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## Executive Summary

This study was conducted for the purpose of satisfying the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and identifying the potential transportation impacts related to the proposed recreation and aquatics center in San Bruno, California. The project is located on the south side of Crystal Springs Road and is bounded by City Park Way at the southeastern side of the property (see Figure 1). The project would demolish the existing San Bruno Veterans Memorial Recreation Center and San Bruno Park Pool and construct a new recreation center with a gymnasium, aquatic center, meeting rooms, and auditorium. Four existing parking lots are provided for the new center. Access to the parking lots would be provided via driveways located on City Park Way, Santa Lucia Avenue/an alleyway, and Crystal Springs Road.

The potential impacts of the project were evaluated in accordance with the standards set forth by the City of San Bruno and the City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG) of San Mateo County. The C/CAG administers the San Mateo County Congestion Management Program (CMP). Given that the project is estimated to generate fewer than 100 peak hour vehicle trips, an analysis in accordance with C/CAG's CMP guidelines is not required. The traffic study includes an analysis of AM and PM peak hour traffic conditions for 2 signalized intersections and 5 unsignalized intersections in the vicinity of the project site. The study also includes an analysis of site access and on-site circulation, as well as potential impacts to transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.

Based on trip generation rates recommended by the Institute of Transportation Engineers, as well as applying the appropriate trip reductions and existing site trip credits, it is estimated that the proposed project would generate 490 net new daily vehicle trips, with 30 net new trips ( 20 inbound and 10 outbound) occurring during the AM peak hour and 39 net new trips (18 inbound and 21 outbound) occurring during the PM peak hour.

## Project Level of Service Analyses

Table ES-1 summarizes the results of the peak-hour intersection level of service analysis for the study intersections under the following conditions: Existing (Chapter 2), Cumulative (Chapter 3), and Existing plus Project and Cumulative plus Project (Chapter 4). Hexagon increased the existing counts by $5 \%$ as a conservative factor to account for the increase in traffic during the spring/summer months versus the winter months, when the existing counts were conducted.

The results of the intersection level of service analysis show that, for all scenarios studied, all the study intersections would continue to operate at LOS D or better during both the AM and PM peak hours of traffic, except the Oak Avenue/City Park Way and Crystal Springs Road intersection (see Table ES-1). The project would add more than 10 trips to a stop-controlled movement, and the intersection would
meet the peak hour signal warrant. Therefore, the project would create a significant impact at this intersection.

The San Bruno Walk 'n Bike Plan recommends a mini-roundabout at the intersection to simplify the intersection control and calm traffic. However, the plan also noted that the mini-roundabout should be further studied to determine the feasibility of a mini-roundabout at this location given the relatively large number of school children and activity. The AM and PM peak-hour intersection volumes warrant signalization under existing, cumulative, and project conditions. Therefore, Hexagon recommends that the City conduct further analysis and feasibility assessment to determine whether a traffic signal should be implemented at the Crystal Springs Road and City Park Way intersection.

## Other Transportation Issues

The proposed site plan shows adequate site access and on-site circulation, and the project would not have an adverse effect on the existing transit services, pedestrian facilities, or bicycle facilities in the study area. Hexagon provides the following recommendations and enhancements for the project:

1. Bicycle parking should be provided.
2. Proposed pedestrian sidewalks along the project on City Park Way should be extended southward to connect to the existing sidewalks that end just north of Portola Way.
3. Better speed signs and pedestrian crossing signs should be installed on City Park Way in front of the project site to raise driver awareness of the pedestrian crossings.

Table ES-1
Intersection Level of Service Summary

| Study Number | Intersection | Peak Hour | Count <br> Date | Existing |  |  |  |  |  | Cumulative |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Traffic Control | No Project |  | with Project |  |  | No Project |  | with Project |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Avg. Delay } \\ & \text { (sec.) } \end{aligned}$ | LOS | Avg. Delay |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Incr. in } \\ & \text { Crit. Delay } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Avg. Dela } \\ & \text { (sec.) } \end{aligned}$ | LOS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Avg. Delay } \\ & \text { (sec.) } \end{aligned}$ | LOS | Incr. in Avg. Delay |
|  |  | AM | 01/23/19 |  | 26.2 | C | 26.8 | C | 0.0 | 29.5 | C | 30.5 | C | 0.0 |
| 1 | Cunningham Way \& Crystal Springs Road | PM | 01/23/19 | Signal | 27.7 | c | 27.0 | c | 0.0 | 28.1 | c | 28.3 | c | 0.0 |
| 2 | Donner Avenue \& Crystal Springs Road | AM | 01/23/19 | AWSC ${ }^{1}$ | 20.7 | C | 21.3 | C | -- | 20.8 | C | 21.3 | C | -- |
|  | Dommer Avenue \& Crystal Springs Road | PM | 01/23/19 | AWSC | 15.9 | C | 16.2 | C | -- | 17.0 | C | 17.4 | C | -- |
| 3 | Oak Avenue \& Crystal Springs Road | AM | 01/23/19 | AWSC ${ }^{1}$ | 73.0 | F | 79.8 | F | -- | 73.4 | F | 80.0 | F | -- |
|  | Oak Avenue \& Crystal Springs Road | PM | 01/23/19 |  | 31.5 | D | 34.9 | D | -- | 36.9 | E | 43.8 | E | -- |
| 4 | Cyrpess Avenue \& Crystal Springs Road | AM | 01/23/19 | AWSC ${ }^{1}$ | 15.0 | B | 15.2 | C | - | 15.4 | B | 15.2 | C | -- |
|  |  |  | 01/23/19 |  | 13.1 | B | 13.2 | B | 0.1 | 13.4 22.1 | B | 13.6 | B | -- |
| 5 | El Camino Real \& Crystal Springs Road | PM | $01 / 23 / 19$ | Signal | 21.5 | C | 21.6 | C | 0.1 | 22.1 | C | 22.3 | C | 0.1 |
| 6 | De Soto Way \& Santa Lucia Avenue (North) | AM | 01/23/19 | AWSC ${ }^{1}$ | 10.0 | A | 10.1 | A | -- | 10.0 | A | 10.1 | A | -- |
|  |  | PM | 01/23/19 |  | 8.7 | A | 8.8 | A | -- | 8.9 | A | 8.9 | A | -- |
| 7 | De Soto Way \& Santa Lucia Avenue (Sorth) | AM | 01/23/19 | TWSC ${ }^{2}$ | 9.5 | A | 9.6 | A | -- | 9.5 | A | 9.6 | A | -- |
|  |  | PM | 01/23/19 |  | 8.3 | A | 8.4 | A | -- | 8.3 | A | 8.4 | A | -- |
| Note: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AWSC $=$ All-Way Stop Control |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TWSC = Two-Way Stop Control |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{1}$ Average delay for an all-way stop controlled intersection is reported for the entire intersection. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{2}$ Average delay for the two-way stop controlled intersection is reported by the Synchro output delay and LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bold indicates a substandard level of service. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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## 1. <br> Introduction

This report presents the results of the Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) for the proposed recreation and aquatics center in San Bruno, California. The project is located on the south side of Crystal Springs Road and is bounded by City Park Way at the southeastern side of the property (see Figure 1). The project would demolish the existing San Bruno Veterans Memorial Recreation Center and San Bruno Park Pool and construct a new recreation center with a gymnasium, aquatic center, meeting rooms, and auditorium. Three existing parking lots are provided for the new center. Access to the parking lots would be provided via driveways located on City Park Way, Santa Lucia Avenue/an alleyway, and Crystal Springs Road. The project proposes to reconfigure the existing parking lot adjacent to the recreation center building.

## Scope of Study

This study was conducted for the purpose of identifying the potential traffic impacts related to the proposed development. The potential impacts of the project were evaluated in accordance with the standards set forth by the City of San Bruno and the City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG) of San Mateo County. The C/CAG administers the San Mateo County Congestion Management Program (CMP). Given that the project is estimated to generate fewer than 100 peak hour vehicle trips, an analysis in accordance with C/CAG's CMP guidelines is not be required. The traffic study includes an analysis of AM and PM peak hour traffic conditions for two signalized intersections and five unsignalized intersections in the vicinity of the project site. The study also includes an analysis of site access and on-site circulation, vehicle queuing, as well as potential impacts to transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.

## Study Intersections

1. Cunningham Way \& Crystal Springs Road
2. Donner Avenue \& Crystal Springs Road*
3. Oak Avenue \& Crystal Springs Road*
4. Cypress Avenue \& Crystal Springs Road*
5. El Camino Real \& Crystal Springs Road
6. De Soto Way \& Santa Lucia Avenue* (north)
7. De Soto Way \& Santa Lucia Avenue* (south)

* Denotes an unsignalized intersection


Figure 1
Site Location and Study Intersections
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Figure 2

Traffic conditions at the study intersections were analyzed for both the weekday AM and PM peak hours of adjacent street traffic. The AM peak hour typically occurs between 7:00 AM and 9:00 AM and the PM peak hour between 4:00 PM and 6:00 PM on a regular weekday. These are the peak commute hours during which most traffic congestion occurs on the roadways.

Traffic conditions were evaluated for the following scenarios:
Scenario 1: Existing Conditions. Existing traffic volumes at the study intersections were obtained from traffic counts conducted in on January 23, 2019. Assuming that park usage would be higher in the spring and summer seasons, the counts were increased by $5 \%$ as a conservative factor. The study intersections were evaluated with a level of service analysis using Synchro software in accordance with the 2010 Highway Capacity Manual methodology.

Scenario 2: Cumulative Conditions. Cumulative traffic volumes reflect traffic added by projected volumes from approved but not yet completed and/or occupied developments in the project area. The approved project trips and/or approved project information were obtained from the City of San Bruno. The approved project information is included in Appendix C.

Scenario 3: Existing plus Project Conditions. Existing traffic volumes with the project were estimated by adding to existing traffic volumes the additional traffic generated by the project. Existing plus project conditions were evaluated relative to existing conditions in order to determine the effects the project would have on the existing roadway network.

Scenario 4: Cumulative plus Project Conditions. Cumulative traffic volumes with the project (hereafter called project traffic volumes) were estimated by adding to cumulative traffic volumes the additional traffic generated by the project. Cumulative plus project conditions were evaluated relative to cumulative conditions in order to determine potential project impacts.

## Methodology

This section presents the methods used to determine the traffic conditions for each scenario described above. It includes descriptions of the data requirements, the analysis methodologies, and the applicable level of service standards.

## Data Requirements

The data required for the analysis were obtained from recent traffic counts, the City of San Bruno, previous traffic studies, and field observations. The following data were collected from these sources:

- existing traffic volumes
- existing lane configurations
- signal timing and phasing
- approved and pending projects

Traffic counts were conducted in the winter season. Park usage is assumed to be higher in the spring and summer seasons. Hexagon checked the counts against the counts supplied by the City of San Bruno done in March of 2018. Although the counts showed similar volumes, Hexagon increased the counts by $5 \%$ as a conservative factor.

## Level of Service Standards and Analysis Methodologies

Traffic conditions at the study intersections were evaluated using level of service (LOS). Level of Service is a qualitative description of operating conditions ranging from LOS A, or free-flow conditions with little or no delay, to LOS F, or jammed conditions with excessive delays. The various analysis methods are described below.

## Signalized Intersections

There are two signalized study intersections in the vicinity of the project site. Level of service at signalized intersections was evaluated based on the 2010 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) level of service methodology using Synchro software. This method evaluates signalized intersection operations on the basis of average control delay time for all vehicles at the intersection. The correlation between average control delay and level of service at signalized intersections is shown in Table 1.

Table 1
Signalized Intersection Level of Service Definitions Based on Control Delay

| Level of Service | Description | Average Control Delay Per Vehicle (sec.) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | Operations with very low delay occurring with favorable progression and/or short cycle lengths. | Up to 10.0 |
| B | Operations with low delay occurring with good progression and/or short cycle lengths. | 10.1 to 20.0 |
| C | Operations with average delays resulting from fair progression and/or longer cycle lengths. Individual cycle failures begin to appear. | 20.1 to 35.0 |
| D | Operations with longer delays due to a combination of unfavorable progression, long cycle lenghts, or high V/C ratios. Many vehicles stop and individual cycle failures are noticeable. | 35.1 to 55.0 |
| E | Operations with high delay values indicating poor progression, long cycle lengths, and high V/C ratios. Individual cycle failures are frequent occurences. This is considered to be the limit of acceptable delay. | 55.1 to 80.0 |
| F | Operation with delays unacceptable to most drivers occurring due to oversaturation, poor progression, or very long cycle lengths. | Greater than 80.0 |
| Source: Transportation Research Board, 2010 Highway Capacity Manual, (Washington, D.C., 2010). |  |  |

## Unsignalized Intersections

Level of service analysis at unsignalized intersections is generally used to determine the need for modification in the type of intersection control (i.e., all-way stop or signalization). As part of the evaluation, traffic volumes, delays and traffic signal warrants are evaluated to determine if the existing intersection control is appropriate.

There are five unsignalized study intersections in the vicinity of the project site. Level of service at unsignalized intersections was based on the 2010 Highway Capacity Manual ( 2010 HCM) method using the Synchro software. This method is applicable for both two-way and all-way stop-controlled intersections. Synchro evaluates unsignalized intersections on the basis of average stopped delay for all-way stop controlled intersections, and the worst approach delay at the intersection for two-way stopcontrolled intersections. The correlation between average control delay and LOS for unsignalized intersections is shown in Table 2.

Table 2
Unsignalized Intersection Level of Service Definitions Based on Control Delay

| Level of Service | Description | Ave rage Control Delay Per <br> Vehicle (se c.) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | Short traffic delays | 10.0 or less |
| B | Average traffic delays | 10.1 to 15.0 |
| C | Long traffic delays | 15.1 to 25.0 |
| D | Very long traffic delays | 25.1 to 35.0 |
| F | Extreme traffic delays | 35.1 to 50.0 |
|  | greater than 50.0 |  |
| Source: Transportation Research Board, 2010 Highway Capacity Manual (Washington, D.C., <br> 2010). |  |  |

## Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis

The level of service calculations at the unsignalized intersections is supplemented with an assessment of the need for installation of a traffic signal, known as a signal warrant analysis. The need for signalization of unsignalized intersections in an urban or suburban context is typically assessed based on the Peak Hour Volume Warrant (Warrant 3) described in the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways (CA MUTCD), Part 4, Highway Traffic Signals. This method makes no evaluation of intersection level of service, but simply provides an indication whether vehicular peak hour volumes are, or would be, sufficiently high to justify installation of a traffic signal.
The decision to install a traffic signal should not be based purely on the warrants alone. Instead, the decision should be considered when one or more of the warrants are met, which triggers further feasibility analysis. Engineering judgment should be exercised to determine how a traffic signal could affect collision rates and traffic conditions at the subject intersection, as well as at adjacent intersections. Other options besides a traffic signal should also be considered, such as all-way stop control, new or enhanced signage, or roadway geometry changes; these measures may be more appropriate than a new traffic signal.

## City of San Bruno Intersection Level of Service Standards

The City of San Bruno General Plan specifies certain intersections at which a level of service standard (LOS D) must be maintained during AM and PM peak periods. The relevant General Plan polices are listed below:

- Policy T-B: Maintain acceptable levels of service for vehicular movement along the city's street network. Acceptable level of service could vary based on characteristics of the area under consideration.
- Policy T-6: Maintain LOS standards for intersections for AM and PM peak periods as shown in Figure 4-2.


## The City does not have a general LOS standard that applies to all intersections, and none of the study intersections are included in General Plan Figure 4-2. However, LOS significance criteria have been developed to ensure that study intersection LOS would remain consistent with General Plan Policy T-B with implementation of the proposed project.California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Intersection Level of Service Standard

The intersection of El Camino Real and Crystal Springs Road is within the jurisdiction of Caltrans. Therefore, that study intersection is subject to Caltrans' standards. According to Caltrans' Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies, Caltrans seeks to maintain a target LOS at the transition between LOS C and LOS D on State highway facilities but acknowledges that this may not always be feasible. In instances where an existing State highway facility is operating worse than the appropriate target LOS, the existing measure of effectiveness (i.e., vehicle delay at intersections and v/c ratio at the ramps) should be maintained. Thus, LOS D is considered the appropriate target LOS for this State Route intersection.

## Significant Impact Criteria

## Signalized Intersections

Significance criteria are used to establish what constitutes an impact. In order to be consistent with the General Plan Policy T-B, a significant impact on intersection operations would occur if for either peak hour

1. The level of service at the intersection degrades from an acceptable level (LOS D or better) under existing conditions to an unacceptable level under existing plus project conditions, or
2. The level of service at the intersection is an unacceptable level (LOS E or F) under existing conditions, and the addition of project trips would cause the critical-movement delay at the intersection to increase by four (4) or more seconds.

## Unsignalized Intersections

In order to be consistent with the General Plan Policy T-B, an unsignalized intersection would have a significant impact if the following would occur:

1. The intersection or a stop-controlled approach degrades from an acceptable LOS D to an unacceptable LOS E or F or is already operating below LOS D, and
2. The project would add ten (10) or more vehicle trips to the critical movement of the intersection or stop-controlled approach during the peak hour, and
3. The intersection meets the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) peak hour volume traffic signal warrant after project completion.

## Report Organization

The remainder of this report is divided into five chapters. Chapter 2 describes the existing roadway network, transit services, and pedestrian and bicycle facilities, as well as a signal warrant analysis. Chapter 3 presents the intersection operations in the study area under the cumulative scenario conditions, including the approved projects in the City of San Bruno. Chapter 4 describes the methods used to estimate the project traffic on the roadway network and presents the intersection operations under existing plus project and cumulative plus project conditions. Chapter 5 provides an evaluation of other transportation-related issues, including potential project impacts on bicycle, pedestrian, and transit facilities, as well as site access, and on-site circulation.
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## 2. <br> Existing Conditions

This chapter describes the existing conditions for transportation facilities in the vicinity of the site, including the roadway network, transit service, pedestrian and bicycle facilities.

## Existing Roadway Network

Regional access to the project site is provided via I-280. Local access to the site is provided via Crystal Springs Road and El Camino Real. These roadways are described below.

I-280 is a north/south freeway west of the project site that extends from San Francisco through San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties. In San Bruno, I-280 is eight lanes wide. Regional access to the project site is provided via an exit at Crystal Springs Road.

El Camino Real (SR 82) is a six-lane north-south arterial with a raised center median within the project area. El Camino Real extends northward to San Francisco where it changes designation to Mission Street and San Jose Avenue, and southward through San Jose. El Camino Real provides access to the project via Crystal Springs Road.

Crystal Springs Road is a two-lane east/west arterial street that extends east from El Camino Real to Cunningham Way. On-street parking is permitted along Crystal Springs Road. The project site is accessed by the intersection at Crystal Springs Road and City Park Way.

City Park Way is a two lane north/south street from Portola Way to Crystal Springs Road. Parking lots are provided off City Park Way to access the current recreation center. The project site is directly accessed by City Park Way.

## Existing Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities

Pedestrian facilities consist of sidewalks, crosswalks, and pedestrian signals at signalized intersections. In the vicinity of the project site, sidewalks exist along both sides of Crystal Springs Road east of Donner Avenue, De Soto Way, and Donner Avenue, providing pedestrian access to and from the project site. Marked crosswalks with pedestrian signal heads and push buttons are provided on all approaches at the signalized intersection of El Camino Real and Crystal Springs Road. A marked crosswalk with pedestrian signal head and push buttons are provided on the east approach at the signalized intersection of Crystal Springs Road and Cunningham Way. At the unsignalized study intersections, marked crosswalks are provided along most stop-controlled approaches. Sidewalk
connections are missing on City Park Way beginning just north of Portola Way. On the east side of the street, a sidewalk connection does not begin again until the City Park Way and Crystal Springs Road intersection. On the west side of the street, sidewalks are provided from the current swimming pool facility to the current staff parking lot. There is also a pedestrian path through the park from the San Bruno Senior Center to the existing recreation center. Although some sidewalk and crosswalk connections are missing, the overall network of sidewalks and crosswalks in the study area has adequate connectivity and provides pedestrians with safe routes from the surrounding neighborhoods to the recreation center.

## Existing Bicycle Facilities

In the vicinity of the project, there are no bike lanes provided on any of the streets (see Figure 3). The nearest bike lanes are provided along Sneath Lane which runs east/west along the Golden Gate National Cemetery. Although the Class II bike lanes along Sneath Lane are the only bicycle lanes that currently exist in San Bruno, the City plans to improve the on-street bicycle network. In July of 2016, the City Council adopted the Walk ' $n$ Bike Plan. This Plan outlines specific improvements to ensure that walking and biking are safe, comfortable, and convenient. The Plan also calls for many support programs and initiatives to encourage more walking and cycling throughout the city. Despite the lack of specific bicycle facilities, the streets near the recreation center generally are local residential streets that are conducive to bicycling due to low speeds and volume.

## Existing Transit Service

Existing transit service to the study area is provided by the San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans), BART, and Caltrain (See Figure 4).

## SamTrans Bus Service

The study area is served directly by one local route and one express route. The transit routes that run through the study area are listed in Table 3, including their route description and commute hour headways. The nearest bus stops are located on Crystal Springs Road at the San Bruno Senior Center and the intersection of Crystal Springs Road and El Camino Real. Both locations are within walking distance of the project site.

## Caltrain Service

The San Bruno Caltrain Station is located 1.6 miles northeast of the project site. The station can be accessed by SamTrans Bus routes 141 and ECR. Caltrain provides frequent passenger train service between San Jose and San Francisco seven days a week. During commute hours, Caltrain provides extended service to Morgan Hill and Gilroy. Trains that stop at the San Bruno Station operate at approximately 30 -minute headways in both directions during the commute hours, with somewhat less frequent service midday. Service operates between about 5:40 AM and 11:45 PM in the northbound direction and between 5:15 AM and 12:30 AM in the southbound direction. Bicycles are permitted on Caltrain. There are bicycle racks and bicycle lockers available at the San Bruno Station. The project site is within short distance of the Caltrain station, and project's residents and workers could easily walk or ride bikes to the station.


