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## Executive Summary

This report presents an analysis of the potential traffic impacts that would be associated with the proposed Creekside Estates, a residential subdivision with 46 single family homes. The project site is located on the south side of Durham-Dayton Highway, east of its intersection with Midway and is currently used as an orchard. A single access point on Durham-Dayton Highway would connect to Street A and serve all 46 residences. The proposed project would be expected to result in 434 new daily trips on average, including 34 trips during the morning peak hour and 46 trips during the evening peak hour.

Under Existing Conditions for the year 2018, all study intersections are currently operating acceptably at LOS C or better during both peak hours.

The Butte County Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Fiscal Years 2017 through 2026-27 includes the installation of a traffic signal at the intersection of Durham-Dayton Highway/Midway by the horizon year 2028. Under Future Conditions, and with the planned installation of a traffic signal at Durham-Dayton Highway/Midway, all study intersections are expected to operate acceptably at LOS A or B during both peak hours. The County of Butte should consider installing a roundabout at the intersection of Durham-Dayton Highway/Midway as an alternative to a traffic signal. A preliminary evaluation indicates that the intersection may be a good candidate for a roundabout.

Upon the addition of project-related traffic to existing volumes, all study intersections would be expected to continue operating acceptably at LOS C or better during both peak hours, and the project's short-term impact on operation would be considered less-than-significant.

Upon the addition of project-related traffic to the volumes anticipated for the year 2028, and with installation of a traffic signal or roundabout at Durham-Dayton Highway/Midway, all study intersections would be expected to operate at LOS A or B during both peak hours and the project's impact on long-term operation would be considered less-than-significant.

The project would provide a sidewalk along the entirety of its frontage with Durham-Dayton Highway; however, the project sidewalk would be disconnected from the surrounding pedestrian network. Because the project site is located within walking distance from the downtown core of Durham and the schools located west of Midway, it is recommended that the project provide a pedestrian path between the project site and Midway. Existing bicycle facilities along with those planned would provide adequate access for bicyclists. Existing transit service is adequate to accommodate the demand anticipated for the project.

As proposed in the site plan, on-site circulation would be expected to operate acceptably. Adequate sight distance is available along Durham-Dayton Highway at the project access to accommodate all turns. A left-turn lane would not be warranted on Durham-Dayton Highway at the project access point. Neither a right-turn lane, nor right-turn taper, would not be warranted at the project access point on Durham-Dayton Highway. Installation of any vegetation or signage at the project access point should be done in a manner that does not impede clear sight lines.

## Introduction

## Introduction

This report presents an analysis of the potential traffic impacts that would be associated with the proposed Creekside Estates, a residential subdivision with 46 single family homes. The project site is located in the community of Durham in unincorporated Butte County. The project would be located east of Midway and on the south side of Durham-Dayton Highway, with access being taken off Durham-Dayton Highway. The traffic study was completed in accordance with the criteria established by the County of Butte and is consistent with standard traffic engineering techniques. It is noted that a traffic study was completed for a residential project on this site in 2013, so data from that study was used in this update.

## Prelude

The purpose of a traffic impact study is to provide County of Butte staff and policy makers such as Planning Commissioners and Board of Supervisors members with data which they can use to make an informed decision regarding the potential traffic impacts of a proposed project, and any associated improvements which would be required to mitigate these impacts to a level of insignificance as defined by the County's General Plan or other policies. Impacts to vehicular traffic are typically evaluated by determining the number of trips the new use would be expected to generate, distributing the new trips to the surrounding street system based on existing travel patterns or anticipated travel patterns specific to the proposed project, then analyzing the impact the new traffic would be expected to have on critical intersections included in the study. Impacts are also reviewed for alternative modes, including pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. Based on the conditions projected, appropriate mitigation measures can be determined that would reduce the traffic impacts of the project to levels which are less than significant.

## Project Profile

The proposed project consists of 46 single family homes with a total development area of approximately 50 acres. The project site is located on the south side of Durham-Dayton Highway, east of the intersection with Midway, and is currently used as an orchard, though the trees would be removed to make room for the project, and occupied by an existing single family dwelling, which would remain. A single access point on Durham-Dayton Highway would serve all 46 residences.

The location of the project site is shown in Figure 1.
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Figure 1 - Study Area and Lane Configurations

## Transportation Setting

## Operational Analysis

## Study Area and Periods

The study area consists of the following intersections and the project access point:

1. Midway/Jones Avenue
2. Durham-Dayton Highway/Midway
3. Durham-Dayton Highway/Jones Avenue
4. Durham-Dayton Highway/Stanford Lane
5. Durham-Dayton Highway/Lott Road

Conditions during the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak periods were evaluated. The weekday morning peak hour occurs between 7:00 and 9:00 a.m. and reflects conditions during the home to work or school commute, while the p.m. peak hour occurs between 4:00 and 6:00 p.m. and typically reflects the highest level of congestion during the homeward bound commute.

## Study Intersections

Midway/Jones Avenue is a "tee" intersection with westbound Jones Avenue stop-controlled and both Midway approaches uncontrolled. The southbound approach on Midway includes a 75 -foot left-turn lane.

Durham-Dayton Highway/Midway is an all-way stop intersection located within the town center of Durham, with single lane approaches. Crosswalks are located on three approaches to the intersection.

Durham-Dayton Highway/Jones Avenue is a "tee" intersection with Durham-Dayton Highway uncontrolled and the approach of Jones Avenue stop-controlled. Class II bicycle lanes are provided on both sides of Durham-Dayton Highway.

Durham-Dayton Highway/Stanford Lane is a "tee" intersection with Durham-Dayton Highway uncontrolled and the approach of Stanford Lane stop-controlled. Class II bicycle lanes are provided on both sides of Durham-Dayton Highway.

Durham-Dayton Highway/Lott Road is two-way stop-controlled on the Lott Road approaches. Class II bicycle lanes are provided on both sides of Durham-Dayton Highway.

The locations of the study intersections and the existing lane configurations and controls are shown in Figure 1.

## Collision History

The collision history for the study area was reviewed to determine any trends or patterns that may indicate a safety issue. Collision rates were calculated based on records available from the California Highway Patrol as published in their Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) reports. The most current five-year period available is from January 1, 2013 through December 31, 2017. As presented in Table 1, the calculated collision rates for the study intersections were compared to average collision rates for similar facilities statewide, as indicated in 2014 Collision Data on California State Highways, California Department of Transportation (Caltrans).

