenant is for facilities located inside and outside of the County operated by the Proposed Tenant used by Members located within the County. The data provided by the Proposed Tenant was used for the facilities it operates as it is the best available resource for the travel patterns of the Proposed Tenant's Members. Pivotal insurance claims visit data was used as the best available data to analyze Other Healthcare System's patient travel distribution. The data provided by the Proposed Tenant covers January 1, 2019 to December 31, 2019 while the data provided by Pivotal Analytics covers April 1, 2019 to March 31, 2020. The 2020 Membership is estimated to be 35,071 , while the 2040 Membership is projected to be 87,729 , for a 20 -year growth of 52,658 Members as shown in Appendix S. For Cumulative plus Project conditions (Scenario B2) conditions assume that Membership is made up of 40-percent Existing Members, 5 -percent Population Growth Members, and 55-percent Transferee Members as shown in Appendix $\mathbf{T}$.

Once the distribution of visits was split among the services, a production-attraction (PA) table was created where visits to facilities were summed by service and used as attractions and the productions were distributed into the TAZs within the County based on the 2019 and 2040 population distribution in the SCC TDM. TransCAD was used to convert the PA table into twentyeight PA matrices, one for each service to balance the production and attractions based on the shortest path matrix. These matrices were summed to mimic a single origin-destination (OD) matrix that is used as an input to assign Member visits along the roadway network. TransCAD was again used to assign the visits within the OD matrix using an all or nothing assignment (i.e. all visits from each origin location that end at the same facility are assigned to a single shortest path regardless of capacity) that optimized travel time along the roadway segments. Based on information provided by the Proposed Tenant it is understood that for the No Project scenario, nearly 29-percent of Member trips include facilities outside of the County, while only 2.4-percent of member trips include facilities outside of the County in the Plus Project scenario.

The visits along each roadway segment were converted to trips using a conversion factor developed using information regarding the size of a facility in square-feet, number of visitors to each facility, and the trip generation rate for Clinics, which is the same as the TIOA rate, in the Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). The visitor to trip ratio was calculated based on the facilities where both the square footage and number of visitors were known. The total square footage was multiplied by the ITE rate and then divided by the total number of visitors. Based on the information provided, the trips per visitor ratio was calculated to be 0.01462 daily trips per annual visitor. The number of total daily trips per scenario and facility type were calculated by multiplying the total visitors by the daily trips per annual visitor ratio. Trips were then factored up on a standard factor based on the ratio of calculated total trips to and from the Project and the total number of trips calculated based on the ITE trip gen rate for the Project, 6,106 daily trips. The trips were then reduced by 10-percent to account for employee trips (based on a ratio developed using the Project of approximately 600 daily trips for 300 employees) whose trip length were calculated separately. The Member trips were then multiplied by the roadway segment length to calculate the total Member VMT. The VMT was then totaled to determine the Member VMT for either No Project or Plus Project scenarios in both Existing and 2040 conditions.

The total VMT for employees was developed by multiplying the employee trips (10-percent of the total trips) by the average employee trip length by facility based on Longitudinal EmployerHousehold Dynamics ("LEHD") data. The employee VMT is added to the total Member VMT to determine the No Project and Project VMT (for both Existing Conditions and 2040 conditions in Scenario A and for Cumulative conditions in Scenario B).


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Kaiser Permanente ("Kaiser") is proposed to occupy and operate the Project if the Project is approved. Therefore, Kaiser-specific data and assumptions were used in this TIOA to provide the most accurate information possible about the Project's potential transportation-related impacts. Considering the Project's size and location, it is believed that there would be a reduction in VMT for any healthcare services provider that may occupy the Project because medical uses primarily serve pre-existing needs (i.e., they do not generate new trips so much as meet existing demand). Because of this, when a new facility is introduced, most often it can be presumed to reduce trip lengths. The primary reason for this is because a typical doctor visit is assumed to occur regardless of the proximity of the facility, but the proximity of the facility will determine the length of that trip and the resultant impact to the overall transportation system.

[^1]:    and Service Project" is typically analyzed with respect to employee travel patterns, whereas travel associated with a MOB is dominated by patient, rather than employee trips.

[^2]:    ${ }^{7}$ Market data refers to data provided by the Proposed Tenant as to what services are provided in specific facilities operated by the Proposed Tenant.