Figure 3
Existing Bicycle Facilities


Figure 4
Existing Transit Services
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Table 3
Existing Bus Routes

| Bus Route | Route Description | Headway ${ }^{1}$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Operated by SamTrans |  |  |
| Local Route 141 | Palmetto Avenue/Manor Drive to SFO AirTrain Station | $30-40 \mathrm{~min}$ |
| Route ECR | Daly City BART Station to Palo Alto Transit Center | $10-15 \mathrm{~min}$ |
| $\frac{\text { Notes: }}{1}$ Approximate headways during peak commute periods. |  |  |

## BART Service

Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) operates regional rail service in the Bay Area, connecting between San Francisco International Airport and Millbrae Intermodal Station to the south, San Francisco to the north, and cities in the East Bay. The nearest BART station is the San Bruno Station, located approximately 2.0 miles from the project on Huntington Avenue east of the El Camino Real and Sneath Lane intersection and just north of I-380. The BART station can be accessed by both SamTrans Local Route 141 and Route ECR. BART trains operate on 15-minute headways during peak hours and 20-minute headways during off-peak hours.

## Existing Intersection Lane Configurations and Traffic Volumes

The existing lane configurations at the study intersections were determined by observations in the field and are shown on Figure 5. Existing traffic volumes at the intersections were obtained from peak hour counts collected on January $23^{\text {rd }}$ of 2019. Assuming that park usage would be higher in the spring and summer seasons, the counts were increased by $5 \%$ as a conservative factor. A tube count was collected on City Park Way for one week beginning January 23 ${ }^{\text {rd }}$ of 2019. The existing peak-hour intersection volumes are shown on Figure 6. Intersection turning-movement counts conducted for this analysis are presented in Appendix A. The volume summary sheets with the increased existing counts are presented in Appendix B.

The Crystal Springs Road and El Camino Real intersection has a driveway on the west side of the intersection. However, the eastbound approach lanes only have one right-turn lane and one left-turn lane (see Figure 5). Eastbound vehicles do not have a lane that allows them to go straight into the driveway. The existing volume counts showed that one car during the PM peak hour went straight into the driveway from the eastbound approach. Because the lane configurations do not show a through lane, Hexagon added the one (1) through vehicle to the left turn lane. The PM peak hour also showed three (3) vehicles coming out of the driveway. The driveway is not a part of the intersection as it is unsignalized; therefore, the vehicles were not included in the intersection analysis.

The tube count on City Park Way between Crystal Springs Road and Portola Way showed that, on average, the mid-week AM peak hour was from 7:00 to 8:00 AM, and the mid-week PM peak hour was from 3:00 to 4:00 PM. The AM peak hour correlates to the normal commute hour, but the PM peak hour corresponds with school traffic and not during the commute period. The mid-week average for the AM peak hour had 552 vehicles ( 276 vehicles northbound and 276 vehicles southbound). The PM peak hour had an average of 591 vehicles ( 287 vehicles northbound and 303 vehicles southbound). The
highest PM peak commute hour was from 5:00 to 6:00 PM with a total average of 548 vehicles ( 255 vehicles northbound and 293 vehicles southbound).

Volumes on the weekend were much lower than during the weekdays. The peak volume on Saturday and Sunday was about 350 vehicles per hour compared to about 550-600 vehicles during peak hours on weekdays.

## Existing Intersection Levels of Service

The results of the intersection level of service analysis show that all of the signalized and unsignalized study intersections currently operate at LOS D or better, except the Oak Avenue/City Park Way and Crystal Springs intersection during the AM peak hour of traffic (see Table 4). The intersection level of service calculation sheets are provided in Appendix D.

Table 4
Existing Intersection Levels of Service

| Study Number | Intersection | Count Date | Traffic Control | Peak Hour | Existing Conditions |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Delay (sec.) | LOS |
| 1 | Cunningham Way \& Crystal Springs Road | 01/23/19 | Signal | AM | 26.2 | C |
|  |  | 01/23/19 |  | PM | 27.7 | C |
| 2 | Donner Avenue \& Crystal Springs Road | 01/23/19 | AWSC ${ }^{1}$ | AM | 20.7 | C |
|  |  | 01/23/19 |  | PM | 15.9 | C |
| 3 | Oak Avenue \& Crystal Springs Road | 01/23/19 | AWSC ${ }^{1}$ | AM | 73.0 | F |
|  |  | 01/23/19 |  | PM | 31.5 | D |
| 4 | Cyrpess Avenue \& Crystal Springs Road | 01/23/19 | AWSC ${ }^{1}$ | AM | 15.0 | B |
|  |  | 01/23/19 |  | PM | 13.1 | B |
| 5 | El Camino Real \& Crystal Springs Road | 01/23/19 | Signal | AM | 21.9 | C |
|  |  | 01/23/19 |  | PM | 21.5 | C |
| 6 | De Soto Way \& Santa Lucia Avenue (North) | 01/23/19 | AWSC ${ }^{1}$ | AM | 10.0 | A |
|  |  | 01/23/19 |  | PM | 8.7 | A |
| 7 | De Soto Way \& Santa Lucia Avenue (Sorth) | 01/23/19 | TWSC ${ }^{2}$ | AM | 9.5 | A |
|  |  | 01/23/19 |  | PM | 8.3 | A |
| Notes: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AWSC = All-Way Stop Control |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TWSC = Two-Way Stop Control |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{1}$ Average delay for an all-way stop controlled intersection is reported for the entire intersection. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{2}$ Average delay for the two-way stop controlled intersection is reported by the Synchro output delay and LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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## Observed Existing Traffic Conditions

Traffic conditions were observed in the field to identify existing operational deficiencies and to confirm the accuracy of calculated intersection levels of service. The purpose of this effort was (1) to identify any existing traffic problems that may not be directly related to level of service, and (2) to identify any locations where the level of service analysis does not accurately reflect existing traffic conditions. Overall, most study intersections operate adequately during both the AM and PM peak hours of traffic, and the level of service analysis appears to accurately reflect actual existing traffic conditions. However, field observations showed that some minor operational problems occur during the AM peak commute hours. These issues are described below.

## Oak Avenue/City Park Way and Crystal Springs Road

This intersection experiences heavy traffic along Crystal Springs Road and City Park Way during the AM peak hour. Vehicle queues were long on the eastbound and northbound approaches, with the eastbound right turn movement occasionally extending to the Donner Avenue and Crystal Springs Road intersection. The movement was separated from the through movement as most vehicles traveling eastbound often created two lanes. Vehicles traveling northbound on City Park Way often experienced a long queue that extended to the front of the current recreational center.

## Donner Avenue and Crystal Springs Road

Field observations also showed that during the AM peak hour at the Donner Avenue and Crystal Springs Road intersection, the eastbound through queue often extended past 10 vehicles; however due to the low traffic volume on the southbound left turn movement, vehicles were able to move through the intersection without a large amount of delay. Occasionally, the queue from the Oak Avenue/City Park Way and Crystal Springs Road intersection backed up into the Donner Avenue and Crystal Springs Road intersection.

## Cypress Avenue and Crystal Springs Road

Eastbound traffic on Crystal Springs Road often experienced a queue of 10 or more vehicles. Due to the low volume of vehicles on Cypress Avenue, vehicles were able to clear the intersection quickly. Vehicles blocked the driveway to the Playground/Corporation Lot (Lot \#2), but there were not many vehicles trying to access the lot during the AM peak hour.

## 3. <br> Cumulative Conditions

This chapter describes cumulative traffic conditions. Cumulative conditions are defined as conditions within the next 3-5 years (a horizon year of 2021-2023) just prior to completion/occupation of the proposed development. Traffic volumes for cumulative conditions comprise existing traffic volumes plus traffic generated by other approved or pending developments in the vicinity of the site. This chapter describes the procedure used to determine cumulative traffic volumes and the resulting traffic conditions.

## Roadway Network and Traffic Volumes Under Cumulative Conditions

It is assumed in this analysis that the transportation network under cumulative conditions would be the same as the existing transportation network because there are no planned and funded transportation improvements at the study intersections.

Cumulative traffic volumes for the study intersections were estimated by adding to existing traffic volumes the trips generated by nearby approved but not yet completed or occupied projects, projects under construction, and projects with a formal application submitted. A list of developments was obtained from the City of San Bruno (see Appendix C). Nearby projects within a 1-mile radius of the project site that are expected to generate a measurable number of vehicle trips at one or more study intersections include the following:

- 406 San Mateo Avenue - a three-story mixed-use development of 83 apartment units and 7,000 square feet of retail space
- 160 El Camino Real Hotel - a three-story hotel with 34 rooms
- 271 El Camino Real - a three-story multi-family development with 24 units
- The Stratford School - a private school for Pre-Kindergarten and Kindergarten students located at 201 Balboa Way

Trip generation estimates for the approved projects were based on their respective traffic study, if available. The traffic study, done by Hexagon, was used for the 406 San Mateo Avenue project. The 160 El Camino Real Hotel project, the 271 El Camino Real residential development, and The Stratford School do not have traffic studies; therefore, trips were estimated based off the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition (2017). The estimated trips from the projects were distributed and assigned throughout the study area based on the trip distribution assumptions present in the traffic studies or based on knowledge of travel patterns in the study area. Figure 7 shows the cumulative traffic volumes.
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## Cumulative Conditions Intersection Level of Service

The analysis results show that the signalized and unsignalized study intersections would operate at LOS D or better during both the AM and PM peak hours, except the Oak Avenue/City Park Way and Crystal Springs Road intersection, which would continue to operate at LOS F during the AM peak hour and would degrade to LOS E during the PM peak hour(see Table 5). The intersection levels of service calculation sheets are included in Appendix D.

## Table 5

Cumulative Intersection Levels of Service

| Study Number | Intersection | Traffic Control | Peak Hour | Existing Conditions |  | Cumulative Conditions |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Avg. Delay (sec.) | LOS | Avg. Delay (sec.) | LOS |
| 1 | Cunningham Way \& Crystal Springs Road | Signal | AM | 26.2 | C | 29.5 | C |
|  |  |  | PM | 27.7 | C | 28.1 | C |
| 2 | Donner Avenue \& Crystal Springs Road | AWSC ${ }^{1}$ | AM | 20.7 | C | 20.8 | C |
|  |  |  | PM | 15.9 | C | 17.0 | C |
| 3 | Oak Avenue \& Crystal Springs Road | AWSC ${ }^{1}$ | AM | 73.0 | F | 73.5 | F |
|  |  |  | PM | 31.5 | D | 36.9 | E |
| 4 | Cyrpess Avenue \& Crystal Springs Road | AWSC ${ }^{1}$ | AM | 15.0 | B | 15.4 | B |
|  |  |  | PM | 13.1 | B | 13.4 | B |
| 5 | El Camino Real \& Crystal Springs Road | Signal | AM | 21.9 | C | 22.1 | C |
|  |  |  | PM | 21.5 | C | 22.1 | C |
| 6 | De Soto Way \& Santa Lucia Avenue (North) | AWSC ${ }^{1}$ | AM | 10.0 | A | 10.0 | A |
|  |  |  | PM | 8.7 | A | 8.9 | A |
| 7 | De Soto Way \& Santa Lucia Avenue (Sorth) | TWSC ${ }^{2}$ | AM | 9.5 | A | 9.5 | A |
|  |  |  | PM | 8.3 | A | 8.3 | A |

[^0]
## 4.

## Project Conditions

This chapter describes traffic conditions with the project and includes: (1) the method by which project traffic is estimated and (2) a level of service summary. Existing plus project conditions are represented by existing traffic conditions with the addition of traffic generated by the project. Existing plus project traffic conditions could potentially occur if the project were to be occupied prior to the other approved projects in the area.

## Transportation Network

Under project conditions, as proposed, the transportation network are assumed to be the same as the existing transportation network.

## Project Trip Estimates

The magnitude of traffic produced by a new development and the locations where that traffic would appear were estimated using a three-step process: (1) trip generation, (2) trip distribution, and (3) trip assignment. In determining project trip generation, the magnitude of traffic traveling to and from the proposed recreation center was estimated for the AM and PM peak hours. As part of the project trip distribution, the directions to and from which the project trips would travel were estimated. In the project trip assignment, the project trips were assigned to specific streets and intersections. These procedures are described below.

## Trip Generation

Through empirical research, data have been collected that quantify the amount of traffic expected to be generated by many types of land uses. These trip generation rates can be used to estimate the future traffic increases that would result from a new development. The trip generation research is published in the Institute of Transportation Engineers' (ITE) Trip Generation Manual.

Project trip generation was estimated by applying the appropriate trip generation rates obtained from the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition (2017). The average trip generation rates for a Recreational Community Center (Land Use 495) was applied to the project. According to the ITE Trip Generation Manual, a recreational community center is described as a stand-alone public facility that often includes classes and clubs, swimming pools, athletic courts, exercise equipment, locker rooms, and a restaurant or snack bar.

The project intends to redevelop the current recreation center of approximately 30,000 square feet into a new recreation center of 47,000 square feet. The trip generation is based on the added square footage of the proposed project. Based on the project description and ITE trip generation rates, the proposed new recreation center would generate a total of 490 new daily vehicle trips, with 30 new trips ( 20 inbound and 10 outbound) occurring during the AM peak hour and 39 new trips ( 18 inbound and 21 outbound) occurring during the PM peak hour (see Table 6).

## Table 6

Project Trip Generation Estimates

| Land Use | Net Increase in Size |  | Daily |  | AM Peak Hour |  |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Rate Trips |  | Rate In |  | Out Total |  | Rate In |  | Out Total |  |
| Proposed Uses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Community Center ${ }^{1}$ | 17 | ksf | 28.82 | 490 | 1.76 | 20 | 10 | 30 | 2.31 | 18 | 21 | 39 |
| Notes: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| KSF $=1,000$ square feet |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{1}$ Recreational Community Center (Land Use 495) average rates published in ITE's Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition, 2017. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Trip Distribution and Assignment

The trip distribution pattern for the project was developed based on existing travel patterns on the surrounding roadway system and the locations of complementary land uses. The peak hour vehicle trips generated by the project were assigned to the roadway network in accordance with the trip distribution pattern. Figure 8 shows the trip distribution pattern for the proposed recreation center. Figure 9 shows the net project trip assignment at the study intersections.

## Existing Plus Project Traffic Volumes

Project trips, as represented in the above project trip assignment, were added to the existing traffic volumes to obtain existing plus project traffic volumes. The existing plus project traffic volumes are shown on Figure 10.


Figure 8
Project Trip Distribution
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## Existing Plus Project Intersection Analysis

The results of the level of service analysis under existing plus project conditions are summarized in Table 7. The results of the analysis show that all study intersections would continue to operate at LOS D or better during both the AM and PM peak hours, except the Oak Avenue/City Park Way and Crystal Springs Road intersection, which would continue to operate at LOS F during the AM peak hour. The intersection levels of service calculation sheets are included in Appendix D.

The San Bruno Walk ' $n$ Bike Plan recommends a mini-roundabout at the intersection to simplify the intersection control and calm traffic. However, the plan also noted that the mini-roundabout should be further studied to determine the feasibility of a mini-roundabout at this location given the relatively large number of school children and activity. As shown in the signal warrant analysis below, the AM and PM peak-hour intersection volumes warrant signalization under existing, cumulative, and project conditions. Therefore, Hexagon recommends that the City conduct further analysis and feasibility assessment to determine whether a traffic signal should be implemented at the Crystal Springs Road and City Park Way intersection.

The Oak Avenue/City Park Way and Crystal Springs Avenue intersection operates at an unacceptable LOS (LOS F) during the AM peak hour under existing conditions, and the project would add more than 10 trips to a stop-controlled movement. The intersection would also warrant a traffic signal after project completion. Therefore, the project would create a significant impact at the study intersection.

Table 7

## Existing Plus Project Intersection Levels of Service

| Study Number | Intersection | Traffic Control | Peak Hour | Existing Conditions |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | No Project |  | With Project |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Avg. Delay (sec.) | LOS | Avg. Delay (sec.) | LOS | Incr. In Avg. Delay |
| 1 | Cunningham Way \& Crystal Springs Road | Signal | AM | 26.2 | C | 26.8 | C | 0.0 |
| 2 | Donner Avenue \& Crystal Springs Road | AWSC ${ }^{1}$ | AM | 20.7 | C | 21.3 | C | -- |
|  |  |  | PM | 15.9 | C | 16.2 | C | -- |
| 3 | Oak Avenue \& Crystal Springs Road | AWSC ${ }^{1}$ | AM | 73.0 | F | 79.8 | F | -- |
|  |  |  | PM | 31.5 | D | 34.9 | D | -- |
| 4 | Cyrpess Avenue \& Crystal Springs Road | AWSC ${ }^{1}$ | AM | 15.0 | B | 15.2 | C | -- |
|  |  |  | PM | 13.1 | B | 13.2 | B | -- |
| 5 | El Camino Real \& Crystal Springs Road | Signal | AM | 21.9 | C | 22.6 | C | 0.1 |
|  |  |  | PM | 21.5 | C | 21.6 | C | 0.1 |
| 6 | De Soto Way \& Santa Lucia Avenue (North) | AWSC ${ }^{1}$ | AM | 10.0 | A | 10.1 | A | -- |
|  |  |  | PM | 8.7 | A | 8.8 | A | -- |
| 7 | De Soto Way \& Santa Lucia Avenue (Sorth) | TWSC ${ }^{2}$ | AM | 9.5 | A | 9.6 | A | -- |
|  |  |  | PM | 8.3 | A | 8.4 | A | -- |
| Note: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AWSC = All-Way Stop Control |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TWSC = Two-Way Stop Control |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{1}$ Average delay for an all-way stop controlled intersection is reported for the entire intersection. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{2}$ Average delay for the two-way stop controlled intersection is reported by the Synchro output delay and LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Cumulative Plus Project Traffic Volumes

Project trips, as previously shown on Figure 9, were added to cumulative traffic volumes to obtain cumulative plus project traffic volumes. The cumulative plus project traffic volumes at the study intersections are shown on Figure 11.

## Cumulative Plus Project Intersection Analysis

The results of the intersection level of service analysis show that all study intersections would continue to operate at LOS D or better during both the AM and PM peak hours of traffic, except the Oak Avenue/City Park Way and Crystal Springs Road intersection, which would continue to operate at LOS F during the AM peak hour and continue to operate at LOS E during the PM peak hour (see Table 8). The project would add more than 10 trips to a stop-controlled movement, and the intersection would warrant a traffic signal; therefore, the project would create a significant impact. The intersection levels of service calculation sheets are included in Appendix D.

Table 8
Cumulative Plus Project Intersection Levels of Service

| Study Number | Intersection | Traffic Control | Peak Hour | Cumulative Conditions |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | No Project |  | With Project |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Avg Delay (sec.) | LOS | Avg Delay (sec.) | LOS | Incr. In Avg. Delay |
| 1 | Cunningham Way \& Crystal Springs Road | Signal | AM <br> PM | $\begin{aligned} & 29.5 \\ & 28.1 \end{aligned}$ | C | $\begin{aligned} & 30.5 \\ & 28.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C} \\ & \mathrm{C} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0 \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ |
| 2 | Donner Avenue \& Crystal Springs Road | AWSC ${ }^{1}$ | AM PM | $\begin{aligned} & 20.8 \\ & 17.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C} \\ & \mathrm{C} \end{aligned}$ | 21.3 17.4 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C} \\ & \mathrm{C} \end{aligned}$ | -- |
| 3 | Oak Avenue \& Crystal Springs Road | AWSC ${ }^{1}$ | AM <br> PM | $\begin{aligned} & 73.4 \\ & 36.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{F} \\ & \mathrm{E} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 80.0 \\ & 43.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & F \\ & E \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 4 | Cyrpess Avenue \& Crystal Springs Road | AWSC ${ }^{1}$ | AM | $\begin{aligned} & 15.4 \\ & 13.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & B \\ & B \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15.2 \\ & 13.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C} \\ & \mathrm{~B} \end{aligned}$ | -- |
| 5 | El Camino Real \& Crystal Springs Road | Signal | AM <br> PM | $\begin{aligned} & 22.1 \\ & 22.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C} \\ & \mathrm{C} \end{aligned}$ | 22.7 22.3 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C} \\ & \mathrm{C} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.1 \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ |
| 6 | De Soto Way \& Santa Lucia Avenue (North) | AWSC ${ }^{1}$ | AM <br> PM | $\begin{gathered} 10.0 \\ 8.9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{A} \\ & \mathrm{~A} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10.1 \\ 8.9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A } \\ & \text { A } \end{aligned}$ | -- |
| 7 | De Soto Way \& Santa Lucia Avenue (Sorth) | TWSC ${ }^{2}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{AM} \\ & \mathrm{PM} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.5 \\ & 8.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A } \\ & \text { A } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.6 \\ & 8.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A } \\ & \text { A } \end{aligned}$ | -- |
| Note: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AWSC = All-Way Stop Control <br> TWSC = Two-Way Stop Control <br> Average delay for an all-way stop controlled intersection is reported for the entire intersection. <br> ${ }^{2}$ Average delay for the two-way stop controlled intersection is reported by the Synchro output delay and LOS <br> Bold indicates a substandard level of service. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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## Signal Warrant Analysis

In conjunction with the level of service analysis, a signal warrant analysis was performed to determine if the unsignalized intersection of Oak Avenue/City Park Way and Crystal Springs Avenue would warrant a traffic signal. The study intersection was analyzed on the basis of one-hour traffic volumes and were checked against the One-Hour signal warrant described in Section 4C. 01 of the California Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CA MUTCD). The guidelines of the signal warrant analysis as well as the result of the analysis is described and summarized below. The signal warrant worksheet and threshold tables are included in Appendix E.