The intersection of Durham-Dayton Highway/Lott Road had two reported collisions during the five-year study period, resulting in a calculated collision rate of 0.31 collisions per million vehicles entering ( $c / m v e$ ). Although the calculated collision rate is slightly above the statewide average for similar facilities, because only two collisions occurred over a five-year period and only one collision involved an injury, no remedial measures appear necessary. All other study intersections had calculated collision rates that were lower than the statewide average rate for similar facilities. The collision rate calculations are provided in Appendix A.

| Study Intersection | Number of Collisions (2013-2017) | Calculated Collision Rate (c/mve) | Statewide Average Collision Rate (c/mve) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Midway/Jones Ave | 1 | 0.08 | 0.16 |
| 2. Durham-Dayton Hwy/Midway | 4 | 0.30 | 0.32 |
| 3. Durham-Dayton Hwy/Jones Ave | 1 | 0.11 | 0.14 |
| 4. Durham-Dayton Hwy/Stanford Ln | 1 | 0.12 | 0.16 |
| 5. Durham-Dayton Hwy/Lott Rd | 2 | 0.31 | 0.23 |

## Alternative Transportation Modes

## Pedestrian Facilities

Pedestrian facilities include sidewalks, crosswalks, pedestrian signal phases, curb ramps, curb extensions, and various streetscape amenities such as lighting, benches, etc. Existing pedestrian facilities located within the study area are focused on Durham-Dayton Highway and Midway, as follows:

- Durham-Dayton Highway - A continuous sidewalk is provided on Durham-Dayton Highway west of the intersection with Midway. Crosswalks are located on the north, south, and west legs at the Midway intersection where there are all-way stops which provide a controlled crossing for pedestrians.
- Midway - Sidewalks extend south from the intersection with Durham-Dayton Highway on both sides of the road and to the north on the west side.

In general, the lack of continuous sidewalks in a rural area is typical. The distance a pedestrian will typically travel to reach a destination is generally half a mile and in a rural area few destinations are located within this threshold. However, the Creekside Estates site is located less than a half-mile from the core of Durham, near the intersection of Durham-Dayton Highway/Midway where there are commercial businesses and the post office. Durham Elementary School and High School are located on the north side of Durham-Dayton Highway, just west of the intersection with Midway. Given these uses in Durham, some pedestrian trips between the development and this downtown area of Durham are expected.

## Bicycle Facilities

The Caltrans Highway Design Manual classifies bikeways into three categories.

- Class I Multi-Use Path - a completely separated right-of-way for the exclusive use of bicycles and pedestrians with cross flows of motorized traffic minimized.
- Class II Bike Lane - a striped and signed lane for one-way bike travel on a street or highway.
- Class III Bike Route - signing only for shared use with motor vehicles within the same travel lane on a street or highway.

In the project area, Class II bike lanes exist on Durham-Dayton Highway between Midway and Lott Road. Table 2 summarizes the existing and planned bicycle facilities in the project vicinity, as contained in the Butte County Bicycle Plan.

Table 2 - Bicycle Facility Summary

| Status <br> Facility | Class | Length <br> (miles) | Begin Point | End Point |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Existing <br> Durham-Dayton Hwy | II | 2.8 | McAnarlin Ave | Esquon Rd |
| Planned |  |  |  |  |
| Jones Ave | III | 2.2 | Durham-Dayton Hwy | Midway |
| Lott Rd | II | 2.1 | Durham-Dayton Hwy | Oroville Chico Hwy |
| Midway | II | 10.9 | Durham-Dayton Hwy | Richvale Hwy |

Source: Source: 2011 Butte County Bicycle Plan, County of Butte, 2011

## Transit Facilities

Transit service in Butte County is provided by B-Line (Butte Regional Transit) operated by the Butte County Association of Governments, which provides fixed-route bus service as well as flexible route paratransit for seniors and those with disabilities. The B-Line's bus Route 32 operates Monday through Friday and stops at the intersection of Durham-Dayton Highway/Midway. This route offers transit service to Chico, Biggs, and Gridley five days a week twice a day, once in the morning and once in the evening. Bike racks are available on all B-Line buses on a first come first served basis.

## Capacity Analysis

## Intersection Level of Service Methodologies

Level of Service (LOS) is used to rank traffic operation on various types of facilities based on traffic volumes and roadway capacity using a series of letter designations ranging from A to F. Generally, Level of Service A represents free flow conditions and Level of Service F represents forced flow or breakdown conditions. A unit of measure that indicates a level of delay generally accompanies the LOS designation.

The study intersections were analyzed using methodologies published in the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM), Transportation Research Board, 2010. This source contains methodologies for various types of intersection control, all of which are related to a measurement of delay in average number of seconds per vehicle.

The intersection of Durham-Dayton Highway/Midway was analyzed using the "All-Way Stop-Controlled" Intersection methodology from the HCM, as the intersections are currently controlled with stop signs on all four approaches. This methodology evaluates delay for each approach based on turning movements, opposing and conflicting traffic volumes, and the number of lanes. Average vehicle delay is computed for the intersection as a whole, and is then related to a Level of Service.

The rest of the study intersections were analyzed using the "Two-Way Stop-Controlled" methodology, which determines a level of service for each minor turning movement by estimating the level of average delay in seconds per vehicle. Results are presented for individual movements together with the weighted overall average delay for the intersection. The ranges of delay associated with the various levels of service are indicated in Table 3.

Table 3 - Intersection Level of Service Criteria

| LOS | Two-Way Stop-Controlled | All-Way Stop-Controlled |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| A | Delay of 0 to 10 seconds. Gaps in traffic are readily <br> available for drivers exiting the minor street. | Delay of 0 to 10 seconds. Upon stopping, drivers are <br> immediately able to proceed. |
| B | Delay of 10 to 15 seconds. Gaps in traffic are somewhat <br> less readily available than with LOS A, but no queuing <br> occurs on the minor street. | Delay of 10 to 15 seconds. Drivers may wait for one or <br> two vehicles to clear the intersection before proceeding <br> from a stop. |
| C | Delay of 15 to 25 seconds. Acceptable gaps in traffic are <br> less frequent, and drivers may approach while another <br> vehicle is already waiting to exit the side street. | Delay of 15 to 25 seconds. Drivers will enter a queue of <br> one or two vehicles on the same approach, and wait for <br> vehicle to clear from one or more approaches prior to <br> entering the intersection. |
| D | Delay of 25 to 35 seconds. There are fewer acceptable gaps <br> in traffic, and drivers may enter a queue of one or two <br> vehicles on the side street. | Delay of 25 to 35 seconds. Queues of more than two <br> vehicles are encountered on one or more approaches. |
| E | Delay of 35 to 50 seconds. Few acceptable gaps in traffic <br> are available, and longer queues may form on the side <br> street. | Delay of 35 to 50 seconds. Longer queues are <br> encountered on more than one approach to the <br> intersection. |
| F | Delay of more than 50 seconds. Drivers may wait for long <br> periods before there is an acceptable gap in traffic for <br> exiting the side streets, creating long queues. | Delay of more than 50 seconds. Drivers enter long <br> queues on all approaches. |

