Appendix K
VMT ANALYSIS

## ROBLA ESTATES TRAFFIC STUDY MEMO

DATE: March 24, 2022
TO: Matthew Ilagan, Pelle Clarke | City of Sacramento
FROM: Brian Kellogg, Vic Maslanka | DKS Associates
SUBJECT: Robla Estates Traffic Study
Project \#19179-016

## INTRODUCTION

The planned Robla Estates site ("Project") is expected to include 177 residential homes and a public park, to be located on the northeast side of Rio Linda Boulevard in the Robla area of the City of Sacramento. This memorandum details the traffic volumes forecasted for each scenario studied and examines the traffic operations, circulation, queuing, and safety effects resulting from a set of proposed intersection types for the future Project site driveway. For this forecasting and analysis effort, the following was included for study intersections and analysis scenarios:

## Study Intersections:

- Rio Linda Boulevard \& Project Site Main Driveway
- Rio Linda Boulevard \& Project Site North Driveway


## Scenarios:

- 2022 Existing (including traffic counts only)
- 2022 Existing + Project (including traffic counts and trips generated by the Project site)
- 2040 Cumulative (incl. grown traffic counts, background site trips and Project site trips)

For volume forecasting, this memo includes an overview of the traffic counting effort done for the project, the background site and trips considered, and the process for estimating background traffic growth and the trips generated by the project site. A signal warrant analysis was done for the intersection of Rio Linda Boulevard and the main Project site driveway and is documented in this memo. The traffic operations and safety analyses observed delays and queues for vehicles and an evaluation of conflict points and pedestrian/bicycle treatments related to the intersection treatments analyzed.

## PLANNED TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS

As part of the Project site build-out, Rio Linda Boulevard is expected to be widened to two lanes going northbound through the site area and tapering back to one lane per direction to the north of the site's north driveway; southbound Rio Linda would remain one-lane. The intersection of Rio Linda Boulevard with the main (south) site driveway is desired as a roundabout, built with two lanes continuing north, one lane southbound, and connecting as a two-lane roadway to the site. The northern site entrance is expected to be a stop-controlled right-in/right-out driveway, right a turn bay provided to enter the site.

For the Cumulative 2040 scenario, a background site - called Leisure Vistas - is expected to add a fourth leg to the roundabout on its west side. Rio Linda Boulevard is also expected to add a lane southbound through the study area to become a four-lane roadway; the roundabout would likewise add a southbound lane for a true $2+1$ configuration.

The site plan for the interim Project build-out (assumed 2022) is shown in Figure 1, with larger size plans and the full 2040 Cumulative build-out provided in Appendix A.


FIGURE 1. PROJECT SITE PLAN (AT BUILD-YEAR)

## EXISTING TRAFFIC VOLUMES

Tube counts were collected along Rio Linda Boulevard to the north of Marysville Boulevard. These counts were taken over the entire week of January 22, 2022 and were aggregated in 15-minute increments. The AM peak hour (7:00-8:00 AM) and PM peak hour (4:30-5:30 PM) volumes, averaged over those weekdays (Mon-Fri), are shown in Figure 2. The full traffic volume and speed data are provided in Appendix B.


FIGURE 2. EXISTING TRAFFIC VOLUMES
A summary of the speed data collected along Rio Linda Boulevard is shown in Table 1. Both directions had an 85th-percentile speed over the posted speed limit of 45 mph . Southbound Rio Linda Boulevard showed lower speeds overall, likely due to the upcoming curve and signal at Claire Avenue/Marysville Boulevard.

TABLE 1. RIO LINDA SPEED SUMMARY

| RIO LINDA <br> DIRECTION | MEDIAN SPEED | 85TH PERCENTILE <br> SPEED | \% OVER 45 MPH |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NORTHBOUND | 48 mph | 56 mph | $67 \%$ |
| SOUTHBOUND | 42 mph | 47 mph | $26 \%$ |

## BACKGROUND TRAFFIC GROWTH

To estimate future background growth, the SACSIM travel demand model was used. The model was run for a Baseline 2016 scenario and a Cumulative 2040 scenario. Looking at the AM and PM peak hour volume projections along Rio Linda Boulevard near the Project site, growth rates in each direction ranged from $0.3 \% /$ year to $2.1 \% /$ year. For this study, an assumed growth rate of $\mathbf{1 \% / y e a r}$ was applied to the collected traffic counts as part of the 2040 Cumulative scenario.

In addition to growing collected traffic counts, the 2040 Cumulative scenario includes the Leisure Vistas site, located adjacent to the Project site and on the southwest side of Rio Linda Boulevard. This background site would include 915 residential units (senior living) and a 43k square-foot neighborhood shopping center. For analysis purposes, it is assumed that roadways interior to the site would connect to Rio Linda Boulevard at the same location as the Project site's main entrance, as well as to Claire Avenue to the south and Sully Street to the southwest. Trips forecasted for this site were included in a previous traffic study for this site; this traffic study is included in Appendix C. Note that trips generated by this background site were not grown alongside the collected traffic counts.

## TRIPS GENERATED BY SITE

## TRIP GENERATION

Trip generation estimates for the Robla Estates site were made based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 11th Edition. Trip figures were estimated for the AM and PM commuter peaks based on adjacent roadway traffic. A summary of the AM and PM peak site trips is shown in Table 2; detailed trip generation reports can be found in Appendix D. While it can be presumed that much of the traffic to/from the park site would come from the surrounding homes, no specific figures for this internal site capture are available. Therefore, to make a conservative analysis, park trips were considered similarly to residential housing trips and distributed external to the site area.

TABLE 2. ROBLA ESTATES TRIP GENERATION SUMMARY

|  | ITE TRIP GEN CLASSIFICATION | AM PEAK TRIPS <br> (ADJ. STREET TRAFFIC) | PM PEAK TRIPS <br> (ADJ. STREET TRAFFIC) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \# | DESCRIPTION | \# OF UNITS | IN | OUT | TOTAL | IN | OUT | TOTAL |
| $\mathbf{2 1 0}$Single-Family <br> Detached Housing | 177 dwelling units | 32 | 92 | 124 | 107 | 63 | 170 |  |
| $\mathbf{4 1 1}$ | Public Park | 1.82 acres | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 10 | 23 |
| TOTAL SITE | $\mathbf{3 2}$ | $\mathbf{9 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 3}$ |  |  |

[^0]
## TRIP DISTRIBUTION AND ROUTING

Trip distribution and route choice for the site was estimated based on the SACSIM travel demand model, as well as traffic counts collected along Rio Linda Boulevard in the vicinity of the proposed site. For the year 2040 Cumulative Conditions, a site on the west side of Rio Linda Boulevard and a fourth leg to the Project site's main driveway are expected. While the site is not expected to facilitate trips between Rio Linda Boulevard and Claire Avenue/Sully Street, the presence of a neighborhood grocery store would likely attract trips from the proposed Project site. Therefore, a nominal 5\% distribution was included for site trips.

The inbound and outbound trip distribution for the Project site is shown in Figure 3 for both the year 2022 Existing + Project and 2040 Cumulative scenarios. Figure 4 shows the AM and PM peak volumes generated by the Project site.


FIGURE 3. PROJECT SITE TRIP DISTRIBUTION

## PROJECTED TRAFFIC VOLUMES

Figure 5 shows the total forecasted traffic volumes for both study intersections, over the 2022 Existing+Project scenario and the 2040 Cumulative scenario. These volumes include projected background traffic based on counts and the SACSIM model, the background Leisure Vistas site to the southwest of the Project site, and the projected Project site volumes. The 2040 Cumulative scenario assumes the build-out of a fourth leg to the intersection of Rio Linda Boulevard and the Project site's main driveway.


FIGURE 4. PROJECT TRAFFIC VOLUMES


FIGURE 5. FULL PROJECT + BACKGROUND TRAFFIC VOLUMES

## REGULATORY SETTING

## CITY OF SACRAMENTO

The Mobility Element of the Sacramento 2035 General Plan outlines goals and policies that coordinate the transportation and circulation system with planned land uses. The following Level of Service (LOS) policy has been used in this study, as amended on January 23, 2018:

Policy M 1.2.2 Level of Service (LOS) Standard. The City shall implement a flexible context sensitive Level of Service (LOS) standard, and will measure traffic operations against the vehicle LOS thresholds established in this policy. The City will measure Vehicle LOS based on the methodology contained in the latest version of the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) published by the Transportation Research Board. The City's specific vehicle LOS thresholds have been defined based on community values with respect to modal priorities, land use context, economic development, and environmental resources and constraints. As such, the City has established variable LOS threshold appropriate for the unique characteristics of the City's diverse neighborhoods and communities. The City will strive to operate the roadway network at LOS D or better for vehicles during typical weekday conditions, including AM and PM peak hour with...exceptions...

In accordance with City policies, the applicable operating standard for the study area intersections is LOS $\mathbf{D}$.

## CEQA GUIDELINES (THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE)

Consistent with Appendix $G$ of the CEQA Guidelines, thresholds of significance adopted by the governing jurisdictions in applicable general plans and previous environmental documents, and professional judgement, a significant impact would occur if the proposed project would result in the effects described below:

## INTERSECTIONS - CITY OF SACRAMENTO

- The traffic generated by the project degrades LOS from an acceptable LOS (without the project) to an unacceptable LOS (with the project),
- The LOS (without project) is unacceptable and project generated traffic increases the average vehicle delay by 5 seconds or more.
- Intersections - LOS A-D is always to be maintained; provided, LOS E or F may be acceptable if improvements are made to the overall transportation system and/or non-vehicular transportation and transit are promoted as part of the project or a City initiated project.


## TRANSIT

- Adversely affect public transit operations,
- Fail to adequately provide access to transit.


## BICYCLE FACILITIES

- Adversely affect existing or planned bicycle facilities,
- Fail to adequately provide for access by bicycle.


## PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION

- Adversely affect existing or planned pedestrian facilities,
- Fail to adequately provide for access by pedestrians.


## CONSTRUCTION-RELATED TRAFFIC IMPACTS

- Degrade an intersection or roadway to an unacceptable level,
- Cause inconveniences to motorists due to prolonged road closures, or
- Result in increased frequency of potential conflicts between vehicles, pedestrians, and bicyclists.


## TRAFFIC SIGNAL WARRANTS

A traffic signal warrant analysis was done for the main site driveway planned for the Robla Estates development along Rio Linda Boulevard, per the methodology described in the California Department of Transportation Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CaMUTCD). For the proposed future intersection, the warrant study was based on volumes projected in the 2040 Cumulative scenario. For this study, the following warrants were analyzed:

- Warrant 1: Eight-Hour Vehicular Volume (not met)
- Warrant 2: Four-Hour Vehicular Volume (meets warrant)
- Warrant 3: Peak Hour Vehicular Volume (meets warrant)

For all vehicular volume warrants, volume thresholds are defined differently for urban and rural areas. The intersection is defined as "rural" if the speed limit or critical speed on the major street is over 40 mph or if it is in an isolated community of fewer than 10,000 people. Because the speed limit of Rio Linda Boulevard is 45 mph through the Project area, this intersection is considered "rural" for purposes of this signal warrant analysis.

Calculations for the signal warrants analyzed are shown in Appendix E.

## WARRANT 1: EIGHT-HOUR VEHICULAR VOLUME

The eight-hour vehicular volume warrant analyzes volumes over 8 hours of an average day and has two conditions, either of which may be satisfied to meet the warrant (or if both are met at $80 \%$ thresholds):

- Condition A, the Minimum Vehicular Volume, is intended for application at locations with a large volume of intersecting traffic, and
- Condition B, the Interruption of Continuous Traffic, is intended where traffic volume on the major street is heavy to where minor street traffic suffers excessive delay

Based on the eight-hour threshold requirements, warrants are not met for the 2040 Cumulative scenario.

The four-hour vehicular volume warrant analyzes volumes over any 4 hours of an average day and is intended where the volume of intersecting traffic is the main reason for installing a traffic signal. The warrant is based on volume thresholds for major- and minor-street traffic. Based on expected volumes in the 2040 Cumulative scenario, the four-hour vehicular volume warrant is met for the main site driveway intersection.


Note: Major street volumes greater than 1000 vph are not plotted here. See Appendix $E$ for more info.

FIGURE 6. CAMUTCD WARRANT 2 RESULTS ( $70 \%$ FACTOR APPLIED)

## WARRANT 3: PEAK HOUR VEHICULAR VOLUME

The peak hour vehicular volume warrant is intended for conditions where minor-street traffic suffers high delay when entering or crossing the major street. It is intended to be applied in cases where a site discharges a large number of vehicles over a short time. For the expected major- and minor-street volumes at Rio Linda Boulevard and the main site driveway, this warrant is met for the AM peak hour.


FIGURE 7. CAMUTCD WARRANT 3 RESULTS (70\% FACTOR APPLIED)

## ROADWAY DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

This section documents the additional design considerations and analysis assumptions for each intersection alternative at the Project site's main driveway and taper lengths for the lane add/drop locations along Rio Linda Boulevard in the study area, based on City of Sacramento and Caltrans standards.

## ROUNDABOUT

At its ultimate build-out (in the 2040 Cumulative scenario), the roundabout planned for the intersection of Rio Linda Boulevard and the Project's main driveway will include two circulating lanes along the Rio Linda Boulevard approaches and one circulating lane along the two site driveways. Cyclists traveling along Rio Linda Boulevard will exit the bike lanes and use a widened sidewalk to cross the roundabout at approach crosswalks with pedestrians.

Prior to construction of the roundabout, a Roundabout Design Concept Report must be submitted to the City for review, per Section 15.11 of the City of Sacramento Design and Procedures Manual. This traffic analysis memo does not include detailed design characteristics of the roundabout, including entry/exit radius or a fastest path analysis.

## SIGNALIZATION/STOP CONTROL

With a widening of Rio Linda Boulevard from two to four lanes expected in the study area, the future intersection with the Project site's main driveway (and the Leisure Vistas driveway for the future 2040 Cumulative scenario) must follow standards for expanded intersections, per Section 15.7.6 of the City of Sacramento Design and Procedures Manual. Based on this guidance, the following was included along Rio Linda Boulevard in the traffic analysis:

- Left-turn pocket of $\mathbf{2 0 0}$ feet into both site driveways
- Right-turn pocket of $\mathbf{1 5 0}$ feet into both site driveways
- Dual left-turn lanes were not required at either Rio Linda Boulevard approach, as future volumes do not reach the 300 vph threshold

Based on the traffic operations analysis done in this study, projected queue lengths for left- and right-turning vehicles off of Rio Linda Boulevard would not require longer turn pockets than indicated in the design standards.

## RIO LINDA BOULEVARD LANE TAPERS

Rio Linda Boulevard is currently a two-lane roadway and is expected to remain so to the north and south of the Project study area. Guidance for taper lengths at lane additions/reductions comes from the Caltrans Highway Design Manual ${ }^{1}$ (Topic 206):

- For lane additions, the minimum recommended distance to transition traffic to the additional width is $\mathbf{2 5 0}$ feet per lane.
- For lane reductions, the recommended taper distance is calculated as $\mathrm{W} * \mathrm{~V}$, where W equals the width of the lane to be dropped and V equals the design speed. For a planned 11 -foot outer lane and 45 mph design speed, this recommended taper distance is 495 feet.


## TRAFFIC OPERATIONS ANALYSIS

## METHODOLOGY

The two proposed intersections along Rio Linda Boulevard were modeled for the 2022 Existing Plus Project and the 2040 Cumulative Scenarios; as there are no existing intersections along Rio Linda Boulevard in the study area, no existing scenario was analyzed.

For stop-controlled and signalized intersections, Synchro, v11 software was used to compute delay and queues using methodology from the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM), 6th Edition. Roundabout operations were modeled using Sidra, v8 software. Level of service thresholds were based on movement delay as specified in the HCM; those thresholds are shown in Table 3.

[^1]The output Synchro and Sidra reports generated for this traffic operations analysis are included in Appendix F.

TABLE 3. INTERSECTION LEVEL OF SERVICE DELAY THRESHOLDS
$\left.\begin{array}{ccc}\hline \text { LEVEL OF } \\ \text { SERVICE (LOS) }\end{array}\right)$ TOTAL DELAY PER VEHICLE (SECONDS)

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

## 2022 EXISTING PLUS PROJECT RESULTS

The delay and level of service results for the 2022 Existing Plus Project scenario are shown in Table 4 for the AM and PM peak hours. With stop control, the main site driveway would face high delay in leaving the Project site, although relative low volumes would mean that queue lengths would not be significant. Both the signalized and roundabout options at this intersection would perform with favorable operations; none of the movements at the roundabout would be expected to near capacity.

TABLE 4. EXISTING PLUS PROJECT TRAFFIC OPERATIONS RESULTS SUMMARY

| INTERSECTION | MVMT | DELAY (S/VEH) \& LEVEL OF SERVICE |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | AM PEAK |  |  | PM PEAK |  |  |
|  |  | STOPCONTROL ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | SIGNAL | ROUNDABOUT ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | STOPCONTROL ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | SIGNAL | ROUNDABOUT ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |
| RIO LINDA BLVD \& MAIN SITE DRWY | NBT | - | 4 (A) | 6 (A) | - | 3 (A) | 6 (A) |
|  | NBR | - | 4 (A) | 5 (A) | - | 3 (A) | 5 (A) |
|  | SBL | 9 (A) | 4 (A) | 11 (B) | 9 (A) | 3 (A) | 11 (B) |
|  | SBT | - | 5 (A) | 6 (A) | - | 6 (A) | 6 (A) |
|  | WBL | 41 (E) | 19 (B) | 9 (A) | 48 (E) | 25 (C) | 7 (A) |
|  | WBR | 41 (E) | 19 (B) | 5 (A) | 48 (E) | 25 (C) | 3 (A) |
|  | Total | - | 5 (A) | 6 (A) | - | 5 (A) | 6 (A) |
| RIO LINDA BLVD \& NORTH SITE DRWY | WBR | 11 (B) | - | - | 10 (A) | - | - |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Delay for side-street stop control is not calculated for free-flowing movements or for the total intersection
${ }^{\text {b }}$ Includes geometric delay as well as control delay

## 2040 CUMULATIVE RESULTS

Traffic operations results for the 2040 Cumulative scenario - including the project site, grown background traffic and the future Leisure Vistas site to the west of the Project - are shown in Table 5 for each intersection control tested for the AM and PM peak hours. While stop-control remains an adequate option for the right-in/right-out north driveway intersection, stop-control results in severe delays for vehicles exiting either the Project site or the Leisure Vistas site onto Rio Linda Boulevard. Delay and capacity for both signalization and the roundabout at the main site driveway were acceptable for both peak hours; additional treatments, such as turn bays and/or protected phasing for left turns do not appear to be needed to improve traffic operations.