Warrant 3 (One-Hour Vehicular Volume) states that the need for a traffic control signal shall be considered if an engineering study finds that, for one hour of an average day, the plotted points representing the vehicles per hour on the major street (total of both approaches) and the corresponding vehicles per hour on the higher-volume minor-street approach (one direction only) all fall above the applicable curve in Figure 4C-3 for the existing combination of approach lanes. As shown in the graph, the minimum volume on the minor street with one lane approach should be at least 100 vehicles and at least 150 vehicles for the minor street approach with two lanes to meet the signal warrant.

Figure 4C-3. Warrant 3, Peak Hour

*Note: 150 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with two or more lanes and 100 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with one lane.

## Signal Warrant Analysis Results

Major and minor approach volumes were plotted for the Oak Avenue/City Park Way and Crystal Springs Avenue intersection on Figure 4C-3 (see Appendix E). The intersection would warrant a traffic signal as both the AM and PM peak hour show that the plotted points of the volumes fall above the curve of a minor street with a one lane approach. The Walk ' $n$ Bike Plan also recommends that a miniroundabout be considered at the intersection to help calm traffic. The roundabout would have similar effects as a signal (see Table 9). In both cases, average delays would be mitigated from over 70 seconds as an unsignalized intersection to under 15 seconds as either a roundabout or signalized intersection. Hexagon recommends that the City conduct further analysis to determine whether a roundabout or traffic signal should be implemented at the Crystal Springs Road and City Park Way intersection.

Table 9
Roundabout vs Signal Level of Service


## 5. <br> Other Transportation Issues

This chapter presents other transportation issues associated with the project. These include an analysis of:

- Site access and circulation
- Potential impacts to pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities

Unlike the level of service impact methodology, which is adopted by the City Council, most of the analyses in this chapter are based on professional judgment in accordance with the standards and methods employed by the traffic engineering community. While operational issues are not considered CEQA impacts, they describe traffic conditions that are relevant to describing the project environment.

## Site Access and On-Site Circulation

The site access and on-site circulation evaluation is based on the site plan prepared by Group 4 Architecture Research + Planning (see Figure 2). Site access was evaluated to determine the adequacy of the site's driveways with regard to the following: traffic volume, delays, geometric design, and sight distance. On-site vehicular circulation was reviewed in accordance with generally accepted traffic engineering standards and transportation planning principles.

## Vehicle Site Access

Vehicular access to the project site would be provided via Crystal Springs Road and City Park Way. The project would provide four parking lots and one drop off zone. One of the parking lots would be accessible from Crystal Springs Road, one lot would be accessed by Santa Lucia Avenue (north) and an alleyway that extends to the Beckner Shelter picnic area, another lot would be accessed by the same alleyway, and one of the parking lots, as well as the drop off zone, would be accessible from City Park Way. The four parking lots are existing to the current site. The project plans to redesign the parking lots to create more spaces. A drop off zone would be created along the project frontage on City Park Way.

## Driveway Operations

The project would provide four ingress/egress driveways along City Park Way, Crystal Springs Road and Santa Lucia Avenue/alleyway. All driveways are existing to the current site, however the driveways on City Park Way would be relocated and redesigned into an ingress/egress driveway for the parking lot. Inbound traffic accessing the project from Crystal Springs Road via the City Park Way driveways experiences virtually no delay since the right turns into the lot do not conflict with other vehicular movements. Inbound traffic traveling northbound on City Park Way must wait for southbound traffic on City Park Way to clear to turn left into the driveways. The tube count conducted on City Park Way showed that, on average, the mid-week AM peak hour occurred from 7:00 AM to 8:00 AM with 276
vehicles traveling southbound, and the mid-week PM peak hour occurred from 3:00 to 4:00 PM with 303 vehicles traveling southbound. Vehicles turning left into the driveway may experience some delay waiting for the southbound traffic to clear but would generally be able to find a gap in the traffic.
Vehicles would also have to yield to pedestrians crossing to and from the field. Outbound vehicles leaving the lot can turn either right or left onto City Park Way. Vehicles turning left out of the parking lot would have to wait for both northbound and southbound traffic on City Park Way to clear. On average, the mid-week AM peak hour had 276 vehicles and the PM peak hour had 287 vehicles. Vehicles may experience delays if the northbound queue extends past the driveways. Vehicles turning right out of the parking lot would also have to yield to pedestrians crossing from the field.

Inbound traffic accessing the project using the corporation yard parking lot via eastbound Crystal Springs Road experiences virtually no delay since the right turns into the lot do not conflict with other vehicular movements; however, vehicles traveling westbound on Crystal Springs Road would have to give the right of way to eastbound traffic on Crystal Springs Road. Field observations showed that there was often an eastbound queue blocking the driveway in the AM peak hour, but there were little to no vehicles trying to access the driveway during the AM peak hour. The PM peak hour showed large gaps between vehicles, therefore there would not be any issues for vehicles turning left into the driveway. Inbound traffic accessing the project via De Soto Way are able to enter the driveway on Santa Lucia Way or the alleyway. Traffic volumes on Santa Lucia Way and De Soto Way are low, therefore vehicles traveling inbound and outbound do not experience heavy delays.

## Sight Distance

The project access points should be free and clear of any obstructions to provide adequate sight distance, thereby ensuring that exiting vehicles can see pedestrians on the sidewalk and vehicles and bicycles traveling on Crystal Springs Road and City Park Way. Any landscaping and signage should be located in such a way to ensure an unobstructed view for drivers exiting the site.

Adequate sight distance (sight distance triangles) should be provided at each parking lot entrance/exit in order to avoid collision with oncoming traffic. Caltrans Highway Design Manual (Section 405.1) states that sight distance requirements are not applied to urban driveways, however, Caltrans standards for stopping sight distance were used in order to provide adequate sight distance at the City Park Way driveways. Sight distance triangles should be measured approximately 10 feet back from the traveled way. Sight distance requirements vary depending on the roadway speeds. Given that City Park Way has a legal speed limit of 25 mph , the Caltrans stopping sight distance is 200 feet (based on a design speed of 30 mph ) for the entrances located on City Park Way. Thus, a driver must be able to see 200 feet north of the driveway along City Park Way in order to stop and avoid a collision. Driveways along Crystal Springs Road and Santa Lucia Avenue and the alleyway provide adequate sight distance.

## Drop-Off and Loading Zone

The existing recreation center does not have a specified drop-off area, but there is approximately 140 feet of a curbside loading zone. The proposed site plan shows a drop off zone on City Park Way of approximately 175 feet. The drop-off zone would fit 7 vehicles, given that one vehicle measures to be 25 feet long, including one police vehicle parking space. The drop-off zone would be 24.5 feet at its widest, which would allow more flexibility for drivers to exit the drop-off zone. The drop off zone would operate similar to the existing loading zone. The proposed loading zone could accommodate more cars than the existing curb area, so even though the new community center would generate more traffic, the drop-off operation would be essentially the same as existing conditions.

## Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Transit Analysis

All new development projects in San Bruno should enhance opportunities for all modes of transportation, consistent with the goals of the City's General Plan and the Walk ' $n$ Bike Plan. It is the goal of the General Plan and the Walk ' $n$ Bike Plan that all development projects accommodate and encourage the use of non-automobile transportation modes within the area. The Walk ' $n$ Bike Plan establishes strategies to foster more multi-modal opportunities, promote active living, and connect to the other modes of transportation within the network. In order to further the goals of the City, pedestrian and bicycle facilities should be encouraged with new development projects.

## Pedestrian Facilities

Pedestrian facilities in the study area consist of sidewalks, crosswalks, and pedestrian signals at signalized intersections (see Chapter 2 for details). The project plans show sidewalks surrounding the border of the recreation center, as well as connecting to the parking lots. The project would install two new crosswalks on City Park Way with pedestrian bridges crossing the creek and connecting to the existing pedestrian path behind the tennis courts and ball field. The project would also construct one publicly accessible pedestrian plaza at the recreation center's entrance along City Park Way. The project should consider assessing the following concerns from the Walk 'n Bike Plan:

- Wider sidewalk paths
- Better maintenance of the paths within the park

Hexagon recommends that better speed signs and pedestrian crossing signs be installed on City Park Way in front of the project site to raise driver awareness of the pedestrian crossings. Wayfinding signage should also be installed for the pedestrian path that runs through the park from the San Bruno Senior Center to help guide pedestrians, as there is no connecting sidewalk on Crystal Springs Road between Donner Avenue and the Senior Center.

The City's Walk ' $n$ Bike Plan outlines the following potential pedestrian improvement strategies, although none are planned or funded projects:

- Intersection of Crystal Springs Road and El Camino Real: Install corner bulb-outs to shorten pedestrian crossing distance and reduce corner curb radii, remove turn pockets where capacity is not needed, narrow travel lanes to provide a pedestrian refuge, and provide supplemental signal faces and signal push buttons or other detectors, as needed.
- Intersection of Crystal Springs Road and Oak Avenue: Construct a mini roundabout to simplify the intersection control and calm traffic. The improvement should be studied to determine the feasibility of a mini roundabout at this location given the relatively large number of school children and activity.
- Crystal Springs Road from Donner Avenue to Cunningham Way: Construct a minimum six-foot sidewalk, curb and gutter. Some locations might require retaining walls.

The project would not include the removal of any pedestrian facilities, nor would it conflict with any adopted plans or policies for new pedestrian facilities. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on pedestrian facilities in the immediate vicinity of the project site, and no project sponsored improvements would be necessary.

The project should consider extending the proposed sidewalks along the project on City Park Way southward to connect to the existing sidewalks that end just north of Portola Way.

## Bicycle Facilities

There are no existing bike facilities in the immediate vicinity of the project site (see Chapter 2 for details). However, there are several potential future additional bicycle facilities in the study area. The City's Walk ' $n$ Bike Plan outlines the following potential bicycle improvement strategies although none are planned or funded projects:

- Class III bike route on Cunningham Way between Jenevein Road and Crystal Springs Road
- Class III bike route on Crystal Springs Road between Cunningham Way and Linden Avenue
- Class III bike route on De Soto Way between Bayview Avenue and Crystal Springs Avenue
- Class III bike route on Oak Avenue between San Bruno Avenue and Crystal Springs Road

The project would not remove any bicycle facilities, nor would it conflict with any adopted plans or policies for new bicycle facilities. Thus, no project sponsored improvements would be necessary.

## Transit Services

The project site is well-served by SamTrans, BART, and Caltrain (see Chapter 2 for details). The nearest bus stops are located on Crystal Springs Road, east of Cunningham Way and at the intersection of Crystal Springs Road and El Camino Real. Additional transit services are provided at the San Bruno Caltrain Station, less than 1.1 miles northeast of the project site, and the San Bruno BART station, located approximately 2 miles northeast of the project site. With the proximity to transit services, it could be expected that a portion (10\%) of employee and patron trips would be made by transit. Assuming up to $10 \%$ of the project trips are transit trips, the project would generate 3 transit trips during the AM peak hour and 3 transit trips during the PM peak hour. There are between 13 and 15 scheduled buses that serve the bus stops near the site during peak hours, eight BART and four Caltrain trains that stop at the San Bruno BART and Caltrain stations. It is assumed that the trains and buses would have sufficient capacity to accommodate this relatively minor increase in ridership. Given that the project would not remove any transit facilities, nor would it conflict with any adopted plans or policies for new transit facilities or services, the proposed project is not expected to have an adverse impact on transit services in the immediate vicinity of the project site. Thus, no project sponsored improvements would be necessary.

# San Bruno Recreation and Aquatics Center TIA Technical Appendices 

## Appendix A Traffic Counts

Location: City Park Way, B/W Crystal Springs Rd \& Portola Way

| Time | Wednesday |  |  | Thursday |  |  | Friday |  |  | Saturday |  |  | Sunday |  |  | Monday |  |  | Tuesday |  |  | Mid-Week Average |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1/23/2019 |  |  | 1/24/2019 |  |  | 1/25/2019 |  |  | 1/26/2019 |  |  | 1/27/2019 |  |  | 1/28/2019 |  |  | 1/29/2019 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | NB | SB | Total | NB | SB | Total | NB | SB | Total | NB | SB | Total | NB | SB | Total | NB | SB | Total | NB | SB | Total | NB | SB | Total |
| 12:00 AM | 9 | 13 | 22 | 8 | 14 | 22 | 8 | 11 | 19 | 16 | 30 | 46 | 17 | 30 | 47 | 1 | 11 | 12 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 7 | 11 | 18 |
| 1:00 AM | 11 | 7 | 18 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 18 | 11 | 18 | 29 | 10 | 19 | 29 | 6 | 12 | 18 | 5 | 3 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 11 |
| 2:00 AM | 0 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 12 | 4 | 10 | 14 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 2 | 4 | 6 |
| 3:00 AM | 5 | 5 | 10 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 9 | 12 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 8 |
| 4:00 AM | 15 | 4 | 19 | 10 | 3 | 13 | 12 | 6 | 18 | 9 | 4 | 13 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 15 | 3 | 18 | 15 | 4 | 19 | 13 | 4 | 17 |
| 5:00 AM | 45 | 12 | 57 | 42 | 10 | 52 | 51 | 17 | 68 | 16 | 3 | 19 | 14 | 5 | 19 | 55 | 15 | 70 | 53 | 20 | 73 | 47 | 14 | 61 |
| 6:00 AM | 108 | 34 | 142 | 119 | 33 | 152 | 121 | 63 | 184 | 29 | 18 | 47 | 18 | 9 | 27 | 118 | 22 | 140 | 123 | 21 | 144 | 117 | 29 | 146 |
| 7:00 AM | 281 | 327 | 608 | 228 | 163 | 391 | 307 | 307 | 614 | 60 | 39 | 99 | 57 | 33 | 90 | 294 | 324 | 618 | 318 | 339 | 657 | 276 | 276 | 552 |
| 8:00 AM | 259 | 250 | 509 | 270 | 243 | 513 | 270 | 248 | 518 | 112 | 61 | 173 | 99 | 78 | 177 | 292 | 244 | 536 | 271 | 243 | 514 | 267 | 245 | 512 |
| 9:00 AM | 194 | 115 | 309 | 278 | 266 | 544 | 196 | 105 | 301 | 161 | 108 | 269 | 142 | 81 | 223 | 170 | 124 | 294 | 190 | 117 | 307 | 221 | 166 | 387 |
| 10:00 AM | 185 | 104 | 289 | 165 | 137 | 302 | 150 | 135 | 285 | 187 | 151 | 338 | 188 | 131 | 319 | 159 | 111 | 270 | 144 | 117 | 261 | 165 | 119 | 284 |
| 11:00 AM | 124 | 149 | 273 | 149 | 127 | 276 | 162 | 160 | 322 | 170 | 145 | 315 | 196 | 148 | 344 | 127 | 159 | 286 | 125 | 127 | 252 | 133 | 134 | 267 |
| 12:00 PM | 131 | 163 | 294 | 156 | 149 | 305 | 152 | 140 | 292 | 145 | 162 | 307 | 183 | 164 | 347 | 149 | 117 | 266 | 146 | 123 | 269 | 144 | 145 | 289 |
| 1:00 PM | 166 | 147 | 313 | 185 | 170 | 355 | 183 | 157 | 340 | 146 | 159 | 305 | 164 | 159 | 323 | 181 | 163 | 344 | 167 | 159 | 326 | 173 | 159 | 331 |
| 2:00 PM | 237 | 219 | 456 | 200 | 179 | 379 | 246 | 183 | 429 | 138 | 129 | 267 | 179 | 141 | 320 | 231 | 193 | 424 | 237 | 223 | 460 | 225 | 207 | 432 |
| 3:00 PM | 270 | 302 | 572 | 320 | 298 | 618 | 331 | 313 | 644 | 166 | 159 | 325 | 170 | 155 | 325 | 326 | 277 | 603 | 272 | 310 | 582 | 287 | 303 | 591 |
| 4:00 PM | 219 | 261 | 480 | 206 | 256 | 462 | 237 | 263 | 500 | 182 | 148 | 330 | 161 | 175 | 336 | 233 | 257 | 490 | 281 | 244 | 525 | 235 | 254 | 489 |
| 5:00 PM | 225 | 283 | 508 | 238 | 299 | 537 | 238 | 289 | 527 | 179 | 186 | 365 | 132 | 152 | 284 | 279 | 330 | 609 | 302 | 296 | 598 | 255 | 293 | 548 |
| 6:00 PM | 173 | 222 | 395 | 203 | 276 | 479 | 183 | 233 | 416 | 102 | 129 | 231 | 99 | 156 | 255 | 140 | 195 | 335 | 180 | 224 | 404 | 185 | 241 | 426 |
| 7:00 PM | 135 | 141 | 276 | 128 | 151 | 279 | 142 | 149 | 291 | 78 | 108 | 186 | 78 | 94 | 172 | 95 | 118 | 213 | 110 | 155 | 265 | 124 | 149 | 273 |
| 8:00 PM | 151 | 149 | 300 | 100 | 128 | 228 | 91 | 111 | 202 | 90 | 99 | 189 | 81 | 81 | 162 | 90 | 104 | 194 | 90 | 117 | 207 | 114 | 131 | 245 |
| 9:00 PM | 44 | 78 | 122 | 62 | 81 | 143 | 148 | 115 | 263 | 72 | 96 | 168 | 42 | 66 | 108 | 59 | 75 | 134 | 58 | 95 | 153 | 55 | 85 | 139 |
| 10:00 PM | 22 | 51 | 73 | 20 | 36 | 56 | 76 | 74 | 150 | 58 | 66 | 124 | 33 | 25 | 58 | 23 | 48 | 71 | 35 | 54 | 89 | 26 | 47 | 73 |
| 11:00 PM | 10 | 22 | 32 | 19 | 31 | 50 | 33 | 54 | 87 | 28 | 36 | 64 | 16 | 22 | 38 | 13 | 21 | 34 | 16 | 31 | 47 | 15 | 28 | 43 |
| Total | 3,019 | 3,062 | 6,081 | 3,114 | 3,062 | 6,176 | 3,350 | 3,147 | 6,497 | 2,164 | 2,069 | 4,233 | 2,089 | 1,943 | 4,032 | 3,064 | 2,934 | 5,998 | 3,149 | 3,034 | 6,183 | 3,094 | 3,053 | 6,147 |
| Percent | 50\% | 50\% | - | 50\% | 50\% | - | 52\% | 48\% | - | 51\% | 49\% | - | 52\% | 48\% | - | 51\% | 49\% | - | 51\% | 49\% | - | 50\% | 50\% | - |
| AM Peak | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 09:00 | 09:00 | 09:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 10:00 | 10:00 | 10:00 | 11:00 | 11:00 | 11:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 | 07:00 |
| Vol. | 281 | 327 | 608 | 278 | 266 | 544 | 307 | 307 | 614 | 187 | 151 | 338 | 196 | 148 | 344 | 294 | 324 | 618 | 318 | 339 | 657 | 276 | 276 | 552 |
| PM Peak | 15:00 | 15:00 | 15:00 | 15:00 | 17:00 | 15:00 | 15:00 | 15:00 | 15:00 | 16:00 | 17:00 | 17:00 | 12:00 | 16:00 | 12:00 | 15:00 | 17:00 | 17:00 | 17:00 | 15:00 | 17:00 | 15:00 | 15:00 | 15:00 |
| Vol. | 270 | 302 | 572 | 320 | 299 | 618 | 331 | 313 | 644 | 182 | 186 | 365 | 183 | 175 | 347 | 326 | 330 | 609 | 302 | 310 | 598 | 287 | 303 | 591 |

1. Mid-week average includes data between Tuesday and Thursday.

www.idaxdata.com

| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Crystal Spring Rd |  |  |  | Crystal Spring Rd |  |  |  | Senior Center Dwy |  |  |  | Cunningham Way |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 |
| 8:30 AM |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 |
| Count Total | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | Crystal Spring Rd |  |  |  | Crystal Spring Rd |  |  |  | Senior Center Dwy |  |  |  | Cunningham Way |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  | TH | RT | LT |  | TH | RT | LT |  | TH | RT | LT |  |  | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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


Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles

| Interval Start | Crystal Spring Rd |  |  |  | Crystal Spring Rd |  |  |  | Senior Center Dwy |  |  |  | Cunningham Way |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

| Interval Start | Crystal Spring Rd |  |  | Crystal Spring Rd |  |  | Senior Center Dwy |  |  | Cunningham Way |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 15-min } \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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


| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Crystal Spring Rd |  |  |  | Crystal Spring Rd |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | Donner Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| Count Total | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 |

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

| Interval Start | Crystal Spring Rd |  |  | Crystal Spring Rd |  |  | 0 |  |  | Donner Ave |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 15-min } \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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


| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Crystal Spring Rd |  |  |  | Crystal Spring Rd |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | Donner Ave |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15-min } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

| Interval Start | Crystal Spring Rd |  |  | Crystal Spring Rd |  |  | 0 |  |  | Donner Ave |  |  | $15-\mathrm{min}$Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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

www.idaxdata.com

| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Crystal Spring Rd |  |  |  | Crystal Spring Rd |  |  |  | City Park Way |  |  |  | Oak Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | T | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 |
| 8:00 AM |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | Crystal Spring Rd |  |  |  | Crystal Spring Rd |  |  |  | City Park Way |  |  |  | Oak Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  | TH | RT | LT |  | TH | RT | LT |  |  | RT | LT |  | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

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


## www.idaxdata.com

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles

| Interval Start | Crystal Spring Rd |  |  |  | Crystal Spring Rd |  |  |  | City Park Way |  |  |  | Oak Ave |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

| Interval Start | Crystal Spring Rd |  |  | Crystal Spring Rd |  |  | City Park Way |  |  | Oak Ave |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15-min } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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


## www.idaxdata.com

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles

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

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

| Interval Start | Crystal Spring Rd |  |  | Crystal Spring Rd |  |  | Cypress Ave |  |  | Cypress Ave |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15-min } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Count Total | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |

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

www.idaxdata.com

| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Crystal Spring Rd |  |  |  | Driveway |  |  |  |  | El Camino Real |  |  |  | El Camino Real |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT |  | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 11 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 18 | 47 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 15 | 54 |
| 8:15 AM |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 18 | 62 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 13 | 64 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 19 | 65 |
| Count Total | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 1 | 112 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 64 | 0 |
| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | Crystal Spring Rd |  |  |  | Driveway |  |  |  |  | El Camino Real |  |  |  | El Camino Real |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  | TH | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH | RT | LT |  |  | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 8:15 AM | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 3 | 7 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Count Total | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 4 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 4 | 0 |

Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any.
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| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Crystal Spring Rd |  |  |  | Driveway |  |  |  |  | El Camino Real |  |  |  |  | El Camino Real |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT |  | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 16 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 3 | 1 | 6 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 35 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 25 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 26 |
| 5:30 PM |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 4 | 0 | 0 |  | 4 | 0 | 9 | 29 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 25 |
| Count Total | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 2 | 60 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 25 | 0 |
| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start | Crystal Spring Rd |  |  |  | Driveway |  |  |  |  | El Camino Real |  |  |  |  | El Camino Real |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT |  | TH | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT |  | TH |  | RT | LT | T |  | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 5:00 PM | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Count Total | 3 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 3 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Note: U-Turn volumes for bikes are included in Left-Turn, if any. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Santa Lucia Way |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | De Soto Way |  |  |  | De Soto Way |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

| Interval Start | Santa Lucia Way |  |  | 0 |  |  | De Soto Way |  |  | De Soto Way |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15-min } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |

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


| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | Santa Lucia Way |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | De Soto Way |  |  |  | De Soto Way |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 15-\mathrm{min} \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| Count Total | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

| Interval Start | Santa Lucia Way |  |  | 0 |  |  | De Soto Way |  |  | De Soto Way |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15-min } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:00 PM | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Count Total | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |

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


Two-Hour Count Summaries

| Interval Start |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | Santa Lucia Ave |  |  |  | De Soto Way |  |  |  |  | De Soto Way |  |  |  | 15-min <br> Total | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | UT | LT | TH |  | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT |  | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 0 |  | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 0 | 41 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 16 | 0 |  | 0 | 25 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 18 | 0 | 69 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 0 |  | 0 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 55 | 0 | 114 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 12 | 0 |  | 0 | 75 | 3 | 0 | 19 | 111 | 0 | 225 | 449 |
| 8:00 AM |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 0 |  | 0 | 40 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 41 | 0 | 105 | 513 |
| 8:15 AM |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 0 |  | 0 | 38 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 20 | 0 | 81 | 525 |
| 8:30 AM8:45 AM |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |  | 0 | 40 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 21 | 0 | 73 | 484 |
|  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 0 |  | 0 | 25 | 1 | 0 | 16 | 22 | 0 | 74 | 333 |
| Count Total |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 77 | 0 |  | 0 | 299 | 8 | 1 | 83 | 299 | 0 | 782 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | All | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 37 | 0 |  | 0 | 192 | 4 | 1 | 53 | 227 | 0 | 525 | 0 |
|  | HV | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
|  | HV\% | - | - | - |  | - | - | 0\% | - | 5\% | - |  | - | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | - | 1\% | 0 |
| Note: Two-hour count summary volumes include heavy vehicles but exclude bicycles in overall count. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interval Start |  | Heavy Vehicle Totals |  |  |  |  |  |  | Bicycles |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pedestrians (Crossing Leg) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | EB | WB |  | NB |  | SB | Total | EB | WB |  | NB |  | SB | Total | Eas |  | West | North | South | h Total |
| 7:00 AM7:15 AM |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 7:30 AM |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 7:45 AM |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 8:00 AM } \\ & \text { 8:15 AM } \end{aligned}$ |  | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
|  |  | 0 | 2 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 2 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:30 AM |  | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 2 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| 8:45 AM |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Count Total |  | 0 | 4 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 2 | 2 |  | 8 | 3 | 1 | 14 |
| Peak Hr |  | 0 | 2 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 2 | 0 |  | 4 | 2 | 1 | 7 |


| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | 0 |  |  |  | Santa Lucia Ave |  |  |  | De Soto Way |  |  |  | De Soto Way |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15-min } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

| Interval Start | 0 |  |  | Santa Lucia Ave |  |  | De Soto Way |  |  | De Soto Way |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15-min } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |

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

## De Soto Way Santa Lucia Ave

Peak Hour


むみх
Date: 01-23-2019
Count Period: 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM
Peak Hour: 4:30 PM to 5:30 PM

| Two-Hour Count Summaries - Heavy Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval Start | 0 |  |  |  | Santa Lucia Ave |  |  |  | De Soto Way |  |  |  | De Soto Way |  |  |  | 15-min Total | Rolling One Hour |
|  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT | UT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |

Two-Hour Count Summaries - Bikes

| Interval Start | 0 |  |  | Santa Lucia Ave |  |  | De Soto Way |  |  | De Soto Way |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15-min } \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ | Rolling One Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |  |
|  | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT | LT | TH | RT |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Count Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak Hour | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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

## Appendix B <br> Volume Summary Sheets






| Pending Project Trips |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 406 San Mateo Avenue | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 160 El Camino Real | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 271 El Camino Real | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 |
| The Stratford School | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 28 |
| Total Pending Trips | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 36 |
| Cumulative Conditions | 8 | 0 | 17 | 35 | 408 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 515 | 8 | 990 |
| Project Trips | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 10 |
| Existing Plus Project Conditions | 8 | 0 | 18 | 36 | 393 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 502 | 8 | 964 |
| Cumulative Plus Project Conditions | 8 | 0 | 18 | 36 | 412 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 519 | 8 | 1000 |




| Pending Project Trips |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 406 San Mateo Avenue | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 160 El Camino Real | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 271 El Camino Real | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 |
| The Stratford School | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Total Pending Trips | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 24 |
| Cumulative Conditions | 4 | 6 | 8 | 12 | 375 | 5 | 2 | 8 | 47 | 25 | 386 | 13 | 891 |
| Project Trips | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 8 |
| Existing Plus Project Conditions | 4 | 5 | 8 | 12 | 374 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 33 | 25 | 387 | 13 | 875 |
| Cumulative Plus Project Conditions | 4 | 6 | 8 | 12 | 379 | 5 | 2 | 8 | 47 | 25 | 390 | 13 | 899 |


| Intersection Number: |
| :--- |
| Traffix Node Number: |
| Intersection NPMe: |
| Peak Hour: |
| Count Date: |



| Pending Project Trips |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 406 San Mateo Avenue | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 18 |
| 160 El Camino Real | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| 271 El Camino Real | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| The Stratford School | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| Total Pending Trips | 1 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 80 |
| Cumulative Conditions | 157 | 1449 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1638 | 253 | 282 | 0 | 163 | 3942 |
| Project Trips | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 8 |
| Existing Plus Project Conditions | 158 | 1418 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1602 | 250 | 279 | 0 | 163 | 3870 |
| Cumulative Plus Project Conditions | 159 | 1449 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1638 | 255 | 284 | 0 | 165 | 3950 |



| Pending Project Trips |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 406 San Mateo Avenue | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 160 El Camino Real | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 271 El Camino Real | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| The Stratford School | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Total Pending Trips | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Cumulative Conditions | 57 | 200 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 148 | 21 | 7 | 0 | 43 | 476 |
| Project Trips | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Existing Plus Project Conditions | 57 | 194 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 155 | 21 | 7 | 0 | 43 | 477 |
| Cumulative Plus Project Conditions | 57 | 208 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 155 | 21 | 7 | 0 | 43 | 491 |


| Intersection Number: | 7 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Traffix Node Number: | 7 |
| Intersection NPMe: | Santa Lucia Avenue (S) and De Soto Way |
| Peak Hour: | PM |
| Count Date: | $1 / 23 / 2019$ |
|  |  |



| Pending Project Trips |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 406 San Mateo Avenue | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 160 El Camino Real | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 271 El Camino Real | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| The Stratford School | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Total Pending Trips | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Cumulative Conditions | 0 | 162 | 54 | 40 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 118 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 384 |
| Project Trips | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Existing Plus Project Conditions | 0 | 170 | 40 | 40 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 125 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 385 |
| Cumulative Plus Project Conditions | 0 | 170 | 54 | 40 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 125 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 399 |

## Appendix C <br> List of Approved Projects

V
V
V V
V
v
v
v $\quad v$
V

|  | Location | Land Use | Project Description | Status |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 406-418 San <br> Mateo Ave <br> (TCP Area) | Mixed Use Residential Multi-Family / Commercial | Three-story mixed-use development with 83 residential rental units and five individual tenant spaces with either specialty restaurant and/or retail uses in approximately 6,975 square feet. The project includes sub-grade parking garage containing 106 parking spaces for the residential uses. All rental units | Under construction completion of residential portion expected approx. May 2019. |
|  | 1250 Grundy Ln (Bayhill Specific Plan Area) | Office | Three-story office building for the San Francisco Police Credit Union with 67,586 square foot of office space and a credit union facility located within the Bayhill Office Park. The project includes two levels of underground parking with 214 spaces. | Under construction TCO issued for floors 2 and 3 in February 2019. |
|  | College Drive East entrance to Skyline College | Residential Single Family Multi-Family | 70-unit residential development, consisting of 40 forsale detached single-family homes and 30 multi-family rental units for college faculty and staff. Includes 11 total affordable rental units: 6 units designated for low income households and 5 for moderate income households. Located on an 8-acre site on the east side of the Skyline College campus. | Under constructiongrading permit issued. |
|  | 111 San Bruno Ave (TCP Area) | Mixed Use Residential Multi-Family / Retail | Five-story mixed-use building, 62 multi-family dwelling units and 7,600 sq. ft. of ground floor retail. Includes 11 total affordable units: 6 units designated for low income households and 5 for moderate income households. | Approved by the City Council in October 2018. Builidng permits submitted and under review. |
|  | 500 Sylvan Ave (TCP Area) | Residential -Multi-Family | Proposed three-story building with 9-unit multi-family rental units with an at-grade parking garage. The project will include a mix of one studio, two one-bedroom and six two-bedroom units. | Planning Commission recommendation for approval to City Council on March 19, 2019; to be reviewed by City Council TBD. |

V
V
V V
$v \quad v$
v
v
v v V

|  | Location | Land Use | Project Description | Status |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mills Park Plaza (TCP Area) <br> 601 - 611 and 643 <br> - 799 El Camino <br> Real <br> 701-751 Camino <br> Plaza <br> 711 - 777 Kains <br> Ave | Mixed Use Residential -Multi-Family / Retail | Proposed 5-story mixed-use development with 425 multi-family rental units, $45,000 \mathrm{sq}$. ft. retail, an approximately 41,600 square foot grocery store 12,600 sq. ft. of retail space. $15 \%$ of the units on site will be designated as affordable units. The existing Mills Plaza commercial buildings would be removed. The Planning process is anticipated to be completed by the end of Summer 2019. | Planning application under review Reviewed by the Architectural Review Committee on March 14, 2019. |
|  | 271 El Camino Real | Residential Multi-Family | Proposed 3-story multi-family development with 24 multi-family rental and for-sale dwelling units. | Planning application under review |
|  | Glenview Terrace | Residential -Single-Family | Proposed development with 29 for-sale detached single-family homes. | Planning application under review |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 160 \text { El Camino } \\ & \text { Real } \end{aligned}$ | Hotel | Proposed 3 -story hotel with 34 rooms and underground parking on a vacant parcel. | Planning application under review |

V V
V
v
v

|  | Location | Land Use | Project Description | Status |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bayhill Specific Plan | Specific Plan | The Bayhill Specific Plan will outline a cohesive, long-term, community driven vision for this key district, that is home to the largest cluster of offices in San Bruno, including headquarters of YouTube, as well as several other uses. Preparation of the Specific Plan will ensure that YouTube's campus expansion needs are integrated into an attractive setting that benefits Bayhill's other property owners, as well as the broader San Bruno community. <br> More information at: <br> https://www.sanbruno.ca.gov/gov/city departments/commd ev/planning division/long range planning/bayhill specific plan.htm | Draft EIR and Draft Specific Plan preparation underway. |

## Appendix D <br> Level of Service Calculations

|  | 7 | $\rightarrow$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ | P |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }_{1}$ | $\hat{i}$ |  | ${ }^{4}$ | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 7 |  | $\uparrow$ | 7 |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 131 | 116 | 2 | 12 | 65 | 405 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 368 | 21 | 29 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 131 | 116 | 2 | 12 | 65 | 405 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 368 | 21 | 29 |
| Number | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 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 |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/n | 1863 | 1863 | 1900 | 1863 | 1863 | 1900 | 1900 | 1863 | 1863 | 1900 | 1863 | 1863 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 142 | 126 | 2 | 13 | 71 | 440 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 400 | 23 | 32 |
| Adj No. of Lanes | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 429 | 840 | 13 | 99 | 128 | 794 | 2 | 7 | 8 | 433 | 25 | 408 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.46 | 0.46 | 0.46 | 0.06 | 0.57 | 0.57 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.26 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 885 | 1829 | 29 | 1774 | 225 | 1392 | 460 | 1380 | 1583 | 1682 | 97 | 1583 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 142 | 0 | 128 | 13 | 0 | 511 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 423 | 0 | 32 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 885 | 0 | 1858 | 1774 | 0 | 1617 | 1840 | 0 | 1583 | 1779 | 0 | 1583 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 8.6 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 14.3 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 1.1 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 14.9 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 14.3 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 0.0 | 1.1 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.02 | 1.00 |  | 0.86 | 0.25 |  | 1.00 | 0.95 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 429 | 0 | 853 | 99 | 0 | 922 | 10 | 0 | 8 | 458 | 0 | 408 |
| VIC Ratio( X ) | 0.33 | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0.55 | 0.41 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.92 | 0.00 | 0.08 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 429 | 0 | 853 | 457 | 0 | 922 | 474 | 0 | 408 | 458 | 0 | 408 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 16.9 | 0.0 | 11.3 | 32.3 | 0.0 | 9.7 | 35.6 | 0.0 | 35.6 | 26.0 | 0.0 | 20.2 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 25.5 | 0.0 | 6.2 | 24.5 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/In | 2.1 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 6.9 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.2 | 0.0 | 0.5 |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 17.3 | 0.0 | 11.4 | 32.9 | 0.0 | 12.1 | 61.1 | 0.0 | 41.8 | 50.5 | 0.0 | 20.3 |
| LnGrp LOS | B |  | B | C |  | B | E |  | D | D |  | C |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 270 |  |  | 524 |  |  | 5 |  |  | 455 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 14.5 |  |  | 12.6 |  |  | 57.2 |  |  | 48.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | E |  |  | D |  |
| Timer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Assigned Phs |  | 2 | 3 | 4 |  | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s |  | 4.4 | 8.0 | 37.0 |  | 22.5 |  | 45.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $Y+R \mathrm{Cc}$ ), $s$ |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s |  | 18.5 | 18.5 | 18.5 |  | 18.5 |  | 41.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s |  | 2.2 | 2.5 | 16.9 |  | 18.7 |  | 16.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 |  | 0.0 |  | 1.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 Ctrl Delay |  |  | 26.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 LOS |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 20.7 |
| Intersection LOS | C |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | * | 4 | F' | M |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 12 | 469 | 450 | 78 | 91 | 35 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 12 | 469 | 450 | 78 | 91 | 35 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 13 | 510 | 489 | 85 | 99 | 38 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  | WB |  | SB |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  | EB |  |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 2 |  | 1 |  | 0 |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  |  | WB |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  | 0 |  | 2 |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right |  |  | SB |  | EB |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 0 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 22.8 |  | 21 |  | 11.6 |  |
| HCM LOS | C |  | C |  | B |  |


| Lane | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $2 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $72 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $98 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $28 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 481 | 450 | 78 | 126 |
| LT Vol | 12 | 0 | 0 | 91 |
| Through Vol | 469 | 450 | 0 | 0 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 0 | 78 | 35 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 523 | 489 | 85 | 137 |
| Geometry Grp | 5 | 7 | 7 | 2 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.759 | 0.753 | 0.114 | 0.246 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 5.228 | 5.541 | 4.832 | 6.465 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 695 | 655 | 743 | 555 |
| Service Time | 3.255 | 3.267 | 2.558 | 4.507 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.753 | 0.747 | 0.114 | 0.247 |
| HCM Control Delay | 22.8 | 23.2 | 8.2 | 11.6 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | C | A | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 7 | 6.8 | 0.4 | 1 |
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| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | \& |  |  | \& |  |  | ${ }_{*} \uparrow$ | 「 |  | \& |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 15 | 288 | 240 | 22 | 267 | 59 | 209 | 42 | 66 | 121 | 60 | 55 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 15 | 288 | 240 | 22 | 267 | 59 | 209 | 42 | 66 | 121 | 60 | 55 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvut Flow | 16 | 313 | 261 | 24 | 290 | 64 | 227 | 46 | 72 | 132 | 65 | 60 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 142.4 |  |  | 39.1 |  |  | 26.6 |  |  | 25.5 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | F |  |  | E |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | NBLn2 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $83 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $51 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $17 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $77 \%$ | $25 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $23 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 251 | 66 | 543 | 348 | 236 |
| LT Vol | 209 | 0 | 15 | 22 | 121 |
| Through Vol | 42 | 0 | 288 | 267 | 60 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 66 | 240 | 59 | 55 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 273 | 72 | 590 | 378 | 257 |
| Geometry Grp | 7 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 5 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.676 | 0.155 | 1.224 | 0.815 | 0.604 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 9.625 | 8.461 | 7.466 | 8.399 | 9.285 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 379 | 427 | 490 | 435 | 392 |
| Service Time | 7.325 | 6.161 | 5.466 | 6.399 | 7.285 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.72 | 0.169 | 1.204 | 0.869 | 0.656 |
| HCM Control Delay | 30.2 | 12.7 | 142.4 | 39.1 | 25.5 |
| HCM Lane LOS | D | B | F | E | D |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 4.8 | 0.5 | 23.1 | 7.5 | 3.8 |
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| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 9 | 471 | 11 | 4 | 254 | 6 | 67 | 16 | 17 | 17 | 14 | 13 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 9 | 471 | 11 | 4 | 254 | 6 | 67 | 16 | 17 | 17 | 14 | 13 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 10 | 512 | 12 | 4 | 276 | 7 | 73 | 17 | 18 | 18 | 15 | 14 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 19 |  |  | 11.6 |  |  | 10.5 |  |  | 9.7 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | C |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | A |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $67 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $39 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $16 \%$ | $96 \%$ | $96 \%$ | $32 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $17 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $30 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 100 | 491 | 264 | 44 |
| LT Vol | 67 | 9 | 4 | 17 |
| Through Vol | 16 | 471 | 254 | 14 |
| RT Vol | 17 | 11 | 6 | 13 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 109 | 534 | 287 | 48 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.183 | 0.715 | 0.406 | 0.081 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 6.052 | 4.822 | 5.091 | 6.075 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 592 | 753 | 709 | 589 |
| Service Time | 4.094 | 2.822 | 3.119 | 4.122 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.184 | 0.709 | 0.405 | 0.081 |
| HCM Control Delay | 10.5 | 19 | 11.6 | 9.7 |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | C | B | A |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0.7 | 6.1 | 2 | 0.3 |
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| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 10 |
| Intersection LOS | A |


| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Lane Configurations | M |  |  | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 65 | 24 | 8 | 234 | 273 | 24 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 65 | 24 | 8 | 234 | 273 | 24 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 71 | 26 | 9 | 254 | 297 | 26 |
| Number of Lanes | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  | NB | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach |  |  | SB | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 0 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  | EB |  |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  | 0 | EB |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 9.1 |  | 9.8 | 1 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | A | A | 10.4 |  |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $3 \%$ | $73 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $97 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $92 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $0 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 242 | 89 | 297 |
| LT Vol | 8 | 65 | 0 |
| Through Vol | 234 | 0 | 273 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 24 | 24 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 263 | 97 | 323 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.332 | 0.14 | 0.397 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 4.539 | 5.204 | 4.427 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 792 | 687 | 814 |
| Service Time | 2.571 | 3.252 | 2.458 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.332 | 0.141 | 0.397 |
| HCM Control Delay | 9.8 | 9.1 | 10.4 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 1.5 | 0.5 | 1.9 |
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|  | 7 | $\rightarrow$ |  | $\dagger$ |  | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | P |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{4}$ | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | \% | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 7 |  | $\uparrow$ | 7 |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 50 | 61 | 1 | 28 | 81 | 290 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 449 | 17 | 86 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 50 | 61 | 1 | 28 | 81 | 290 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 449 | 17 | 86 |
| Number | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 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 |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/n | 1863 | 1863 | 1900 | 1863 | 1863 | 1900 | 1900 | 1863 | 1863 | 1900 | 1863 | 1863 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 54 | 66 | 1 | 30 | 88 | 315 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 488 | 18 | 93 |
| Adj No. of Lanes | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 456 | 775 | 12 | 91 | 188 | 673 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 534 | 20 | 493 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.05 | 0.53 | 0.53 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.31 | 0.31 | 0.31 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 978 | 1830 | 28 | 1774 | 357 | 1280 | 0 | 1863 | 1583 | 1714 | 63 | 1583 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 54 | 0 | 67 | 30 | 0 | 403 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 506 | 0 | 93 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 978 | 0 | 1858 | 1774 | 0 | 1637 | 0 | 1863 | 1583 | 1777 | 0 | 1583 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 2.9 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 12.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.4 | 0.0 | 3.3 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 6.9 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 12.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.4 | 0.0 | 3.3 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.01 | 1.00 |  | 0.78 | 0.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.96 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 456 | 0 | 787 | 91 | 0 | 861 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 553 | 0 | 493 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.09 | 0.33 | 0.00 | 0.47 | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.29 | 0.91 | 0.00 | 0.19 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 456 | 0 | 787 | 421 | 0 | 861 | 0 | 454 | 386 | 627 | 0 | 559 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 16.3 | 0.0 | 13.4 | 35.7 | 0.0 | 11.6 | 0.0 | 38.8 | 38.8 | 25.8 | 0.0 | 19.6 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 29.0 | 41.0 | 16.9 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 5.8 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 13.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 16.4 | 0.0 | 13.5 | 37.8 | 0.0 | 13.4 | 0.0 | 67.8 | 79.8 | 42.7 | 0.0 | 19.8 |
| LnGrp LOS | B |  | B | D |  | B |  | E | E | D |  | B |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 121 |  |  | 433 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 599 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 14.8 |  |  | 15.1 |  |  | 73.8 |  |  | 39.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | E |  |  | D |  |
| Timer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Assigned Phs |  | 2 | 3 | 4 |  | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s |  | 4.2 | 8.0 | 37.0 |  | 28.8 |  | 45.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $Y+R \mathrm{Rc}$ ), $s$ |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.5 |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s |  | 19.0 | 18.5 | 18.5 |  | 27.5 |  | 41.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s |  | 2.0 | 3.3 | 8.9 |  | 23.4 |  | 14.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 |  | 0.9 |  | 1.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 Ctrl Delay |  |  | 27.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 LOS |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^3]Synchro 10 Report


| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | M |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 8 | 498 | 389 | 35 | 17 | 8 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 8 | 498 | 389 | 35 | 17 | 8 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 9 | 541 | 423 | 38 | 18 | 9 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |


| Approach | EB | WB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Opposing Approach | WB | EB |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  | WB |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Conflicting Approach Right |  | SB | EB |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| HCM Control Delay | 17.9 | 14 | 9.4 |
| HCM LOS | C | B | A |


| Lane | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $2 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $68 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $98 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $32 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 506 | 389 | 35 | 25 |
| LT Vol | 8 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Through Vol | 498 | 389 | 0 | 0 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 0 | 35 | 8 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 550 | 423 | 38 | 27 |
| Geometry Grp | 5 | 7 | 7 | 2 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.705 | 0.587 | 0.045 | 0.046 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 4.612 | 4.999 | 4.294 | 6.064 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 786 | 723 | 833 | 587 |
| Service Time | 2.638 | 2.728 | 2.023 | 4.135 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.7 | 0.585 | 0.046 | 0.046 |
| HCM Control Delay | 17.9 | 14.6 | 7.2 | 9.4 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | B | A | A |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 5.9 | 3.9 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
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| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 31.5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Intersection LOS | D |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | 4 |  |  | ¢ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | F |  | $\dagger$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 20 | 324 | 168 | 74 | 285 | 45 | 117 | 48 | 59 | 37 | 44 | 22 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 20 | 324 | 168 | 74 | 285 | 45 | 117 | 48 | 59 | 37 | 44 | 22 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mumt Flow | 22 | 352 | 183 | 80 | 310 | 49 | 127 | 52 | 64 | 40 | 48 | 24 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 45.1 |  |  | 27.9 |  |  | 15 |  |  | 13.5 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | E |  |  | D |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | NBLn2 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $71 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $36 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $29 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $71 \%$ | $43 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $21 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 165 | 59 | 512 | 404 | 103 |
| LT Vol | 117 | 0 | 20 | 74 | 37 |
| Through Vol | 48 | 0 | 324 | 285 | 44 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 59 | 168 | 45 | 22 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 179 | 64 | 557 | 439 | 112 |
| Geometry Grp | 7 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 5 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.405 | 0.126 | 0.925 | 0.773 | 0.246 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 8.134 | 7.046 | 5.984 | 6.335 | 7.921 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 441 | 506 | 601 | 566 | 456 |
| Service Time | 5.92 | 4.832 | 4.056 | 4.412 | 5.921 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.406 | 0.126 | 0.927 | 0.776 | 0.246 |
| HCM Control Delay | 16.4 | 10.9 | 45.1 | 27.9 | 13.5 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | B | E | D | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 1.9 | 0.4 | 11.8 | 7.1 | 1 |
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| Intersection |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 13.1 |  |
| Intersection LOS | B |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 13 | 383 | 25 | 5 | 370 | 12 | 33 | 7 | 2 | 8 | 5 | 4 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 13 | 383 | 25 | 5 | 370 | 12 | 33 | 7 | 2 | 8 | 5 | 4 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mumt Flow | 14 | 416 | 27 | 5 | 402 | 13 | 36 | 8 | 2 | 9 | 5 | 4 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 13.7 |  |  | 12.9 |  |  | 9.6 |  |  | 9.2 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  | B |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $79 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $47 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $17 \%$ | $91 \%$ | $96 \%$ | $29 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $5 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $24 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 42 | 421 | 387 | 17 |
| LT Vol | 33 | 13 | 5 | 8 |
| Through Vol | 7 | 383 | 370 | 5 |
| RT Vol | 2 | 25 | 12 | 4 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 46 | 458 | 421 | 18 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.076 | 0.578 | 0.537 | 0.03 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 5.998 | 4.544 | 4.592 | 5.885 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 592 | 792 | 782 | 602 |
| Service Time | 4.085 | 2.584 | 2.633 | 3.981 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.078 | 0.578 | 0.538 | 0.03 |
| HCM Control Delay | 9.6 | 13.7 | 12.9 | 9.2 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | B | B | A |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0.2 | 3.8 | 3.2 | 0.1 |
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[^4]| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 8.7 |
| Intersection LOS | A |


| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Lane Configurations | 4 |  |  | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 43 | 7 | 21 | 148 | 186 | 57 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 43 | 7 | 21 | 148 | 186 | 57 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 47 | 8 | 23 | 161 | 202 | 62 |
| Number of Lanes | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| Opposing Approach |  |  | SB | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 0 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  | EB |  |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  | 1 | 0 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  |  | 0 | EB |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 | 0 | 1 |  |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 8.4 |  | 8.6 | 8.9 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | A | A | A |  |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $12 \%$ | $86 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $88 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $77 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $0 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $23 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 169 | 50 | 243 |
| LT Vol | 21 | 43 | 0 |
| Through Vol | 148 | 0 | 186 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 7 | 57 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 184 | 54 | 264 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.222 | 0.075 | 0.303 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 4.356 | 4.979 | 4.133 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 827 | 721 | 874 |
| Service Time | 2.369 | 3.002 | 2.133 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.222 | 0.075 | 0.302 |
| HCM Control Delay | 8.6 | 8.4 | 8.9 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | A |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0.8 | 0.2 | 1.3 |
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|  | 7 | $\rightarrow$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  | 4 | 4 | 1 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }_{1}$ | $\hat{i}$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\hat{1}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 7 |  | $\uparrow$ | 7 |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 131 | 116 | 2 | 12 | 65 | 409 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 372 | 21 | 29 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 131 | 116 | 2 | 12 | 65 | 409 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 372 | 21 | 29 |
| Number | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Initial $\mathrm{Q}(\mathrm{Qb})$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 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 |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/n | 1863 | 1863 | 1900 | 1863 | 1863 | 1900 | 1900 | 1863 | 1863 | 1900 | 1863 | 1863 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 142 | 126 | 2 | 13 | 71 | 445 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 404 | 23 | 32 |
| Adj No. of Lanes | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 425 | 840 | 13 | 99 | 127 | 795 | 2 | 7 | 8 | 433 | 25 | 408 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.46 | 0.46 | 0.46 | 0.06 | 0.57 | 0.57 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.26 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 881 | 1829 | 29 | 1774 | 222 | 1394 | 460 | 1380 | 1583 | 1683 | 96 | 1583 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 142 | 0 | 128 | 13 | 0 | 516 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 427 | 0 | 32 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 881 | 0 | 1858 | 1774 | 0 | 1617 | 1840 | 0 | 1583 | 1779 | 0 | 1583 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 8.7 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 14.5 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 16.9 | 0.0 | 1.1 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 15.2 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 14.5 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 16.9 | 0.0 | 1.1 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.02 | 1.00 |  | 0.86 | 0.25 |  | 1.00 | 0.95 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 425 | 0 | 853 | 99 | 0 | 922 | 10 | 0 | 8 | 458 | 0 | 408 |
| V/C Ratio( X ) | 0.33 | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0.56 | 0.41 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.93 | 0.00 | 0.08 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 425 | 0 | 853 | 457 | 0 | 922 | 474 | 0 | 408 | 458 | 0 | 408 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 17.1 | 0.0 | 11.3 | 32.3 | 0.0 | 9.7 | 35.6 | 0.0 | 35.6 | 26.1 | 0.0 | 20.2 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 25.5 | 0.0 | 6.2 | 26.2 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 2.1 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 6.9 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.5 | 0.0 | 0.5 |
| LnGrp Delay (d),s/veh | 17.5 | 0.0 | 11.4 | 32.9 | 0.0 | 12.2 | 61.1 | 0.0 | 41.8 | 52.3 | 0.0 | 20.3 |
| LnGrp LOS | B |  | B | C |  | B | E |  | D | D |  | C |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 270 |  |  | 529 |  |  | 5 |  |  | 459 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 14.6 |  |  | 12.7 |  |  | 57.2 |  |  | 50.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | E |  |  | D |  |
| Timer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Assigned Phs |  | 2 | 3 | 4 |  | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s |  | 4.4 | 8.0 | 37.0 |  | 22.5 |  | 45.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $Y+R \mathrm{Rc}$ ), $s$ |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s |  | 18.5 | 18.5 | 18.5 |  | 18.5 |  | 41.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+1), s |  | 2.2 | 2.5 | 17.2 |  | 18.9 |  | 16.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 |  | 0.0 |  | 1.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 Ctrl Delay |  |  | 26.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 LOS |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | ${ }_{*}$ | 4 | 「' | * |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 12 | 473 | 454 | 79 | 92 | 35 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 12 | 473 | 454 | 79 | 92 | 35 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 13 | 514 | 493 | 86 | 100 | 38 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  | WB |  | SB |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  | EB |  |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 2 |  | 1 |  | 0 |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  |  | WB |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  | 0 |  | 2 |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right |  |  | SB |  | EB |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 0 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 23.5 |  | 21.5 |  | 11.7 |  |
| HCM LOS | C |  | C |  | B |  |


| Lane | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $2 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $72 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $98 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $28 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 485 | 454 | 79 | 127 |
| LT Vol | 12 | 0 | 0 | 92 |
| Through Vol | 473 | 454 | 0 | 0 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 0 | 79 | 35 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 527 | 493 | 86 | 138 |
| Geometry Grp | 5 | 7 | 7 | 2 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.768 | 0.761 | 0.116 | 0.249 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 5.242 | 5.554 | 4.846 | 6.49 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 691 | 651 | 740 | 554 |
| Service Time | 3.269 | 3.281 | 2.572 | 4.533 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.763 | 0.757 | 0.116 | 0.249 |
| HCM Control Delay | 23.5 | 23.8 | 8.2 | 11.7 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | C | A | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 7.3 | 7 | 0.4 | 1 |
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| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | * |  |  | \& |  |  | * | 「 |  | * |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 15 | 288 | 245 | 26 | 267 | 59 | 215 | 46 | 70 | 121 | 64 | 55 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 15 | 288 | 245 | 26 | 267 | 59 | 215 | 46 | 70 | 121 | 64 | 55 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 16 | 313 | 266 | 28 | 290 | 64 | 234 | 50 | 76 | 132 | 70 | 60 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 157.5 |  |  | 42.7 |  |  | 28.8 |  |  | 27 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | F |  |  | E |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | NBLn2 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $82 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $18 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $76 \%$ | $27 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $23 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 261 | 70 | 548 | 352 | 240 |
| LT Vol | 215 | 0 | 15 | 26 | 121 |
| Through Vol | 46 | 0 | 288 | 267 | 64 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 70 | 245 | 59 | 55 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 284 | 76 | 596 | 383 | 261 |
| Geometry Grp | 7 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 5 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.708 | 0.166 | 1.261 | 0.837 | 0.623 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 9.771 | 8.611 | 7.622 | 8.611 | 9.505 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 372 | 419 | 482 | 425 | 383 |
| Service Time | 7.471 | 6.311 | 5.622 | 6.611 | 7.505 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.763 | 0.181 | 1.237 | 0.901 | 0.681 |
| HCM Control Delay | 33 | 13 | 157.5 | 42.7 | 27 |
| HCM Lane LOS | D | B | F | E | D |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 5.2 | 0.6 | 24.5 | 8 | 4 |

San Bruno Community Center
Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc.
Synchro 10 Report
Page 2


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | * |  |  | \& |  |  | * |  |  | * |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 9 | 475 | 11 | 4 | 258 | 6 | 67 | 16 | 17 | 17 | 14 | 13 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 9 | 475 | 11 | 4 | 258 | 6 | 67 | 16 | 17 | 17 | 14 | 13 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 10 | 516 | 12 | 4 | 280 | 7 | 73 | 17 | 18 | 18 | 15 | 14 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 18.6 |  |  | 11.7 |  |  | 10.4 |  |  | 9.7 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | C |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | A |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $67 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $39 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $16 \%$ | $96 \%$ | $96 \%$ | $32 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $17 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $30 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 100 | 495 | 268 | 44 |
| LT Vol | 67 | 9 | 4 | 17 |
| Through Vol | 16 | 475 | 258 | 14 |
| RT Vol | 17 | 11 | 6 | 13 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 109 | 538 | 291 | 48 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.183 | 0.706 | 0.413 | 0.081 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 6.072 | 4.829 | 5.11 | 6.096 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 592 | 753 | 708 | 589 |
| Service Time | 4.089 | 2.829 | 3.11 | 4.117 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.184 | 0.714 | 0.411 | 0.081 |
| HCM Control Delay | 10.4 | 18.6 | 11.7 | 9.7 |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | C | B | A |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0.7 | 5.9 | 2 | 0.3 |
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|  | 4 |  | 4 |  | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |  |  |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{*}$ | 「＇ | 1 | 价个 | 性个 |  |  |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 152 | 379 | 162 | 1264 | 1204 | 57 |  |  |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 152 | 379 | 162 | 1264 | 1204 | 57 |  |  |
| Number | 7 | 14 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 16 |  |  |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |  |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1863 | 1863 | 1863 | 1863 | 1863 | 1900 |  |  |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 165 | 412 | 176 | 1374 | 1309 | 62 |  |  |
| Adj No．of Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |  |
| Cap，veh／h | 483 | 431 | 213 | 3192 | 2277 | 108 |  |  |
| Arrive On Green | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.12 | 0.63 | 0.46 | 0.46 |  |  |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1774 | 1583 | 1774 | 5253 | 5143 | 236 |  |  |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 165 | 412 | 176 | 1374 | 892 | 479 |  |  |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1774 | 1583 | 1774 | 1695 | 1695 | 1821 |  |  |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 6.7 | 23.0 | 8.7 | 12.4 | 17.4 | 17.4 |  |  |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 6.7 | 23.0 | 8.7 | 12.4 | 17.4 | 17.4 |  |  |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.13 |  |  |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 483 | 431 | 213 | 3192 | 1551 | 833 |  |  |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.34 | 0.96 | 0.83 | 0.43 | 0.57 | 0.58 |  |  |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 483 | 431 | 335 | 3192 | 1551 | 833 |  |  |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 26.3 | 32.2 | 38.7 | 8.5 | 18.0 | 18.0 |  |  |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 0.4 | 32.2 | 9.1 | 0.4 | 1.6 | 2.9 |  |  |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 3.4 | 21.5 | 4.8 | 5.9 | 8.4 | 9.5 |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 26.7 | 64.4 | 47.8 | 9.0 | 19.5 | 20.8 |  |  |
| LnGrp LOS | C | E | D | A | B | C |  |  |
| Approach Vol，veh／h | 577 |  |  | 1550 | 1371 |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh | 53.6 |  |  | 13.4 | 20.0 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | D |  |  | B | B |  |  |  |
| Timer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Assigned Phs |  | 2 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  |  |
| Phs Duration（ $G+Y+R \mathrm{c}$ ），s |  | 61.0 |  | 29.0 | 15.3 | 45.7 |  |  |
| Change Period（ $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ），s |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |  |  |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s |  | 56.5 |  | 24.5 | 17.0 | 35.0 |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s |  | 14.4 |  | 25.0 | 10.7 | 19.4 |  |  |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s |  | 14.1 |  | 0.0 | 0.2 | 8.4 |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 22.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\text { HCM } 2010 \text { LOS }$ |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |
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| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | M |  |  | $\uparrow$ | $\hat{F}$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 65 | 24 | 8 | 241 | 281 | 24 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 65 | 24 | 8 | 241 | 281 | 24 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 71 | 26 | 9 | 262 | 305 | 26 |
| Number of Lanes | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| Opposing Approach |  |  | SB |  | NB |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 0 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  | EB |  |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  | 1 |  | 0 |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  |  | EB |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  | 0 |  | 1 |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 9.2 |  | 9.9 |  | 10.5 |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  | A |  | B |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $3 \%$ | $73 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $97 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $92 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $0 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 249 | 89 | 305 |
| LT Vol | 8 | 65 | 0 |
| Through Vol | 241 | 0 | 281 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 24 | 24 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 271 | 97 | 332 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.342 | 0.141 | 0.409 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 4.55 | 5.239 | 4.439 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 790 | 682 | 809 |
| Service Time | 2.584 | 3.29 | 2.47 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.343 | 0.142 | 0.41 |
| HCM Control Delay | 9.9 | 9.2 | 10.5 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 1.5 | 0.5 | 2 |
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|  | 7 | $\rightarrow$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  | 4 | 4 | 1 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{4}$ | $\hat{i}$ |  | \% | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 7 |  | $\uparrow$ | 7 |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 50 | 61 | 1 | 28 | 81 | 294 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 453 | 17 | 86 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 50 | 61 | 1 | 28 | 81 | 294 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 453 | 17 | 86 |
| Number | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Initial $\mathrm{Q}(\mathrm{Qb})$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 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 |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/n | 1863 | 1863 | 1900 | 1863 | 1863 | 1900 | 1900 | 1863 | 1863 | 1900 | 1863 | 1863 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 54 | 66 | 1 | 30 | 88 | 320 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 492 | 18 | 93 |
| Adj No. of Lanes | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 455 | 779 | 12 | 91 | 187 | 678 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 539 | 20 | 498 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.43 | 0.43 | 0.43 | 0.05 | 0.53 | 0.53 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.31 | 0.31 | 0.31 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 974 | 1830 | 28 | 1774 | 353 | 1283 | 0 | 1863 | 1583 | 1714 | 63 | 1583 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 54 | 0 | 67 | 30 | 0 | 408 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 510 | 0 | 93 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 974 | 0 | 1858 | 1774 | 0 | 1636 | 0 | 1863 | 1583 | 1777 | 0 | 1583 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 2.9 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 12.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.4 | 0.0 | 3.3 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 7.0 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 12.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.4 | 0.0 | 3.3 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.01 | 1.00 |  | 0.78 | 0.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.96 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 455 | 0 | 790 | 91 | 0 | 865 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 559 | 0 | 498 |
| V/C Ratio( X ) | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.08 | 0.33 | 0.00 | 0.47 | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.29 | 0.91 | 0.00 | 0.19 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 455 | 0 | 790 | 423 | 0 | 865 | 0 | 451 | 384 | 646 | 0 | 576 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 16.2 | 0.0 | 13.3 | 35.5 | 0.0 | 11.5 | 0.0 | 38.6 | 38.6 | 25.6 | 0.0 | 19.4 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 29.0 | 41.0 | 16.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 5.9 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 13.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 16.3 | 0.0 | 13.3 | 37.6 | 0.0 | 13.3 | 0.0 | 67.6 | 79.6 | 41.5 | 0.0 | 19.5 |
| LnGrp LOS | B |  | B | D |  | B |  | E | E | D |  | B |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 121 |  |  | 438 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 603 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 14.7 |  |  | 15.0 |  |  | 73.6 |  |  | 38.1 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | E |  |  | D |  |
| Timer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Assigned Phs |  | 2 | 3 | 4 |  | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s |  | 4.2 | 8.0 | 37.0 |  | 28.4 |  | 45.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $Y+R \mathrm{Rc}$ ), $s$ |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s |  | 18.8 | 18.5 | 18.5 |  | 28.2 |  | 41.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s |  | 2.0 | 3.3 | 9.0 |  | 23.4 |  | 14.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 |  | 1.0 |  | 1.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 Ctrl Delay |  |  | 27.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 LOS |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | M |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 8 | 502 | 393 | 36 | 18 | 8 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 8 | 502 | 393 | 36 | 18 | 8 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 9 | 546 | 427 | 39 | 20 | 9 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |


| Approach | EB | WB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Opposing Approach | WB | EB |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  | WB |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Conflicting Approach Right |  | SB | EB |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| HCM Control Delay | 18.3 | 14.2 | 9.5 |
| HCM LOS | C | B | A |