[^0]
## Traffic Operation Standards

The proposed project, along with all study intersections, is located within unincorporated Butte County. Therefore, traffic operation standards for the entire study area are based upon the County of Butte's policies, as contained in the Butte County General Plan 2030, policy CIR-P6.1:

The level of service for County-maintained roads within unincorporated areas of the county but outside municipalities' sphere of influences (SOI) shall be level of service (LOS) C or better during the PM peak hour. Within a municipality's SOI, the level of service shall meet the municipality's level of service policy.

None of the study intersections are located within a municipality's SOI, so the County's standard of LOS C was applied to all study intersections.

## Existing Conditions

The Existing Conditions scenario provides an evaluation of current operation based on existing traffic volumes during the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours. This condition does not include project-generated traffic volumes. Rather than collecting new counts, volume data collected for a previously proposed version of the project in 2013 was factored up to reflect volumes indicative of 2018.

The Butte County Association of Governments (BCAG) has a gravity demand model that provides volume projections from a base year of 2006 to a future year of 2035 for the entire county. The model indicates that volumes in the project vicinity are expected to increase at a rate of 2.24 percent annually during the morning peak hour and 1.65 percent annually during the p.m. peak hour. Accounting for the five years of growth that has occurred since the 2013 analysis, growth factors of 1.11 and 1.08 were applied to the 2013 volumes to determine likely existing volumes. The BCAD volume data and growth factor calculations are contained in Appendix $B$.

## Intersection Levels of Service

Under Existing Conditions for the year 2018, all study intersections are currently operating acceptably at LOS C or better during both peak hours. (All the stop-controlled approaches are operating at LOS B.) The existing traffic volumes are shown in Figure 2 and a summary of the intersection levels of service is contained in Table 4. Copies of the Level of Service Calculations for all evaluated scenarios are provided in Appendix C.


Figure 2 - Existing Traffic Volumes

Table 4 - Existing Peak Hour Intersection Levels of Service

| Study Intersection Approach | Existing Conditions |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
|  | Delay | LOS | Delay | LOS |
| 1. Midway/Jones Ave | 0.5 | A | 0.9 | A |
| Westbound Jones Ave Approach | 10.6 | B | 10.0 | B |
| 2. Durham-Dayton Hwy/Midway | 15.5 | C | 12.2 | B |
| 3. Durham-Dayton Hwy/Jones Ave | 0.7 | A | 0.7 | A |
| Southbound Jones Ave Approach | 10.6 | B | 10.2 | $B$ |
| 4. Durham-Dayton Hwy/Stanford Ln | 1.1 | A | 0.7 | A |
| Northbound Stanford Ln Approach | 11.2 | B | 10.6 | B |
| 5. Durham-Dayton Hwy/Lott Rd | 3.1 | A | 3.1 | A |
| Northbound Lott Rd Approach | 10.2 | $B$ | 11.2 | $B$ |
| Southbound Lott Rd Approach | 9.3 | A | 9.9 | $A$ |

Notes: Delay is measured in average seconds per vehicle; LOS = Level of Service; Results for minor approaches to two-way stop-controlled intersections are indicated in italics

## Future Conditions

The same growth rates used to factor up the 2013 counts for Existing Conditions were applied to determine volumes representative of the horizon year 2028 (15 years from collection of the counts and 10 years into the future). Based on the BCAG data, growth factors of 1.34 and 1.25 were applied to the morning and evening peak hours, respectively. As contained in the Butte County Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Fiscal Years 2017 through 2026-27, the intersection of Durham-Dayton Highway/Midway is planned to be signalized by the horizon year 2028, so levels of service at this intersection were analyzed with the planned improvement, in addition to its existing controls.

## Intersection Levels of Service

Under Future Conditions, and with the planned installation of a traffic signal at Durham-Dayton Highway/Midway, all study intersections are expected to operate acceptably at LOS B or better during both peak hours. Future volumes are shown in Figure 3 and the resulting levels of service are summarized in Table 5.
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Figure 3 - Future Traffic Volumes

Table 5 - Future Peak Hour Intersection Levels of Service

| Study Intersection Approach | Future Conditions |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
|  | Delay | LOS | Delay | LOS |
| 1. Midway/Jones Ave | 0.5 | A | 0.9 | A |
| Westbound Jones Ave Approach | 11.2 | $B$ | 10.3 | B |
| 2. Durham-Dayton Hwy/Midway | 30.0 | D | 15.3 | C |
| Traffic Signal | 14.8 | B | 14.5 | B |
| Roundabout | 10.5 | B | 8.1 | A |
| 3. Durham-Dayton Hwy/Jones Ave | 0.8 | A | 0.7 | A |
| Southbound Jones Ave Approach | 11.3 | $B$ | 10.6 | B |
| 4. Durham-Dayton Hwy/Stanford Ave | 1.2 | A | 0.7 | A |
| Northbound Stanford Ave Approach | 12.1 | $B$ | 11.2 | $B$ |
| 5. Durham-Dayton Hwy/Lott Rd | 3.2 | A | 3.2 | A |
| Northbound Lott Rd Approach | 10.6 | $B$ | 11.7 | $B$ |
| Southbound Lott Rd Approach | 9.5 | A | 10.2 | B |

Notes: Delay is measured in average seconds per vehicle; LOS = Level of Service; Results for minor approaches to two-way stop-controlled intersections are indicated in italics; Bold text indicates unacceptable operation; Shaded cells represent conditions with planned or recommended improvements

In addition to a traffic signal, the intersection of Durham-Dayton Highway/Midway was evaluated as a roundabout after a preliminary analysis indicated that the intersection may be a good candidate for such a facility based on geometry, right-of-way availability, rural setting, and traffic volumes. The CIP cost estimate for the planned traffic signal is $\$ 450,000$ and a single-lane roundabout may likely be similar in cost. For this reason, along with the safety benefits that roundabouts provide, it is recommended that the County explore the possibility of installing a roundabout as opposed to a traffic signal. As shown in Table 5 above, doing so would result in delays less than those expected upon signalization.