TABLE 5. 2040 CUMULATIVE TRAFFIC OPERATIONS RESULTS SUMMARY

| INTERSECTION | MVMT | DELAY (S/VEH) \& LEVEL OF SERVICE |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | AM PEAK |  |  | PM PEAK |  |  |
|  |  | STOPCONTROL ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | SIGNAL | ROUNDABOUT ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | STOPCONTROL ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | SIGNAL | ROUNDABOUT ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |
| RIO LINDA BLVD \& MAIN SITE DRWY / LEISURE VISTAS DRWY | NBL | 9 (A) | 4 (A) | 9 (A) | 11 (B) | 6 (A) | 10 (A) |
|  | NBT | (A) | 5 (A) | 6 (A) | - | 4 (A) | 6 (A) |
|  | NBR | - | 5 (A) | 5 (A) | - | 4 (A) | 6 (A) |
|  | SBL | 10 (A) | 5 (A) | 11 (B) | 9 (A) | 4 (A) | 11 (B) |
|  | SBT | - | 4 (A) | 6 (A) | - | 5 (A) | 6 (A) |
|  | SBR | - | 4 (A) | 5 (A) | - | 5 (A) | 5 (A) |
|  | EBL | 27 (D) | 14 (B) | 12 (B) | 100 (F) | 17 (B) | 14 (B) |
|  | EBT | 27 (D) | 14 (B) | 7 (A) | 100 (F) | 17 (B) | 9 (A) |
|  | EBR | 27 (D) | 14 (B) | 6 (A) | 100 (F) | 17 (B) | 9 (A) |
|  | WBL | 76 (F) | 15 (B) | 9 (A) | 103 (F) | 17 (B) | 8 (A) |
|  | WBT | 76 (F) | 15 (B) | 9 (A) | 103 (F) | 17 (B) | 7 (A) |
|  | WBR | 76 (F) | 15 (B) | 6 (A) | 103 (F) | 17 (B) | 4 (A) |
|  | Total | - | 5 (A) | 6 (A) | - | 5 (A) | 7 (A) |
| RIO LINDA BLVD \& NORTH SITE DRWY | WBR | 12 (B) | - | - | 10 (B) | - | - |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Delay for side-street stop control is not calculated for free-flowing movements or for the total intersection
${ }^{\text {b }}$ Includes geometric delay as well as control delay

## INTERSECTION SAFETY

This study does not include a crash analysis and did not include collection of crash data along Rio Linda Boulevard. Rather, this section focuses on the differences in driver and active transportation safety between the stop-controlled, signalized, and roundabout options for the main site driveway intersection with Rio Linda Boulevard. As noted in the Project site plan (Appendix A and Figure 1), the desired treatment along Rio Linda Boulevard includes a northbound separated bike lane, a roundabout at the main site driveway (with cyclists directed to the sidewalk through the circulating roadway), and a right-in/right-out stop at the site's north driveway.

For the signalized and stop-controlled options, vehicles turning left into either the Project site or Leisure Vistas from Rio Linda Boulevard would cross free-flowing opposing traffic; following City standards for expanded intersection design, left- and right-turn bays would be included along Rio Linda Boulevard. For the stop-controlled option, vehicles exiting either site would cross oncoming traffic; with the noted high delay for the 2040 Cumulative scenario (see Table 5), those drivers may risk angle crashes as they become impatient and take smaller gaps to exit either site.

A roundabout has the benefits of naturally slowing down all vehicles approaching the intersection. With fewer - as well as lower speed - conflict points than a traditional intersection, roundabouts
typically exhibit lower rates of severe as well as angle crashes. From the operations analysis, having a $2+1$ configuration roundabout at the site's main entrance would provide low delay for all movements for expected volume growth in the 2040 Cumulative scenario. To accommodate safe crossings for peds and cyclists, use of Rectangular Rapid-Flashing Beacons (RRFBs), as well as advance warning signs along Rio Linda Boulevard, would be recommended.

## CONCLUSION

This memo documented the traffic analysis for the proposed Robla Estates site along Rio Linda Boulevard and included a forecast of background traffic along Rio Linda and the effect of the background Leisure Vistas site on the proposed intersection at the Project site's south entrance. Based on peak hour volume projections, either a signalized or roundabout alternative at the site's south entrance would accommodate demand at acceptable delay/capacity levels. The roundabout option would provide additional safety benefits, especially for left-turning traffic, by slowing down approaching vehicles and reducing conflict points at the intersection; the roundabout would also not require additional turn bays or slip lanes to safety accommodate vehicles turning off of Rio Linda Boulevard. Use of control devices such as RRFBs at each crosswalk and warning signs along Rio Linda Boulevard are recommended to increase driver awareness of crossing cyclists and pedestrians.
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## APPENDIX A: SITE PLANS

## EXISTING CONDITIONS EXHIBIT

## 5330 RIO LINDA BOULEVARD

CITY OF SACRAMENTO, SACRAMENTO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA MARCH, 2021




SECTION RIO LINDA BOULEVARD (INTERIM) $\frac{\text { NO SCMLE }}{}$


SECTION RIO LINDA BOULEVARD (ULTIMATE)
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## APPENDIX B: TRAFFIC VOLUME AND SPEED COUNTS

| NB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start | 1 | 16 | 21 | 26 | 31 | 36 | 41 | 46 | 51 | 56 | 61 | 66 | 71 | 76 |  | Pace | Number |
| Time | 15 | 20 | 25 | 30 | 35 | 40 | 45 | 50 | 55 | 60 | 65 | 70 | 75 | 999 | Total | Speed | in Pace |
| 01/22/22 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 11 | 13 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 51 | 46-55 | 24 |
| 01:00 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 12 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 51-60 | 23 |
| 02:00 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 9 | 9 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 33 | 46-55 | 18 |
| 03:00 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 38 | 46-55 | 13 |
| 04:00 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 10 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 51-60 | 16 |
| 05:00 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 10 | 11 | 16 | 16 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 70 | 56-65 | 32 |
| 06:00 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 18 | 17 | 13 | 4 | 12 | 4 | 1 | 91 | 46-55 | 35 |
| 07:00 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 39 | 45 | 47 | 25 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 182 | 51-60 | 92 |
| 08:00 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 26 | 48 | 48 | 53 | 31 | 10 | 3 | 1 | 244 | 51-60 | 101 |
| 09:00 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 29 | 76 | 111 | 79 | 35 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 368 | 51-60 | 190 |
| 10:00 | 12 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 11 | 40 | 91 | 141 | 62 | 21 | 10 | 3 | 1 | 402 | 46-55 | 232 |
| 11:00 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 77 | 116 | 116 | 74 | 19 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 442 | 46-55 | 232 |
| 12 PM | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 63 | 127 | 133 | 52 | 21 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 434 | 46-55 | 260 |
| 13:00 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 37 | 59 | 112 | 92 | 51 | 14 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 400 | 46-55 | 204 |
| 14:00 | 21 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 12 | 19 | 44 | 126 | 99 | 47 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 385 | 46-55 | 225 |
| 15:00 | 24 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 50 | 112 | 112 | 40 | 15 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 383 | 46-55 | 224 |
| 16:00 | 21 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 25 | 90 | 115 | 77 | 30 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 379 | 41-50 | 205 |
| 17:00 | 16 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 51 | 105 | 120 | 73 | 27 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 419 | 41-50 | 225 |
| 18:00 | 19 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 27 | 68 | 97 | 78 | 31 | 14 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 354 | 41-50 | 175 |
| 19:00 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 22 | 59 | 67 | 53 | 17 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 241 | 41-50 | 126 |
| 20:00 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 23 | 51 | 43 | 46 | 14 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 196 | 41-50 | 94 |
| 21:00 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 46 | 55 | 39 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 169 | 41-50 | 101 |
| 22:00 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 13 | 40 | 34 | 30 | 11 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 151 | 41-50 | 74 |
| 23:00 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 26 | 24 | 26 | 14 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 104 | 46-55 | 50 |
| Total | 256 | 5 | 16 | 18 | 87 | 356 | 946 | 1445 | 1348 | 709 | 280 | 100 | 29 | 11 | 5606 |  |  |
| Percent | 4.6\% | 0.1\% | 0.3\% | 0.3\% | 1.6\% | 6.4\% | 16.9\% | 25.8\% | 24.0\% | 12.6\% | 5.0\% | 1.8\% | 0.5\% | 0.2\% |  |  |  |
| AM Peak | 11:00 |  | 04:00 | 06:00 | 10:00 | 08:00 | 11:00 | 11:00 | 10:00 | 09:00 | 09:00 | 06:00 | 06:00 | 05:00 | 11:00 |  |  |
| Vol. | 22 |  | 1 | 1 | 9 | 12 | 77 | 116 | 141 | 79 | 35 | 12 | 4 | 1 | 442 |  |  |
| PM Peak | 12:00 | 15:00 | 17:00 | 18:00 | 18:00 | 18:00 | 17:00 | 12:00 | 12:00 | 12:00 | 12:00 | 15:00 | 13:00 | 13:00 | 12:00 |  |  |
| Vol. | 26 | 2 | 7 | 7 | 27 | 68 | 105 | 127 | 133 | 52 | 21 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 434 |  |  |


| NB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start | 1 | 16 | 21 | 26 | 31 | 36 | 41 | 46 | 51 | 56 | 61 | 66 | 71 | 76 |  | Pace | Number |
| Time | 15 | 20 | 25 | 30 | 35 | 40 | 45 | 50 | 55 | 60 | 65 | 70 | 75 | 999 | Total | Speed | in Pace |
| 01/23/22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 14 | 17 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 54 | 41-50 | 31 |
| 01:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 17 | 13 | 12 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 41-50 | 30 |
| 02:00 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 12 | 9 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 46-55 | 21 |
| 03:00 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 29 | 44-53 | 13 |
| 04:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 44-53 | 10 |
| 05:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 11 | 11 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 38 | 46-55 | 22 |
| 06:00 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 13 | 13 | 12 | 7 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 61 | 41-50 | 26 |
| 07:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 14 | 23 | 20 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 89 | 51-60 | 43 |
| 08:00 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 14 | 30 | 47 | 65 | 25 | 15 | 3 | 1 | 216 | 51-60 | 112 |
| 09:00 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 22 | 79 | 106 | 86 | 37 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 359 | 51-60 | 192 |
| 10:00 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 32 | 76 | 118 | 91 | 33 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 375 | 51-60 | 209 |
| 11:00 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 37 | 75 | 120 | 98 | 29 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 383 | 51-60 | 218 |
| 12 PM | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 28 | 73 | 91 | 66 | 32 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 322 | 46-55 | 164 |
| 13:00 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 56 | 95 | 114 | 69 | 20 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 396 | 46-55 | 209 |
| 14:00 | 13 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 31 | 65 | 111 | 78 | 28 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 359 | 51-60 | 189 |
| 15:00 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 39 | 77 | 110 | 78 | 28 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 360 | 49-58 | 188 |
| 16:00 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 9 | 36 | 114 | 87 | 63 | 25 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 364 | 46-55 | 201 |
| 17:00 | 14 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 8 | 46 | 80 | 137 | 75 | 42 | 10 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 430 | 41-50 | 217 |
| 18:00 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 39 | 64 | 85 | 56 | 21 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 293 | 41-50 | 149 |
| 19:00 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 16 | 61 | 70 | 55 | 21 | 9 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 251 | 41-50 | 131 |
| 20:00 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 34 | 52 | 42 | 23 | 15 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 187 | 46-55 | 94 |
| 21:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 25 | 28 | 40 | 16 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 126 | 46-55 | 68 |
| 22:00 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 16 | 19 | 24 | 18 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 96 | 46-55 | 43 |
| 23:00 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 16 | 20 | 13 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 66 | 46-55 | 36 |
| Total | 182 | 1 | 2 | 19 | 45 | 222 | 649 | 1186 | 1298 | 896 | 339 | 96 | 28 | 6 | 4969 |  |  |
| Percent | 3.7\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.9\% | 4.5\% | 13.1\% | 23.9\% | 26.1\% | 18.0\% | 6.8\% | 1.9\% | 0.6\% | 0.1\% |  |  |  |
| AM Peak | 09:00 | 02:00 |  | 03:00 | 08:00 | 11:00 | 11:00 | 09:00 | 11:00 | 11:00 | 09:00 | 08:00 | 09:00 | 03:00 | 11:00 |  |  |
| Vol. | 14 | 1 |  | 1 | 2 | 7 | 37 | 79 | 120 | 98 | 37 | 15 | 4 | 1 | 383 |  |  |
| PM Peak | 12:00 |  | 14:00 | 17:00 | 16:00 | 17:00 | 17:00 | 17:00 | 13:00 | 14:00 | 12:00 | 14:00 | 16:00 | 15:00 | 17:00 |  |  |
| Vol. | 22 |  | 1 | 12 | 8 | 46 | 80 | 137 | 114 | 78 | 32 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 430 |  |  |


| NB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start | 1 | 16 | 21 | 26 | 31 | 36 | 41 | 46 | 51 | 56 | 61 | 66 | 71 | 76 |  | Pace | Number |
| Time | 15 | 20 | 25 | 30 | 35 | 40 | 45 | 50 | 55 | 60 | 65 | 70 | 75 | 999 | Total | Speed | in Pace |
| 01/24/22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 12 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 43 | 50-59 | 19 |
| 01:00 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 29 | 46-55 | 13 |
| 02:00 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 51-60 | 12 |
| 03:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 16 | 10 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 43 | 51-60 | 26 |
| 04:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 20 | 14 | 20 | 10 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 73 | 51-60 | 34 |
| 05:00 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 19 | 32 | 43 | 60 | 40 | 22 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 233 | 46-55 | 103 |
| 06:00 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 13 | 64 | 107 | 84 | 30 | 17 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 347 | 46-55 | 191 |
| 07:00 | 63 | 22 | 69 | 50 | 47 | 59 | 102 | 144 | 90 | 27 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 684 | 41-50 | 246 |
| 08:00 | 28 | 6 | 5 | 13 | 19 | 27 | 95 | 103 | 122 | 57 | 28 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 512 | 46-55 | 225 |
| 09:00 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 25 | 77 | 105 | 66 | 13 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 326 | 46-55 | 182 |
| 10:00 | 14 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 34 | 91 | 103 | 61 | 18 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 340 | 46-55 | 194 |
| 11:00 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 45 | 85 | 96 | 66 | 19 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 342 | 46-55 | 181 |
| 12 PM | 17 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 24 | 44 | 83 | 83 | 59 | 17 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 343 | 46-55 | 166 |
| 13:00 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 24 | 63 | 100 | 101 | 62 | 22 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 402 | 46-55 | 201 |
| 14:00 | 40 | 5 | 16 | 17 | 29 | 52 | 70 | 118 | 78 | 34 | 10 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 473 | 46-55 | 196 |
| 15:00 | 37 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 12 | 44 | 94 | 124 | 100 | 47 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 484 | 46-55 | 224 |
| 16:00 | 51 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 21 | 80 | 135 | 104 | 40 | 12 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 464 | 46-55 | 239 |
| 17:00 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 14 | 48 | 99 | 117 | 66 | 36 | 12 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 442 | 41-50 | 216 |
| 18:00 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 10 | 31 | 67 | 114 | 58 | 26 | 12 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 344 | 41-50 | 181 |
| 19:00 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 14 | 55 | 66 | 48 | 25 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 240 | 41-50 | 121 |
| 20:00 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 17 | 31 | 35 | 29 | 32 | 10 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 165 | 41-50 | 66 |
| 21:00 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 15 | 50 | 39 | 22 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 151 | 46-55 | 89 |
| 22:00 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 16 | 24 | 33 | 19 | 8 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 115 | 46-55 | 57 |
| 23:00 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 21 | 12 | 12 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 63 | 46-55 | 33 |
| Total | 376 | 36 | 99 | 109 | 203 | 440 | 1054 | 1677 | 1466 | 809 | 280 | 102 | 25 | 7 | 6683 |  |  |
| Percent | 5.6\% | 0.5\% | 1.5\% | 1.6\% | 3.0\% | 6.6\% | 15.8\% | 25.1\% | 21.9\% | 12.1\% | 4.2\% | 1.5\% | 0.4\% | 0.1\% |  |  |  |
| AM Peak | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 08:00 | 09:00 | 08:00 | 06:00 | 09:00 | 06:00 | 07:00 |  |  |
| Vol. | 63 | 22 | 69 | 50 | 47 | 59 | 102 | 144 | 122 | 66 | 28 | 9 | 3 | 2 | 684 |  |  |
| PM Peak | 16:00 | 14:00 | 14:00 | 14:00 | 14:00 | 14:00 | 17:00 | 16:00 | 16:00 | 13:00 | 13:00 | 13:00 | 16:00 | 14:00 | 15:00 |  |  |
| Vol. | 51 | 5 | 16 | 17 | 29 | 52 | 99 | 135 | 104 | 62 | 22 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 484 |  |  |


| NB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start | 1 | 16 | 21 | 26 | 31 | 36 | 41 | 46 | 51 | 56 | 61 | 66 | 71 | 76 |  | Pace | Number |
| Time | 15 | 20 | 25 | 30 | 35 | 40 | 45 | 50 | 55 | 60 | 65 | 70 | 75 | 999 | Total | Speed | in Pace |
| 01/25/22 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 12 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 36 | 46-55 | 17 |
| 01:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 46-55 | 11 |
| 02:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 36-45 | 12 |
| 03:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 17 | 7 | 9 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 46-55 | 24 |
| 04:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 25 | 22 | 12 | 10 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 81 | 46-55 | 47 |
| 05:00 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 19 | 28 | 50 | 56 | 45 | 17 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 236 | 46-55 | 106 |
| 06:00 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 34 | 86 | 93 | 86 | 39 | 10 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 369 | 41-50 | 179 |
| 07:00 | 51 | 35 | 57 | 43 | 42 | 82 | 132 | 116 | 61 | 15 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 645 | 41-50 | 248 |
| 08:00 | 30 | 13 | 7 | 15 | 26 | 46 | 85 | 134 | 108 | 52 | 17 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 537 | 46-55 | 242 |
| 09:00 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 39 | 83 | 115 | 69 | 24 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 360 | 46-55 | 198 |
| 10:00 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 33 | 98 | 104 | 57 | 14 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 348 | 46-55 | 202 |
| 11:00 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 38 | 78 | 100 | 53 | 17 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 318 | 46-55 | 178 |
| 12 PM | 15 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 13 | 27 | 75 | 119 | 55 | 23 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 338 | 46-55 | 194 |
| 13:00 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 15 | 19 | 66 | 114 | 88 | 40 | 11 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 380 | 46-55 | 202 |
| 14:00 | 35 | 5 | 5 | 11 | 17 | 42 | 99 | 131 | 101 | 34 | 12 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 498 | 45-54 | 232 |
| 15:00 | 39 | 2 | 3 | 15 | 28 | 34 | 79 | 121 | 110 | 39 | 9 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 485 | 46-55 | 231 |
| 16:00 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 40 | 104 | 135 | 77 | 52 | 22 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 483 | 41-50 | 239 |
| 17:00 | 30 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 22 | 40 | 95 | 114 | 82 | 25 | 11 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 434 | 41-50 | 209 |
| 18:00 | 14 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 13 | 48 | 91 | 108 | 56 | 35 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 380 | 41-50 | 199 |
| 19:00 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 49 | 53 | 83 | 28 | 13 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 257 | 46-55 | 136 |
| 20:00 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 13 | 39 | 50 | 43 | 20 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 184 | 46-55 | 93 |
| 21:00 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 20 | 38 | 42 | 18 | 10 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 142 | 46-55 | 80 |
| 22:00 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 21 | 26 | 15 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 92 | 46-55 | 47 |
| 23:00 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 9 | 12 | 17 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 64 | 51-60 | 29 |
| Total | 346 | 56 | 74 | 121 | 208 | 490 | 1148 | 1676 | 1522 | 739 | 271 | 89 | 24 | 14 | 6778 |  |  |
| Percent | 5.1\% | 0.8\% | 1.1\% | 1.8\% | 3.1\% | 7.2\% | 16.9\% | 24.7\% | 22.5\% | 10.9\% | 4.0\% | 1.3\% | 0.4\% | 0.2\% |  |  |  |
| AM Peak | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 08:00 | 09:00 | 09:00 | 09:00 | 10:00 | 05:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 |  |  |
| Vol. | 51 | 35 | 57 | 43 | 42 | 82 | 132 | 134 | 115 | 69 | 24 | 9 | 2 | 3 | 645 |  |  |
| PM Peak | 15:00 | 14:00 | 14:00 | 15:00 | 15:00 | 18:00 | 16:00 | 16:00 | 12:00 | 12:00 | 12:00 | 19:00 | 15:00 | 22:00 | 14:00 |  |  |
| Vol. | 39 | 5 | 5 | 15 | 28 | 48 | 104 | 135 | 119 | 55 | 23 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 498 |  |  |