| Lane | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $2 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $69 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $98 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $31 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 510 | 393 | 36 | 26 |
| LT Vol | 8 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Through Vol | 502 | 393 | 0 | 0 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 0 | 36 | 8 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 554 | 427 | 39 | 28 |
| Geometry Grp | 5 | 7 | 7 | 2 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.712 | 0.594 | 0.047 | 0.048 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 4.622 | 5.007 | 4.302 | 6.092 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 782 | 722 | 832 | 584 |
| Service Time | 2.648 | 2.737 | 2.032 | 4.167 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.708 | 0.591 | 0.047 | 0.048 |
| HCM Control Delay | 18.3 | 14.8 | 7.2 | 9.5 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | B | A | A |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 6.1 | 4 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
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| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 34.9 |
| Intersection LOS | D |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | F |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 20 | 324 | 173 | 78 | 285 | 45 | 123 | 52 | 63 | 37 | 48 | 22 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 20 | 324 | 173 | 78 | 285 | 45 | 123 | 52 | 63 | 37 | 48 | 22 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 22 | 352 | 188 | 85 | 310 | 49 | 134 | 57 | 68 | 40 | 52 | 24 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 51.5 |  |  | 30.7 |  |  | 15.7 |  |  | 14 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | F |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | NBLn2 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $70 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $35 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $30 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $45 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $21 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 175 | 63 | 517 | 408 | 107 |
| LT Vol | 123 | 0 | 20 | 78 | 37 |
| Through Vol | 52 | 0 | 324 | 285 | 48 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 63 | 173 | 45 | 22 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 190 | 68 | 562 | 443 | 116 |
| Geometry Grp | 7 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 5 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.44 | 0.138 | 0.954 | 0.798 | 0.262 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 8.334 | 7.248 | 6.109 | 6.582 | 8.105 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 436 | 498 | 590 | 554 | 445 |
| Service Time | 6.034 | 4.948 | 4.208 | 4.582 | 6.118 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.436 | 0.137 | 0.953 | 0.8 | 0.261 |
| HCM Control Delay | 17.4 | 11.1 | 51.5 | 30.7 | 14 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | B | F | $D$ | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 2.2 | 0.5 | 12.8 | 7.6 | 1 |
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| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 13 | 387 | 25 | 5 | 374 | 12 | 33 | 7 | 2 | 8 | 5 | 4 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 13 | 387 | 25 | 5 | 374 | 12 | 33 | 7 | 2 | 8 | 5 | 4 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mumt Flow | 14 | 421 | 27 | 5 | 407 | 13 | 36 | 8 | 2 | 9 | 5 | 4 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 13.8 |  |  | 13 |  |  | 9.6 |  |  | 9.2 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  | B |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $79 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $47 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $17 \%$ | $91 \%$ | $96 \%$ | $29 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $5 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $24 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 42 | 425 | 391 | 17 |
| LT Vol | 33 | 13 | 5 | 8 |
| Through Vol | 7 | 387 | 374 | 5 |
| RT Vol | 2 | 25 | 12 | 4 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 46 | 462 | 425 | 18 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.076 | 0.584 | 0.543 | 0.03 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 6.016 | 4.549 | 4.598 | 5.903 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 590 | 790 | 782 | 600 |
| Service Time | 4.105 | 2.589 | 2.639 | 4.001 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.078 | 0.585 | 0.543 | 0.03 |
| HCM Control Delay | 9.6 | 13.8 | 13 | 9.2 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | B | B | A |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0.2 | 3.8 | 3.3 | 0.1 |
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| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Lane Configurations | 4 |  |  | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 43 | 7 | 21 | 155 | 194 | 57 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 43 | 7 | 21 | 155 | 194 | 57 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 47 | 8 | 23 | 168 | 211 | 62 |
| Number of Lanes | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |


| Approach | EB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Opposing Approach |  | SB | NB |
| Opposing Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB | EB |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  | EB |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| HCM Control Delay | 8.5 | 8.7 | 9 |
| HCM LOS | A | A | A |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $12 \%$ | $86 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $88 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $77 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $0 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $23 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 176 | 50 | 251 |
| LT Vol | 21 | 43 | 0 |
| Through Vol | 155 | 0 | 194 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 7 | 57 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 191 | 54 | 273 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.232 | 0.076 | 0.314 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 4.364 | 5.015 | 4.148 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 825 | 715 | 873 |
| Service Time | 2.38 | 3.04 | 2.148 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.232 | 0.076 | 0.313 |
| HCM Control Delay | 8.7 | 8.5 | 9 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | A |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0.9 | 0.2 | 1.3 |
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|  | 7 | $\rightarrow$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  | 4 | 4 | 1 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }_{1}$ | $\hat{i}$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\hat{1}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 7 |  | $\uparrow$ | 7 |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 131 | 116 | 2 | 12 | 65 | 422 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 385 | 21 | 29 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 131 | 116 | 2 | 12 | 65 | 422 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 385 | 21 | 29 |
| Number | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Initial $\mathrm{Q}(\mathrm{Qb})$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 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 |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/n | 1863 | 1863 | 1900 | 1863 | 1863 | 1900 | 1900 | 1863 | 1863 | 1900 | 1863 | 1863 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 142 | 126 | 2 | 13 | 71 | 459 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 418 | 23 | 32 |
| Adj No. of Lanes | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 414 | 840 | 13 | 99 | 123 | 798 | 2 | 7 | 8 | 434 | 24 | 408 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.46 | 0.46 | 0.46 | 0.06 | 0.57 | 0.57 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.26 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 870 | 1829 | 29 | 1774 | 216 | 1399 | 460 | 1380 | 1583 | 1686 | 93 | 1583 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 142 | 0 | 128 | 13 | 0 | 530 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 441 | 0 | 32 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 870 | 0 | 1858 | 1774 | 0 | 1616 | 1840 | 0 | 1583 | 1778 | 0 | 1583 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 9.0 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 15.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 17.6 | 0.0 | 1.1 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 16.0 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 15.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 17.6 | 0.0 | 1.1 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.02 | 1.00 |  | 0.87 | 0.25 |  | 1.00 | 0.95 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 414 | 0 | 853 | 99 | 0 | 922 | 10 | 0 | 8 | 458 | 0 | 408 |
| V/C Ratio( X ) | 0.34 | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0.58 | 0.41 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.96 | 0.00 | 0.08 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 414 | 0 | 853 | 457 | 0 | 922 | 474 | 0 | 408 | 458 | 0 | 408 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 17.6 | 0.0 | 11.3 | 32.3 | 0.0 | 9.9 | 35.6 | 0.0 | 35.6 | 26.4 | 0.0 | 20.2 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 2.6 | 25.5 | 0.0 | 6.2 | 32.7 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 2.2 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 7.3 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 12.7 | 0.0 | 0.5 |
| LnGrp Delay (d),s/veh | 18.0 | 0.0 | 11.4 | 32.9 | 0.0 | 12.5 | 61.1 | 0.0 | 41.8 | 59.1 | 0.0 | 20.3 |
| LnGrp LOS | B |  | B | C |  | B | E |  | D | E |  | C |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 270 |  |  | 543 |  |  | 5 |  |  | 473 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 14.9 |  |  | 13.0 |  |  | 57.2 |  |  | 56.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | E |  |  | E |  |
| Timer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Assigned Phs |  | 2 | 3 | 4 |  | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s |  | 4.4 | 8.0 | 37.0 |  | 22.5 |  | 45.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $Y+R \mathrm{Rc}$ ), $s$ |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s |  | 18.5 | 18.5 | 18.5 |  | 18.5 |  | 41.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+1), s |  | 2.2 | 2.5 | 18.0 |  | 19.6 |  | 17.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |  | 0.0 |  | 2.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 Ctrl Delay |  |  | 29.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 LOS |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 20.8 |
| Intersection LOS | C |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | 4 | 4 | 「 | * |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 12 | 469 | 451 | 78 | 91 | 35 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 12 | 469 | 451 | 78 | 91 | 35 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 13 | 510 | 490 | 85 | 99 | 38 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  | WB |  | SB |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  | EB |  |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 2 |  | 1 |  | 0 |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  |  | WB |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  | 0 |  | 2 |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right |  |  | SB |  | EB |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 0 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 22.8 |  | 21.2 |  | 11.6 |  |
| HCM LOS | C |  | C |  | B |  |


| Lane | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $2 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $72 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $98 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $28 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 481 | 451 | 78 | 126 |
| LT Vol | 12 | 0 | 0 | 91 |
| Through Vol | 469 | 451 | 0 | 0 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 0 | 78 | 35 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 523 | 490 | 85 | 137 |
| Geometry Grp | 5 | 7 | 7 | 2 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.759 | 0.755 | 0.114 | 0.246 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 5.229 | 5.541 | 4.832 | 6.467 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 690 | 652 | 743 | 555 |
| Service Time | 3.257 | 3.267 | 2.558 | 4.51 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.758 | 0.752 | 0.114 | 0.247 |
| HCM Control Delay | 22.8 | 23.4 | 8.2 | 11.6 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | C | A | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 7 | 6.9 | 0.4 | 1 |
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| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | * |  |  | \& |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | * |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 15 | 288 | 240 | 22 | 268 | 59 | 209 | 42 | 66 | 121 | 60 | 55 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 15 | 288 | 240 | 22 | 268 | 59 | 209 | 42 | 66 | 121 | 60 | 55 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 16 | 313 | 261 | 24 | 291 | 64 | 227 | 46 | 72 | 132 | 65 | 60 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 143.2 |  |  | 39.5 |  |  | 26.6 |  |  | 25.5 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | F |  |  | E |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | NBLn2 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $83 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $51 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $17 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $77 \%$ | $25 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $23 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 251 | 66 | 543 | 349 | 236 |
| LT Vol | 209 | 0 | 15 | 22 | 121 |
| Through Vol | 42 | 0 | 288 | 268 | 60 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 66 | 240 | 59 | 55 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 273 | 72 | 590 | 379 | 257 |
| Geometry Grp | 7 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 5 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.676 | 0.156 | 1.226 | 0.818 | 0.605 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 9.636 | 8.472 | 7.475 | 8.406 | 9.297 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 376 | 426 | 490 | 432 | 390 |
| Service Time | 7.336 | 6.172 | 5.475 | 6.406 | 7.297 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.726 | 0.169 | 1.204 | 0.877 | 0.659 |
| HCM Control Delay | 30.2 | 12.7 | 143.2 | 39.5 | 25.5 |
| HCM Lane LOS | D | B | F | E | D |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 4.8 | 0.5 | 23.2 | 7.6 | 3.8 |
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| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | * |  |  | \& |  |  | * |  |  | * |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 9 | 471 | 11 | 4 | 255 | 6 | 67 | 16 | 17 | 17 | 14 | 13 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 9 | 471 | 11 | 4 | 255 | 6 | 67 | 16 | 17 | 17 | 14 | 13 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 10 | 512 | 12 | 4 | 277 | 7 | 73 | 17 | 18 | 18 | 15 | 14 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 19 |  |  | 11.6 |  |  | 10.5 |  |  | 9.7 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | C |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | A |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $67 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $39 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $16 \%$ | $96 \%$ | $96 \%$ | $32 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $17 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $30 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 100 | 491 | 265 | 44 |
| LT Vol | 67 | 9 | 4 | 17 |
| Through Vol | 16 | 471 | 255 | 14 |
| RT Vol | 17 | 11 | 6 | 13 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 109 | 534 | 288 | 48 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.183 | 0.715 | 0.407 | 0.081 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 6.053 | 4.823 | 5.091 | 6.077 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 592 | 753 | 709 | 589 |
| Service Time | 4.095 | 2.823 | 3.119 | 4.124 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.184 | 0.709 | 0.406 | 0.081 |
| HCM Control Delay | 10.5 | 19 | 11.6 | 9.7 |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | C | B | A |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0.7 | 6.1 | 2 | 0.3 |
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|  | 4 |  | 4 |  | 1 | 4 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |  |  |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{4}$ | F＇ | ${ }^{7}$ | 个坐 | 种个 |  |  |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 150 | 379 | 161 | 1270 | 1217 | 56 |  |  |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 150 | 379 | 161 | 1270 | 1217 | 56 |  |  |
| Number | 7 | 14 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 16 |  |  |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |  |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1863 | 1863 | 1863 | 1863 | 1863 | 1900 |  |  |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 163 | 412 | 175 | 1380 | 1323 | 61 |  |  |
| Adj No．of Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |  |
| Cap，veh／h | 494 | 441 | 212 | 3157 | 2246 | 104 |  |  |
| Arrive On Green | 0.28 | 0.28 | 0.12 | 0.62 | 0.45 | 0.45 |  |  |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1774 | 1583 | 1774 | 5253 | 5150 | 230 |  |  |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 163 | 412 | 175 | 1380 | 900 | 484 |  |  |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1774 | 1583 | 1774 | 1695 | 1695 | 1822 |  |  |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 6.5 | 22.7 | 8.6 | 12.6 | 17.8 | 17.8 |  |  |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 6.5 | 22.7 | 8.6 | 12.6 | 17.8 | 17.8 |  |  |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.13 |  |  |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 494 | 441 | 212 | 3157 | 1528 | 821 |  |  |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.33 | 0.93 | 0.82 | 0.44 | 0.59 | 0.59 |  |  |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 506 | 452 | 335 | 3157 | 1528 | 821 |  |  |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Upstream Filter（I） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 25.6 | 31.5 | 38.4 | 8.8 | 18.4 | 18.4 |  |  |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 0.4 | 26.4 | 8.9 | 0.4 | 1.7 | 3.1 |  |  |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 3.2 | 20.8 | 4.8 | 6.0 | 8.6 | 9.6 |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 26.0 | 57.9 | 47.3 | 9.3 | 20.0 | 21.5 |  |  |
| LnGrp LOS | C | E | D | A | C | C |  |  |
| Approach Vol，veh／h | 575 |  |  | 1555 | 1384 |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh | 48.8 |  |  | 13.5 | 20.5 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | D |  |  | B | C |  |  |  |
| Timer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Assigned Phs |  | 2 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  |  |
| Phs Duration（ $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ），s |  | 60.0 |  | 29.4 | 15.2 | 44.8 |  |  |
| Change Period（ $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ），$s$ |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |  |  |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s |  | 55.5 |  | 25.5 | 16.9 | 34.1 |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋l1），s |  | 14.6 |  | 24.7 | 10.6 | 19.8 |  |  |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s |  | 14.0 |  | 0.2 | 0.2 | 8.0 |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 Ctrl Delay |  |  | 22.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 LOS |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |
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| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 10 |
| Intersection LOS | A |


| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | M |  |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 65 | 24 | 8 | 234 | 273 | 24 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 65 | 24 | 8 | 234 | 273 | 24 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 71 | 26 | 9 | 254 | 297 | 26 |
| Number of Lanes | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| Opposing Approach |  |  | SB |  | NB |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 0 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  | EB |  |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  | 1 |  | 0 |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  |  | EB |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  | 0 |  | 1 |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 9.1 |  | 9.8 |  | 10.4 |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  | A |  | B |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $3 \%$ | $73 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $97 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $92 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $0 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 242 | 89 | 297 |
| LT Vol | 8 | 65 | 0 |
| Through Vol | 234 | 0 | 273 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 24 | 24 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 263 | 97 | 323 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.332 | 0.14 | 0.397 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 4.539 | 5.204 | 4.427 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 792 | 687 | 814 |
| Service Time | 2.571 | 3.252 | 2.458 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.332 | 0.141 | 0.397 |
| HCM Control Delay | 9.8 | 9.1 | 10.4 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 1.5 | 0.5 | 1.9 |
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|  | 7 | $\rightarrow$ |  | $\dagger$ |  | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | P |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{4}$ | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | \% | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 7 |  | $\uparrow$ | 7 |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 50 | 61 | 1 | 28 | 81 | 309 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 466 | 17 | 86 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 50 | 61 | 1 | 28 | 81 | 309 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 466 | 17 | 86 |
| Number | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 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 |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/n | 1863 | 1863 | 1900 | 1863 | 1863 | 1900 | 1900 | 1863 | 1863 | 1900 | 1863 | 1863 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 54 | 66 | 1 | 30 | 88 | 336 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 507 | 18 | 93 |
| Adj No. of Lanes | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 434 | 771 | 12 | 91 | 178 | 678 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 551 | 20 | 509 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.05 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.32 | 0.32 | 0.32 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 959 | 1830 | 28 | 1774 | 339 | 1295 | 0 | 1863 | 1583 | 1716 | 61 | 1583 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 54 | 0 | 67 | 30 | 0 | 424 | 0 | 1 | , | 525 | 0 | 93 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 959 | 0 | 1858 | 1774 | 0 | 1634 | 0 | 1863 | 1583 | 1777 | 0 | 1583 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 3.0 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 13.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 22.3 | 0.0 | 3.3 |
| Cycle Q Clear (g_c), s | 8.1 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 13.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 22.3 | 0.0 | 3.3 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.01 | 1.00 |  | 0.79 | 0.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.97 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 434 | 0 | 783 | 91 | 0 | 855 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 571 | 0 | 509 |
| VIC Ratio( X ) | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.09 | 0.33 | 0.00 | 0.50 | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.29 | 0.92 | 0.00 | 0.18 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 434 | 0 | 783 | 419 | 0 | 855 | 0 | 449 | 382 | 637 | 0 | 568 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 17.2 | 0.0 | 13.6 | 35.9 | 0.0 | 12.0 | 0.0 | 39.0 | 39.0 | 25.6 | 0.0 | 19.2 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 29.0 | 41.0 | 17.6 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 6.4 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 13.7 | 0.0 | 1.5 |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 17.3 | 0.0 | 13.7 | 38.0 | 0.0 | 14.1 | 0.0 | 68.0 | 80.0 | 43.2 | 0.0 | 19.3 |
| LnGrp LOS | B |  | B | D |  | B |  | E | E | D |  | B |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 121 |  |  | 454 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 618 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 15.3 |  |  | 15.6 |  |  | 74.0 |  |  | 39.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | E |  |  | D |  |
| Timer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Assigned Phs |  | 2 | 3 | 4 |  | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s |  | 4.2 | 8.0 | 37.0 |  | 29.2 |  | 45.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $Y+R \mathrm{Rc}$ ), $s$ |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s |  | 18.9 | 18.5 | 18.5 |  | 28.1 |  | 41.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s |  | 2.0 | 3.3 | 10.1 |  | 24.3 |  | 15.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 |  | 0.9 |  | 1.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 Ctrl Delay |  |  | 28.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 LOS |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ | 「 | M |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 8 | 515 | 408 | 35 | 17 | 8 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 8 | 515 | 408 | 35 | 17 | 8 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mumt Flow | 9 | 560 | 443 | 38 | 18 | 9 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  | WB |  | SB |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  | EB |  |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 2 |  | 1 |  | 0 |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  |  | WB |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  | 0 |  | 2 |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right |  |  | SB |  | EB |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 0 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 19.3 |  | 14.8 |  | 9.5 |  |
| HCM LOS | C |  | B |  | A |  |


| Lane | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $2 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $68 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $98 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $32 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 523 | 408 | 35 | 25 |
| LT Vol | 8 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Through Vol | 515 | 408 | 0 | 0 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 0 | 35 | 8 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 568 | 443 | 38 | 27 |
| Geometry Grp | 5 | 7 | 7 | 2 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.732 | 0.618 | 0.046 | 0.046 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 4.638 | 5.015 | 4.31 | 6.142 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 779 | 718 | 830 | 579 |
| Service Time | 2.663 | 2.744 | 2.039 | 4.221 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.729 | 0.617 | 0.046 | 0.047 |
| HCM Control Delay | 19.3 | 15.5 | 7.2 | 9.5 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | C | A | A |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 6.5 | 4.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 |



| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | * |  |  | \& |  |  | 4 | 「 |  | * |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 20 | 327 | 182 | 74 | 304 | 45 | 117 | 48 | 59 | 37 | 44 | 22 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 20 | 327 | 182 | 74 | 304 | 45 | 117 | 48 | 59 | 37 | 44 | 22 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 22 | 355 | 198 | 80 | 330 | 49 | 127 | 52 | 64 | 40 | 48 | 24 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 54.1 |  |  | 32.5 |  |  | 15.3 |  |  | 13.8 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | F |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | NBLn2 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $71 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $36 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $29 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $62 \%$ | $72 \%$ | $43 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $34 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $21 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 165 | 59 | 529 | 423 | 103 |
| LT Vol | 117 | 0 | 20 | 74 | 37 |
| Through Vol | 48 | 0 | 327 | 304 | 44 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 59 | 182 | 45 | 22 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 179 | 64 | 575 | 460 | 112 |
| Geometry Grp | 7 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 5 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.412 | 0.128 | 0.968 | 0.819 | 0.252 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 8.275 | 7.187 | 6.058 | 6.415 | 8.115 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 432 | 495 | 598 | 561 | 446 |
| Service Time | 6.073 | 4.984 | 4.136 | 4.501 | 6.115 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.414 | 0.129 | 0.962 | 0.82 | 0.251 |
| HCM Control Delay | 16.8 | 11.1 | 54.1 | 32.5 | 13.8 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | B | F | D | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 2 | 0.4 | 13.5 | 8.2 | 1 |



| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | * |  |  | ¢ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | ¢ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 13 | 386 | 25 | 5 | 375 | 12 | 47 | 8 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 4 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 13 | 386 | 25 | 5 | 375 | 12 | 47 | 8 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 4 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mumt Flow | 14 | 420 | 27 | 5 | 408 | 13 | 51 | 9 | 2 | 9 | 7 | 4 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | I |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 14.2 |  |  | 13.3 |  |  | 9.9 |  |  | 9.3 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  | B |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $82 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $44 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $14 \%$ | $91 \%$ | $96 \%$ | $33 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $4 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $22 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 57 | 424 | 392 | 18 |
| LT Vol | 47 | 13 | 5 | 8 |
| Through Vol | 8 | 386 | 375 | 6 |
| RT Vol | 2 | 25 | 12 | 4 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 62 | 461 | 426 | 20 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.106 | 0.59 | 0.551 | 0.033 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 6.148 | 4.61 | 4.657 | 6.072 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 587 | 779 | 771 | 593 |
| Service Time | 4.148 | 2.669 | 2.717 | 4.075 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.106 | 0.592 | 0.553 | 0.034 |
| HCM Control Delay | 9.9 | 14.2 | 13.3 | 9.3 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | B | B | A |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0.4 | 3.9 | 3.4 | 0.1 |




| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Lane Configurations | 4 |  |  | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 43 | 7 | 21 | 148 | 200 | 57 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 43 | 7 | 21 | 148 | 200 | 57 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 47 | 8 | 23 | 161 | 217 | 62 |
| Number of Lanes | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| Opposing Approach |  |  | SB | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 0 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  | EB |  |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  | 1 |  | 0 |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  |  | EB |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 | 0 | 1 |  |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 8.5 |  | 8.6 | 9.1 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | A | A | A |  |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $12 \%$ | $86 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $88 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $78 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $0 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $22 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 169 | 50 | 257 |
| LT Vol | 21 | 43 | 0 |
| Through Vol | 148 | 0 | 200 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 7 | 57 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 184 | 54 | 279 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.223 | 0.076 | 0.321 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 4.371 | 5.013 | 4.143 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 823 | 716 | 874 |
| Service Time | 2.387 | 3.037 | 2.143 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.224 | 0.075 | 0.319 |
| HCM Control Delay | 8.6 | 8.5 | 9.1 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | A |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0.9 | 0.2 | 1.4 |


|  | 7 | $\rightarrow$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  | 4 | 4 | 1 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }_{1}$ | $\hat{i}$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\hat{1}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 7 |  | $\uparrow$ | 7 |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 131 | 116 | 2 | 12 | 65 | 426 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 389 | 21 | 29 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 131 | 116 | 2 | 12 | 65 | 426 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 389 | 21 | 29 |
| Number | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Initial $\mathrm{Q}(\mathrm{Qb})$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 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 |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/n | 1863 | 1863 | 1900 | 1863 | 1863 | 1900 | 1900 | 1863 | 1863 | 1900 | 1863 | 1863 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 142 | 126 | 2 | 13 | 71 | 463 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 423 | 23 | 32 |
| Adj No. of Lanes | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 411 | 840 | 13 | 99 | 123 | 799 | 2 | 7 | 8 | 434 | 24 | 408 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.46 | 0.46 | 0.46 | 0.06 | 0.57 | 0.57 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.26 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 867 | 1829 | 29 | 1774 | 215 | 1401 | 460 | 1380 | 1583 | 1687 | 92 | 1583 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 142 | 0 | 128 | 13 | 0 | 534 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 446 | 0 | 32 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 867 | 0 | 1858 | 1774 | 0 | 1616 | 1840 | 0 | 1583 | 1778 | 0 | 1583 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 9.0 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 15.2 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 17.9 | 0.0 | 1.1 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 16.3 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 15.2 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 17.9 | 0.0 | 1.1 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.02 | 1.00 |  | 0.87 | 0.25 |  | 1.00 | 0.95 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 411 | 0 | 853 | 99 | 0 | 922 | 10 | 0 | 8 | 458 | 0 | 408 |
| V/C Ratio( X ) | 0.35 | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0.58 | 0.41 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.97 | 0.00 | 0.08 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 411 | 0 | 853 | 457 | 0 | 922 | 474 | 0 | 408 | 458 | 0 | 408 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 17.7 | 0.0 | 11.3 | 32.3 | 0.0 | 9.9 | 35.6 | 0.0 | 35.6 | 26.5 | 0.0 | 20.2 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 25.5 | 0.0 | 6.2 | 35.3 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 2.2 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 7.4 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 13.2 | 0.0 | 0.5 |
| LnGrp Delay (d),s/veh | 18.2 | 0.0 | 11.4 | 32.9 | 0.0 | 12.6 | 61.1 | 0.0 | 41.8 | 61.8 | 0.0 | 20.3 |
| LnGrp LOS | B |  | B | C |  | B | E |  | D | E |  | C |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 270 |  |  | 547 |  |  | 5 |  |  | 478 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 15.0 |  |  | 13.0 |  |  | 57.2 |  |  | 59.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | E |  |  | E |  |
| Timer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Assigned Phs |  | 2 | 3 | 4 |  | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s |  | 4.4 | 8.0 | 37.0 |  | 22.5 |  | 45.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $Y+R \mathrm{Rc}$ ), $s$ |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s |  | 18.5 | 18.5 | 18.5 |  | 18.5 |  | 41.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+1), s |  | 2.2 | 2.5 | 18.3 |  | 19.9 |  | 17.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 2.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 Ctrl Delay |  |  | 30.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 LOS |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh $\quad 21.3$ |  |
| Intersection LOS | C |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | M |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 12 | 473 | 455 | 79 | 92 | 35 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 12 | 473 | 455 | 79 | 92 | 35 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 13 | 514 | 495 | 86 | 100 | 38 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  | WB |  | SB |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  | EB |  |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 2 |  | 1 |  | 0 |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  | 0 | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right |  |  | SB | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 0 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 23.5 | 21.6 | 11.7 |  |  |  |
| HCM LOS | C | C | B |  |  |  |


| Lane | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $2 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $72 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $98 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $28 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 485 | 455 | 79 | 127 |
| LT Vol | 12 | 0 | 0 | 92 |
| Through Vol | 473 | 455 | 0 | 0 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 0 | 79 | 35 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 527 | 495 | 86 | 138 |
| Geometry Grp | 5 | 7 | 7 | 2 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.768 | 0.763 | 0.116 | 0.249 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 5.243 | 5.554 | 4.846 | 6.491 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 691 | 653 | 740 | 554 |
| Service Time | 3.271 | 3.281 | 2.572 | 4.536 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.763 | 0.758 | 0.116 | 0.249 |
| HCM Control Delay | 23.5 | 23.9 | 8.2 | 11.7 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | C | A | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 7.3 | 7.1 | 0.4 | 1 |



| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | * |  |  | \& |  |  | * | 「 |  | * |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 15 | 288 | 245 | 26 | 268 | 59 | 215 | 46 | 70 | 121 | 64 | 55 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 15 | 288 | 245 | 26 | 268 | 59 | 215 | 46 | 70 | 121 | 64 | 55 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 16 | 313 | 266 | 28 | 291 | 64 | 234 | 50 | 76 | 132 | 70 | 60 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 157.9 |  |  | 43.1 |  |  | 28.8 |  |  | 27 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | F |  |  | E |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | NBLn2 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $82 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $18 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $76 \%$ | $27 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $23 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 261 | 70 | 548 | 353 | 240 |
| LT Vol | 215 | 0 | 15 | 26 | 121 |
| Through Vol | 46 | 0 | 288 | 268 | 64 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 70 | 245 | 59 | 55 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 284 | 76 | 596 | 384 | 261 |
| Geometry Grp | 7 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 5 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.708 | 0.167 | 1.262 | 0.84 | 0.623 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 9.778 | 8.618 | 7.628 | 8.614 | 9.516 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 372 | 419 | 482 | 422 | 383 |
| Service Time | 7.478 | 6.318 | 5.628 | 6.614 | 7.516 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.763 | 0.181 | 1.237 | 0.91 | 0.681 |
| HCM Control Delay | 33 | 13 | 157.9 | 43.1 | 27 |
| HCM Lane LOS | D | B | F | E | D |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 5.2 | 0.6 | 24.6 | 8 | 4 |



| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | * |  |  | \& |  |  | * |  |  | * |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 9 | 475 | 11 | 4 | 259 | 6 | 67 | 16 | 17 | 17 | 14 | 13 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 9 | 475 | 11 | 4 | 259 | 6 | 67 | 16 | 17 | 17 | 14 | 13 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 10 | 516 | 12 | 4 | 282 | 7 | 73 | 17 | 18 | 18 | 15 | 14 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 18.6 |  |  | 11.7 |  |  | 10.5 |  |  | 9.7 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | C |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | A |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $67 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $39 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $16 \%$ | $96 \%$ | $96 \%$ | $32 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $17 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $30 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 100 | 495 | 269 | 44 |
| LT Vol | 67 | 9 | 4 | 17 |
| Through Vol | 16 | 475 | 259 | 14 |
| RT Vol | 17 | 11 | 6 | 13 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 109 | 538 | 292 | 48 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.183 | 0.707 | 0.415 | 0.081 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 6.077 | 4.831 | 5.111 | 6.101 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 592 | 753 | 708 | 589 |
| Service Time | 4.094 | 2.831 | 3.111 | 4.123 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.184 | 0.714 | 0.412 | 0.081 |
| HCM Control Delay | 10.5 | 18.6 | 11.7 | 9.7 |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | C | B | A |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0.7 | 5.9 | 2 | 0.3 |


|  | 4 |  | 4 |  |  | 4 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |  |  |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{1}$ | ブ | \％ | 个中4 | 种个 |  |  |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 152 | 381 | 163 | 1270 | 1217 | 58 |  |  |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 152 | 381 | 163 | 1270 | 1217 | 58 |  |  |
| Number | 7 | 14 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 16 |  |  |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |  |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1863 | 1863 | 1863 | 1863 | 1863 | 1900 |  |  |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 165 | 414 | 177 | 1380 | 1323 | 63 |  |  |
| Adj No．of Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |  |
| Cap，veh／h | 485 | 433 | 214 | 3187 | 2267 | 108 |  |  |
| Arrive On Green | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.12 | 0.63 | 0.46 | 0.46 |  |  |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1774 | 1583 | 1774 | 5253 | 5142 | 237 |  |  |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 165 | 414 | 177 | 1380 | 902 | 484 |  |  |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1774 | 1583 | 1774 | 1695 | 1695 | 1821 |  |  |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 6.7 | 23.2 | 8.8 | 12.5 | 17.7 | 17.7 |  |  |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 6.7 | 23.2 | 8.8 | 12.5 | 17.7 | 17.7 |  |  |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.13 |  |  |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 485 | 433 | 214 | 3187 | 1545 | 830 |  |  |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.34 | 0.96 | 0.83 | 0.43 | 0.58 | 0.58 |  |  |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 485 | 433 | 337 | 3187 | 1545 | 830 |  |  |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Upstream Filter（I） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 26.2 | 32.2 | 38.6 | 8.6 | 18.2 | 18.2 |  |  |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 0.4 | 32.2 | 9.1 | 0.4 | 1.6 | 3.0 |  |  |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 3.4 | 21.6 | 4.8 | 5.9 | 8.6 | 9.6 |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 26.6 | 64.4 | 47.7 | 9.0 | 19.8 | 21.1 |  |  |
| LnGrp LOS | C | E | D | A | B | C |  |  |
| Approach Vol，veh／h | 579 |  |  | 1557 | 1386 |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh | 53.6 |  |  | 13.4 | 20.3 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | D |  |  | B | C |  |  |  |
| Timer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Assigned Phs |  | 2 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  |  |
| Phs Duration（ $G+Y+R \mathrm{c}$ ），s |  | 60.9 |  | 29.1 | 15.4 | 45.5 |  |  |
| Change Period（Y＋Rc），s |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |  |  |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s |  | 56.4 |  | 24.6 | 17.1 | 34.8 |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋l1），s |  | 14.5 |  | 25.2 | 10.8 | 19.7 |  |  |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s |  | 14.1 |  | 0.0 | 0.2 | 8.3 |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 Ctrl Delay |  |  | 22.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 LOS |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |



| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | M |  |  | $\uparrow$ | $\hat{1}$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 65 | 24 | 8 | 241 | 281 | 24 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 65 | 24 | 8 | 241 | 281 | 24 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 71 | 26 | 9 | 262 | 305 | 26 |
| Number of Lanes | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| Opposing Approach |  |  | SB |  | NB |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 0 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  | EB |  |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  | 1 |  | 0 |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  |  | EB |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  | 0 |  | 1 |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 9.2 |  | 9.9 |  | 10.5 |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  | A |  | B |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $3 \%$ | $73 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $97 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $92 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $0 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 249 | 89 | 305 |
| LT Vol | 8 | 65 | 0 |
| Through Vol | 241 | 0 | 281 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 24 | 24 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 271 | 97 | 332 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.342 | 0.141 | 0.409 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 4.55 | 5.239 | 4.439 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 790 | 682 | 809 |
| Service Time | 2.584 | 3.29 | 2.47 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.343 | 0.142 | 0.41 |
| HCM Control Delay | 9.9 | 9.2 | 10.5 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 1.5 | 0.5 | 2 |


|  | 7 | $\rightarrow$ |  | $\dagger$ |  | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | P |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{4}$ | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | ${ }^{4}$ | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 7 |  | $\uparrow$ | 7 |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 50 | 61 | 1 | 28 | 81 | 313 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 470 | 17 | 86 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 50 | 61 | 1 | 28 | 81 | 313 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 470 | 17 | 86 |
| Number | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 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 |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/n | 1863 | 1863 | 1900 | 1863 | 1863 | 1900 | 1900 | 1863 | 1863 | 1900 | 1863 | 1863 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 54 | 66 | 1 | 30 | 88 | 340 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 511 | 18 | 93 |
| Adj No. of Lanes | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 428 | 769 | 12 | 90 | 175 | 677 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 555 | 20 | 512 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 0.05 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.32 | 0.32 | 0.32 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 956 | 1830 | 28 | 1774 | 336 | 1298 | 0 | 1863 | 1583 | 1716 | 60 | 1583 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 54 | 0 | 67 | 30 | 0 | 428 | 0 | 1 | , | 529 | 0 | 93 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 956 | 0 | 1858 | 1774 | 0 | 1634 | 0 | 1863 | 1583 | 1777 | 0 | 1583 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 3.0 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 13.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 22.5 | 0.0 | 3.3 |
| Cycle Q Clear (g_c), s | 8.4 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 13.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 22.5 | 0.0 | 3.3 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.01 | 1.00 |  | 0.79 | 0.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.97 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 428 | 0 | 780 | 90 | 0 | 853 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 574 | 0 | 512 |
| VIC Ratio( X ) | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0.09 | 0.33 | 0.00 | 0.50 | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.29 | 0.92 | 0.00 | 0.18 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 428 | 0 | 780 | 418 | 0 | 853 | 0 | 446 | 379 | 638 | 0 | 568 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 17.5 | 0.0 | 13.7 | 36.0 | 0.0 | 12.2 | 0.0 | 39.1 | 39.1 | 25.6 | 0.0 | 19.1 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 29.0 | 41.0 | 17.8 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 6.4 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 13.9 | 0.0 | 1.5 |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 17.6 | 0.0 | 13.8 | 38.1 | 0.0 | 14.3 | 0.0 | 68.1 | 80.1 | 43.5 | 0.0 | 19.3 |
| LnGrp LOS | B |  | B | D |  | B |  | E | F | D |  | B |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 121 |  |  | 458 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 622 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 15.5 |  |  | 15.8 |  |  | 74.1 |  |  | 39.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | E |  |  | D |  |
| Timer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Assigned Phs |  | 2 | 3 | 4 |  | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s |  | 4.2 | 8.0 | 37.0 |  | 29.4 |  | 45.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $Y+R \mathrm{Rc}$ ), $s$ |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s |  | 18.8 | 18.5 | 18.5 |  | 28.2 |  | 41.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s |  | 2.0 | 3.3 | 10.4 |  | 24.5 |  | 15.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 |  | 0.9 |  | 1.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 Ctrl Delay |  |  | 28.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 LOS |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |




| Lane | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $2 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $69 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $98 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $31 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 527 | 412 | 36 | 26 |
| LT Vol | 8 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Through Vol | 519 | 412 | 0 | 0 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 0 | 36 | 8 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 573 | 448 | 39 | 28 |
| Geometry Grp | 5 | 7 | 7 | 2 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.739 | 0.625 | 0.047 | 0.048 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 4.647 | 5.024 | 4.319 | 6.172 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 779 | 721 | 828 | 576 |
| Service Time | 2.673 | 2.753 | 2.048 | 4.252 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.736 | 0.621 | 0.047 | 0.049 |
| HCM Control Delay | 19.7 | 15.8 | 7.3 | 9.6 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | C | A | A |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 6.7 | 4.4 | 0.1 | 0.2 |



| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | * |  |  | \& |  |  | 4 | 「 |  | \& |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 20 | 327 | 187 | 78 | 304 | 45 | 123 | 52 | 63 | 37 | 48 | 22 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 20 | 327 | 187 | 78 | 304 | 45 | 123 | 52 | 63 | 37 | 48 | 22 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 22 | 355 | 203 | 85 | 330 | 49 | 134 | 57 | 68 | 40 | 52 | 24 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 66.5 |  |  | 38.2 |  |  | 16.3 |  |  | 14.4 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | F |  |  | E |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | NBLn2 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $70 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $35 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $30 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $61 \%$ | $71 \%$ | $45 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $21 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 175 | 63 | 534 | 427 | 107 |
| LT Vol | 123 | 0 | 20 | 78 | 37 |
| Through Vol | 52 | 0 | 327 | 304 | 48 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 63 | 187 | 45 | 22 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 190 | 68 | 580 | 464 | 116 |
| Geometry Grp | 7 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 5 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.448 | 0.141 | 1.015 | 0.861 | 0.269 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 8.484 | 7.397 | 6.298 | 6.68 | 8.312 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 424 | 484 | 580 | 543 | 430 |
| Service Time | 6.245 | 5.156 | 4.318 | 4.703 | 6.39 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.448 | 0.14 | 1 | 0.855 | 0.27 |
| HCM Control Delay | 18 | 11.4 | 66.5 | 38.2 | 14.4 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | B | F | E | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 2.3 | 0.5 | 15.3 | 9.3 | 1.1 |



| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | 4 |  |  | ¢ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 13 | 390 | 25 | 5 | 379 | 12 | 47 | 8 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 4 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 13 | 390 | 25 | 5 | 379 | 12 | 47 | 8 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 4 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mumt Flow | 14 | 424 | 27 | 5 | 412 | 13 | 51 | 9 | 2 | 9 | 7 | 4 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 14.4 |  |  | 13.5 |  |  | 9.9 |  |  | 9.3 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  | B |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | WBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $82 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $44 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $14 \%$ | $91 \%$ | $96 \%$ | $33 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $4 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $22 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 57 | 428 | 396 | 18 |
| LT Vol | 47 | 13 | 5 | 8 |
| Through Vol | 8 | 390 | 379 | 6 |
| RT Vol | 2 | 25 | 12 | 4 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 62 | 465 | 430 | 20 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.106 | 0.597 | 0.558 | 0.033 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 6.17 | 4.618 | 4.665 | 6.095 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 584 | 777 | 770 | 590 |
| Service Time | 4.17 | 2.675 | 2.724 | 4.099 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.106 | 0.598 | 0.558 | 0.034 |
| HCM Control Delay | 9.9 | 14.4 | 13.5 | 9.3 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | B | B | A |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0.4 | 4 | 3.5 | 0.1 |


|  | 4 |  | 4 |  | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |  |  |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | F | ＊ | 个众 | 种个 |  |  |  |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 165 | 284 | 255 | 1638 | 1449 | 159 |  |  |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 165 | 284 | 255 | 1638 | 1449 | 159 |  |  |
| Number | 7 | 14 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 16 |  |  |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  |  |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1863 | 1863 | 1863 | 1863 | 1863 | 1900 |  |  |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 179 | 309 | 277 | 1780 | 1575 | 173 |  |  |
| Adj No．of Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |  |
| Cap，veh／h | 361 | 322 | 316 | 3543 | 2180 | 239 |  |  |
| Arrive On Green | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.18 | 0.70 | 0.47 | 0.47 |  |  |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1774 | 1583 | 1774 | 5253 | 4820 | 510 |  |  |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 179 | 309 | 277 | 1780 | 1147 | 601 |  |  |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1774 | 1583 | 1774 | 1695 | 1695 | 1773 |  |  |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 8.0 | 17.4 | 13.7 | 14.7 | 24.5 | 24.5 |  |  |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 8.0 | 17.4 | 13.7 | 14.7 | 24.5 | 24.5 |  |  |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  | 0.29 |  |  |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 361 | 322 | 316 | 3543 | 1588 | 831 |  |  |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.50 | 0.96 | 0.88 | 0.50 | 0.72 | 0.72 |  |  |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 361 | 322 | 404 | 3543 | 1588 | 831 |  |  |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Upstream Filter（I） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 31.8 | 35.5 | 36.0 | 6.4 | 19.2 | 19.2 |  |  |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 1.1 | 39.4 | 15.9 | 0.5 | 2.9 | 5.4 |  |  |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 4.0 | 17.3 | 8.1 | 6.9 | 11.9 | 13.1 |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 32.8 | 74.9 | 51.9 | 6.9 | 22.1 | 24.7 |  |  |
| LnGrp LOS | C | E | D | A | C | C |  |  |
| Approach Vol，veh／h | 488 |  |  | 2057 | 1748 |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh | 59.4 |  |  | 12.9 | 23.0 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | E |  |  | B | C |  |  |  |
| Timer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Assigned Phs |  | 2 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  |  |
| Phs Duration（ $G+Y+R c$ ），s |  | 67.2 |  | 22.8 | 20.5 | 46.7 |  |  |
| Change Period（ $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ），s |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |  |  |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s |  | 62.7 |  | 18.3 | 20.5 | 37.7 |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋l1），s |  | 16.7 |  | 19.4 | 15.7 | 26.5 |  |  |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s |  | 21.6 |  | 0.0 | 0.4 | 8.2 |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 Ctrl Delay |  |  | 22.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 LOS |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |



| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% |  |  | $\uparrow$ | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 43 | 7 | 21 | 155 | 208 | 57 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 43 | 7 | 21 | 155 | 208 | 57 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 47 | 8 | 23 | 168 | 226 | 62 |
| Number of Lanes | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| Opposing Approach |  |  | SB |  | NB |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 0 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  | EB |  |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  | 1 |  | 0 |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  |  | EB |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  | 0 |  | 1 |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 8.5 |  | 8.7 |  | 9.2 |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  | A |  | A |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $12 \%$ | $86 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $88 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $78 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $0 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $22 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 176 | 50 | 265 |
| LT Vol | 21 | 43 | 0 |
| Through Vol | 155 | 0 | 208 |
| RT Vol | 0 | 7 | 57 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 191 | 54 | 288 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.233 | 0.076 | 0.332 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 4.382 | 5.049 | 4.145 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 823 | 710 | 870 |
| Service Time | 2.395 | 3.074 | 2.156 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.232 | 0.076 | 0.331 |
| HCM Control Delay | 8.7 | 8.5 | 9.2 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | A |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0.9 | 0.2 | 1.5 |


| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 12.5 |
| Intersection LOS | B |


| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Entry Lanes | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Conflicting Circle Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Adj Approach Flow, veh/h | 595 | 382 | 360 | 262 |
| Demand Flow Rate, veh/h | 606 | 390 | 468 | 564 |
| Vehicles Circulating, veh/h | 235 | 306 | 371 | 132 |
| Vehicles Exiting, veh/h | 596 | 532 | 3.186 | 0 |
| Follow-Up Headway, s | 3.186 | 0.186 | 1.000 |  |
| Ped Vol Crossing Leg, \#/h | 0 | 0 | 1.000 | 11.8 |
| Ped Cap Adj | 1.000 | 1.000 | 9.9 | B |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 15.7 | 10.6 | A |  |
| Approach LOS | C | B |  |  |


| Lane | Left | Left | Left | Right | Left |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Designated Moves | LTR | LTR | LT | R | LTR |
| Assumed Moves | LTR | LTR | LT | R | LTR |
| RT Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Util | 1.000 | 1.000 | 0.788 | 0.212 | 1.000 |
| Critical Headway, s | 5.193 | 5.193 | 5.193 | 5.193 | 5.193 |
| Entry Flow, veh/h | 606 | 390 | 290 | 78 | 267 |
| Cap Entry Lane, veh/h | 893 | 832 | 706 | 706 | 643 |
| Entry HV Adj Factor | 0.981 | 0.980 | 0.979 | 0.974 | 0.980 |
| Flow Entry, veh/h | 595 | 382 | 284 | 76 | 262 |
| Cap Entry, veh/h | 877 | 815 | 692 | 688 | 630 |
| V/C Ratio | 0.678 | 0.469 | 10.411 | 0.110 | 0.415 |
| Control Delay, s/veh | 15.7 | 10.6 | 6.4 | 11.8 |  |
| LOS | C | 3 | 2 | A | B |
| 95th \%tile Queue, veh | 5 | 3 | 0 | 2 |  |