## Project Description

The proposed project consists of 46 single family homes with a total development area of approximately 50 acres. The project site is located on the south side of Durham-Dayton Highway, east of its intersection with Midway and is currently used as an orchard, though the trees would be removed to make room for the project, and occupied by an existing single family dwelling, which would remain. As proposed, the project would be constructed in three phases; the first phase would include construction of 16 homes and project Streets A, B, and C, the second phase would extend Street A to the southeast, construct Street D, and add 19 more homes, and the third phase would extend Street A to the southwest and construct 11 more homes. A single access point on Durham-Dayton Highway would connect to Street A and serve all 46 residences.

The proposed project site plan is shown in Figure 4.


## Trip Generation

The anticipated trip generation for the proposed project was estimated using standard rates published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) in Trip Generation Manual, 10 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Edition, 2017. Rates for "Single Family Detached Housing" (ITE LU \#210) were applied. Based on this land use, the proposed project would be expected to result in 434 new daily trips on average, including 34 trips during the morning peak hour and 46 trips during the evening peak hour. It should be noted that the existing orchard that would be removed as part of the project is likely generating a nominal amount of traffic so any trip generation credits were ignored to provide conservative results. The anticipated trip generation for the proposed project is shown in Table 6.

Table 6 - Trip Generation Summary

| Land Use | Units | Daily |  | AM Peak Hour |  |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Rate | Trips | Rate | Trips | In | Out | Rate | Trips | In | Out |
| Proposed <br> Single Family Detached <br> Housing 46 | 9.44 | 434 | 0.74 | 34 | 9 | 25 | 0.99 | 46 | 29 | 17 |  |

## Trip Distribution

The trip distribution was developed based on existing traffic patterns, volumes presented in the County's travel demand forecasting model, and the anticipated origins and destinations for residents of the project. As would be expected, the highest percentages were assigned to those roads connecting to Chico. Table 7 summarizes the distribution assumptions applied.

Table 7 - Trip Distribution Assumptions

| Route | Percent |
| :--- | :---: |
| To/from West via Durham-Dayton Hwy | $35 \%$ |
| To/from North via Midway | $25 \%$ |
| To/from North via Jones Ave | $5 \%$ |
| To/From South via Midway | $10 \%$ |
| To/From North via Lott Rd | $5 \%$ |
| To/From East via Durham-Dayton Hwy | $\mathbf{2 0 \%}$ |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

## Intersection Operation

## Existing plus Project Conditions

Upon the addition of project-generated traffic to existing volumes, all study intersections are expected to continue operating acceptably at LOS C or better during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. The project traffic volumes are shown in Figure 5 and LOS results are summarized in Table 8.
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Figure 5 - Project Traffic Volumes

Table 8 - Existing and Existing plus Project Peak Hour Intersection Levels of Service

| Study Intersection |  | ting | ndi |  |  | ng | Pr |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach | AM | eak |  | eak | AM | eak |  |  |
|  | Delay | LOS | Delay | LOS | Delay | LOS | Delay | LOS |
| 1. Midway/Jones Ave | 0.5 | A | 0.9 | A | 0.5 | A | 0.9 | A |
| Westbound Jones Ave Approach | 10.6 | B | 10.0 | B | 10.6 | B | 10.0 | B |
| 2. Durham-Dayton Hwy/Midway | 15.5 | C | 12.2 | B | 16.2 | C | 12.7 | B |
| 3. Durham-Dayton Hwy/Jones Ave | 0.7 | A | 0.7 | A | 0.7 | A | 0.7 | A |
| Southbound Jones Ave Approach | 10.6 | B | 10.2 | B | 10.9 | B | 10.6 | B |
| 4. Durham-Dayton Hwy/Stanford Ave | 1.1 | A | 0.7 | A | 1.1 | A | 0.6 | A |
| Northbound Stanford Ave Approach | 11.2 | B | 10.6 | B | 11.3 | B | 10.7 | B |
| 5. Durham-Dayton Hwy/Lott Rd | 3.1 | A | 3.1 | A | 3.1 | A | 3.0 | A |
| Northbound Lott Rd Approach | 10.2 | $B$ | 11.2 | $B$ | 10.3 | $B$ | 11.3 | $B$ |
| Southbound Lott Rd Approach | 9.3 | A | 9.9 | A | 9.4 | A | 9.9 | $A$ |

Notes: Delay is measured in average seconds per vehicle; LOS = Level of Service; Results for minor approaches to two-way stop-controlled intersections are indicated in italics

It should be noted that with the addition of project-related traffic volumes, average delay at the intersections of Durham-Dayton Highway with Stanford Lane and Lott Road decreases slightly during the p.m. peak hour. While this is counter-intuitive, this condition occurs when a project adds trips to movements that are currently underutilized or have delays that are below the intersection average, resulting in a better balance between approaches and lower overall average delay. The project would add traffic predominantly to the through and right-turn movements at the aforementioned intersections during the evening peak hour, and these movements have delays that are lower than the averages for the intersections as a whole, resulting in a slight reduction in the overall average delay. The conclusion could incorrectly be drawn that the project actually improves operation at these intersections based on this data alone; however, it is more appropriate to conclude that the project trips are expected to make use of excess capacity, so drivers will experience little, if any, change in conditions as a result of the project.

Finding - Upon the addition of project-related traffic to existing volumes, all study intersections would be expected to continue operating acceptably at LOS C or better during both peak hours, and the project's shortterm impact on operation would be considered less-than-significant.

## Future plus Project Conditions

Project-generated traffic was added to the traffic volumes obtained from the growth rates derived from the BCAG model to determine how the surrounding roadways would function under Future plus Project conditions. Upon the addition of project generated traffic, and with implementation of the planned traffic signal or roundabout at Durham-Dayton Highway/Midway, all study intersections would be expected to operate acceptably at LOS A or B during both peak hours; these results are summarized in Table 9.

Table 9 - Future and Future plus Project Peak Hour Intersection Levels of Service

| Study Intersection Approach | Future Conditions |  |  |  | Future plus Project |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  | AM Peak |  | PM Peak |  |
|  | Delay | LOS | Delay | LOS | Delay | LOS | Delay | LOS |
| 1. Midway/Jones Ave | 0.5 | A | 0.9 | A | 0.5 | A | 0.9 | A |
| Westbound Jones Ave Approach | 11.2 | B | 10.3 | B | 11.3 | B | 10.3 | B |
| 2. Durham-Dayton Hwy/Midway | 30.0 | D | 15.3 | C | 33.6 | D | 16.1 | C |
| Traffic Signal | 14.8 | B | 14.5 | B | 14.9 | B | 14.6 | B |
| Roundabout | 10.5 | B | 8.1 | A | 10.9 | B | 8.3 | A |
| 3. Durham-Dayton Hwy/Jones Ave | 0.8 | A | 0.7 | A | 0.8 | A | 0.7 | A |
| Southbound Jones Ave Approach | 11.3 | B | 10.6 | B | 11.5 | B | 11.0 | $B$ |
| 4. Durham-Dayton Hwy/Stanford Ln | 1.2 | A | 0.7 | A | 1.2 | A | 0.7 | A |
| Northbound Stanford Ln Approach | 12.1 | B | 11.2 | $B$ | 12.2 | B | 11.2 | $B$ |
| 5. Durham-Dayton Hwy/Lott Rd | 3.2 | A | 3.2 | A | 3.1 | A | 3.1 | A |
| Northbound Lott Rd Approach | 10.6 | B | 11.7 | B | 10.6 | B | 11.8 | B |
| Southbound Lott Rd Approach | 9.5 | $A$ | 10.2 | B | 9.6 | A | 10.2 | B |

Notes: Delay is measured in average seconds per vehicle; LOS = Level of Service; Results for minor approaches to two-way stop-controlled intersections are indicated in italics; Bold text indicates unacceptable operation; Shaded cells represent conditions with planned or recommended improvements

Finding - Upon the addition of project-related traffic to the volumes anticipated for the year 2028, and with installation of a traffic signal or roundabout at Durham-Dayton Highway/Midway, all study intersections would be expected to operate at LOS A or B during both peak hours and the project's impact on long-term operation would be considered less-than-significant.

Recommendation - As mentioned earlier in this report, the County should explore the feasibility of installing a roundabout at Durham-Dayton Highway/Midway, instead of a traffic signal.

## Alternative Transportation Modes

## Pedestrian Facilities

Given the rural nature of the area surrounding the project site, the lack of sidewalks near the project is generally acceptable. However, because the project is located less than half a mile from the downtown area of Durham, where there are markets, the post office as well as the Elementary and High School, some residents including students may wish to walk from the development to the downtown area. Therefore, it is recommended that an all-weather pedestrian walkway or path be provided on the south side of Durham-Dayton Highway between the proposed terminus of the project sidewalk at the property boundary and the intersection with Midway. Crosswalks are already present at the intersection of Durham-Dayton Highway/Midway where there is an all-way Stop control. With these improvements, students walking to the Durham schools could take the following route:

- Walking along the south side of Durham-Dayton Highway on the recommended sidewalk/all-weather pathway to the intersection with Midway (approximately 2,500 feet).
- Crossing to the northwest corner of the Midway intersection using the all-way Stop controlled crossing.
- Walking along the north side of Durham-Dayton Highway on the existing sidewalk/asphalt pathways to Goodspeed Street or Putney Drive which access the Elementary and High Schools (approximately 1,000 feet).

Finding - The project would provide a sidewalk/all-weather pathway along the entirety of its frontage with Durham-Dayton Highway; however, the project sidewalk would be disconnected from the surrounding pedestrian network in the core of Durham.

Recommendation - Because the project site is located within walking distance from the downtown core of Durham and the schools located west of Midway, it is recommended that the project provide an all-weather pedestrian path on the south side of Durham-Dayton Highway between the project site and the intersection with Midway.

## Bicycle Facilities

The existing bicycle lanes on Durham-Dayton Highway would provide adequate bicycle access for the development. The planned bicycle facilities in the area, including bicycle lanes on Midway and Lott Road as well as a future Class III bicycle route on Jones Avenue, will further improve bicycle access in the area of the development. No additional bicycle improvements are included or needed as part of this project proposal.

Finding - Existing bicycle facilities along with those planned would provide adequate access for bicyclists.

## Transit

Existing transit routes are adequate to accommodate project-generated transit trips. The existing transit stop at Durham-Dayton Highway/Midway is located approximately 0.5 miles from the project site, which is considered an acceptable walking distance. Because the development falls within the half-mile threshold that is often used as an upper limit of transit accessibility, no changes to existing services are recommended.

Finding - Existing transit service is adequate to accommodate the demand anticipated for the project.

## Access and Circulation

## Site Access

Access to the project site would be provided via a new public Street A, which would connect to the south side of Durham-Dayton Highway approximately 0.5 miles east of Midway. Street A would extend straight back from the middle of a horizontal curve in the alignment of Durham-Dayton Highway and from there would bend to the southeast where it would provide access to project Streets B, C, D, and E which would run perpendicular to Street A. All proposed project streets would be equipped with curbs, gutters, and sidewalks.

Finding - As proposed in the site plan, on-site circulation would be expected to operate acceptably.

## Sight Distance

Sight distance along Durham-Dayton Highway was evaluated based on sight distance criteria contained in the Highway Design Manual published by Caltrans. At intersections of public streets, a substantially clear line of sight should be maintained between the driver of a vehicle waiting at the crossroad and the driver of an approaching vehicle. The recommended sight distance at intersections is based on corner sight distance, which uses the approach travel speeds as the basis for determining the recommended sight distance. Table 10 summarizes the minimum sight distance requirements.

| Table 10 - Intersection Sight Distance Criteria |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Speed | Public Road <br> Major Approach <br> Stopping Sight Distance | Public Road <br> Minor Approach <br> Corner Sight Distance | Private Road <br> and Rural Driveway <br> Stopping Sight Distance |
| 30 mph | 200 feet | 330 feet | 200 feet |
| 35 mph | 250 feet | 385 feet | 250 feet |
| 40 mph | 300 feet | 440 feet | 300 feet |

Source: Highway Design Manual, $6^{\text {th }}$ Edition, California Department of Transportation, 2017

The speed limit on the segment of Durham-Dayton Highway along the project frontage is 35 miles per hour. For a $35-\mathrm{mph}$ design speed, a public road intersection should have a corner sight distance of at least 385 feet. Based on a review of field conditions, sight distance at the proposed access points extends more than 400 feet in both directions, which is adequate for the posted speed limit.

Finding - Adequate sight distance is available at the project intersection to accommodate all turns.
Recommendation - To ensure that adequate sight lines are retained, it is recommended that any vegetation planted along the project frontages is maintained such that it is less than three, or more than seven, feet in height.

## Access Analysis

## Left-Turn Lane Warrants

The need for a left-turn lanes on Durham-Dayton Highway at the project access point was evaluated based on criteria contained in the Intersection Channelization Design Guide, National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) Report No. 279, Transportation Research Board, 1985, as well as an update of the methodology developed by the Washington State Department of Transportation and published in the Method For Prioritizing

Intersection Improvements, January 1997. The NCHRP report references a methodology developed by M. D. Harmelink that includes equations that can be applied to expected or actual traffic volumes in order to determine the need for a left-turn pocket based on safety issues. Based on our research and discussions with Caltrans staff, this methodology is consistent with the Guidelines for Reconstruction of Intersections, August 1985, which was referenced in Section 405.2, Left-turn Channelization, of previous editions of the Caltrans HDM, though this reference has been deleted from the most recent edition of this manual.

Based on Future plus Project volumes, which represents worst-case conditions, a left-turn lane would not be warranted during either of the weekday peak hours.

Finding - A left-turn lane would not be warranted on Durham-Dayton Highway at the project access point.

## Right-Turn Lane Warrants

The need for a right-turn lane or taper was also evaluated and would consist of a lane installed to the right of the travel lane and would be a minimum of ten feet wide, plus a shoulder where not adjacent to a curb. A right-turn taper is a shoulder area that gets progressively wider as the motorist drives toward the intersection. Both improvements are meant to provide an area for motorists turning right to move out of the traffic lane without impeding through traffic.

The need for a right-turn lane or taper on Durham-Dayton Highway was evaluated under the same worst-case conditions that left-turn lane warrants were evaluated. Based on Future plus Project volumes, no additional facilities in the form of either a right-turn lane or right-turn taper would be warranted during either of the weekday peak hours.

The turn-lane analysis sheets are contained in Appendix D.

Finding - Neither a right-turn lane, nor right-turn taper, would not be warranted at the project access point on Durham-Dayton Highway.

## Conclusions and Recommendations

## Conclusions

- Under Existing Conditions, all study intersections currently operate at LOS C or better during both the a.m. and p.m. peak hours, meeting the applicable County of Butte LOS standards.
- With the projected future growth in regional traffic, all study intersections are expected to continue to operate acceptably at LOS C or better during both peak hours, except for Durham-Dayton Highway/Midway which would be expected to deteriorate to LOS D during the morning peak hour. Upon installation of the planned traffic signal identified in the County's CIP, the intersection would be expected to operate acceptably at LOS $B$ during the morning peak hour.
- The proposed project is expected to generate an average of 434 new daily trips on average, of which 34 would occur during the a.m. peak hour and 46 would occur during the p.m. peak hour.
- With the addition of project-generated traffic to existing volumes, all study intersections are expected to continue to operate acceptably. Likewise, acceptable operations are expected under Future plus Project Conditions, assuming installation of a traffic signal at Durham-Dayton Highway/Midway.
- The project would provide a sidewalk along its frontage with Durham-Dayton Highway; however, the sidewalk would terminate at the project boundaries leaving the site isolated from the downtown area and the schools west of Midway.
- Existing Class II bicycle lanes are located on both sides of Durham-Dayton Highway in the study area. Proposed bicycle facilities are planned for Midway, Jones Avenue, and Lott Road. These existing and proposed facilities provide adequate access for bicyclists.
- The project site is served by one transit line connecting the area of Durham with several nearby cities. This transit line is expected to accommodate the demand generated by the proposed development.
- On-site circulation would be expected to operate acceptably and adequate sight distance is available at the proposed access point to accommodate all turns into and out of the site.
- No additional right- or left-turn channelization facilities would be warranted on Durham-Dayton Highway at the project access point.


## Recommendations

- As part of the Butte County Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Fiscal Years 2017 through 2026-27, the County of Butte should consider installing a roundabout at the intersection of Durham-Dayton Highway/Midway as an alternative to a traffic signal. A preliminary evaluation indicates that the intersection may be a good candidate for a roundabout.
- It is suggested that an all-weather path or walkway be provided on the south side of Durham-Dayton Highway, connecting the proposed development with the existing crosswalk and sidewalks at the intersection with Midway which lead to the core area of Durham.
- Installation of any vegetation or signage at the project access point should be done in a manner that does not impede clear sight lines.
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## Appendix A

## Collision Rate Calculations





## Appendix B

## BCAG Volume Data and Growth Factor Calculations

Butte County Association of Governments - Regional Traffic Volume Forecasts (2035)
Information Prepared October 20, 2008