| NB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start | 1 | 16 | 21 | 26 | 31 | 36 | 41 | 46 | 51 | 56 | 61 | 66 | 71 | 76 |  | Pace | Number |
| Time | 15 | 20 | 25 | 30 | 35 | 40 | 45 | 50 | 55 | 60 | 65 | 70 | 75 | 999 | Total | Speed | in Pace |
| 01/26/22 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 46-55 | 16 |
| 01:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 31 | 47-56 | 13 |
| 02:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 26 | 46-55 | 14 |
| 03:00 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 16 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 47 | 51-60 | 25 |
| 04:00 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 14 | 19 | 18 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 74 | 51-60 | 37 |
| 05:00 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 33 | 54 | 64 | 54 | 18 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 243 | 46-55 | 118 |
| 06:00 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 20 | 49 | 112 | 111 | 62 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 385 | 46-55 | 223 |
| 07:00 | 38 | 13 | 25 | 34 | 55 | 97 | 164 | 158 | 96 | 40 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 732 | 41-50 | 322 |
| 08:00 | 20 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 9 | 22 | 60 | 133 | 152 | 93 | 29 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 536 | 46-55 | 285 |
| 09:00 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 18 | 31 | 75 | 107 | 85 | 32 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 372 | 51-60 | 192 |
| 10:00 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 15 | 57 | 86 | 75 | 51 | 28 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 339 | 46-55 | 161 |
| 11:00 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 40 | 85 | 78 | 64 | 26 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 316 | 46-55 | 163 |
| 12 PM | 32 | 1 | 0 | 17 | 31 | 48 | 78 | 90 | 84 | 51 | 12 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 447 | 46-55 | 174 |
| 13:00 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 24 | 80 | 100 | 123 | 65 | 23 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 461 | 46-55 | 223 |
| 14:00 | 26 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 7 | 23 | 54 | 102 | 102 | 61 | 20 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 412 | 46-55 | 204 |
| 15:00 | 37 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 8 | 35 | 78 | 116 | 116 | 44 | 15 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 465 | 46-55 | 232 |
| 16:00 | 34 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 30 | 56 | 93 | 102 | 53 | 20 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 406 | 46-55 | 195 |
| 17:00 | 25 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 24 | 73 | 90 | 115 | 86 | 31 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 463 | 41-50 | 205 |
| 18:00 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 47 | 93 | 101 | 72 | 21 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 376 | 41-50 | 194 |
| 19:00 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 34 | 73 | 85 | 50 | 23 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 292 | 41-50 | 158 |
| 20:00 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 15 | 48 | 70 | 57 | 24 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 232 | 46-55 | 127 |
| 21:00 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 23 | 41 | 25 | 20 | 16 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 140 | 46-55 | 66 |
| 22:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 12 | 19 | 26 | 14 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 93 | 46-55 | 45 |
| 23:00 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 12 | 17 | 10 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 55 | 46-55 | 29 |
| Total | 314 | 15 | 39 | 99 | 208 | 526 | 1142 | 1682 | 1596 | 915 | 305 | 99 | 30 | 9 | 6979 |  |  |
| Percent | 4.5\% | 0.2\% | 0.6\% | 1.4\% | 3.0\% | 7.5\% | 16.4\% | 24.1\% | 22.9\% | 13.1\% | 4.4\% | 1.4\% | 0.4\% | 0.1\% |  |  |  |
| AM Peak | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 08:00 | 08:00 | 09:00 | 09:00 | 05:00 | 10:00 | 07:00 |  |  |
| Vol. | 38 | 13 | 25 | 34 | 55 | 97 | 164 | 158 | 152 | 93 | 32 | 13 | 4 | 2 | 732 |  |  |
| PM Peak | 15:00 | 12:00 | 14:00 | 12:00 | 12:00 | 17:00 | 18:00 | 15:00 | 13:00 | 13:00 | 13:00 | 13:00 | 12:00 | 12:00 | 15:00 |  |  |
| Vol. | 37 | 1 | 3 | 17 | 31 | 73 | 93 | 116 | 123 | 65 | 23 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 465 |  |  |


| NB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start | 1 | 16 | 21 | 26 | 31 | 36 | 41 | 46 | 51 | 56 | 61 | 66 | 71 | 76 |  | Pace | Number |
| Time | 15 | 20 | 25 | 30 | 35 | 40 | 45 | 50 | 55 | 60 | 65 | 70 | 75 | 999 | Total | Speed | in Pace |
| 01/27/22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 11 | 10 | 9 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 47 | 46-55 | 21 |
| 01:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 46-55 | 16 |
| 02:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 32 | 41-50 | 14 |
| 03:00 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 8 | 9 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 51-60 | 17 |
| 04:00 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 17 | 25 | 13 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 46-55 | 42 |
| 05:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 25 | 58 | 68 | 44 | 20 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 233 | 46-55 | 126 |
| 06:00 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 36 | 59 | 88 | 102 | 47 | 16 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 372 | 46-55 | 190 |
| 07:00 | 54 | 28 | 34 | 51 | 47 | 60 | 126 | 134 | 86 | 30 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 656 | 41-50 | 260 |
| 08:00 | 23 | 3 | 4 | 9 | 12 | 20 | 69 | 166 | 152 | 75 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 550 | 46-55 | 318 |
| 09:00 | 19 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 40 | 108 | 95 | 79 | 18 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 383 | 46-55 | 203 |
| 10:00 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 13 | 37 | 75 | 71 | 58 | 28 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 313 | 46-55 | 146 |
| 11:00 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 44 | 102 | 101 | 55 | 17 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 340 | 46-55 | 203 |
| 12 PM | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 18 | 64 | 109 | 99 | 42 | 12 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 378 | 46-55 | 208 |
| 13:00 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 18 | 64 | 108 | 99 | 57 | 19 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 392 | 46-55 | 207 |
| 14:00 | 26 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 31 | 47 | 76 | 110 | 71 | 48 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 435 | 41-50 | 186 |
| 15:00 | 54 | 6 | 6 | 16 | 34 | 56 | 108 | 124 | 80 | 35 | 8 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 533 | 41-50 | 232 |
| 16:00 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 41 | 79 | 133 | 96 | 39 | 13 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 446 | 46-55 | 229 |
| 17:00 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 20 | 34 | 102 | 125 | 72 | 34 | 12 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 451 | 41-50 | 227 |
| 18:00 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 18 | 54 | 112 | 106 | 57 | 28 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 393 | 41-50 | 218 |
| 19:00 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 23 | 55 | 80 | 47 | 30 | 12 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 273 | 41-50 | 135 |
| 20:00 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 16 | 34 | 63 | 51 | 19 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 209 | 46-55 | 114 |
| 21:00 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 23 | 33 | 31 | 21 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 136 | 46-55 | 64 |
| 22:00 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 29 | 26 | 18 | 9 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 106 | 46-55 | 55 |
| 23:00 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 12 | 16 | 14 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 71 | 51-60 | 30 |
| Total | 383 | 40 | 53 | 102 | 206 | 483 | 1168 | 1810 | 1477 | 811 | 256 | 74 | 19 | 10 | 6892 |  |  |
| Percent | 5.6\% | 0.6\% | 0.8\% | 1.5\% | 3.0\% | 7.0\% | 16.9\% | 26.3\% | 21.4\% | 11.8\% | 3.7\% | 1.1\% | 0.3\% | 0.1\% |  |  |  |
| AM Peak | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 08:00 | 08:00 | 09:00 | 10:00 | 05:00 | 05:00 | 02:00 | 07:00 |  |  |
| Vol. | 54 | 28 | 34 | 51 | 47 | 60 | 126 | 166 | 152 | 79 | 28 | 10 | 3 | 1 | 656 |  |  |
| PM Peak | 15:00 | 15:00 | 14:00 | 15:00 | 15:00 | 15:00 | 18:00 | 16:00 | 12:00 | 13:00 | 13:00 | 12:00 | 13:00 | 12:00 | 15:00 |  |  |
| Vol. | 54 | 6 | 7 | 16 | 34 | 56 | 112 | 133 | 99 | 57 | 19 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 533 |  |  |


| NB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start | 1 | 16 | 21 | 26 | 31 | 36 | 41 | 46 | 51 | 56 | 61 | 66 | 71 | 76 |  | Pace | Number |
| Time | 15 | 20 | 25 | 30 | 35 | 40 | 45 | 50 | 55 | 60 | 65 | 70 | 75 | 999 | Total | Speed | in Pace |
| 01/28/22 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 12 | 12 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 46-55 | 24 |
| 01:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 54-63 | 9 |
| 02:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 9 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 46-55 | 17 |
| 03:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 13 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 44 | 46-55 | 21 |
| 04:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 14 | 22 | 26 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 89 | 51-60 | 48 |
| 05:00 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 17 | 45 | 66 | 63 | 19 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 221 | 51-60 | 129 |
| 06:00 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 17 | 55 | 90 | 109 | 55 | 16 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 373 | 46-55 | 199 |
| 07:00 | 52 | 13 | 14 | 28 | 38 | 70 | 100 | 175 | 110 | 50 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 662 | 46-55 | 285 |
| 08:00 | 15 | 5 | 5 | 12 | 13 | 22 | 88 | 154 | 127 | 70 | 20 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 540 | 46-55 | 281 |
| 09:00 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 40 | 88 | 97 | 62 | 22 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 352 | 46-55 | 185 |
| 10:00 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 17 | 64 | 102 | 89 | 52 | 14 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 360 | 46-55 | 191 |
| 11:00 | 16 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 20 | 58 | 97 | 85 | 57 | 17 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 360 | 46-55 | 182 |
| 12 PM | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 20 | 68 | 119 | 108 | 43 | 20 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 396 | 46-55 | 227 |
| 13:00 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 26 | 87 | 107 | 105 | 43 | 16 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 418 | 46-55 | 212 |
| 14:00 | 28 | 3 | 5 | 10 | 13 | 31 | 69 | 153 | 111 | 31 | 14 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 474 | 46-55 | 264 |
| 15:00 | 59 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 20 | 60 | 143 | 114 | 86 | 27 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 536 | 41-50 | 257 |
| 16:00 | 39 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 21 | 40 | 85 | 111 | 89 | 36 | 21 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 464 | 46-55 | 200 |
| 17:00 | 49 | 2 | 3 | 15 | 19 | 79 | 117 | 99 | 51 | 27 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 471 | 41-50 | 216 |
| 18:00 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 18 | 58 | 129 | 103 | 59 | 21 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 419 | 41-50 | 232 |
| 19:00 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 32 | 73 | 87 | 62 | 29 | 12 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 321 | 41-50 | 160 |
| 20:00 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 17 | 43 | 43 | 44 | 33 | 12 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 212 | 46-55 | 87 |
| 21:00 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 16 | 33 | 61 | 49 | 14 | 9 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 209 | 46-55 | 110 |
| 22:00 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 12 | 23 | 31 | 24 | 13 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 119 | 49-58 | 55 |
| 23:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 19 | 21 | 35 | 10 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 99 | 46-55 | 56 |
| Total | 389 | 26 | 40 | 93 | 185 | 565 | 1325 | 1842 | 1569 | 793 | 294 | 95 | 19 | 10 | 7245 |  |  |
| Percent | 5.4\% | 0.4\% | 0.6\% | 1.3\% | 2.6\% | 7.8\% | 18.3\% | 25.4\% | 21.7\% | 10.9\% | 4.1\% | 1.3\% | 0.3\% | 0.1\% |  |  |  |
| AM Peak | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 08:00 | 08:00 | 09:00 | 06:00 | 06:00 | 04:00 | 07:00 |  |  |
| Vol. | 52 | 13 | 14 | 28 | 38 | 70 | 100 | 175 | 127 | 70 | 22 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 662 |  |  |
| PM Peak | 15:00 | 14:00 | 14:00 | 17:00 | 16:00 | 17:00 | 15:00 | 14:00 | 14:00 | 12:00 | 16:00 | 21:00 | 22:00 | 19:00 | 15:00 |  |  |
| Vol. | 59 | 3 | 5 | 15 | 21 | 79 | 143 | 153 | 111 | 43 | 21 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 536 |  |  |
| Total | 2246 | 179 | 323 | 561 | 1142 | 3082 | 7432 | 11318 | 10276 | 5672 | 2025 | 655 | 174 | 67 | 45152 |  |  |
| Percent | 5.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.7\% | 1.2\% | 2.5\% | 6.8\% | 16.5\% | 25.1\% | 22.8\% | 12.6\% | 4.5\% | 1.5\% | 0.4\% | 0.1\% |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Percen |  | 38 MPH |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Perce |  | 48 MPH |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Perce |  | 56 MPH |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Perce |  | 61 MPH |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stats |  | 10 MP | Pace Sp |  | 55 MPH |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | ber in P |  | 21594 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | ent in P |  | 47.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Num | of Vehi | $>45 \mathrm{M}$ |  | 30187 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Perc | of Vehic | $>45 \mathrm{M}$ |  | 66.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Mean S | d(Avera |  | 47 MPH |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| SB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start | 1 | 16 | 21 | 26 | 31 | 36 | 41 | 46 | 51 | 56 | 61 | 66 | 71 | 76 |  | Pace | Number |
| Time | 15 | 20 | 25 | 30 | 35 | 40 | 45 | 50 | 55 | 60 | 65 | 70 | 75 | 999 | Total | Speed | in Pace |
| 01/22/22 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 22 | 11 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 40-49 | 33 |
| 01:00 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 32 | 12 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 41-50 | 44 |
| 02:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 9 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 36-45 | 15 |
| 03:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 14 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 | 41-50 | 27 |
| 04:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 40-49 | 13 |
| 05:00 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 14 | 11 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 41-50 | 25 |
| 06:00 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 26 | 35 | 20 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103 | 36-45 | 61 |
| 07:00 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 37 | 50 | 23 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 136 | 36-45 | 87 |
| 08:00 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 59 | 93 | 29 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 216 | 36-45 | 152 |
| 09:00 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 86 | 113 | 51 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 285 | 36-45 | 199 |
| 10:00 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 29 | 85 | 125 | 70 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 333 | 36-45 | 210 |
| 11:00 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 25 | 127 | 158 | 48 | 9 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 392 | 36-45 | 285 |
| 12 PM | 24 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 22 | 114 | 181 | 71 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 436 | 36-45 | 295 |
| 13:00 | 24 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 18 | 105 | 181 | 93 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 444 | 36-45 | 286 |
| 14:00 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 111 | 224 | 82 | 19 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 468 | 36-45 | 335 |
| 15:00 | 29 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 17 | 116 | 183 | 69 | 12 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 440 | 36-45 | 299 |
| 16:00 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 34 | 164 | 168 | 75 | 15 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 486 | 36-45 | 332 |
| 17:00 | 19 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 48 | 143 | 157 | 42 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 429 | 36-45 | 300 |
| 18:00 | 13 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 34 | 112 | 117 | 28 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 315 | 36-45 | 229 |
| 19:00 | 10 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 27 | 80 | 92 | 38 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 258 | 36-45 | 172 |
| 20:00 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 80 | 87 | 25 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 229 | 36-45 | 167 |
| 21:00 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 65 | 76 | 30 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 201 | 36-45 | 141 |
| 22:00 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 49 | 70 | 30 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 174 | 36-45 | 119 |
| 23:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 25 | 39 | 21 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 93 | 36-45 | 64 |
| Total | 253 | 9 | 8 | 47 | 380 | 1626 | 2248 | 900 | 172 | 27 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5678 |  |  |
| Percent | 4.5\% | 0.2\% | 0.1\% | 0.8\% | 6.7\% | 28.6\% | 39.6\% | 15.9\% | 3.0\% | 0.5\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |  |  |  |
| AM Peak | 11:00 |  |  | 09:00 | 10:00 | 11:00 | 11:00 | 10:00 | 11:00 | 11:00 | 11:00 |  | 09:00 |  | 11:00 |  |  |
| Vol. | 17 |  |  | 5 | 29 | 127 | 158 | 70 | 9 | 4 | 2 |  | 1 |  | 392 |  |  |
| PM Peak | 15:00 | 13:00 | 19:00 | 17:00 | 17:00 | 16:00 | 14:00 | 13:00 | 14:00 | 15:00 | 15:00 |  |  | 12:00 | 16:00 |  |  |
| Vol. | 29 | 5 | 3 | 10 | 48 | 164 | 224 | 93 | 19 | 3 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 486 |  |  |


| SB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start | 1 | 16 | 21 | 26 | 31 | 36 | 41 | 46 | 51 | 56 | 61 | 66 | 71 | 76 |  | Pace | Number |
| Time | 15 | 20 | 25 | 30 | 35 | 40 | 45 | 50 | 55 | 60 | 65 | 70 | 75 | 999 | Total | Speed | in Pace |
| 01/23/22 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 17 | 20 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 41-50 | 37 |
| 01:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 17 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 36-45 | 24 |
| 02:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 13 | 10 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 41-50 | 23 |
| 03:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 41-50 | 11 |
| 04:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 11 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 36-45 | 20 |
| 05:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 36-45 | 14 |
| 06:00 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 23 | 12 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 41-50 | 35 |
| 07:00 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 33 | 24 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 81 | 41-50 | 57 |
| 08:00 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 34 | 73 | 47 | 13 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 177 | 41-50 | 120 |
| 09:00 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 31 | 122 | 80 | 30 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 290 | 41-50 | 202 |
| 10:00 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 | 139 | 80 | 14 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 306 | 41-50 | 219 |
| 11:00 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 67 | 158 | 83 | 22 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 352 | 41-50 | 241 |
| 12 PM | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 106 | 206 | 99 | 24 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 459 | 36-45 | 312 |
| 13:00 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 74 | 195 | 96 | 21 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 416 | 41-50 | 291 |
| 14:00 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 50 | 158 | 134 | 28 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 392 | 41-50 | 292 |
| 15:00 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 52 | 155 | 109 | 23 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 367 | 41-50 | 264 |
| 16:00 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 77 | 182 | 101 | 17 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 406 | 41-50 | 283 |
| 17:00 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 32 | 99 | 121 | 64 | 12 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 349 | 36-45 | 220 |
| 18:00 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 60 | 126 | 77 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 307 | 41-50 | 203 |
| 19:00 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 54 | 92 | 67 | 19 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 251 | 41-50 | 159 |
| 20:00 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 52 | 70 | 61 | 22 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 219 | 41-50 | 131 |
| 21:00 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 24 | 56 | 31 | 16 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 136 | 41-50 | 87 |
| 22:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 17 | 39 | 37 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 107 | 41-50 | 76 |
| 23:00 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 26 | 20 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 | 41-50 | 46 |
| Total | 186 | 1 | 1 | 13 | 122 | 929 | 2043 | 1268 | 312 | 54 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4936 |  |  |
| Percent | 3.8\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.3\% | 2.5\% | 18.8\% | 41.4\% | 25.7\% | 6.3\% | 1.1\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |  |  |  |
| AM Peak | 09:00 |  |  | 05:00 | 09:00 | 11:00 | 11:00 | 11:00 | 09:00 | 11:00 | 08:00 | 07:00 | 11:00 |  | 11:00 |  |  |
| Vol. | 16 |  |  | 3 | 9 | 67 | 158 | 83 | 30 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 352 |  |  |
| PM Peak | 15:00 | 23:00 | 20:00 | 17:00 | 17:00 | 12:00 | 12:00 | 14:00 | 14:00 | 15:00 | 15:00 |  |  |  | 12:00 |  |  |
| Vol. | 18 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 32 | 106 | 206 | 134 | 28 | 8 | 1 |  |  |  | 459 |  |  |


| SB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start | 1 | 16 | 21 | 26 | 31 | 36 | 41 | 46 | 51 | 56 | 61 | 66 | 71 | 76 |  | Pace | Number |
| Time | 15 | 20 | 25 | 30 | 35 | 40 | 45 | 50 | 55 | 60 | 65 | 70 | 75 | 999 | Total | Speed | in Pace |
| 01/24/22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 41-50 | 26 |
| 01:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 12 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 41-50 | 19 |
| 02:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 41-50 | 8 |
| 03:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 41-50 | 10 |
| 04:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 11 | 13 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 41-50 | 24 |
| 05:00 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 39 | 18 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 92 | 36-45 | 63 |
| 06:00 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 65 | 69 | 49 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 206 | 36-45 | 134 |
| 07:00 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 23 | 90 | 142 | 81 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 423 | 36-45 | 232 |
| 08:00 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 15 | 57 | 159 | 82 | 15 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 365 | 41-50 | 241 |
| 09:00 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 63 | 135 | 68 | 14 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 307 | 41-50 | 203 |
| 10:00 | 20 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 75 | 139 | 57 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 315 | 36-45 | 214 |
| 11:00 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 77 | 147 | 93 | 18 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 360 | 41-50 | 240 |
| 12 PM | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 18 | 79 | 171 | 71 | 19 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 377 | 36-45 | 250 |
| 13:00 | 18 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 12 | 109 | 157 | 69 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 382 | 36-45 | 266 |
| 14:00 | 23 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 15 | 117 | 244 | 98 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 518 | 36-45 | 361 |
| 15:00 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 191 | 277 | 100 | 17 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 650 | 36-45 | 468 |
| 16:00 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 17 | 197 | 319 | 102 | 15 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 693 | 36-45 | 516 |
| 17:00 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 45 | 193 | 269 | 84 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 642 | 36-45 | 462 |
| 18:00 | 12 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 26 | 125 | 157 | 66 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 398 | 36-45 | 282 |
| 19:00 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 88 | 141 | 53 | 12 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 312 | 36-45 | 229 |
| 20:00 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 29 | 95 | 54 | 11 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 209 | 41-50 | 149 |
| 21:00 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 22 | 57 | 29 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 135 | 41-50 | 86 |
| 22:00 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 27 | 47 | 21 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 112 | 36-45 | 74 |
| 23:00 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 26 | 23 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 41-50 | 49 |
| Total | 340 | 2 | 7 | 33 | 270 | 1649 | 2827 | 1268 | 248 | 49 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 6703 |  |  |
| Percent | 5.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.1\% | 0.5\% | 4.0\% | 24.6\% | 42.2\% | 18.9\% | 3.7\% | 0.7\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |  |  |  |
| AM Peak | 07:00 | 10:00 |  | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 08:00 | 11:00 | 11:00 | 09:00 | 08:00 |  |  | 08:00 | 07:00 |  |  |
| Vol. | 68 | 1 |  | 8 | 23 | 90 | 159 | 93 | 18 | 7 | 2 |  |  | 1 | 423 |  |  |
| PM Peak | 17:00 | 23:00 | 13:00 | 16:00 | 17:00 | 16:00 | 16:00 | 16:00 | 14:00 | 12:00 | 17:00 | 17:00 |  | 16:00 | 16:00 |  |  |
| Vol. | 37 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 45 | 197 | 319 | 102 | 20 | 7 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 693 |  |  |


| SB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start | 1 | 16 | 21 | 26 | 31 | 36 | 41 | 46 | 51 | 56 | 61 | 66 | 71 | 76 |  | Pace | Number |
| Time | 15 | 20 | 25 | 30 | 35 | 40 | 45 | 50 | 55 | 60 | 65 | 70 | 75 | 999 | Total | Speed | in Pace |
| 01/25/22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 12 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 36-45 | 21 |
| 01:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 41-50 | 16 |
| 02:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 41-50 | 10 |
| 03:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 9 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 36-45 | 18 |
| 04:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 10 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 36-45 | 22 |
| 05:00 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 18 | 27 | 21 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85 | 41-50 | 48 |
| 06:00 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 24 | 77 | 75 | 23 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 213 | 36-45 | 152 |
| 07:00 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 53 | 131 | 100 | 34 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 404 | 36-45 | 231 |
| 08:00 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 30 | 90 | 151 | 49 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 369 | 36-45 | 241 |
| 09:00 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 63 | 119 | 69 | 18 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 296 | 41-50 | 188 |
| 10:00 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 16 | 51 | 137 | 76 | 19 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 324 | 41-50 | 213 |
| 11:00 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 83 | 154 | 75 | 19 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 354 | 36-45 | 237 |
| 12 PM | 13 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 63 | 107 | 108 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 317 | 41-50 | 215 |
| 13:00 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 103 | 183 | 71 | 23 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 400 | 36-45 | 286 |
| 14:00 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 102 | 234 | 152 | 40 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 573 | 41-50 | 386 |
| 15:00 | 36 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 24 | 120 | 265 | 156 | 29 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 646 | 41-50 | 421 |
| 16:00 | 33 | 0 | 10 | 6 | 17 | 118 | 289 | 172 | 38 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 688 | 41-50 | 461 |
| 17:00 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 36 | 186 | 300 | 124 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 704 | 36-45 | 486 |
| 18:00 | 19 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 110 | 156 | 98 | 22 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 426 | 36-45 | 266 |
| 19:00 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 60 | 132 | 65 | 28 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 304 | 41-50 | 197 |
| 20:00 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 28 | 85 | 73 | 21 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 222 | 41-50 | 158 |
| 21:00 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 30 | 59 | 53 | 19 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 173 | 41-50 | 112 |
| 22:00 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 44 | 40 | 16 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 119 | 41-50 | 84 |
| 23:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 23 | 24 | 14 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 41-50 | 47 |
| Total | 335 | 3 | 11 | 62 | 289 | 1486 | 2686 | 1511 | 395 | 54 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6839 |  |  |
| Percent | 4.9\% | 0.0\% | 0.2\% | 0.9\% | 4.2\% | 21.7\% | 39.3\% | 22.1\% | 5.8\% | 0.8\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |  |  |  |
| AM Peak | 07:00 |  |  | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 11:00 | 10:00 | 10:00 | 00:00 |  | 00:00 |  |  | 07:00 |  |  |
| Vol. | 54 |  |  | 21 | 53 | 131 | 154 | 76 | 19 | 4 |  | 1 |  |  | 404 |  |  |
| PM Peak | 15:00 | 15:00 | 16:00 | 16:00 | 17:00 | 17:00 | 17:00 | 16:00 | 14:00 | 15:00 | 19:00 |  |  |  | 17:00 |  |  |
| Vol. | 36 | 2 | 10 | 6 | 36 | 186 | 300 | 172 | 40 | 10 | 2 |  |  |  | 704 |  |  |


| SB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start | 1 | 16 | 21 | 26 | 31 | 36 | 41 | 46 | 51 | 56 | 61 | 66 | 71 | 76 |  | Pace | Number |
| Time | 15 | 20 | 25 | 30 | 35 | 40 | 45 | 50 | 55 | 60 | 65 | 70 | 75 | 999 | Total | Speed | in Pace |
| 01/26/22 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 15 | 15 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 | 41-50 | 30 |
| 01:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 9 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 41-50 | 20 |
| 02:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 41-50 | 18 |
| 03:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 43-52 | 11 |
| 04:00 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 16 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 40-49 | 23 |
| 05:00 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 13 | 29 | 22 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84 | 41-50 | 51 |
| 06:00 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 48 | 76 | 67 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 221 | 41-50 | 143 |
| 07:00 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 18 | 82 | 169 | 82 | 29 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 414 | 37-46 | 251 |
| 08:00 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 61 | 142 | 93 | 13 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 349 | 41-50 | 235 |
| 09:00 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 55 | 129 | 80 | 14 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 296 | 41-50 | 209 |
| 10:00 | 19 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 57 | 142 | 72 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 315 | 41-50 | 214 |
| 11:00 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 80 | 137 | 86 | 16 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 346 | 41-50 | 223 |
| 12 PM | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 116 | 218 | 115 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 495 | 36-45 | 334 |
| 13:00 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 89 | 155 | 109 | 27 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 428 | 41-50 | 264 |
| 14:00 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 86 | 239 | 136 | 30 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 533 | 41-50 | 375 |
| 15:00 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 119 | 290 | 138 | 26 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 643 | 41-50 | 428 |
| 16:00 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 19 | 116 | 309 | 191 | 32 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 704 | 41-50 | 500 |
| 17:00 | 54 | 11 | 12 | 6 | 49 | 170 | 289 | 109 | 17 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 719 | 36-45 | 459 |
| 18:00 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 107 | 194 | 95 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 438 | 36-45 | 301 |
| 19:00 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 54 | 124 | 82 | 15 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 297 | 41-50 | 206 |
| 20:00 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 46 | 108 | 67 | 17 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 249 | 41-50 | 175 |
| 21:00 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 23 | 81 | 54 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 180 | 41-50 | 135 |
| 22:00 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 25 | 43 | 33 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 119 | 41-50 | 76 |
| 23:00 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 20 | 21 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 41-50 | 41 |
| Total | 350 | 11 | 14 | 24 | 232 | 1365 | 2947 | 1701 | 332 | 58 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7047 |  |  |
| Percent | 5.0\% | 0.2\% | 0.2\% | 0.3\% | 3.3\% | 19.4\% | 41.8\% | 24.1\% | 4.7\% | 0.8\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |  |  |  |
| AM Peak | 07:00 |  | 10:00 | 10:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 08:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 00:00 | 11:00 |  |  | 07:00 |  |  |
| Vol. | 27 |  | 1 | 5 | 18 | 82 | 169 | 93 | 29 | 6 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 414 |  |  |
| PM Peak | 17:00 | 17:00 | 17:00 | 16:00 | 17:00 | 17:00 | 16:00 | 16:00 | 16:00 | 13:00 | 16:00 |  |  | 16:00 | 17:00 |  |  |
| Vol. | 54 | 11 | 12 | 6 | 49 | 170 | 309 | 191 | 32 | 6 | 2 |  |  | 2 | 719 |  |  |


| SB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Start | 1 | 16 | 21 | 26 | 31 | 36 | 41 | 46 | 51 | 56 | 61 | 66 | 71 | 76 |  | Pace | Number |
| Time | 15 | 20 | 25 | 30 | 35 | 40 | 45 | 50 | 55 | 60 | 65 | 70 | 75 | 999 | Total | Speed | in Pace |
| 01/27/22 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 18 | 11 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 39-48 | 29 |
| 01:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 11 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 41-50 | 22 |
| 02:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 41-50 | 11 |
| 03:00 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 41-50 | 17 |
| 04:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 12 | 9 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 41-50 | 21 |
| 05:00 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 19 | 42 | 21 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 99 | 41-50 | 63 |
| 06:00 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 46 | 84 | 33 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 197 | 36-45 | 130 |
| 07:00 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 114 | 157 | 70 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 413 | 36-45 | 271 |
| 08:00 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 82 | 125 | 77 | 18 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 348 | 36-45 | 207 |
| 09:00 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 57 | 133 | 59 | 16 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 295 | 40-49 | 192 |
| 10:00 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 66 | 121 | 70 | 17 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 289 | 41-50 | 191 |
| 11:00 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 69 | 151 | 78 | 19 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 355 | 41-50 | 229 |
| 12 PM | 22 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 87 | 164 | 85 | 13 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 395 | 36-45 | 251 |
| 13:00 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 67 | 155 | 119 | 24 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 395 | 41-50 | 274 |
| 14:00 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 17 | 156 | 281 | 95 | 18 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 612 | 36-45 | 437 |
| 15:00 | 53 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 21 | 142 | 270 | 112 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 622 | 36-45 | 412 |
| 16:00 | 41 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 28 | 167 | 303 | 145 | 22 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 721 | 36-45 | 470 |
| 17:00 | 42 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 38 | 201 | 291 | 90 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 687 | 36-45 | 492 |
| 18:00 | 21 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 27 | 139 | 178 | 66 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 459 | 36-45 | 317 |
| 19:00 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 62 | 131 | 67 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 289 | 41-50 | 198 |
| 20:00 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 42 | 117 | 69 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 245 | 41-50 | 186 |
| 21:00 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 84 | 56 | 13 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 202 | 41-50 | 140 |
| 22:00 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 45 | 39 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 107 | 41-50 | 84 |
| 23:00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 33 | 20 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 | 41-50 | 53 |
| Total | 395 | 4 | 10 | 37 | 249 | 1590 | 2915 | 1421 | 280 | 51 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6961 |  |  |
| Percent | 5.7\% | 0.1\% | 0.1\% | 0.5\% | 3.6\% | 22.8\% | 41.9\% | 20.4\% | 4.0\% | 0.7\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |  |  |  |
| AM Peak | 07:00 | 03:00 |  | 05:00 | 11:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 11:00 | 11:00 | 07:00 | 09:00 |  |  |  | 07:00 |  |  |
| Vol. | 45 | 1 |  | 2 | 17 | 114 | 157 | 78 | 19 | 3 | 2 |  |  |  | 413 |  |  |
| PM Peak | 15:00 | 15:00 | 18:00 | 18:00 | 17:00 | 17:00 | 16:00 | 16:00 | 13:00 | 21:00 | 12:00 |  |  |  | 16:00 |  |  |
| Vol. | 53 | 3 | 4 | 12 | 38 | 201 | 303 | 145 | 24 | 5 | 2 |  |  |  | 721 |  |  |



| Start | 22-Jan-22 |  | 23-Jan-22 |  | 24-Jan-22 |  | 25-Jan-22 |  | 26-Jan-22 |  | 27-Jan-22 |  | 28-Jan-22 |  | Week Average |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time | NB | SB | NB | SB | NB | SB | NB | SB | NB | SB | NB | SB | NB | SB | NB | SB |
| 12:00 AM | 51 | 54 | 54 | 58 | 43 | 39 | 36 | 45 | 36 | 42 | 47 | 50 | 46 | 37 | 45 | 46 |
| 01:00 | 37 | 64 | 54 | 31 | 29 | 28 | 28 | 23 | 31 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 27 | 24 | 34 | 33 |
| 02:00 | 33 | 20 | 38 | 34 | 25 | 10 | 31 | 16 | 26 | 26 | 32 | 14 | 33 | 11 | 31 | 19 |
| 03:00 | 38 | 37 | 29 | 17 | 43 | 19 | 52 | 26 | 47 | 15 | 40 | 25 | 44 | 35 | 42 | 25 |
| 04:00 | 33 | 23 | 23 | 29 | 73 | 38 | 81 | 35 | 74 | 45 | 73 | 35 | 89 | 46 | 64 | 36 |
| 05:00 | 70 | 42 | 38 | 24 | 233 | 92 | 236 | 85 | 243 | 84 | 233 | 99 | 221 | 81 | 182 | 72 |
| 06:00 | 91 | 103 | 61 | 54 | 347 | 206 | 369 | 213 | 385 | 221 | 372 | 197 | 373 | 209 | 285 | 172 |
| 07:00 | 182 | 136 | 89 | 81 | 684 | 423 | 645 | 404 | 732 | 414 | 656 | 413 | 662 | 427 | 521 | 328 |
| 08:00 | 244 | 216 | 216 | 177 | 512 | 365 | 537 | 369 | 536 | 349 | 550 | 348 | 540 | 341 | 448 | 309 |
| 09:00 | 368 | 285 | 359 | 290 | 326 | 307 | 360 | 296 | 372 | 296 | 383 | 295 | 352 | 287 | 360 | 294 |
| 10:00 | 402 | 333 | 375 | 306 | 340 | 315 | 348 | 324 | 339 | 315 | 313 | 289 | 360 | 321 | 354 | 315 |
| 11:00 | 442 | 392 | 383 | 352 | 342 | 360 | 318 | 354 | 316 | 346 | 340 | 355 | 360 | 409 | 357 | 367 |
| 12:00 PM | 434 | 436 | 322 | 459 | 343 | 377 | 338 | 317 | 447 | 495 | 378 | 395 | 396 | 392 | 380 | 410 |
| 01:00 | 400 | 444 | 396 | 416 | 402 | 382 | 380 | 400 | 461 | 428 | 392 | 395 | 418 | 469 | 407 | 419 |
| 02:00 | 385 | 468 | 359 | 392 | 473 | 518 | 498 | 573 | 412 | 533 | 435 | 612 | 474 | 614 | 434 | 530 |
| 03:00 | 383 | 440 | 360 | 367 | 484 | 650 | 485 | 646 | 465 | 643 | 533 | 622 | 536 | 650 | 464 | 574 |
| 04:00 | 379 | 486 | 364 | 406 | 464 | 693 | 483 | 688 | 406 | 704 | 446 | 721 | 464 | 714 | 429 | 630 |
| 05:00 | 419 | 429 | 430 | 349 | 442 | 642 | 434 | 704 | 463 | 719 | 451 | 687 | 471 | 651 | 444 | 597 |
| 06:00 | 354 | 315 | 293 | 307 | 344 | 398 | 380 | 426 | 376 | 438 | 393 | 459 | 419 | 491 | 366 | 405 |
| 07:00 | 241 | 258 | 251 | 251 | 240 | 312 | 257 | 304 | 292 | 297 | 273 | 289 | 321 | 344 | 268 | 294 |
| 08:00 | 196 | 229 | 187 | 219 | 165 | 209 | 184 | 222 | 232 | 249 | 209 | 245 | 212 | 265 | 198 | 234 |
| 09:00 | 169 | 201 | 126 | 136 | 151 | 135 | 142 | 173 | 140 | 180 | 136 | 202 | 209 | 232 | 153 | 180 |
| 10:00 | 151 | 174 | 96 | 107 | 115 | 112 | 92 | 119 | 93 | 119 | 106 | 107 | 119 | 183 | 110 | 132 |
| 11:00 | 104 | 93 | 66 | 74 | 63 | 73 | 64 | 77 | 55 | 59 | 71 | 77 | 99 | 106 | 75 | 80 |
| Total | 5606 | 5678 | 4969 | 4936 | 6683 | 6703 | 6778 | 6839 | 6979 | 7047 | 6892 | 6961 | 7245 | 7339 | 6451 | 6501 |
| Day | 11284 |  | 9905 |  | 13386 |  | 13617 |  | 14026 07:00 07:00 |  | 13853 07:00 07:00 |  | 14584 |  | 12952 |  |
| AM Peak | 11:00 | 11:00 | 11:00 | 11:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 |  |  | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 11:00 |
| Vol. | 442 | 392 | 383 | 352 | 684 | 423 | 645 | 404 | 732 | 414 |  |  | 656 | 413 | 662 | 427 | 521 | 367 |
| PM Peak | 12:00 | 16:00 | 17:00 | 12:00 | 15:00 | 16:00 | 14:00 | 17:00 | 15:00 | 17:00 | 15:00 | 16:00 | 15:00 | 16:00 | 15:00 | 16:00 |
| Vol. | 434 | 486 | 430 | 459 | 484 | 693 | 498 | 704 | 465 | 719 | 533 | 721 | 536 | 714 | 464 | 630 |
| Comb. Total | 11284 |  | 9905 |  | 13386 |  | 13617 |  | 14026 |  | 13853 |  | 14584 |  | 12952 |  |
| ADT | ADT 12,951 |  | AADT 12,951 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## APPENDIX C: "LEISURE VISTAS" BACKGROUND TRAFFIC STUDY

## INTRODUCTION

This Transportation and Circulation section discusses existing (2004) and future (2025) transportation and circulation conditions associated with the Leisure Vistas development. The analysis includes consideration of automobile traffic impacts on roadway capacity, transit impacts, bicycle impacts, and pedestrian impacts. Quantitative analyses of a.m. and p.m. peak hour conditions have been conducted for the following scenarios:

- Existing Without Project
- Existing With Project
- Future Without Project
- Future With Project


## PROPOSED PROJECT

As illustrated in Figure 1, the project site is located north of Claire Avenue and west of Rio Linda Boulevard in the Robla area of the City of Sacramento. Figure 2 illustrates the proposed site plan.

A total of 915 residential units are proposed, consisting of courtyard units (congregate care facility), assisted living units, and cottage units (attached senior housing). The residential units are proposed to be located on parcels 1, 2, and 3 (see Figure 2). A neighborhood shopping center of 43,000 square feet is proposed on parcel 4 adjacent to Rio Linda Boulevard. Parcel 5 is proposed for development as 3.8 net acres of park.

The proposed site roadway system is illustrated on Figure 2. Access is provided to Rio Linda Boulevard, to Sully Street at the intersection with Claire Avenue, and to Claire Avenue about midway between Sully Street and Rio Linda Boulevard. The site roadway system will provide an indirect connection through the site between Sully Street (at Claire Avenue) and Rio Linda Boulevard. For analysis purposes, it is assumed that Claire Avenue will be completed between Rio Linda Boulevard and Sully Street.

The site roadway system described above is planned with design elements to provide an environment that results in appropriate speeds for a residential development and to minimize through traffic.

## ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Figure 1 illustrates the roadway system near the project site.

## Roadway System - Regional Access

Regional automobile access to the site is provided primarily by the I-80 freeway located about 1.4 miles south of the site. I-80 is an east-west interstate freeway extending from San Francisco to the west to New Jersey to the east. I-80 is a six-lane freeway in the site vicinity. To the west, it
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Figure 2 SITE PLAN
provides access to I-5. Near the site, I-80 has full interchanges at Norwood Avenue and at Raley Boulevard.

## Roadway System - Local Access

Direct access to the site is provided via Rio Linda Boulevard, Claire Avenue, and Sully Street. Other roadways providing site access include Norwood Avenue, Main Avenue, Bell Avenue, and Marysville Boulevard.

Rio Linda Boulevard is a north-south roadway that forms the eastern boundary of the site. To the south, Rio Linda Boulevard extends to El Camino Avenue and Del Paso Boulevard in the North Sacramento area of the City of Sacramento. To the north, Rio Linda Boulevard extends to the Rio Linda and Elverta areas of unincorporated Sacramento County. In the site vicinity, Rio Linda Boulevard has one travel lane in each direction. Rio Linda Boulevard has signalized intersections at Claire Avenue / Marysville Boulevard and at Bell Avenue.

Claire Avenue is a two-lane east-west local street. Claire Avenue extends westerly from Rio Linda Boulevard about 1500 feet toward Sully Street. The easterly leg of its intersection with Rio Linda Boulevard is Marysville Boulevard. Claire Avenue also extends easterly from Marysville Boulevard southeast of the intersection of Rio Linda Boulevard.

Sully Street is a two-lane north-south local street. It begins at Main Avenue and extends northerly to the site. The southerly leg of its signalized intersection with Main Avenue is Norwood Avenue.

Norwood Avenue is a north-south roadway that begins at Main Avenue and extends southerly to Grove Avenue in the North Sacramento area of the City of Sacramento. Norwood Avenue provides direct access from the site to I-80. Norwood Avenue has signalized intersections at Main Avenue / Sully Street and at Bell Avenue. North of Bell Avenue, Norwood Avenue has one travel lane in each direction.

Main Avenue is an east-west roadway located about 0.5 miles south of the site. To the west, it becomes Del Paso Road and provides access to the North Natomas area and I-5. To the east, it extends to McClellan Park (the former Air Force Base), interrupted by Magpie Creek immediately east of Rio Linda Boulevard. Main Avenue has one travel lane in each direction between Sully Street / Norwood Avenue and Rio Linda Boulevard. West of Sully Street / Norwood Avenue, it has two travel lanes in each direction.

Bell Avenue is an east-west roadway located about one mile south of the site. To the west, it terminates about 0.6 miles west of Norwood Avenue in a residential area. To the east, it extends to McClellan Park. In the site vicinity, Bell Avenue has one travel lane in each direction.

## Pedestrian System

Sidewalks are not provided on the roadways immediately adjacent to the site. The Sacramento Northern Parkway, located east of and generally parallel to Rio Linda Boulevard,
follows the former Sacramento Northern Electric Railway right-of-way and provides a pedestrian and bicycle path (see Figure 1).

## Bicycle System

A Sacramento City / County Bicycle Task Force developed a 2010 Bikeway Master Plan for the region. The Master Plan is a policy document that was prepared to coordinate and develop a bikeway system that will benefit and serve the recreational and transportation needs of the public. Officially designated bicycle facilities are classified as follows:

Class I: Off-street bike trails or paths which are physically separated from streets or roads used by motorized vehicles.

Class II: On street bike lanes with signs, striped lane markings, and pavement legends.
Class III: On-street bike routes marked by signs and shared with motor vehicles and pedestrians. Optional four-inch edge lines painted on the pavement.

Figure 3 illustrates the bikeway master plan in the site vicinity. The primary existing bikeway near the site is the Sacramento Northern Parkway. The Parkway provides a continuous north-south offstreet facility from Rio Linda in unincorporated Sacramento County to north to the American River Parkway to the south. The only other existing bikeway in the immediate site vicinity is an on-street facility on Bell Avenue from Rio Linda Boulevard westerly to Taylor Street.

Both on-street and off-street bikeways are proposed in many locations near the site. The following bikeways would be adjacent to or extend through the project site:

- Claire Avenue - On-street bikeway from Sully Street to Raley Boulevard.
- Rio Linda Boulevard - On-street bikeway northerly from Claire Avenue into unincorporated Sacramento County.
- Rio Linda / Robla Creek - Off-street bikeway from the Natomas East Main Drainage Canal to the Sacramento Northern Parkway.
- Northerly extension of Sully Street - Off-Street bikeway across the Rio Linda / Robla Creek extending into unincorporated Sacramento County.


## Transit System

The Sacramento Regional Transit District (RT) operates 80 bus routes and 26.9 miles of light rail covering a 418 square-mile service area. Buses and light rail run 365 days a year using 76 light rail vehicles, 258 buses powered by compressed natural gas (CNG) and 17 shuttle vans. Buses operate daily from 5:00 a.m. to 11:30 p.m. every 15 to 60 minutes, depending on the route.
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Light rail trains operate from 4:30 a.m. to 1:00 a.m. daily with service every 15 minutes during the day and every 30 minutes in the evening.

Figure 4 illustrates transit services in the site vicinity. The two RT bus routes operating closest to the site are Routes 14 and 19. Near the site, Route 14 operates on Main Avenue west of Norwood Avenue and Norwood Avenue south of Main Avenue. Route 14 serves North Natomas to the west and North Sacramento to the south. It provides access to the Arden / Del Paso Light Rail Station. Route 19 operates on Claire Avenue east of Marysville Boulevard and Rio Linda Boulevard south of Claire Avenue. Route 19 serves North Sacramento, Rio Linda, Elverta, North Highlands, and McClellan Park. It provides access to the Arden / Del Paso and Watt / I-80 Light Rail Stations.

## Study Area

For traffic analysis purposes, a set of intersections and roadway segments were selected based upon the anticipated volume of project traffic, the distributional patterns of project traffic, and known locations of operational difficulty. The following locations, illustrated in Figure 5, were identified:

- Intersections

1. Norwood Avenue and Bell Avenue (signalized)
2. Rio Linda Boulevard and Bell Avenue (signalized)
3. Norwood Avenue / Sully Street and Main Avenue (signalized)
4. Rio Linda Boulevard and Main Avenue (unsignalized)
5. Rio Linda Boulevard and Claire Avenue / Marysville Boulevard (signalized)
6. Sully Street / Site Roadway and Claire Avenue (unsignalized)
7. Rio Linda Boulevard and Site Roadway (unsignalized)

- Roadway Segments

1. Bell Avenue West of Rio Linda Boulevard
2. Main Avenue West of Rio Linda Boulevard
3. Marysville Boulevard North of Main Avenue
4. Norwood Avenue North of Bell Avenue
5. Norwood Avenue South of Bell Avenue
6. Rio Linda Boulevard North of Ascot Avenue
7. Rio Linda Boulevard North of Bell Avenue
8. Rio Linda Boulevard North of Claire Avenue
9. Rio Linda Boulevard North of Main Avenue

## REGULATORY SETTING

Roadway operations are regulated by agencies with jurisdiction of the particular roadway. All study area roadways are under the jurisdiction of the City of Sacramento.
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Figure 5
STUDY AREA

## EXISTING TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

Existing Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes

The existing traffic volumes at the study area intersections were counted during the a.m. and p.m. commuter periods (7:00 to 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 to 6:00 p.m.) on Wednesday June 9, 2004. Peak hour intersection traffic volume data is illustrated in Figures 6 and 7.

## Existing Daily Traffic Volumes

Daily traffic volumes were recorded on the nine study area roadway segments on Wednesday June 9 or Tuesday June 15, 2004. Daily traffic volume data is summarized in Figure 8 and Table 1.

## Methodology

Field reconnaissance was undertaken to ascertain the traffic control characteristics of each of the study area intersections and roadway segments. Figure 9 illustrates existing intersection geometry. Determination of roadway operating conditions is based upon comparison of known or projected traffic volumes during peak hours to roadway capacity. In an urban setting, roadway capacity is generally governed by intersection characteristics, and intersection delay is used to determine "levels of service." Levels of service describe roadway operating conditions. Level of service is a qualitative measure of the effect of a number of factors, including speed and travel time, traffic interruptions, freedom to maneuver, safety, driving comfort and convenience, delay, and operating costs. Levels of service are designated "A" through "F" from best to worst, which cover the entire range of traffic operations that might occur. Levels of Service (LOS) "A" through "E" generally represent traffic volumes at less than roadway capacity, while LOS "F" represents over capacity and / or forced flow conditions.

The City of Sacramento General Plan includes a goal of maintaining LOS "C" throughout the roadway network. Because of the constraints of existing development in the City, and because of other environmental concerns, this goal cannot always be met.

## Intersection Analysis

Intersection analyses were conducted using a methodology outlined in the Transportation Research Board’s Special Report 209, Highway Capacity Manual, 2000. The methodology utilized is known as "operational analysis." This procedure calculates an average control delay per vehicle at an intersection, and assigns a level of service designation based upon the delay. The method also provides a calculation of the volume-to-capacity ( $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ) ratio of the critical movements at signalized intersections. Tables 2 and 3 present the level of service criteria for signalized and unsignalized intersections, respectively.

## Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis

Study area unsignalized intersections were evaluated to determine if traffic signals are appropriate under year 2004 or 2025 conditions, with or without the project. The investigation of the need for a
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| EXISTING DAILY TRAFFIC VOLUMES |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Roadway | Location | Volume |  |
| Bell Avenue | West of Rio Linda Boulevard | 9,490 |  |
| Main Avenue | West of Rio Linda Boulevard | 7,210 |  |
| Marysville Boulevard | North of Main Avenue | 4,670 |  |
| Norwood Avenue | North of Bell Avenue | 8,120 |  |
|  | South of Bell Avenue | 19,740 |  |
| Rio Linda Boulevard | North of Ascot Avenue | 13,660 |  |
|  | North of Bell Avenue | 9,740 |  |
|  | North of Claire Avenue | 13,660 |  |
|  | North of Main Avenue | 13,010 |  |
| Source: DKS Associates, 2005. |  |  |  |

traffic signal is commonly referred to as "warrant analysis." This study specifically considered Warrant 3, Peak Hour, as defined by the Federal Highway Administration’s Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) for Streets and Highways, 2003 Edition, and as modified by Caltrans' MUTCD 2003 California Supplement. Warrant 3 includes two parts - A and B. Part A considers side street delay, number of traffic lanes, number of intersection approaches, and peak hour traffic volumes. Part B considers community size, major street travel speed, number of traffic lanes, and peak hour traffic volumes. If the criteria of either Part A or Part B are met, then a traffic signal is warranted.

## Results of Peak Hour Analysis

## Intersection Operations

Table 4 summarizes the existing a.m. and p.m. peak hour operating conditions at the study area intersections. At unsignalized intersections, the average intersection level of service is utilized to determine conformity with the City's goal. Individual movements may operate at worse levels service. All of the intersections currently meet the City's level of service "C" goal with the exception of the unsignalized intersection of Rio Linda Boulevard and Main Avenue. This intersection operates at LOS "E" in the a.m. peak hour.
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| TABLE 2 <br> LEVEL OF SERVICE CRITERIA SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Level of Service (LOS) | Control Delay Per Vehicle (seconds) | Description |
| A | $\leq 10.0$ | Very low control delay. Occurs when progression is extremely favorable and most vehicles arrive during the green phase. Most vehicles do not stop at all. Short cycle lengths may also contribute to low delay. |
| B | $\begin{gathered} >10.0 \text { and } \\ \leq 20.0 \end{gathered}$ | Generally occurs with good progression, short cycle lengths, or both. More vehicles stop than with LOS "A," causing higher levels of average delay. |
| C | $\begin{gathered} >20.0 \text { and } \\ \leq 35.0 \end{gathered}$ | These higher delays may result from fair progression, longer cycle lengths, or both. Individual cycle failures may begin to appear at this level. The number of vehicles stopping is significant at this level, though many still pass through the intersection without stopping. |
| D | $\begin{gathered} >35.0 \text { and } \\ \leq 55.0 \end{gathered}$ | The influence of congestion becomes more noticeable. Longer delays may result from some combination of unfavorable progression, long cycle lengths, or high v/c ratios. Many vehicles stop, and the proportion of vehicles not stopping declines. Individual cycle failures are noticeable. |
| E | $\begin{gathered} >55.0 \text { and } \\ \leq 80.0 \end{gathered}$ | These high delay values generally indicate poor progression, long cycle lengths, and high v/c ratios. Individual cycle failures are frequent occurrences. |
| F | > 80.0 | This level, considered to be unacceptable to most drivers, often occurs with oversaturation, that is, when arrival flow rates exceed the capacity of the intersection. It may also occur at high v/c ratios below 1.0 with many individual cycle failures. Poor progression and long cycle lengths may also be major contributing causes to such delay levels. |
| Source: Highway Capacity Manual, Transportation Research Board, Special Report No. 209, Washington, D.C., 2000. |  |  |

## Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis

Traffic signal warrant analysis was conducted at the unsignalized intersection of Rio Linda Boulevard and Main Avenue. Traffic signal warrants are a series of criteria that should be met before a traffic signal is installed. Utilizing the peak hour warrant, this intersection warrants a traffic signal.

| LEVEL OF SERVICE CRITERIA <br> UNSIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Level of Service (LOS) | Total Delay Per Vehicle (seconds) |  |  |
| A | $\leq 10$ |  |  |
| B | $>10$ and $\leq 15$ |  |  |
| C | $>15$ and $\leq 25$ |  |  |
| D | $>25$ and $\leq 35$ |  |  |
| E | $>35$ and $\leq 50$ |  |  |
| F | $>50$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Source: Highway Capacity <br> Washington, $D . C ., ~ 2000 . ~$ |  |  |  |

TABLE 4
EXISTING INTERSECTION OPERATING CONDITIONS

| Intersection | A.M. Peak Hour |  | P.M. Peak Hour |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | LOS | Delay <br> (Seconds) | LOS | Delay <br> (Seconds) |
| Norwood Avenue and Bell Avenue (signalized) | B | 19.5 | B | 18.5 |
| Rio Linda Boulevard and Bell Avenue (signalized) | B | 10.5 | B | 10.2 |
| Norwood Ave. / Sully St. and Main Ave. (signalized) | B | 17.8 | B | 14.0 |
| Rio Linda Boulevard \& Main Avenue (all-way stop) | E | 44.4 | C | 22.2 |
| Rio Linda Boulevard \& Claire Avenue / Marysville <br> Boulevard (signalized) | A | 8.1 | A | 7.2 |
| Source |  |  |  |  |

Source: DKS Associates, 2005.

## IMPACTS AND MITIGATION

## Method of Analysis

This analysis assumes that the traffic associated with the project is fully additive to other traffic on the roadway system. For the existing with project scenario, full development of the project is assumed to occur "instantaneously." In this manner, the traffic and impacts associated with the project can be directly compared to known and measured existing conditions. For the future scenarios, traffic associated with full development of the project has been added to year 2025 traffic
on the roadway system．The year 2025 forecasts were developed through use of the regional SACMET travel model．The regional travel model encompasses the entire Sacramento region，and forecasts peak hour and daily traffic volumes based upon projections of future land use and transportation networks throughout the region．

## Trip Generation

Trip generation of the proposed project is based upon information on trip generation compiled by the Institute of Transportation Engineers（Trip Generation，Seventh Edition）．

## Residential Uses

As shown in Table 5， 915 residential units are proposed，consisting of courtyard units（congregate care facility），assisted living units，and cottage units（attached senior adult housing）．The residential uses are proposed to be located on parcels 1，2，and 3 （see Figure 2）．These uses are anticipated to generate 65 vehicle trips during the a．m．peak commuter hour， 159 trips during the p．m．peak commuter hour，and 1,873 trips daily．

| TABLE 5RESIDENTIAL USES VEHICULAR TRIP GENERATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | ic | rip |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | М. P Hour |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { M. P } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| Land Use | ITE Land Use（Code） |  | 品 | 号 | － | 嵒 | 号 | W | 需 |
| Courtyard Units | Congregate Care Facility (253) | 753 | 27 | 19 | 45 | 70 | 58 | 128 | 1，521 |
| Assisted Living | Assisted Living（254） | 122 | 11 | 6 | 17 | 12 | 15 | 27 | 212 |
| Cottage Units | Senior Adult Housing－ Attached（252） | 40 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 139 |
| Residential Uses Subtotal |  | 915 | 39 | 26 | 65 | 85 | 74 | 159 | 1，873 |
| Source：DKS Associates，2005，based on Trip Generation，Seventh Edition． |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Neighborhood Shopping Center

A neighborhood shopping center of 43,000 square feet is proposed on parcel 4 adjacent to Rio Linda Boulevard．As shown in Table 6，the project is anticipated to generate 94 vehicular trips during the a．m．peak hour， 359 vehicular trips during the p．m．peak hour，and 3，959 trips daily．

| EIGHBORHOOD SHOP | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ГABLE } \\ & \text { NTER } \end{aligned}$ | $\mathbf{E H}$ | CUL |  | RIP | ENE | ATI |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Trip Type |  | Vehicle Trips |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | A．M．Peak Hour |  |  | P．M．Peak Hour |  |  | 克 |
|  |  | 号 | 哭 | T | 硅 | 语 |  |  |
| New Trips | 66\％ | 38 | 24 | 62 | 114 | 123 | 237 | 2，613 |
| Pass－By Trips | 34\％ | 20 | 13 | 32 | 59 | 63 | 122 | 1，346 |
| Shopping Center Subtotal | 100\％ | 58 | 37 | 94 | 172 | 187 | 359 | 3，959 |

Source：DKS Associates，2005，based on Trip Generation，Seventh Edition，ITE Land Use Code 820.