[^3]:    ${ }^{8}$ The Scenario A Existing No Project and No Project 2040, in contrast, assume that all Members in the No Project condition receive healthcare at one of the Proposed Tenant's existing facilities.

[^4]:    ${ }^{9}$ Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA (2018), California Governor's Office of Planning and Research, Page 16

[^5]:    ${ }^{10}$ Market data for Other Healthcare Systems is based on insurance claims data provided by Pivotal Analytics regarding patient demand by service type and the types of services offered by Other Healthcare Systems.

[^6]:    ${ }^{11}$ See Policy 3.12.4.
    ${ }^{12}$ See Santa Cruz County Code, § 5.52.010 et seq.

[^7]:    ${ }^{13}$ See https://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/ped_bike/univcourse/pdf/swless124.pdf.

[^8]:    ${ }^{14}$ Kaiser Permanente ("Kaiser") is proposed to occupy and operate the Project if the Project is approved. Therefore, Kaiser-specific data and assumptions were used in this TIOA to provide the most accurate information possible about the Project's potential transportation-related impacts. Considering the Project's size and location, it is believed that there would be a reduction in VMT for any healthcare services provider that may occupy the Project because medical uses primarily serve pre-existing needs (i.e., they do not generate new trips so much as meet existing demand). Because of this, when a new facility is introduced most often it can be presumed to reduce trip lengths. The primary reason for this is because a typical doctor visit is assumed to occur regardless of the proximity of the facility, but the proximity of the facility will determine the length of that trip and the resultant impact to the overall transportation system.

[^9]:    ${ }^{15}$ California Air Resources Board (Nov. 2018) 2018 Progress Report on California's Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act, pp. 4, 5.
    ${ }^{16}$ Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA (2018), California Governor's Office of Planning and Research, Page 5 [addition of through lanes, including general purpose lanes, HOV lanes, peak period lanes, auxiliary lanes or lanes through grade-separated interchanges would likely lead to measurable and substantial increases in vehicle travel]).
    ${ }^{17}$ Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Cruz, Resolution No. 146-2020, adopted June 16, 2020.
    ${ }^{18}$ Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA (2018), California Governor's Office of Planning and Research, Page 5
    ${ }^{19}$ Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Cruz, Resolution No. 146-2020, adopted June 16, 2020 providing that a project will have a significant transportation impact unless it generates VMT meeting the following thresholds: (i)

[^10]:    Residential Projects: 15 percent below Countywide per capita average VMT; (ii) Office and Service Projects: 15 percent below the Countywide per employee average VMT; (iii) Retail Projects: no net increase in the Countywide average VMT; (v) All Other Land Uses: no net increase in VMT. The Project is not a Residential or Retail Project and should not be classified as an "Office and Service Project" either for purposes of analyzing VMT given that an "Office and Service Project" is typically analyzed with respect to employee travel patterns, whereas travel associated with a MOB is dominated by patient, rather than employee trips $\underset{\underline{\underline{*}}}{ }$

[^11]:    ${ }^{20}$ Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA (2018), California Governor's Office of Planning and Research, Page 16

[^12]:    ${ }^{21}$ Market data refers to data provided by the Proposed Tenant as to what services are provided in specific facilities operated by the Proposed Tenant.

[^13]:    ${ }^{22}$ The Pivotal Analytics platform employs claims-based service utilization rates provided by Optum (a health insurance company with access to insurance claims data across the United States), and trended local population demographic data provided by Geolytics (one of the largest US census aggregators) as a basis for these calculations.
    ${ }^{23}$ Geolytics is one of the largest US census aggregators.

[^14]:    24 The Scenario A Existing No Project and No Project 2040, in contrast, assume that all Members in the No Project condition receive healthcare at one of the Proposed Tenant's existing facilities.

[^15]:    ${ }^{25}$ Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA (2018), California Governor's Office of Planning and Research, Page 16

[^16]:    ${ }^{26}$ See Policy 3.12.4
    ${ }^{27}$ See Santa Cruz County Code, $\S 5.52 .010$ et seq.

[^17]:    ${ }^{28} \mathrm{~A}$ marketing technique to encourage engagement with a product of service.

[^18]:    ${ }^{29}$ Turner, S., Wood, G., Hughes, T., \& Singh, R. (2011). Safety Performance Functions for Bicycle Crashes in New Zealand and Australia. Transportation Research Record, 2236(1), 66-73. https://doi.org/10.3141/2236-08

[^19]:    ${ }^{30}$ Federal Highway Administration. FHWA Course on Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Instructor's Guide. https://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/ped bike/univcourse/pdf/swless124.pdf.