|  |  |  |  | 2006 Traffic Volumes * |  |  | 2035 Traffic Volume Forecast ** |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SITE_ID | JURISDICTION | ROUTE | LOCATION | Average Daily Traffic Volume | PM Peak Hour Volume | AM Peak Hour Volume | Average Daily Traffic Volume | PM Peak Hour Volume | AM Peak Hour Volume |
| 1 | City of Biggs | B ST | E of 7TH ST | 2,312 | 191 | 173 | 4,150 | 410 | 310 |
| 2 | City of Biggs | W BIGGS GRIDLEY RD | S of BANNOCK ST | 1,865 | 170 | 130 | 5,390 | 510 | 410 |
| 3 | Butte County | AFTON RD | W of AGUA FRIAS RD | 79 | 8 | 10 | 110 | 10 | 20 |
| 4 | Butte County | AGUAS FRIAS RD | S of DURHAM DAYTON RD | 815 | 86 | 94 | 1,300 | 140 | 130 |
| 5 | Butte County | AGUAS FRIAS RD | S of NELSON RD | 491 | 50 | 44 | 980 | 100 | 80 |
| 6 | Butte County | CHICO RIVER RD | W of ALBERTON RD | 1,311 | 136 | 127 | 1,900 | 180 | 160 |
| 7 | Butte County | COHASSET HWY | N of KEEFER RD | 1,718 | 173 | 186 | 1,910 | 190 | 200 |
| 8 | Butte County | COLUSA HWY | W of HATCH RD | 496 | 52 | 54 | 720 | 70 | 70 |
| 9 | City of Chico | DAYTON RD | S of ARCHER AVE | 6,709 | 585 | 550 | 17,600 | 1,440 | 1,460 |
| 10 | Butte County | DAYTON RD | N of HEGAN LN | 3,533 | 342 | 336 | 3,890 | 410 | 390 |
| 11 | Butte County | DUNSTONE DR | S of GRUBBS RD | 195 | 25 | 20 | 200 | 30 | 30 |
| 12 | Butte County | DURHAM DAYTON HWY | W of OROVILLE-CHICO HWY | 2,215 | 198 | 257 | 2,810 | 240 | 300 |
| 13 | Butte County | DURHAM PENZ RD | E of SR 99 | 8,289 | 818 | 1,017 | 13,370 | 1,030 | 1,920 |
| 14 | Butte County | DURHAM PENZ RD | E of SR 191 | 2,255 | 197 | 229 | 3,050 | 250 | 330 |
| 15 | Butte County | E GRIDLEY RD | At FEATHER RIVER BRIDGE | 6,250 | 551 | 487 | 12,210 | 1,230 | 990 |
| 16 | Butte County | ENTLER AVE | E of MIDWAY | 1,230 | 128 | 111 | 1,240 | 130 | 120 |
| 17 | Butte County | FORBESTOWN RD | S of OLD OLIVE HWY | 2,978 | 266 | 259 | 6,250 | 520 | 550 |
| 18 | Butte County | GARNER LN | N of SR 99 | 5,548 | 524 | 600 | 14,140 | 1,310 | 1,310 |
| 19 | Butte County | HAMILTON CITY NORD | N of BENNETT RD | 735 | 71 | 94 | 1,440 | 150 | 150 |
| 20 | Butte County | HEGAN LN | E of FIMPLE LN | 3,583 | 346 | 283 | 4,580 | 390 | 360 |
| 21 | City of Chico | HICKS LN | N of EATON RD | 3,239 | 311 | 308 | 17,680 | 1,640 | 1,540 |
| 22 | Butte County | HONEY RUN RD | W of CENTERVILLE RD | 1,598 | 148 | 175 | 1,600 | 150 | 180 |
| 23 | Butte County | KEEFER RD | W of GARNER LN | 1,109 | 109 | 102 | 1,250 | 130 | 130 |
| 24 | Butte County | LARKIN RD | S of CHANDON AVE | 2,672 | 250 | 218 | 4,550 | 440 | 370 |
| 25 | City of Oroville | LARKIN RD | S of SR 162 | 4,098 | 358 | 311 | 7,500 | 670 | 560 |
| 26 | Butte County | LOS VERJELES RD | S of LA PORTE RD | 996 | 83 | 84 | 1,020 | 90 | 90 |
| 27 | Butte County | LOWER WYANDOTTE RD | W of ALVERDA DR | 7,210 | 573 | 461 | 12,880 | 1,000 | 870 |
| 28 | Butte County | MERIDIAN RD | E of SR 99 | 1,145 | 112 | 119 | 1,150 | 120 | 120 |
| 29 | Butte County | MIDWAY RD | S of DURHAM DAYTON RD | 4,549 | 433 | 370 | 6,910 | 640 | 610 |
| 30 | City of Chico | MIDWAY RD | S of E PARK AVE | 16,545 | 1,399 | 1,307 | 31,840 | 3,030 | 2,380 |
| 31 | Butte County | MIDWAY RD | S of HEGAN LN | 9,114 | 857 | 771 | 17,240 | 1,740 | 1,300 |
| 32 | Butte County | MIDWAY RD | N of NELSON SHIPPEE RD | 1,511 | 151 | 133 | 1,770 | 170 | 160 |
| 33 | Butte County | MINERS RANCH RD | S of SR 162 | 2,777 | 242 | 208 | 4,740 | 440 | 480 |
| 34 | Butte County | OAKVALE AVE | S of SR 162 | 2,754 | 338 | 409 | 4,350 | 410 | 570 |
| 35 | Butte County | OPHIR RD | E of FEATHER RIVER BLVD | 6,999 | 613 | 546 | 17,730 | 1,490 | 1,490 |
| 36 | Butte County | ORD FERRY RD | W of RIVER RD | 3,244 | 322 | 271 | 4,430 | 440 | 360 |
| 37 | Butte County | ORD FERRY RD | W of AGUAS FRIAS RD | 3,753 | 365 | 346 | 4,430 | 440 | 410 |
| 38 | Butte County | ORO-QUINCY HWY | At LAKE MADRONE BRIDGE | 375 | 47 | 56 | 760 | 80 | 80 |
| 39 | Butte County | ORO-BANGOR HWY | S of V-7 RD | 1,949 | 196 | 197 | 3,670 | 360 | 330 |
| 40 | Butte County | ORO-BANGOR HWY | E of FOOTHILL BLVD | 1,747 | 178 | 237 | 2,300 | 250 | 330 |
| 41 | Butte County | OROVILLE-BANGOR HWY | N of SWEDES FLAT RD | 2,036 | 186 | 162 | 2,040 | 190 | 180 |
| 42 | City of Oroville | ORO-QUINCY HWY | E of FOOTHILL BLVD | 3,116 | 303 | 297 | 4,270 | 460 | 460 |
| 43 | Butte County | PENNINGTON RD | S of W EVANS REIMER RD | 253 | 24 | 23 | 450 | 40 | 40 |
| 44 | Butte County | SKYLINE BLVD | S of SR 162 | 1,261 | 118 | 117 | 1,270 | 120 | 120 |
| 45 | Butte County | SKYWAY | S of COUTOLENC RD | 776 | 68 | 66 | 1,140 | 100 | 100 |
| 46 | Butte County | SKYWAY | N of NIMSHEW RD | 1,781 | 152 | 138 | 2,500 | 210 | 200 |
| 47 | Butte County | SKYWAY | S of POWELLTON RD | 1,054 | 96 | 88 | 1,420 | 120 | 120 |
| 48 | Butte County | UPPER PALERMO RD | S of OPHIR RD/LOWER WYANDOTTE RD | 3,904 | 311 | 378 | 4,860 | 380 | 480 |
| 49 | Butte County | W SACRAMENTO AVE | W of MUIR AVE | 961 | 102 | 78 | 970 | 110 | 80 |
| 50 | City of Chico | BROADWAY | N of SR 32 (8TH ST) | 10,097 | 945 | 796 | 13,220 | 1,230 | 1,220 |
| 51 | City of Chico | BROADWAY | S of 2ND ST | 7,306 | 681 | 619 | 8,720 | 950 | 680 |
| 52 | City of Chico | BRUCE | N of LAKEWEST DR | 12,581 | 1,159 | 970 | 21,480 | 2,060 | 1,700 |
| 53 | City of Chico | BRUCE RD | S of HUMBOLT RD | 10,487 | 1,001 | 886 | 24,340 | 2,390 | 2,030 |
| 54 | City of Chico | BRUCE RD | N of SKYWAY | 8,493 | 831 | 720 | 23,960 | 2,450 | 1,860 |
| 55 | City of Chico | BRUCE RD | N of E 20TH ST | 11,082 | 1,068 | 1,049 | 25,130 | 2,370 | 2,180 |
| 56 | City of Chico | COHASSET RD | N of EAST AVE | 17,728 | 1,498 | 1,379 | 19,820 | 1,850 | 1,670 |
| 57 | City of Chico | COHASSET RD | N of EATON RD | 11,033 | 1,228 | 1,162 | 18,310 | 2,030 | 1,780 |
| 58 | City of Chico | COHASSET RD | S of EAST | 24,961 | 2,097 | 1,867 | 31,880 | 2,780 | 2,360 |
| 59 | City of Chico | E 1ST AVE | E of ESPLANADE | 12,394 | 1,048 | 871 | 14,450 | 1,200 | 1,060 |
| 60 | City of Chico | E 1ST AVE | W of ESPLANADE RD | 10,981 | 894 | 750 | 12,130 | 950 | 810 |
| 61 | City of Chico | E 1ST AVE | W of LONGFELLOW | 14,138 | 1,196 | 1,106 | 17,370 | 1,570 | 1,420 |
| 62 | City of Chico | E 1ST AVE | W of SHERMAN AVE | 16,913 | 1,300 | 1,294 | 16,920 | 1,340 | 1,320 |