Typically，the total vehicular trips recorded at shopping centers are based on counts taken at the driveways to a center．Studies have found that a significant number of the vehicles entering the driveways of a shopping center would already be on the adjacent roadway，making a different trip． ＂Pass－by trips＂are vehicle trips already traveling on the adjacent roadway system that are diverted into and out of the driveways serving the shopping center．Based upon data collected by ITE，the average number of pass－by trips at a shopping center is 34 percent during the p．m．peak hour．Data is not available for the a．m．peak hour or on a daily basis．The 34 percent factor was applied to the shopping center＇s trip generation for all time periods．In the traffic analysis，new（not pass－by）trips are assigned to the roadway network in accordance with the trip distribution．Pass－by trips are assigned at the driveway locations together with the new trips．

## Summary

Table 7 summarizes the total trip generation associated with the project．The proposed park use on Parcel 5 is expected to generate a minimal number of trips．

No reduction in trip generation has been made for＂internal＂trips between the residential and retail portions of the project．Of the total number of shopping center vehicular trips，it is anticipated that a very small percentage would be generated by the residential portion of the project．

## Baseline Project Traffic Volumes

Traffic impact studies often consider the traffic of other development projects in the site vicinity if such projects have been approved and are under construction or have a high probability of implementation．There were no known baseline projects within the study area at the time this analysis commenced．

| $\text { TABLE } 7$ <br> LEISURE VISTAS VEHICULAR TRIP GENERATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Vehicle Trips |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | A．M．Peak Hour |  |  | P．M．Peak Hour |  |  | 交 |
| Land Use | 品 | 号 | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ |  | 哭品 | W |  |
| Residential | 39 | 26 | 65 | 85 | 74 | 159 | 1，873 |
| Shopping Center（new trips only） | 38 | 24 | 62 | 114 | 123 | 237 | 2，613 |
| Project Total | 77 | 50 | 127 | 199 | 197 | 396 | 4，486 |

Source：DKS Associates，2005，based on Trip Generation，Seventh Edition．

## Trip Distribution and Assignment

The distribution of trips associated with the project was derived utilizing the regional SACMET travel model，observations of travel patterns near the site，and knowledge of the proposed access locations associated with the project．Separate distributions were developed for residential and retail uses，and for existing（2004）and future（2025）conditions．The difference in the project trip distribution for existing and future conditions is due to changes in land use，transportation networks， and roadway travel times over time．Figures 10 and 11 illustrate the traffic distributions for the residential and shopping center uses，respectively．The shopping center trip distribution illustrated in Figure 11 is for new trips only；shopping center pass－by trips are re－routed from through traffic volumes on Rio Linda Boulevard and added to the new－trips for development of total trips to be assigned to the site roadways．

The retail component of the project has frontage along Rio Linda Boulevard．For analysis purposes， it was assumed that direct retail parcel access to Rio Linda Boulevard would be limited to right－in／ right－out movements．Full access to all project components is provided via the intersection of Rio Linda Boulevard and the Site Roadway．

The project trip generation volumes and trip distribution patterns are utilized to assign vehicle trips to the study area roadway network．Figures 12 and 13 show the project only traffic volumes on study area roadways for the existing（2004）and future（2025）scenarios respectively．

## Future（Year 2025）Traffic Volume Forecasts

Year 2025 traffic volume forecasts without the project were developed through utilization of SACOG＇s regional SACMET travel model．Figures 14 and 15 illustrate future peak hour volumes at the study area intersections．Figure 16 and Table 8 show future daily traffic volumes．
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| TABLE 8 <br> EXISTING AND FUTURE NO PROJECT DAILY TRAFFIC VOLUMES |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Volume |  |
| Roadway | Location | 2004 | 2025 |
| Bell Avenue | West of Rio Linda Boulevard | 9,490 | 10,970 |
| Main Avenue | West of Rio Linda Boulevard | 7,210 | 16,020 |
| Marysville Boulevard | North of Main Avenue | 4,670 | 7,920 |
| Norwood Avenue | North of Bell Avenue | 8,120 | 13,020 |
|  | South of Bell Avenue | 19,740 | 22,620 |
| Rio Linda Boulevard | North of Ascot Avenue | 13,660 | 20,460 |
|  | North of Bell Avenue | 9,740 | 15,140 |
|  | North of Claire Avenue | 13,660 | 20,460 |
|  | North of Main Avenue | 13,010 | 19,550 |
| Source: DKS Associates, 2005. |  |  |  |

The year 2025 forecasts assume regional changes in land use and transportation systems in accordance with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan adopted by SACOG. In the study area, the following roadway improvements are anticipated to be implemented by the year 2025:

- Widen Main Avenue from 2 lanes to 4 lanes between Norwood Avenue and Rio Linda Boulevard.
- Widen Bell Avenue from 2 lanes to 4 lanes between Norwood Avenue and Raley Boulevard.

Figure 17 illustrates year 2025 intersection geometry. It was assumed that the intersection of Main Avenue and Rio Linda Boulevard would be signalized in conjunction with the planned Main Avenue roadway widening. As noted earlier, this intersection currently warrants a traffic signal.

## STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

The standards of significance in this analysis are based upon the current practice of the appropriate regulatory agencies.

## Intersections

In the City of Sacramento, a significant traffic impact (intersection) occurs when:
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1. the traffic generated by a project degrades peak period level of service from A, B, or C (without project) to D, E, or F (with project); or,
2. the LOS (without project) is D, E, or F, and project generated traffic increases the peak period average vehicle delay by five seconds or more.

## Bikeways

A significant bikeway impact would occur if the project hindered or eliminated an existing designated bikeway, or if the project interfered with implementation of a proposed bikeway.

A significant bikeway impact could occur if the project were to result in unsafe conditions for bicyclists, including unsafe bicycle/pedestrian or bicycle/motor vehicle conflicts.

## Pedestrian Facilities

A significant pedestrian circulation impact would occur if the project were to result in unsafe conditions for pedestrians, including unsafe increase pedestrian / bicycle or pedestrian / motor vehicle conflicts.

## Transit System

A significant impact to the transit system would occur where project generated ridership, when added to existing or future ridership, exceeds available or planned system capacity. Capacity is defined as the total number of passengers the system of busses and light rail vehicles can carry during the peak hours of operation.

## Project-Specific Impacts and Mitigation Measures (Existing 2004)

## Impact 1 Intersections

The project would increase traffic volumes at study area intersections. As discussed below, the changes in intersection operating conditions with the addition of project-generated traffic do not exceed the City's standards of significance for impacts to intersections. Therefore, the impacts of existing plus proposed project conditions at study intersections are less than significant.

Discussion Figures 18 and 19 illustrate peak hour traffic volumes associated with the existing plus project scenario. Intersection operating conditions associated with the existing plus project scenario are summarized in Tables 9 and 10.

Changes in intersection operating conditions do not exceed the intersection standards of significance. The new intersections associated with the project operate at LOS "C" or better.
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| TABLE 9 <br> EXISTING PLUS PROJECT A.M. PEAK HOUR INTERSECTION OPERATING CONDITIONS |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Without Project |  | With Project |  |
| Intersection | LOS | Delay (Seconds) | LOS | Delay (Seconds) |
| Norwood Avenue and Bell Avenue (signalized) | B | 19.5 | B | 19.7 |
| Rio Linda Boulevard and Bell Avenue (signalized) | B | 10.5 | B | 10.5 |
| Norwood Ave. / Sully St. and Main Ave. (signalized) | B | 17.8 | B | 18.8 |
| Rio Linda Boulevard \& Main Avenue (all-way stop) | E | 44.4 | E | 38.2 |
| Rio Linda Boulevard \& Claire Avenue / Marysville Boulevard (signalized) | A | 8.1 | A | 8.2 |
| Sully St. / Site Roadway \& Claire Ave. (unsignalized) <br> - Intersection average <br> - Westbound approach |  | - | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{A} \\ & \mathrm{~A} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.9 \\ & 9.0 \end{aligned}$ |
| Rio Linda Boulevard \& Site Roadway (unsignalized) <br> - Intersection average <br> - Northbound left turn <br> - Eastbound left turn <br> - Eastbound right turn |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A } \\ & \text { A } \\ & \text { C } \\ & \text { B } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.8 \\ 9.8 \\ 22.6 \\ 14.8 \end{gathered}$ |
| Source: DKS Associates, 2005. |  |  |  |  |

For informational purposes only, Figure 20 and Table 11 show existing plus project daily traffic volumes. Figure 12 illustrates the assignment of project traffic on the roadway network.

## Mitigation Measures

None required.

## Signal Warrant Analysis

Traffic signal warrant analysis was conducted at the three unsignalized study area intersections. Utilizing the peak hour warrant, the intersection of Rio Linda Boulevard and Main Avenue warrants a traffic signal under existing without and with project conditions in both a.m. and p.m. peak hour analysis periods. The intersection of Rio Linda Boulevard and the Site Roadway also warrants a
traffic signal under existing with project conditions in the p.m. peak hour. The intersection of Sully Street / Site Roadway and Claire Avenue does not warrant a traffic signal under existing with project conditions.

| TABLE 10 <br> EXISTING PLUS PROJECT P.M. PEAK HOUR <br> INTERSECTION OPERATING CONDITIONS |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Without Project |  |  |  |
|  | With Project |  |  |  |
|  | LOS | Delay <br> (Seconds) | LOS | Delay <br> (Seconds) |
| Norwood Avenue and Bell Avenue (signalized) | B | 18.5 | B | 19.0 |
| Rio Linda Boulevard and Bell Avenue (signalized) | B | 10.2 | B | 10.3 |
| Norwood Ave. / Sully St. and Main Ave. (signalized) | B | 14.0 | B | 15.1 |
| Rio Linda Boulevard \& Main Avenue (all-way stop) | C | 22.2 | C | 24.1 |
| Rio Linda Boulevard \& Claire Avenue / Marysville <br> Boulevard (signalized) | A | 7.2 | A | 7.9 |
| Sully St. / Site Roadway \& Claire Ave. (unsignalized) |  |  |  |  |
| - Intersection average |  |  |  |  |
| - Westbound approach |  |  |  |  |

Source: DKS Associates, 2005.

## Impact 2 Bikeways

The proposed project would result in the addition of employees, residents, patrons, and visitors to the site, some of whom would travel by bicycle. The proposed project would not result in any changes to the existing or future bikeway system. Bicycle impacts are considered less than significant.

Discussion
The proposed project is not anticipated to hinder or eliminate an existing designated bikeway, or interfere with implementation of a proposed bikeway. The project is not anticipated to result in unsafe conditions for bicyclists, including unsafe bicycle / pedestrian or bicycle / motor vehicle conflicts.
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| TABLE 11 <br> YEAR 2004 WITHOUT AND WITH PROJECT DAILY TRAFFIC VOLUMES |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Volume |  |
| Roadway | Location | Without Project | With Project |
| Bell Avenue | West of Rio Linda Boulevard | 9,490 | 9,750 |
| Main Avenue | West of Rio Linda Boulevard | 7,210 | 7,150 |
| Marysville Boulevard | North of Main Avenue | 4,670 | 5,360 |
| Norwood Avenue | North of Bell Avenue | 8,120 | 8,870 |
|  | South of Bell Avenue | 19,740 | 20,260 |
| Rio Linda Boulevard | North of Ascot Avenue | 13,660 | 14,710 |
|  | North of Bell Avenue | 9,740 | 10,170 |
|  | North of Claire Avenue | 13,660 | 14,610 |
|  | North of Main Avenue | 13,010 | 13,380 |
| Site Roadway | At Rio Linda Boulevard | - | 1,240 |
|  | At Sully Street | - | 1,490 |
|  | At Claire Avenue | - | 1,140 |
| Source: DKS Associates, 2005. |  |  |  |

## Mitigation Measures

None required.

## Impact 3 Pedestrian Facilities

The proposed project would result in the addition of employees, residents, patrons, and visitors to the site. Pedestrian impacts are considered less than significant.

Discussion The project is not anticipated to result in unsafe conditions for pedestrians, including unsafe bicycle / pedestrian or pedestrian / motor vehicle conflicts.

## Mitigation Measures

None required.

## Impact 4 Transit System

The project would increase demand for transit services. As discussed below, the impact of the proposed project on the transit system is less than significant.

Discussion The proposed project would result in the addition of employees, residents, patrons, and visitors to the site, some of whom would travel by transit. Although particular transit vehicles operate at or near capacity during the peak commuter periods, a review of existing transit operations and plans for future transit services indicate that there is ample capacity on the Regional Transit system to support the anticipated increase in trips. Because the existing and future transit system capacity is sufficient to accommodate the increased project generated transit ridership, the impact of the proposed project is considered less than significant.

## Mitigation Measures

None required.

## Future Impacts and Mitigation Measures (Year 2025)

The analysis of transportation and circulation impacts under future conditions focuses on year 2025 conditions.

## Impact 5 Intersections - Future

The project would increase traffic volumes at study area intersections. As discussed below, the changes in intersection operating conditions with the addition of project-generated traffic do not exceed the City's standards of significance for impacts to intersections. Therefore, the impacts of future plus proposed project conditions at study intersections are less than significant.

Discussion Figures 21 and 22 illustrate future plus project peak hour volumes. Intersection operating conditions associated with the future plus project scenario are summarized in Tables 12 and 13.

Changes in intersection operating conditions with the proposed project do not exceed the City's intersection standards of significance. As shown in Tables 12 and 13, all of the study area intersections including the new intersections associated with the project operate at LOS "C" or better.

For informational purposes only, Figure 23 and Table 14 show future plus project daily traffic volumes. Figure 13 illustrates the assignment of project traffic on the roadway network.

## Mitigation Measures

None required.
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| TABLE 12 <br> FUTURE PLUS PROJECT A.M. PEAK HOUR INTERSECTION OPERATING CONDITIONS |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Without Project |  | With Project |  |
| Intersection | LOS | Delay (Seconds) | LOS | Delay (Seconds) |
| Norwood Avenue and Bell Avenue (signalized) | C | 20.3 | C | 20.5 |
| Rio Linda Boulevard and Bell Avenue (signalized) | B | 10.6 | B | 10.6 |
| Norwood Ave. / Sully St. and Main Ave. (signalized) | C | 23.0 | C | 23.9 |
| Rio Linda Boulevard \& Main Avenue (signalized) | C | 20.1 | B | 18.9 |
| Rio Linda Boulevard \& Claire Avenue / Marysville Boulevard (signalized) | B | 10.2 | B | 10.7 |
| Sully St. / Site Roadway \& Claire Ave. (unsignalized) <br> - Intersection average <br> - Westbound approach |  | $\checkmark$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A } \\ & \text { B } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.0 \\ & 9.1 \end{aligned}$ |
| Rio Linda Boulevard \& Site Roadway (unsignalized) <br> - Intersection average <br> - Northbound left turn <br> - Eastbound left turn <br> - Eastbound right turn |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A } \\ & \text { B } \\ & \text { E } \\ & \text { C } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.1 \\ 10.3 \\ 37.4 \\ 16.5 \end{gathered}$ |
| Source: DKS Associates, 2005. |  |  |  |  |

## Signal Warrant Analysis

Traffic signal warrant analysis was conducted at the two unsignalized study area site intersections. The intersection of Rio Linda Boulevard and the Site Roadway warrants a traffic signal under future plus project conditions in the p.m. peak hour. The intersection of Sully Street / Site Roadway and Claire Avenue does not warrant a traffic signal under future plus project conditions.

## Impact 6 Bikeways

The proposed project would result in the addition of employees, residents, patrons, and visitors to the site, some of whom would travel by bicycle. The proposed project would not result in any changes to the existing or future bikeway system. Bicycle impacts are considered less than significant.

| TABLE 13 <br> FUTURE PLUS PROJECT P.M. PEAK HOUR INTERSECTION OPERATING CONDITIONS |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Without Project |  | With Project |  |
| Intersection | LOS | Delay (Seconds) | LOS | Delay (Seconds) |
| Norwood Avenue and Bell Avenue (signalized) | C | 20.3 | C | 20.4 |
| Rio Linda Boulevard and Bell Avenue (signalized) | B | 17.0 | B | 16.8 |
| Norwood Ave. / Sully St. and Main Ave. (signalized) | C | 29.3 | C | 30.9 |
| Rio Linda Boulevard \& Main Avenue (signalized) | B | 14.8 | B | 14.6 |
| Rio Linda Boulevard \& Claire Avenue / Marysville Boulevard (signalized) | B | 12.8 | B | 13.8 |
| Sully St. / Site Roadway \& Claire Ave. (unsignalized) <br> - Intersection average <br> - Westbound approach |  | - | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{A} \\ & \mathrm{~A} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.7 \\ & 9.6 \end{aligned}$ |
| Rio Linda Boulevard \& Site Roadway (unsignalized) <br> - Intersection average <br> - Northbound left turn <br> - Eastbound left turn <br> - Eastbound right turn |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { A } \\ \text { A } \\ \text { F } \\ \text { B } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7.3 \\ 9.4 \\ 136.1 \\ 13.4 \end{gathered}$ |
| Source: DKS Associates, 2005. |  |  |  |  |

Discussion The proposed project is not anticipated to hinder or eliminate an existing designated bikeway, or interfere with implementation of a proposed bikeway. The project is not anticipated to result in unsafe conditions for bicyclists, including unsafe bicycle / pedestrian or bicycle / motor vehicle conflicts.

## Mitigation Measures

None required.

## Impact 7 Pedestrian Facilities

The proposed project would result in the addition of employees, residents, patrons, and visitors to the site. Pedestrian impacts are considered less than significant.
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| TABLE 14 <br> YEAR 2025 WITHOUT AND WITH PROJECT DAILY TRAFFIC VOLUMES |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Volume |  |
| Roadway | Location | Without Project | With Project |
| Bell Avenue | West of Rio Linda Boulevard | 10,970 | 11,170 |
| Main Avenue | West of Rio Linda Boulevard | 16,020 | 15,580 |
| Marysville Boulevard | North of Main Avenue | 7,920 | 8,710 |
| Norwood Avenue | North of Bell Avenue | 13,020 | 13,590 |
|  | South of Bell Avenue | 22,620 | 23,060 |
| Rio Linda Boulevard | North of Ascot Avenue | 20,460 | 21,450 |
|  | North of Bell Avenue | 15,140 | 15,530 |
|  | North of Claire Avenue | 20,460 | 21,250 |
|  | North of Main Avenue | 19,550 | 19,510 |
| Site Roadway | At Rio Linda Boulevard | - | 1,650 |
|  | At Sully Street | - | 1,860 |
|  | At Claire Avenue | - | 1,170 |
| Source: DKS Associates, 2005. |  |  |  |

Discussion The project is not anticipated to result in unsafe conditions for pedestrians, including unsafe bicycle / pedestrian or pedestrian / motor vehicle conflicts.

## Mitigation Measures

None required.

## Impact 8 Transit System

The project would increase demand for transit services. As discussed below, the impact of the proposed project on the transit system is less than significant.

Discussion The proposed project would result in the addition of employees, residents, patrons, and visitors to the site, some of whom would travel by transit. Although particular transit vehicles operate at or near capacity during the peak commuter periods, a review of existing transit operations and plans for future transit services indicate that there is ample capacity on the Regional Transit system to support the anticipated increase in trips. Because the existing and future transit system capacity is sufficient
to accommodate the increased project generated transit ridership, the impact of the proposed project is considered less than significant.

## Mitigation Measures

None required.

## SITE ACCESS AND VEHICULAR CIRCULATION

In addition to the analysis of project impacts in conjunction with the City's standards of significance for CEQA review, an analysis of site access and vehicular circulation was also conducted. This analysis focuses on the project's access to Rio Linda Boulevard. Currently, Rio Linda Boulevard north of Marysville Boulevard operates as a high-speed two-lane roadway with uninterrupted flow through a rural area. The project proposes site access to Rio Linda Boulevard via a site roadway, as illustrated in Figure 2. In addition, Parcel 4, located along Rio Linda Boulevard, would accommodate a proposed neighborhood shopping center.

At this time, detailed plans for the proposed shopping center are not available. This analysis anticipates that access to Rio Linda Boulevard via a separate driveway will be requested during development within the PUD. Based upon direction from City staff, this analysis assumes that a separate driveway on Rio Linda Boulevard with right-in and right-out movements only might be considered for evaluation with a future development proposal.

## Access Recommendations

## Rio Linda Boulevard and Site Roadway

1. The intersection was analyzed with all movements permitted; that is, with permitted right turns and left turns both entering and exiting the site.
2. Based upon the high speed operations of Rio Linda Boulevard and the anticipated delay for the left turn movement from the Site Roadway onto northbound Rio Linda Boulevard (see Tables 10, 12, and 13), a traffic signal should be installed at this location. Based upon full development of the project (both residential and retail components), a traffic signal is warranted at this location.

With the installation of a traffic signal, this intersection would exhibit the following operating conditions:

- Existing Plus Project, a.m. peak hour - Level of Service "A", 6.0 seconds average delay
- Existing Plus Project, p.m. peak hour - Level of Service "B", 18.0 seconds average delay
- Future Plus Project, a.m. peak hour - Level of Service "A", 7.2 seconds average delay
- Future Plus Project, p.m. peak hour - Level of Service "C", 32.0 seconds average delay

3. The site roadway eastbound approach to the intersection should consist of separate right and left turn lanes. These lanes should be a minimum of 150 feet long.
4. The site roadway westbound departure from the intersection should have one travel lane.
5. Center channelization on the site roadway is optional from a traffic operations perspective.
6. A northbound left turn lane should be constructed on Rio Linda Boulevard. The lane is necessitated by the high through volumes on Rio Linda Boulevard as well as the high-speed operations. The storage length of the left turn lane should be at least 150 feet, with appropriate lane tapers north and south of the intersection.
7. Center channelization is desirable on Rio Linda Boulevard, particularly if right-in / right-out access is provided to the retail parcel.
8. A southbound separate right turn lane on Rio Linda Boulevard should be provided to separate decelerating traffic from the high-speed Rio Linda Boulevard through traffic.
9. Sight distance at the subject intersection was reviewed by City staff. For a City standard design speed of 50 miles per hour, a clear sight distance of 427 feet is required. The nearest impediment to sight distance is a bridge over a watercourse located about 555 feet north of the proposed intersection location. This distance exceeds the required sight distance for a 55 mile per hour design speed (525 feet).

## APPENDIX D: PROJECT SITE TRIP GENERATION WORKSHEETS

## Single-Family Detached Housing <br> (210)

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: Dwelling Units
On a: Weekday,
Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic,
One Hour Between 7 and 9 a.m.
Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
Number of Studies: 192
Avg. Num. of Dwelling Units: 226
Directional Distribution: 26\% entering, $74 \%$ exiting
Vehicle Trip Generation per Dwelling Unit

| Average Rate | Range of Rates | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.70 | $0.27-2.27$ | 0.24 |

Data Plot and Equation


## Single-Family Detached Housing <br> (210)

Vehicle Trip Ends vs: Dwelling Units
On a: Weekday,
Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic,
One Hour Between 4 and 6 p.m.
Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
Number of Studies: 208
Avg. Num. of Dwelling Units: 248
Directional Distribution: 63\% entering, 37\% exiting
Vehicle Trip Generation per Dwelling Unit

| Average Rate | Range of Rates | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.94 | $0.35-2.98$ | 0.31 |

Data Plot and Equation


## Public Park

## Vehicle Trip Ends vs: Acres

On a: Weekday,
Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic,
One Hour Between 7 and 9 a.m.
Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
Number of Studies: 5
Avg. Num. of Acres: 398
Directional Distribution: 59\% entering, 41\% exiting

## Vehicle Trip Generation per Acre

| Average Rate | Range of Rates | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.02 | $0.00-4.50$ | 0.23 |

Data Plot and Equation


## Public Park

## Vehicle Trip Ends vs: Acres

On a: Weekday,
Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic,
One Hour Between 4 and 6 p.m.
Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban
Number of Studies: 6
Avg. Num. of Acres: 516
Directional Distribution: 55\% entering, 45\% exiting
Vehicle Trip Generation per Acre

| Average Rate | Range of Rates | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.11 | $0.05-3.50$ | 0.24 |

Data Plot and Equation
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## APPENDIX E: CAMUTCD SIGNAL WARRANTS

## MUTCD WARRANT 1, EIGHT-HOUR VEHICULAR VOLUME

| Number of Lanes for Moving Traffic <br> on Each Approach |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Major Street: | 2 or More Lanes |
| Minor Street: | 1 Lane |


| Built-up Isolated Community With Less Than 10,000 | Yes |
| ---: | ---: |
| Population or Above 40 MPH on Major Street? |  |

Combination of Conditions A and B Necessary?*: Yes
*Only applicable for Warrant 1 if after an adequate trial of other alternatives that could cause less delay and inconvenience to traffic has failed to solve the traffic problems. See Section 4C. 02 of the 2014 MUTCD for application.

| Condition A - Minimum Vehicular Volume |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes for moving traffic on each approach |  | Vehicles per hour on major street (total of both approaches) |  |  |  | Vehicles per hour on higher-volume minor street approach (one direction only) |  |  |  |
| Major Street | Minor Street | 100\% | 80\% | 70\% | 56\% | 100\% | 80\% | 70\% | 56\% |
| 1 | 1 | 500 | 400 | 350 | 280 | 150 | 120 | 105 | 84 |
| 2 or More | 1 | 600 | 480 | 420 | 336 | 150 | 120 | 105 | 84 |
| 2 or More | 2 or More | 600 | 480 | 420 | 336 | 200 | 160 | 140 | 112 |
| 1 | 2 or More | 500 | 400 | 350 | 280 | 200 | 160 | 140 | 112 |


| Condition B - Interruption of Continuous Traffic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of lanes for moving traffic on each approach |  | Vehicles per hour on major street (total of both approaches) |  |  |  | Vehicles per hour on higher-volume minor street approach (one direction only) |  |  |  |
| Major Street | Minor Street | 100\% | 80\% | 70\% | 56\% | 100\% | 80\% | 70\% | 56\% |
| 1 | 1 | 750 | 600 | 525 | 420 | 75 | 60 | 53 | 42 |
| 2 or More | 1 | 900 | 720 | 630 | 504 | 75 | 60 | 53 | 42 |
| 2 or More | 2 or More | 900 | 720 | 630 | 504 | 100 | 80 | 70 | 56 |
| 1 | 2 or More | 750 | 600 | 525 | 420 | 100 | 80 | 70 | 56 |

## Condition A Evaluation

Number of Unique Hours Met: N/A
Condition A Satisfied? N/A

Condition B Evaluation

| Condition B Evaluation |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Unique Hours Met: N/A |  |  |  |  |  |


| Number of Unique Hours Met for Condition A: 0 |
| :--- |
| Number of Unique Hours Met for Condition B: |
| 13 |
| Combination of Condition A and Condition B Satisfied? |

## MUTCD WARRANT 2, FOUR-HOUR VEHICULAR VOLUME

| Number of Lanes for Moving Traffic on Each |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Approach |  |$|$


| Total Number of Unique Hours Met <br> On Figure 4C-2 |
| :---: |
| 5 |


| Built-up Isolated Community With Less Than 10,000 Population or Above 40 MPH <br> on Major Street? | Yes |
| ---: | ---: |


| Hourly Vehicular Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hour Interval | Major Street Combined | Highest Minor Street Approach | Hour Met? |
| Beginning At | Vehicles Per Hour (VPH) | Vehicles Per Hour (VPH) |  |
| 12:00 AM | 99 | 1 |  |
| 12:15 AM | 88 | 1 |  |
| 12:30 AM | 80 | 1 |  |
| 12:45 AM | 71 | 1 |  |
| 1:00 AM | 66 | 1 |  |
| 1:15 AM | 63 | 1 |  |
| 1:30 AM | 57 | 1 |  |
| 1:45 AM | 54 | 1 |  |
| 2:00 AM | 53 | 1 |  |
| 2:15 AM | 57 | 1 |  |
| 2:30 AM | 63 | 1 |  |
| 2:45 AM | 73 | 2 |  |
| 3:00 AM | 82 | 3 |  |
| 3:15 AM | 88 | 4 |  |
| 3:30 AM | 94 | 6 |  |
| 3:45 AM | 113 | 8 |  |
| 4:00 AM | 139 | 10 |  |
| 4:15 AM | 182 | 12 |  |
| 4:30 AM | 233 | 15 |  |
| 4:45 AM | 285 | 18 |  |
| 5:00 AM | 379 | 24 |  |
| 5:15 AM | 447 | 31 |  |
| 5:30 AM | 515 | 40 |  |
| 5:45 AM | 600 | 51 |  |
| 6:00 AM | 683 | 61 |  |
| 6:15 AM | 856 | 69 |  |
| 6:30 AM | 1061 | 76 | Met |
| 6:45 AM | 1200 | 80 | Met |
| 7:00 AM | 1289 | 81 | Met |
| 7:15 AM | 1269 | 78 | Met |
| 7:30 AM | 1208 | 72 | Met |
| 7:45 AM | 1153 | 64 | Met |
| 8:00 AM | 1049 | 58 |  |
| 8:15 AM | 954 | 52 |  |
| 8:30 AM | 870 | 48 |  |
| 8:45 AM | 794 | 45 |  |
| 9:00 AM | 773 | 44 |  |
| 9:15 AM | 769 | 44 |  |
| 9:30 AM | 759 | 44 |  |
| 9:45 AM | 768 | 44 |  |
| 10:00 AM | 770 | 44 |  |
| 10:15 AM | 779 | 43 |  |
| 10:30 AM | 798 | 42 |  |
| 10:45 AM | 813 | 42 |  |
| 11:00 AM | 826 | 42 |  |
| 11:15 AM | 846 | 44 |  |
| 11:30 AM | 858 | 46 |  |
| 11:45 AM | 876 | 48 |  |


| Hourly Vehicular Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hour Interval | Major Street Combined | Highest Minor Street Approach | Hour Met? |
| Beginning At | Vehicles Per Hour (VPH) | Vehicles Per Hour (VPH) |  |
| 12:00 PM | 915 | 55 |  |
| 12:15 PM | 934 | 56 |  |
| 12:30 PM | 943 | 57 |  |
| 12:45 PM | 974 | 58 |  |
| 1:00 PM | 974 | 58 |  |
| 1:15 PM | 1006 | 58 |  |
| 1:30 PM | 1062 | 57 |  |
| 1:45 PM | 1118 | 57 |  |
| 2:00 PM | 1214 | 57 |  |
| 2:15 PM | 1261 | 57 |  |
| 2:30 PM | 1293 | 58 |  |
| 2:45 PM | 1328 | 60 | Met |
| 3:00 PM | 1349 | 63 | Met |
| 3:15 PM | 1370 | 65 | Met |
| 3:30 PM | 1392 | 68 | Met |
| 3:45 PM | 1385 | 69 | Met |
| 4:00 PM | 1365 | 70 | Met |
| 4:15 PM | 1363 | 69 | Met |
| 4:30 PM | 1387 | 68 | Met |
| 4:45 PM | 1374 | 68 | Met |
| 5:00 PM | 1337 | 67 | Met |
| 5:15 PM | 1294 | 63 | Met |
| 5:30 PM | 1178 | 60 |  |
| 5:45 PM | 1073 | 55 |  |
| 6:00 PM | 973 | 49 |  |
| 6:15 PM | 875 | 45 |  |
| 6:30 PM | 812 | 42 |  |
| 6:45 PM | 746 | 38 |  |
| 7:00 PM | 691 | 36 |  |
| 7:15 PM | 637 | 33 |  |
| 7:30 PM | 582 | 31 |  |
| 7:45 PM | 554 | 29 |  |
| 8:00 PM | 517 | 27 |  |
| 8:15 PM | 486 | 25 |  |
| 8:30 PM | 460 | 22 |  |
| 8:45 PM | 416 | 20 |  |
| 9:00 PM | 401 | 17 |  |
| 9:15 PM | 377 | 14 |  |
| 9:30 PM | 340 | 11 |  |
| 9:45 PM | 319 | 9 |  |
| 10:00 PM | 275 | 8 |  |
| 10:15 PM | 241 | 7 |  |
| 10:30 PM | 222 | 6 |  |
| 10:45 PM | 190 | 6 |  |
| 11:00 PM | 176 | 4 |  |



## MUTCD WARRANT 3, PEAK HOUR

| Number of Lanes for Moving Traffic on Each |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Approach |  |


| Built-up Isolated Community With Less Than 10,000 Population or Above 40 MPH on |
| ---: | ---: |
| Major Street? |$\quad$| Yes |
| ---: |

Is this signal warrant being applied for an unusual case, such as office complexes, manufacturing plants, industrial complexes, or high-occupancy vehicle facilities that No
attract or discharge large numbers of vehicles over a short time?

| Indicate whether all three of the following conditions for the same 1 hour (any four consecutive 15- <br> minute periods) of an average day are present* |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Does the total stopped time delay experienced by the traffic on one minor-street <br> approach (one direction only) controlled by a STOP sign equal or exceed 4 vehicle-hours <br> for a one-lane approach or 5 vehicle-hours for a two-lane approach? | Yes |  |  |
| Does the volume on the same minor-street approach (one direction only) equal or exceed <br> 100 vehicles per hour for one moving lane of traffic or 150 vehicles per hour for two <br> moving lanes? | No |  |  |
| Does the total entering volume serviced during the hour equal or exceed 650 vehicles per <br> hour for intersection with three approaches or 800 vehicles per hour for intersections with <br> four or more approaches? | Yes |  |  |
| *If applicable, attach all supporting calculations and documentation. |  |  |  |


| Total Number of Unique Hours Met <br> On Figure 4C-4 |
| :---: |
| 1 |


| Hourly Vehicular Volume |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hour Interval | Major Street Combined | Highest Minor Street Approach | Hour Met? |
| Beginning At | Vehicles Per Hour (VPH) | Vehicles Per Hour (VPH) | Hour Met? |
| 6:45 AM | 1200 | 80 | Met |
| 7:00 AM | 1289 | 81 | Met |
| 7:15 AM | 1269 | 78 | Met |
| 7:30 AM | 1208 | 72 |  |
| 7:45 AM | 1153 | 64 |  |
| 8:00 AM | 1049 | 58 |  |
| 8:15 AM | 954 | 52 |  |
| 8:30 AM | 870 | 48 |  |
| 8:45 AM | 794 | 45 |  |
| 9:00 AM | 773 | 44 |  |
| 9:15 AM | 769 | 44 |  |
| 1:30 PM | 1062 | 57 |  |
| 1:45 PM | 1118 | 57 |  |
| 2:00 PM | 1214 | 57 |  |
| 2:15 PM | 1261 | 57 |  |
| 2:30 PM | 1293 | 58 |  |
| 2:45 PM | 1328 | 60 |  |
| 3:00 PM | 1349 | 63 |  |
| 3:15 PM | 1370 | 65 |  |
| 3:30 PM | 1392 | 68 |  |
| 3:45 PM | 1385 | 69 |  |
| 4:00 PM | 1365 | 70 |  |

MUTCD Figure 4C-4. Warrant 3, Peak Hour (70\% Factor)


Major Street - Total of Both Approaches - Vehicles Per Hour (VPH)
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## APPENDIX F: SYNCHRO \& SIDRA REPORTS

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | $\mathbf{r}$ |  | 4 | $\mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | 4 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 69 | 9 | 681 | 19 | 8 | 416 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 69 | 9 | 681 | 19 | 8 | 416 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | 150 | 200 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 91 | 92 | 92 | 80 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 75 | 10 | 748 | 21 | 9 | 520 |





| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement V | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations | M |  | 44 | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 55 | 7 | 465 | 72 | 30 | 728 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 55 | 7 | 465 | 72 | 30 | 728 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | 150 | 200 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 89 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 60 | 8 | 505 | 78 | 33 | 818 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\mathbf{7}$ | 4. | $\mathbf{7}$ |  | $\mathbf{4}$ |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 11 | 454 | 18 | 0 | 758 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 11 | 454 | 18 | 0 | 758 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | 0 | - | 70 | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 89 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 12 | 493 | 20 | 0 | 852 |




| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |




| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |



## SITE LAYOUT

$\theta$ Site: 1 [Rio Linda Blvd \& Main Site Drwy]
Existing Plus Project - AM Peak
Site Category: (None)
Roundabout
$1 N$
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## Site: 1 [Rio Linda Blvd \& Main Site Drwy]

Existing Plus Project - AM Peak
Site Category: (None)
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Mov } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | Demand Total veh/h | $\begin{gathered} \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | of Queue Distance ft | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate | Aver. No. Cycles | Average Speed mph |
| South: Rio Linda Blvd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | T1 | 748 | 2.0 | 0.278 | 5.6 | LOS A | 1.4 | 36.6 | 0.06 | 0.46 | 0.06 | 39.6 |
| 18 | R2 | 21 | 0.0 | 0.278 | 5.3 | LOS A | 1.4 | 36.6 | 0.06 | 0.47 | 0.06 | 30.3 |
| Appro | ch | 769 | 1.9 | 0.278 | 5.6 | LOS A | 1.4 | 36.6 | 0.06 | 0.46 | 0.06 | 39.3 |
| East: Main Site Drwy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 75 | 0.0 | 0.114 | 8.5 | LOS A | 0.4 | 10.2 | 0.56 | 0.78 | 0.56 | 28.3 |
| 16 | R2 | 10 | 0.0 | 0.114 | 4.6 | LOS A | 0.4 | 10.2 | 0.56 | 0.78 | 0.56 | 27.9 |
| Approach |  | 85 | 0.0 | 0.114 | 8.0 | LOS A | 0.4 | 10.2 | 0.56 | 0.78 | 0.56 | 28.2 |
| North: Rio Linda Blvd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 9 | 0.0 | 0.422 | 10.7 | LOS B | 2.8 | 70.7 | 0.30 | 0.49 | 0.30 | 30.9 |
| 4 | T1 | 520 | 2.0 | 0.422 | 6.1 | LOS A | 2.8 | 70.7 | 0.30 | 0.49 | 0.30 | 38.6 |
| Appro |  | 529 | 2.0 | 0.422 | 6.2 | LOS A | 2.8 | 70.7 | 0.30 | 0.49 | 0.30 | 38.5 |
| All Ve | cles | 1382 | 1.8 | 0.422 | 6.0 | LOS A | 2.8 | 70.7 | 0.19 | 0.49 | 0.19 | 38.1 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 6). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement. LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 6).
Roundabout Capacity Model: US HCM 6.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## Site: 1 [Rio Linda Blvd \& Main Site Drwy]

Existing Plus Project - PM Peak
Site Category: (None)
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ |  | Deman Total veh/h | $\begin{array}{r} \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | of Queue Distance ft | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate | Aver. No. Cycles | Average Speed mph |
| South: Rio Linda Blvd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | T1 | 505 | 2.0 | 0.215 | 5.7 | LOS A | 1.0 | 26.0 | 0.13 | 0.47 | 0.13 | 39.4 |
| 18 | R2 | 78 | 0.0 | 0.215 | 5.4 | LOS A | 1.0 | 26.0 | 0.13 | 0.48 | 0.13 | 30.1 |
| Appr | ch | 584 | 1.7 | 0.215 | 5.7 | LOS A | 1.0 | 26.0 | 0.13 | 0.47 | 0.13 | 37.8 |
| East: Main Site Drwy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 60 | 0.0 | 0.074 | 7.3 | LOS A | 0.3 | 6.6 | 0.47 | 0.67 | 0.47 | 28.6 |
| 16 | R2 | 8 | 0.0 | 0.074 | 3.4 | LOS A | 0.3 | 6.6 | 0.47 | 0.67 | 0.47 | 28.2 |
| Approach |  | 67 | 0.0 | 0.074 | 6.9 | LOS A | 0.3 | 6.6 | 0.47 | 0.67 | 0.47 | 28.6 |
| North: Rio Linda Blvd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 33 | 0.0 | 0.668 | 10.9 | LOS B | 7.1 | 180.4 | 0.43 | 0.48 | 0.43 | 30.6 |
| 4 | T1 | 818 | 2.0 | 0.668 | 6.2 | LOS A | 7.1 | 180.4 | 0.43 | 0.48 | 0.43 | 38.1 |
| Appr |  | 851 | 1.9 | 0.668 | 6.4 | LOS A | 7.1 | 180.4 | 0.43 | 0.48 | 0.43 | 37.7 |
| All Ve | icles | 1502 | 1.8 | 0.668 | 6.1 | LOS A | 7.1 | 180.4 | 0.31 | 0.49 | 0.31 | 37.2 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 6). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ ratio (degree of saturation) per movement. LOS F will result if $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>1$ irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 6).
Roundabout Capacity Model: US HCM 6.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 4.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\leqslant$ |  |  | \& |  | ${ }^{*}$ | 44 | F゙ | ${ }^{1}$ | 中4 | 7 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 10 | 2 | 6 | 66 | 5 | 8 | 23 | 802 | 18 | 7 | 496 | 10 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 10 | 2 | 6 | 66 | 5 | 8 | 23 | 802 | 18 | 7 | 496 | 10 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | 200 | - | 150 | 200 | - | 150 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 91 | 92 | 92 | 80 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 11 | 2 | 7 | 72 | 5 | 9 | 25 | 881 | 20 | 8 | 620 | 11 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 7.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \& |  |  | \& |  | * | 中4 | 7 | ${ }^{*}$ | 中4 | 7 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 38 | 6 | 24 | 53 | 4 | 7 | 66 | 545 | 69 | 28 | 874 | 24 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 38 | 6 | 24 | 53 | 4 | 7 | 66 | 545 | 69 | 28 | 874 | 24 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | 200 | - | 150 | 200 | - | 150 |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 89 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 41 | 7 | 26 | 58 | 4 | 8 | 72 | 592 | 75 | 30 | 982 | 26 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\mathbf{7}$ | 个. | $\mathbf{7}$ |  | 个4 |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 10 | 573 | 17 | 0 | 926 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 10 | 573 | 17 | 0 | 926 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | 0 | - | 70 | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 89 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 11 | 623 | 18 | 0 | 1040 |



| Approach | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 10.3 | 0 | 0 |

HCM LOS B

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBT | NBRWBLn1 | SBT |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Capacity (veh/h) | - | - | 690 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | - | -0.016 | - |  |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | - | - | 10.3 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | - | - | $B$ | - |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | - | - | 0 | - |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | \＆ |  |  | \＆ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 中4 | 「 | \％ | 中4 | F |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 10 | 2 | 6 | 66 | 5 | 8 | 23 | 802 | 18 | 7 | 496 | 10 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 10 | 2 | 6 | 66 | 5 | 8 | 23 | 802 | 18 | 7 | 496 | 10 |
| 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 |  | 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 | 1900 | 1870 | 1900 | 1900 | 1870 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 11 | 2 | 7 | 72 | 5 | 9 | 25 | 881 | 20 | 8 | 620 | 11 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.91 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.80 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Cap，veh／h | 234 | 32 | 55 | 311 | 8 | 15 | 642 | 2184 | 990 | 517 | 2184 | 990 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.61 | 0.61 | 0.61 | 0.61 | 0.61 | 0.61 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 757 | 349 | 595 | 1261 | 88 | 158 | 808 | 3554 | 1610 | 628 | 3554 | 1610 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 20 | 0 | 0 | 86 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 881 | 20 | 8 | 620 | 11 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1701 | 0 | 0 | 1506 | 0 | 0 | 808 | 1777 | 1610 | 628 | 1777 | 1610 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 4.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 2.8 | 0.1 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.3 | 4.3 | 0.2 | 4.6 | 2.8 | 0.1 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.55 |  | 0.35 | 0.84 |  | 0.10 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 321 | 0 | 0 | 333 | 0 | 0 | 642 | 2184 | 990 | 517 | 2184 | 990 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.26 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.04 | 0.40 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.28 | 0.01 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 1249 | 0 | 0 | 1227 | 0 | 0 | 642 | 2184 | 990 | 517 | 2184 | 990 |
| 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 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 14.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 14.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 3.4 | 2.6 | 4.5 | 3.1 | 2.6 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 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 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 14.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 15.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 2.6 | 4.6 | 3.4 | 2.6 |
| LnGrp LOS | B | A | A | B | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 20 |  |  | 86 |  |  | 926 |  |  | 639 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 14.3 |  |  | 15.3 |  |  | 3.9 |  |  | 3.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |
| Timer－Assigned Phs |  | 2 |  | 4 |  | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration（ $G+Y+R c$ ），$s$ |  | 26.0 |  | 8.2 |  | 26.0 |  | 8.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period（ $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ），s |  | 5.0 |  | 5.0 |  | 5.0 |  | 5.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s |  | 21.0 |  | 24.0 |  | 21.0 |  | 24.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s |  | 6.3 |  | 2.4 |  | 6.6 |  | 3.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s |  | 5.1 |  | 0.0 |  | 3.4 |  | 0.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay |  |  | 4.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |


| Major/Minor | Minor1 |  |  |  |  |  | Major1 |  | Major2 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conflicting Flow All | - | 448 | 0 | 0 | - |  |  |  |  |  |


| Approach | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HCM Control Delay, s | 11.5 | 0 | 0 |

HCMLOS B

| Minor Lane/Major Mvmt | NBT | NBRWBLn1 | SBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity (veh/h) | - | -564 | - |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | - | -0.025 | - |
| HCM Control Delay (s) | - | -11.5 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | - | - | B |
| HCM 95th \%tile Q(veh) | - | - | 0.1 |
| H | - |  |  |



| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | \$ |  |  | ¢ |  | \% | ¢ $\uparrow$ | 「 | \% | 个 4 | F |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 38 | 6 | 24 | 53 | , | 7 | 66 | 545 | 69 | 28 | 874 | 24 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 38 | 6 | 24 | 53 | 4 | 7 | 66 | 545 | 69 | 28 | 874 | 24 |
| 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 |  | 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 | 1900 | 1870 | 1900 | 1900 | 1870 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 41 | 7 | 26 | 58 | 4 | 8 | 72 | 592 | 75 | 30 | 982 | 26 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.89 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Cap, veh/h | 221 | 24 | 57 | 293 | 12 | 18 | 481 | 2310 | 1047 | 634 | 2310 | 1047 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.65 | 0.65 | 0.65 | 0.65 | 0.65 | 0.65 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 816 | 244 | 574 | 1286 | 121 | 182 | 582 | 3554 | 1610 | 782 | 3554 | 1610 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 74 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 72 | 592 | 75 | 30 | 982 | 26 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/n | 1634 | 0 | 0 | 1589 | 0 | 0 | 582 | 1777 | 1610 | 782 | 1777 | 1610 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 5.3 | 0.2 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.1 | 2.8 | 0.7 | 3.5 | 5.3 | 0.2 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.55 |  | 0.35 | 0.83 |  | 0.11 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 303 | 0 | 0 | 323 | 0 | 0 | 481 | 2310 | 1047 | 634 | 2310 | 1047 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.24 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.22 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.26 | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.43 | 0.02 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 1065 | 0 | 0 | 1044 | 0 | 0 | 481 | 2310 | 1047 | 634 | 2310 | 1047 |
| 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 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 16.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 16.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.3 | 2.9 | 2.6 | 3.7 | 3.4 | 2.5 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 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 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.0 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 17.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 17.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.0 | 3.2 | 2.7 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 2.5 |
| LnGrp LOS | B | A | A | B | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 74 |  |  | 70 |  |  | 739 |  |  | 1038 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 17.3 |  |  | 17.2 |  |  | 3.4 |  |  | 3.9 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |


| Timer - Assigned Phs | 2 | 4 | 6 | 8 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s | 31.0 | 9.0 | 31.0 | 9.0 |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 26.0 | 24.0 | 26.0 | 24.0 |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s | 10.1 | 3.5 | 7.3 | 3.4 |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 4.1 | 0.3 | 6.5 | 0.3 |

Intersection Summary

| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay | 4.7 |
| :--- | ---: |
| HCM 6th LOS | A |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay，s／veh | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\mathbf{7}$ | 个中 | $\mathbf{7}$ |  | 个中 |
| Traffic Vol，veh／h | 0 | 10 | 573 | 17 | 0 | 926 |
| Future Vol，veh／h | 0 | 10 | 573 | 17 | 0 | 926 |
| Conflicting Peds，\＃／hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | 0 | - | 70 | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage，\＃ | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Grade，\％ | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 89 |
| Heavy Vehicles，\％ | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 11 | 623 | 18 | 0 | 1040 |



| Approach | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HCM Control Delay，s | 10.3 | 0 | 0 |

HCMLOS B

| Minor Lane／Major Mvmt | NBT | NBRWBLn1 | SBT |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Capacity（veh／h） | - | -690 | - |
| HCM Lane V／C Ratio | - | -0.016 | - |
| HCM Control Delay（s） | - | -10.3 | - |
| HCM Lane LOS | - | - | B |
| HCM 95th \％tile Q（veh） | - | - | 0 |
| （v） | - |  |  |

## SITE LAYOUT

© $\operatorname{site} 1$ [Rio Linda Blvd \& Main Site Drwy/Leisure Vistas Drwy]
2040 Cumulative - AM Peak
Site Category: (None)
Roundabout
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## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## Site: 1 [Rio Linda Blvd \& Main Site Drwy/Leisure Vistas Drwy]

2040 Cumulative - AM Peak
Site Category: (None)
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Mov } \\ \text { ID } \end{gathered}$ | Turn | Deman Total veh/h | $\begin{gathered} \text { lows } \\ \text { HV } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | of Queue Distance ft | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate | Aver. No. Cycles | Average Speed mph |
| South: Rio Linda Blvd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 25 | 0.0 | 0.339 | 9.4 | LOS A | 1.9 | 48.1 | 0.12 | 0.47 | 0.12 | 37.9 |
| 8 | T1 | 881 | 2.0 | 0.339 | 5.7 | LOS A | 1.9 | 48.1 | 0.12 | 0.47 | 0.12 | 39.3 |
| 18 | R2 | 20 | 0.0 | 0.339 | 5.4 | LOS A | 1.9 | 48.1 | 0.12 | 0.46 | 0.12 | 30.1 |
| Appr |  | 926 | 1.9 | 0.339 | 5.8 | LOS A | 1.9 | 48.1 | 0.12 | 0.47 | 0.12 | 39.0 |
| East: Main Site Drwy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 72 | 0.0 | 0.134 | 9.4 | LOS A | 0.5 | 11.8 | 0.60 | 0.81 | 0.60 | 28.5 |
| 6 | T1 | 5 | 0.0 | 0.134 | 8.6 | LOS A | 0.5 | 11.8 | 0.60 | 0.81 | 0.60 | 27.7 |
| 16 | R2 | 9 | 0.0 | 0.134 | 5.6 | LOS A | 0.5 | 11.8 | 0.60 | 0.81 | 0.60 | 27.9 |
| Appr |  | 86 | 0.0 | 0.134 | 8.9 | LOS A | 0.5 | 11.8 | 0.60 | 0.81 | 0.60 | 28.4 |
| North: Rio Linda Blvd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 8 | 0.0 | 0.252 | 10.9 | LOS B | 1.2 | 30.8 | 0.26 | 0.48 | 0.26 | 31.4 |
| 4 | T1 | 620 | 2.0 | 0.252 | 5.8 | LOS A | 1.2 | 30.8 | 0.26 | 0.48 | 0.26 | 39.3 |
| 14 | R2 | 11 | 0.0 | 0.252 | 5.0 | LOS A | 1.2 | 30.8 | 0.26 | 0.47 | 0.26 | 36.7 |
| Approach |  | 638 | 1.9 | 0.252 | 5.8 | LOS A | 1.2 | 30.8 | 0.26 | 0.48 | 0.26 | 39.1 |
| West: Leisure Vistas Drwy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 2 \\ & 12 \end{aligned}$ | L2 | 11 | 0.0 | 0.025 | 12.0 | LOS B | 0.1 | 2.2 | 0.52 | 0.72 | 0.52 | 34.6 |
|  | T1 | 2 | 0.0 | 0.025 | 6.9 | LOS A | 0.1 | 2.2 | 0.52 | 0.72 | 0.52 | 34.7 |
|  | R2 | 7 | 0.0 | 0.025 | 6.4 | LOS A | 0.1 | 2.2 | 0.52 | 0.72 | 0.52 | 34.0 |
| Approach |  | 20 | 0.0 | 0.025 | 9.6 | LOS A | 0.1 | 2.2 | 0.52 | 0.72 | 0.52 | 34.4 |
| All Vehicles |  | 1670 | 1.8 | 0.339 | 6.0 | LOS A | 1.9 | 48.1 | 0.20 | 0.49 | 0.20 | 38.2 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 6). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
LOS F will result if v/c > 1 irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements (v/c not used as specified in HCM 6).
Roundabout Capacity Model: US HCM 6.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.

## MOVEMENT SUMMARY

## Site: 1 [Rio Linda Blvd \& Main Site Drwy/Leisure Vistas Drwy]

2040 Cumulative - PM Peak
Site Category: (None)
Roundabout

| Movement Performance - Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mov } \\ & \text { ID } \end{aligned}$ | Turn | Deman Total veh/h | ows HV $\%$ | Deg. Satn v/c | Average Delay sec | Level of Service | 95\% Back Vehicles veh | f Queue Distance ft | Prop. Queued | Effective Stop Rate | Aver. No. Cycles | Average Speed mph |
| South: Rio Linda Blvd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | L2 | 72 | 0.0 | 0.284 | 9.7 | LOS A | 1.4 | 36.6 | 0.23 | 0.52 | 0.23 | 37.0 |
| 8 | T1 | 592 | 2.0 | 0.284 | 5.9 | LOS A | 1.4 | 36.6 | 0.23 | 0.51 | 0.23 | 38.6 |
| 18 | R2 | 75 | 0.0 | 0.284 | 5.6 | LOS A | 1.4 | 36.6 | 0.23 | 0.49 | 0.23 | 29.9 |
| Appr | ch | 739 | 1.6 | 0.284 | 6.3 | LOS A | 1.4 | 36.6 | 0.23 | 0.51 | 0.23 | 37.3 |
| East: Main Site Drwy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | L2 | 58 | 0.0 | 0.090 | 8.1 | LOS A | 0.3 | 8.0 | 0.54 | 0.74 | 0.54 | 29.0 |
| 6 | T1 | 4 | 0.0 | 0.090 | 7.4 | LOS A | 0.3 | 8.0 | 0.54 | 0.74 | 0.54 | 28.1 |
| 16 | R2 | 8 | 0.0 | 0.090 | 4.4 | LOS A | 0.3 | 8.0 | 0.54 | 0.74 | 0.54 | 28.4 |
| Appr |  | 70 | 0.0 | 0.090 | 7.7 | LOS A | 0.3 | 8.0 | 0.54 | 0.74 | 0.54 | 28.8 |
| North: Rio Linda Blvd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | L2 | 30 | 0.0 | 0.421 | 11.2 | LOS B | 2.5 | 62.8 | 0.37 | 0.52 | 0.37 | 31.1 |
| 4 | T1 | 982 | 2.0 | 0.421 | 6.0 | LOS A | 2.5 | 62.8 | 0.37 | 0.52 | 0.37 | 38.8 |
| 14 | R2 | 26 | 0.0 | 0.421 | 5.3 | LOS A | 2.5 | 62.8 | 0.37 | 0.51 | 0.37 | 36.3 |
| Approach |  | 1039 | 1.9 | 0.421 | 6.2 | LOS A | 2.5 | 62.8 | 0.37 | 0.52 | 0.37 | 38.4 |
| West: Leisure Vistas Drwy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 2 \\ & 12 \end{aligned}$ | L2 | 41 | 0.0 | 0.131 | 14.3 | LOS B | 0.5 | 11.3 | 0.64 | 0.86 | 0.64 | 33.5 |
|  | T1 | 7 | 0.0 | 0.131 | 9.2 | LOS A | 0.5 | 11.3 | 0.64 | 0.86 | 0.64 | 33.6 |
|  | R2 | 26 | 0.0 | 0.131 | 8.7 | LOS A | 0.5 | 11.3 | 0.64 | 0.86 | 0.64 | 32.9 |
| Approach |  | 74 | 0.0 | 0.131 | 11.9 | LOS B | 0.5 | 11.3 | 0.64 | 0.86 | 0.64 | 33.3 |
| All Vehicles |  | 1921 | 1.6 | 0.421 | 6.5 | LOS A | 2.5 | 62.8 | 0.33 | 0.53 | 0.33 | 37.3 |

Site Level of Service (LOS) Method: Delay \& v/c (HCM 6). Site LOS Method is specified in the Parameter Settings dialog (Site tab). Roundabout LOS Method: Same as Signalised Intersections.
Vehicle movement LOS values are based on average delay and v/c ratio (degree of saturation) per movement.
LOS F will result if v/c > 1 irrespective of movement delay value (does not apply for approaches and intersection).
Intersection and Approach LOS values are based on average delay for all movements ( $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ not used as specified in HCM 6).
Roundabout Capacity Model: US HCM 6.
SIDRA Standard Delay Model is used. Control Delay includes Geometric Delay.
Gap-Acceptance Capacity: Traditional M1.
HV (\%) values are calculated for All Movement Classes of All Heavy Vehicle Model Designation.


[^0]:    a Small sample size. Fitted curve equation not given.

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ As of this memo, the latest update to the manual is July 1, 2020