[^20]:    ${ }^{31}$ The Santa Cruz County Code is current through Ordinance 5331, passed April 14, 2020.

[^21]:    ${ }^{32}$ Average peak rate $=3.23$ spaces per $1,000 \mathrm{sq}$. ft.
    ${ }^{33} 85^{\text {th }}$ percentile rate $=4.59$ spaces per 1,000 sq. ft.
    ${ }^{34}$ Medical Office (ITE LU 720)

[^22]:    ${ }^{35}$ The LOS Policy also requires consideration of consistency with the Congestion Management Plan, but the County is no longer governed by a Congestion Management Plan.

[^23]:    ${ }^{36}$ The LOS Policy described in the General Plan refers to the "sum of all critical movements" at such an intersection increasing by more than $1 \%$. As a matter of practice, the County does not sum critical movements at an intersection. The County LOS Policy is outdated and, pursuant to modern industry standards, the County considers whether the $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio at any critical movement at the intersection increases by more than $1 \%$ to analyze the deficiency and will produce the actual deficiency on a movement, rather than summing all the movements and then calculating a weighted average. This method of calculating each critical movement individually has been approved and utilized in other studies by the County Public Works Department and generally provides for a more conservative analysis.

[^24]:    ${ }^{37}$ California Department of Transportation. May 20, 2020. Vehicle Miles Traveled-Focused Transportation Impact Study Guide. Pages 4-5. https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/programs/transportation-planning/documents/sb-743/2020-05-20-approved-vmt-focused-tisg-a11y.pdf
    ${ }^{38}$ California Department of Transportation. Senate Bill (SB) 743 Implementation. Website Accessed August 31, 2020.
    ${ }^{39}$ Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission. Highway 1 Corridor Investment Program. Website Accessed August 31, 2020.

[^25]:    ${ }^{40}$ See Highway 1 Corridor Investment Program website at https://sccrtc.org/projects/streets-highways/hwy1corridor/ for additional information and documents.

[^26]:    *This trip generation estimate does not attempt to quantify the redistribution of trips that is expected to occur from trips that would otherwise be made to MOBs in the San Jose area and to other MOBs in the immediate area. As explained in the introduction to the Trip Generation Estimates Section of this TIOA, the proposed MOB will be redirecting trips that are already using the road network. The VMT Chapter (Chapter 2) of this report evaluates the redistribution of trips that are expected to occur due to MOBs in the Santa Cruz County and San Jose areas.
    **Transportation demand management ("TDM") measures will be implemented with the Project which would
    potentially reduce Project trips. Trip generation and assignment were not reduced to reflect this reduction.

[^27]:    ${ }^{41}$ See http://www.trafficware.com/synchro.html for additional software/modeling details.

[^28]:    ${ }^{42}$ See http://www.trafficware.com/synchro.html for additional software/modeling details.

[^29]:    ${ }^{43}$ See https://sccrtc.org/projects/streets-highways/hwy1corridor/.

[^30]:    ${ }^{44}$ See https://sccrtc.org/projects/streets-highways/hwy1corridor/ for more information.

[^31]:    ${ }^{45}$ See http://www.trafficware.com/synchro.html for additional software/modeling details.

[^32]:    ${ }^{46}$ Available at https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/programs/transportation-planning/documents/sb-743/2020-05-20-approved-vmt-focused-tisg-a11y.pdf.

[^33]:    ${ }^{47}$ See Highway 1 Corridor Investment Program website at https://sccrtc.org/projects/streets-highways/hwy1corridor/ for additional information and documents. The EIR is currently under litigation.

[^34]:    ${ }^{48}$ Based on FHWA Crash Prediction Module Engineer's Manual- IHSDM (2019) SPF Formula for segments reference: Nspf-rs-Total $=$ AADT*L*365*10-6*e-0.312

[^35]:    

[^36]:    ${ }^{1}$ Traffic Operations Report, April 2012, Tables 8-1, 8-3, 8-4, 8-5.

[^37]:    * Repeat as often as needed, with appropriate numbering, to cover all pavement alternatives investigated.
    ** Includes both future maintenance, construction, and project support costs.