| Segment | AM 2006 | AM 2035 | Growth Rate | PM 2006 | PM 2035 | Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| *Midway S of Durham-Daton Hwy | 370 | 610 | $2.24 \%$ | 433 | 640 | $1.65 \%$ |

*Source is Butte County Association of Governments - Regional Traffic Volumes Forecasts (2035)

| 2013 to 2018 AM GROWTH FACTOR | 1.112 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2013 to 2018 PM GROWTH FACTOR | 1.082 |
| 2013 to 2028 AM GROWTH FACTOR | 1.336 |
| 2013 to 2028 PM GROWTH FACTOR | 1.247 |
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Intersection Level of Service Calculations
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## Generated with PTV VISTRO

| Movement, Approach, \& Intersection Results |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d_M, Delay for Movement [sven] | 11.35 | 11.35 | 11.35 | 11.72 | 11.72 | 11.72 | 20.26 | 20.26 | 20.26 | 14.01 | 14.01 | 14.01 |
| Movement LOS | в | в | в | B | B | в | c | c | c | B | в | в |
| d_A, Apprach Delay [siven] | 11.35 |  |  | 11.72 |  |  | 20.26 |  |  | 14.01 |  |  |
| Approach Los | в |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| d_LI, Intersection Delay [swen] | 14.81 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection LOS | в |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection V/C | 0.540 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


$\mathrm{d} M$, Delay for Movement
 .

| Lane Group Calculations |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | c | c | c | c |
| C, Cycle Length [s] | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 |
| L. Total Lost Time per Cycle [s] | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 |
| 11_p, Permitted Start-Up Lost Time [s] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| 12, Clearance Lost Time [s] | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| g_i, Effective Green Time [s] | 28 | 28 | 24 | 24 |
| $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{C}$, Green / Cycle | 0.46 | 0.46 | 0.40 | 0.40 |
| (v/s)_i Volume / Saturation Flow Rate | 0.17 | 0.18 | 0.36 | 0.22 |
| s, saturation flow rate [veV/h] | 1639 | 1634 | 1106 | 1762 |
| c, Capacity [veh/h] | 832 | 822 | 536 | 778 |
| d1, Uniform Delay [s] | 10.27 | 10.52 | 17.36 | 13.52 |
| k, delay calibration | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.15 | 0.11 |
| I, Upstream Filtering Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| d2, Incremental Delay [s] | 1.08 | 1.20 | 2.91 | 0.50 |
| d3, Initial Queue Delay [s] | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Rp, platoon ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| PF, progression factor | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Lane Group Results |  |  |  |  |
| X, volume / capacity | 0.33 | 0.36 | 0.74 | 0.50 |
| d, Delay for Lane Group [s/veh] | 11.35 | 11.72 | 20.26 | 14.01 |
| Lane Group LOS | B | B | c | B |
| Critical Lane Group | No | Yes | Yes | No |
| 50th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 2.32 | 2.34 | 5.23 | 3.47 |
| 50th-Percentile Queue Length [ft] | 57.98 | 58.50 | 130.67 | 86.85 |
| 95 th-Percentile Queue Length [veh] | 4.17 | 4.21 | 8.98 | 6.25 |
| 95th-Percentile Queue Length [ff] | 104.36 | 105.30 | 224.40 | 156.32 |

 $\qquad$

Intersection Settings

| Number of Conficting Circulating Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| Number of Conflicting Circulating Lanes | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Circulating Flow Rate [veh/h] | 389 |  |  | 420 |  |  | 159 |  |  | 436 |  |  |
| Exiting Flow Rate [veh/h] | 196 |  |  | 386 |  |  | 124 |  |  | 366 |  |  |
| Demand Flow Rate [veh/h] | 68 | 170 | 40 | 34 | 88 | 170 | 189 | 158 | 52 | 34 | 310 | 44 |
| Adjusted Demand Flow Rate [veh/h] | 68 | 170 | 40 | 34 | 88 | 170 | 189 | 158 | 52 | 34 | 310 | 44 |
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 | Pedestrian Recall |
| :---: |
| Detector Location $[f t]$ |
| Detector Length $[f t]$ |
| I, Upstream Filtering Factor |







 | Offset $[$ ss] |
| :---: |
| Offset Reference |
| Permissive Mode |
| Lost time [s] |
| Phasing \& Timing |
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## Appendix D

## Turn Lane Warrants

## Turn Lane Warrant Analysis - Tee Intersections
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## Turn Lane Warrant Analysis - Tee Intersections
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[^0]:    Reference: Highway Capacity Manual, Transportation Research Board, 2010

[^1]:    Creekside Estates TIS

[^2]:    Creekside Estates TIS <br> PM Existing

[^3]:    Creekside Estates TIS

[^4]:    Creekside Estates TIS

[^5]:    Creekside Estates TIS
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