San Bruno Community Center Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc.

|  | 7 | $\rightarrow$ |  | $\downarrow$ |  | 4 | 4 | 4 |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | \$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 7 |  | ¢ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 15 | 288 | 245 | 26 | 267 | 59 | 215 | 46 | 70 | 121 | 64 | 55 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 15 | 288 | 245 | 26 | 267 | 59 | 215 | 46 | 70 | 121 | 64 | 55 |
| Number | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Initial $\mathrm{Q}(\mathrm{Qb})$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 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 |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1900 | 1863 | 1900 | 1900 | 1863 | 1900 | 1900 | 1863 | 1863 | 1900 | 1863 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 16 | 313 | 266 | 28 | 290 | 64 | 234 | 50 | 76 | 132 | 70 | 60 |
| Adj No. of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | , | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 85 | 369 | 304 | 106 | 563 | 118 | 523 | 99 | 654 | 272 | 141 | 89 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 17 | 930 | 766 | 61 | 1420 | 298 | 930 | 240 | 1583 | 381 | 341 | 215 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 595 | 0 | 0 | 382 | 0 | 0 | 284 | 0 | 76 | 262 | 0 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 1713 | 0 | 0 | 1779 | 0 | 0 | 1169 | 0 | 1583 | 938 | 0 | 0 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 3.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 5.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear (g_c), s | 15.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.3 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 14.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.03 |  | 0.45 | 0.07 |  | 0.17 | 0.82 |  | 1.00 | 0.50 |  | 0.23 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 758 | 0 | 0 | 787 | 0 | 0 | 622 | 0 | 654 | 502 | 0 | 0 |
| V/C Ratio( X ) | 0.79 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.49 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.46 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.52 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 857 | 0 | 0 | 885 | 0 | 0 | 622 | 0 | 654 | 502 | 0 | 0 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 13.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.8 | 0.0 | 8.6 | 13.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 4.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 8.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 17.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 13.2 | 0.0 | 8.9 | 17.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  | A | B |  |  |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 595 |  |  | 382 |  |  | 360 |  |  | 262 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 17.5 |  |  | 11.4 |  |  | 12.3 |  |  | 17.3 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |
| Timer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Assigned Phs |  | 2 |  | 4 |  | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s |  | 24.0 |  | 23.2 |  | 24.0 |  | 23.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $Y+R \mathrm{R}$ ), $s$ |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s |  | 19.5 |  | 21.5 |  | 19.5 |  | 21.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s |  | 11.3 |  | 17.1 |  | 16.5 |  | 9.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s |  | 1.3 |  | 1.6 |  | 0.4 |  | 1.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 Ctrl Delay |  |  | 14.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 LOS |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^11]Synchro 10 Report


| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Entry Lanes | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Conflicting Circle Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Adj Approach Flow, veh/h | 562 | 444 | 259 | 116 |
| Demand Flow Rate, veh/h | 573 | 453 | 264 | 540 |
| Vehicles Circulating, veh/h | 181 | 217 | 422 | 130 |
| Vehicles Exiting, veh/h | 477 | 469 | 3.182 | 3.186 |
| Follow-Up Headway, s | 3.186 | 0 |  |  |
| Ped Vol Crossing Leg, \#/h | 0 | 0 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Ped Cap Adj | 1.000 | 1.000 | 7.5 | A |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 12.8 | 10.5 | A |  |
| Approach LOS | B | B |  |  |


| Lane | Left | Left | Left | Right | Left |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Designated Moves | LTR | LTR | LT | R | LTR |
| Assumed Moves | LTR | LTR | R | LTR |  |
| RT Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Util | 1.000 | 1.000 | 0.739 | 0.261 | 1.000 |
| Critical Headway, s | 5.193 | 5.193 | 5.193 | 5.193 | 5.193 |
| Entry Flow, veh/h | 573 | 453 | 195 | 69 | 118 |
| Cap Entry Lane, veh/h | 943 | 910 | 741 | 741 | 658 |
| Entry HV Adj Factor | 0.981 | 0.980 | 0.979 | 0.986 | 0.983 |
| Flow Entry, veh/h | 562 | 444 | 791 | 68 | 116 |
| Cap Entry, veh/h | 925 | 891 | 725 | 730 | 647 |
| V/C Ratio | 0.608 | 0.498 | 0.263 | 0.093 | 0.179 |
| Control Delay, s/veh | 12.8 | 10.5 | 8 | 5.9 | 7.7 |
| LOS | B | 3 | 1 | 0 | A |
| 95th \%tile Queue, veh | 4 | 3 |  | 1 |  |


|  | $y$ | $\rightarrow$ |  | $\dagger$ |  | 4 | 4 | 4 | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 7 |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 20 | 324 | 173 | 78 | 285 | 45 | 123 | 52 | 63 | 37 | 48 | 22 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 20 | 324 | 173 | 78 | 285 | 45 | 123 | 52 | 63 | 37 | 48 | 22 |
| Number | 7 | 4 | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 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 |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1900 | 1863 | 1900 | 1900 | 1863 | 1900 | 1900 | 1863 | 1863 | 1900 | 1863 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 22 | 352 | 188 | 85 | 310 | 49 | 134 | 57 | 68 | 40 | 52 | 24 |
| Adj No. of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 95 | 435 | 224 | 175 | 474 | 69 | 541 | 207 | 654 | 284 | 348 | 137 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 29 | 1127 | 581 | 205 | 1226 | 177 | 980 | 502 | 1583 | 427 | 842 | 331 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 562 | 0 | 0 | 444 | 0 | 0 | 191 | 0 | 68 | 116 | 0 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/n | 1737 | 0 | 0 | 1608 | 0 | 0 | 1482 | 0 | 1583 | 1600 | 0 | 0 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 3.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 13.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.04 |  | 0.33 | 0.19 |  | 0.11 | 0.70 |  | 1.00 | 0.34 |  | 0.21 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 755 | 0 | 0 | 717 | 0 | 0 | 748 | 0 | 654 | 769 | 0 | 0 |
| VIC Ratio(X) | 0.74 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.62 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.26 | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.15 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 952 | 0 | 0 | 891 | 0 | 0 | 748 | 0 | 654 | 769 | 0 | 0 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(I) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 12.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.7 | 0.0 | 8.1 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 2.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 6.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 14.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 12.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.5 | 0.0 | 8.4 | 8.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | B |  |  | B |  |  | A |  | A | A |  |  |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 562 |  |  | 444 |  |  | 259 |  |  | 116 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 14.8 |  |  | 12.2 |  |  | 9.2 |  |  | 8.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |
| Timer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Assigned Phs |  | 2 |  | 4 |  | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s |  | 23.0 |  | 21.8 |  | 23.0 |  | 21.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $Y+R \mathrm{Rc}$ ), s |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s |  | 18.5 |  | 22.5 |  | 18.5 |  | 22.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s |  | 5.5 |  | 15.0 |  | 3.8 |  | 11.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s |  | 1.0 |  | 2.3 |  | 0.5 |  | 2.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 Ctrl Delay |  |  | 12.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 LOS |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^12]Synchro 10 Report


| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Entry Lanes | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Conflicting Circle Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Adj Approach Flow, veh/h | 595 | 383 | 360 | 262 |
| Demand Flow Rate, veh/h | 606 | 391 | 468 | 267 |
| Vehicles Circulating, veh/h | 235 | 306 | 370 |  |
| Vehicles Exiting, veh/h | 597 | 532 | 3.186 | 132 |
| Follow-Up Headway, s | 3.186 | 0 | 3.186 |  |
| Ped Vol Crossing Leg, \#/h | 0 | 0 | 1.000 | 0 |
| Ped Cap Adj | 1.000 | 1.000 | 9.9 | 1.000 |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 15.7 | 10.6 | A | 11.8 |
| Approach LOS | C | B | B |  |


| Lane | Left | Left | Left | Right | Left |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Designated Moves | LTR | LTR | LT | R | LTR |
| Assumed Moves | LTR | LTR | LT | R | LTR |
| RT Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Util | 1.000 | 1.000 | 0.788 | 0.212 | 1.000 |
| Critical Headway, s | 5.193 | 5.193 | 5.193 | 5.193 | 5.193 |
| Entry Flow, veh/h | 606 | 391 | 290 | 78 | 267 |
| Cap Entry Lane, veh/h | 893 | 832 | 706 | 706 | 642 |
| Entry HV Adj Factor | 0.981 | 0.980 | 0.979 | 0.974 | 0.980 |
| Flow Entry, veh/h | 595 | 383 | 284 | 76 | 262 |
| Cap Entry, veh/h | 877 | 815 | 692 | 688 | 629 |
| V/C Ratio | 0.678 | 0.470 | 10.411 | 0.110 | 0.416 |
| Control Delay, s/veh | 15.7 | 10.6 | $B$ | 6.4 | 11.8 |
| LOS | B | 3 | 2 | 0 | B |
| 95th \%tile Queue, veh | 5 | 3 | 0 | 2 |  |


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \$ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | ¢ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 15 | 288 | 245 | 26 | 268 | 59 | 215 | 46 | 70 | 121 | 64 | 55 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 15 | 288 | 245 | 26 | 268 | 59 | 215 | 46 | 70 | 121 | 64 | 55 |
| Number | 7 |  | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 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 |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1900 | 1863 | 1900 | 1900 | 1863 | 1900 | 1900 | 1863 | 1863 | 1900 | 1863 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 16 | 313 | 266 | 28 | 291 | 64 | 234 | 50 | 76 | 132 | 70 | 60 |
| Adj No. of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 85 | 369 | 304 | 106 | 564 | 118 | 523 | 99 | 654 | 272 | 141 | 89 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 17 | 930 | 766 | 61 | 1421 | 297 | 930 | 240 | 1583 | 381 | 341 | 215 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 595 |  | 0 | 383 | 0 | 0 | 284 | 0 | 76 | 262 | 0 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/n | 1713 | 0 | 0 | 1779 | 0 | 0 | 1169 | 0 | 1583 | 938 | 0 | 0 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 3.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 5.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 15.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.3 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 14.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.03 |  | 0.45 | 0.07 |  | 0.17 | 0.82 |  | 1.00 | 0.50 |  | 0.23 |
| Lane Grp $\operatorname{Cap}$ (c), veh/h | 758 | 0 | 0 | 787 | 0 | 0 | 622 | 0 | 654 | 502 | 0 | 0 |
| VIC Ratio(X) | 0.79 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.49 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.46 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.52 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 857 | 0 | 0 | 885 | 0 | 0 | 622 | 0 | 654 | 502 | 0 | 0 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 13.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.8 | 0.0 | 8.6 | 13.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 4.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 8.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 17.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 13.2 | 0.0 | 8.9 | 17.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  | A | B |  |  |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 595 |  |  | 383 |  |  | 360 |  |  | 262 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 17.5 |  |  | 11.4 |  |  | 12.3 |  |  | 17.3 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |
| Timer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Assigned Phs |  | 2 |  | 4 |  | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s |  | 24.0 |  | 23.2 |  | 24.0 |  | 23.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $Y+R \mathrm{C})$ ) $s$ |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s |  | 19.5 |  | 21.5 |  | 19.5 |  | 21.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s |  | 11.3 |  | 17.1 |  | 16.5 |  | 9.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s |  | 1.3 |  | 1.6 |  | 0.4 |  | 1.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 Ctrl Delay |  |  | 14.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 LOS |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 11.0 |
| Intersection LOS | B |


| Approach | EB | WB |  | NB | SB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Entry Lanes | 1 | 1 |  | 2 | 1 |
| Conflicting Circle Lanes | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |
| Adj Approach Flow, veh/h | 580 | 464 |  | 259 | 116 |
| Demand Flow Rate, veh/h | 591 | 474 |  | 264 | 118 |
| Vehicles Circulating, veh/h | 181 | 217 |  | 425 | 561 |
| Vehicles Exiting, veh/h | 498 | 472 |  | 347 | 130 |
| Follow-Up Headway, s | 3.186 | 3.186 |  | 3.186 | 3.186 |
| Ped Vol Crossing Leg, \#/h | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| Ped Cap Adj | 1.000 | 1.000 |  | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Approach Delay, s/veh | 13.3 | 11.0 |  | 7.5 | 7.9 |
| Approach LOS | B | B |  | A | A |
| Lane | Left | Left | Left | Right | Left |
| Designated Moves | LTR | LTR | LT | R | LTR |
| Assumed Moves | LTR | LTR | LT | R | LTR |
| RT Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Util | 1.000 | 1.000 | 0.739 | 0.261 | 1.000 |
| Critical Headway, s | 5.193 | 5.193 | 5.193 | 5.193 | 5.193 |
| Entry Flow, veh/h | 591 | 474 | 195 | 69 | 118 |
| Cap Entry Lane, veh/h | 943 | 910 | 739 | 739 | 645 |
| Entry HV Adj Factor | 0.981 | 0.980 | 0.979 | 0.986 | 0.983 |
| Flow Entry, veh/h | 580 | 464 | 191 | 68 | 116 |
| Cap Entry, veh/h | 925 | 891 | 723 | 728 | 634 |
| V/C Ratio | 0.627 | 0.521 | 0.264 | 0.093 | 0.183 |
| Control Delay, s/veh | 13.3 | 11.0 | 8.1 | 5.9 | 7.9 |
| LOS | B | B | A | A | A |
| 95th \%tile Queue, veh | 5 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 |


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ |  | $\checkmark$ | $\stackrel{-}{*}$ | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \$ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\stackrel{1}{*}$ | 「 |  | ¢ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 20 | 327 | 187 | 78 | 304 | 45 | 123 | 52 | 63 | 37 | 48 | 22 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 20 | 327 | 187 | 78 | 304 | 45 | 123 | 52 | 63 | 37 | 48 | 22 |
| Number | 7 | , | 14 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 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 |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1900 | 1863 | 1900 | 1900 | 1863 | 1900 | 1900 | 1863 | 1863 | 1900 | 1863 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 22 | 355 | 203 | 85 | 330 | 49 | 134 | 57 | 68 | 40 | 52 | 24 |
| Adj No. of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 92 | 447 | 247 | 172 | 507 | 69 | 523 | 201 | 632 | 275 | 336 | 132 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.40 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 28 | 1098 | 606 | 196 | 1244 | 170 | 981 | 503 | 1583 | 427 | 842 | 331 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 580 |  | , | 464 | 0 | 0 | 191 | 0 | 68 | 116 | 0 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/n | 1732 | 0 | 0 | 1610 | 0 | 0 | 1484 | 0 | 1583 | 1600 | 0 | 0 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 2.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 13.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.04 |  | 0.35 | 0.18 |  | 0.11 | 0.70 |  | 1.00 | 0.34 |  | 0.21 |
| Lane Grp $\operatorname{Cap}$ (c), veh/h | 786 | 0 | 0 | 747 | 0 | 0 | 724 | 0 | 632 | 743 | 0 | 0 |
| VIC Ratio(X) | 0.74 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.62 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.26 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.16 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 1102 | 0 | 0 | 1027 | 0 | 0 | 724 | 0 | 632 | 743 | 0 | 0 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 12.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.4 | 0.0 | 8.8 | 9.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 6.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 13.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.3 | 0.0 | 9.1 | 9.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  | A | A |  |  |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 580 |  |  | 464 |  |  | 259 |  |  | 116 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 13.8 |  |  | 11.9 |  |  | 10.0 |  |  | 9.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |
| Timer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Assigned Phs |  | 2 |  | 4 |  | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s |  | 23.0 |  | 23.4 |  | 23.0 |  | 23.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $Y+R \mathrm{R}$ ), s |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s |  | 18.5 |  | 27.5 |  | 18.5 |  | 27.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s |  | 5.7 |  | 15.7 |  | 3.9 |  | 12.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s |  | 1.0 |  | 3.2 |  | 0.5 |  | 2.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 Ctrl Delay |  |  | 12.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 2010 LOS |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

# Appendix E <br> Signal Warrant Analysis Sheets 

## Oak Ave/City Park Way \&Crystal Springs Ave

AM PEAK PERIOD


Source: Figure 4C-3 California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways (FHWA's MUTCD 2010 Edition, as amended for use in California).

* Note: 150 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with two or more lanes and 100 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with one lane.


## Warrant 3, Part B - Peak-Hour Vehicular Volume
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## TRAFFIC SIGNAL WARRANTS WORKSHEET



AM PEAK PERIOD

## Warrant 3 - Peak Hour

## $\overline{\text { PART A }}$

(All parts 1, 2, and 3 below must be satisfied)


PART B

|  |  | AM PEAK PERIOD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Approach Lanes |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\otimes}{2} \\ & \frac{2}{0} \\ & \vec{J} \\ & \frac{1}{J} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \pm \\ & \stackrel{ \pm}{ \pm} \\ & \frac{0}{J} \\ & \stackrel{0}{5} \\ & 0 \\ & \hline 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | One | $\begin{gathered} 2 \text { or } \\ \text { More } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Major Street - Both Approaches | Crystal Springs Ave | X |  | 890 | 899 | 892 | 900 |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Street - Highest Approach | Oak Ave/ City Park Way | X |  | 317 | 331 | 317 | 331 |  |  |  |  |
| Signal Warranted based on Part B? |  |  |  | YES | Yes | No | YES |  |  |  |  |

The Warrant is satisfied if the plotted point for vehicles per hour on the major street (both approaches) and the corresponding per hour higher vehicle volume minor street approach (one direction only) for one hour (any four consecutive 15-minute periods) fall above the applicable curves in California MUTCD Figure 4C-3 or 4C-4.

Source: California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways (FHWA's MUTCD 2010 Edition, as amended for use in California). Notes:

## Oak Ave/City Park Way \&Crystal Springs Ave

PM PEAK HOUR


Source: Figure 4C-3 California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways (FHWA's MUTCD 2010 Edition, as amended for use in California).

* Note: 150 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with two or more lanes and 100 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with one lane.


## Warrant 3, Part B - Peak-Hour Vehicular Volume

|  |  | PM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Approach Lanes |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \stackrel{+}{ \pm} \\ & \stackrel{y}{2} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | One | 2 or More |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Major Street - Both Approaches | Crystal Springs Ave | X |  | 916 | 925 | 920 | 929 |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Street - Highest Approach | Oak Ave/ City <br> Park Way | X |  | 224 | 238 | 224 | 238 |  |  |  |  |
| Signal Warranted Based on Part B - Peak-Hour Volumes? |  |  |  | No | Yes | No | Yes |  |  |  |  |
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## Warrant 3 - Peak Hour

## PART A

(All parts 1, 2, and 3 below must be satisfied)


## PART B
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[^0]:    Notes:
    AWSC = All-Way Stop Control TWSC = Two-Way Stop Control
    ${ }^{1}$ Average delay for an all-way stop controlled intersection is reported for the entire intersection.
    ${ }^{2}$ Average delay for the two-way stop controlled intersection is reported by the Synchro output delay and LOS
    Bold indicates a substandard level of service.

[^1]:    San Bruno Community Center
    Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc.

[^2]:    San Bruno Community Center
    Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc.

[^3]:    San Bruno Community Center
    Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc.

[^4]:    San Bruno Community Center
    Synchro 10 Report
    Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc.
    Page 2

[^5]:    San Bruno Community Center
    Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc.

[^6]:    San Bruno Community Center
    Hexagon Transportation Consultants，Inc．

[^7]:    San Bruno Community Center
    Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc.

[^8]:    San Bruno Community Center
    Synchro 10 Report
    Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc.
    Page 2

[^9]:    San Bruno Community Center
    Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc.

[^10]:    San Bruno Community Center
    Hexagon Transportation Consultants，Inc．

[^11]:    San Bruno Community Center
    Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc.

[^12]:    San Bruno Community Center
    Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc.

[^13]:    *Warrant is satisfied if plotted points fall above the appropriate curve in graph above.

[^14]:    *Warrant is satisfied if plotted points fall above the appropriate curve in graph above.

[^15]:    The Warrant is satisfied if the plotted point for vehicles per hour on the major street (both approaches) and the corresponding per hour higher vehicle volume minor street approach (one direction only) for one hour (any four consecutive 15-minute periods) fall above the applicable curves in California MUTCD Figure 4C-3 or 4C-4.

    Source: California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways (FHWA's MUTCD 2010 Edition, as amended for use in California). Notes:

