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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study analyzes the forecast traffic conditions associated with the proposed Monserate Winery in the Fallbrook Community Planning Area of unincorporated San Diego County. As part of the proposed winery, the project will include a tasting room, restaurant, and three separate event venues. The project is located on Gird Road north of SR-76 and south of Reche Road on the site of the old Fallbrook Golf Course. The proposed winery is projected to be built out and operational by Year 2020.

The proposed project is forecast to generate approximately 1,237 net new daily trips on a typical Saturday which includes approximately 232 PM peak hour trips. This analysis focuses on the typical peak operating conditions of the winery which occurs on a Saturday evening.

This study considers the level of service operations for intersections and roadways as well as the corner sight distance requirements at the project driveway.

## Level of Service Analysis Results

## Intersection Analysis

The results of the Existing conditions analysis show that all study intersections currently operate at acceptable levels of service (LOS B or better).

The results of the Opening Year 2020 conditions show that all study intersections are forecast to operate at acceptable levels of service (LOS B or better).

With the addition of project related traffic, all study intersections continue to operate at acceptable levels of service for the Opening Year 2020 With Project conditions.

## Roadway Segment Analysis

The results of the Existing conditions analysis show that all study roadway segments currently operate at an acceptable level of service (LOS B or better) on a daily and peak hour basis.

The results of the Opening Year 2020 conditions show that all study roadway segments are forecast to operate at an acceptable level of service (LOS B or better) on a daily and peak hour basis.

With the addition of project related traffic, all study roadway segments continue to operate at acceptable levels of service on a daily and peak hour basis for the Opening Year 2020 With Project conditions.

## Sight Distance Requirements

Based on County guidelines, the required sight distance that needs to be kept free of visual obstructions (i.e. monuments, landscaping, berms, etc.) for vehicles turning left from the project driveway onto northbound Gird Road is 450 feet. In addition, any tree canopy within the sight triangle should also be maintained at a level no less than 10 feet above the roadway at all times. The available sight distance is approximately 480 feet (measured along the path of travel). South of the project driveway, there is approximately 940 feet of available sight distance. Therefore, the available sight distance at the project driveway is greater than the minimum required by County guidelines in both the north and south direction on Gird Road.

## 2 INTRODUCTION

This study analyzes the forecast traffic conditions associated with the proposed Monserate Winery in the Fallbrook Community Planning Area of unincorporated San Diego County. As part of the proposed winery, the project will include a tasting room, restaurant, and three separate event venues. The project is located on Gird Road north of SR-76 and south of Reche Road on the site of the old Fallbrook Golf Course. The proposed winery is projected to be built out and operational by Year 2020. Exhibit 1 shows the proposed site plan.

The proposed project is forecast to generate approximately 1,237 net new daily trips on a typical Saturday which includes approximately 232 net new PM peak hour trips. This analysis focuses on the typical peak operating conditions of the winery which occurs on a Saturday evening.

This traffic impact study has been prepared in accordance with the County of San Diego standards and guidelines as outlined in the following documents:

- County of San Diego Report \& Content Requirements - Transportation \& Traffic (August 2011)
- County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance - Transportation \& Traffic (August 2011)
- San Diego County Public Road Standards (March 2012)
- Guidelines for Transportation Impact Studies in the San Diego Region (draft - January 2019)

The scope of this traffic study was coordinated with County staff. Appendix A includes the Traffic Study Scoping Agreement.

### 2.1 STUDY AREA

This study evaluates the following three intersections during the PM peak hour in the vicinity of the project site:

1. Reche Road and Gird Road,

## 3. SR-76 and Gird Road.

2. Gird Road and Project Driveway, and

This study also evaluates the following two roadway segments in the vicinity of the project site for average daily traffic volumes in a 24-hour period as well as the PM peak hour:

1. Gird Road between Reche Road and the Project Driveway, and
2. Gird Road between the Project Driveway and SR-76

These three intersections and two roadway segments have been identified in coordination with County staff as potential locations impacted by the proposed project as shown in Exhibit 2. These study locations are analyzed for the following conditions:

- Existing
- Opening Year 2020 Without Project
- Opening Year 2020 With Project




### 2.2 ANALYSISMETHODOLOGY

### 2.2.1 Intersection Methodology

Level of Service (LOS) is commonly used as a qualitative description of intersection operation and is based on the capacity of the intersection and the volume of traffic using the intersection. The intersection analysis conforms to the operational analysis methodology outlined in the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM $6^{\text {th }}$ Edition) and performed utilizing the Synchro 10 traffic analysis software.

The HCM analysis methodology describes the operation of an intersection using a range of level of service from LOS A (free-flow conditions) to LOS F (severely congested conditions), based on the corresponding stopped delay experienced per vehicle for study intersections as shown in Table 1.

Synchro reports average delays for a signalized intersection, which correspond to a particular LOS, to describe the overall operation of an intersection. Unsignalized intersection LOS for all-way stops is based on the average delay for all approaches. Delay for one-way or two-way stop-controlled intersections is based on available gaps in traffic flow on the non-controlled approach and LOS is based on the approach with the worst delay.

Table 1 - Level of Service \& Delay Range

| Level of <br> Service | Control Delay (seconds/vehicle) |  | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
|  | Signalized <br> Intersections | Unsignalized <br> Intersections |  |
| A | $<10.0$ | $<10.0$ | Operates with very low delay and most vehicles <br> do not stop. |
| B | $>10.0$ to 20.0 | $>10.0$ to 15.0 | Operates with good progression with some <br> restricted movements. |
| C | $>21.0$ to 35.0 | $>15.1$ to 25.0 | Operates with significant number of vehicles <br> stopping with some backup and light congestion. |
| D | $>35.1$ to 55.0 | $>25.0$ to 35.0 | Operates with noticeable congestion, longer <br> delays occur, and many vehicles stop. |
| E | $>55.0$ to 80.0 | $>35.1$ to 50.0 | Operates with significant delay, extensive <br> queuing and unfavorable progression. |
| F | $>80.0$ | $>50.0$ | Operates at a level that is unacceptable to most <br> drivers. Arrival rates exceed capacity of the <br> intersection. Extensive queuing occurs. |

Source: Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) 6th Edition.

### 2.2.1 Roadway Segment Methodology

The basis for analyzing roadway segments is the comparison of daily volumes to roadway capacity. The capacity of a roadway segment is affected by a number of factors including street width, roadway design, number of travel lanes, number of intersection driveways, presence of raised medians, etc. The analysis results provide a planning-level assessment of whether a segment is under, approaching, or over capacity.

Table 2A presents the roadway segment capacity and LOS standards contained in the San Diego County Public Road Standards.

Table 2A - Roadway Segment Daily Level of Service Criteria

| Mobility Element Roads |  | No. of Travel Lanes | Level of Service Capacity (ADT) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LOS A | LOS B | LOS C | LOS D | LOSE |
|  | Expressway (6.1) |  | 6 | 36,000 | 54,000 | 70,000 | 86,000 | 108,000 |
|  | Prime Arterial (6.2) | 6 | 22,000 | 37,000 | 44,600 | 50,000 | 57,000 |
| Major Road | With Raised Medians (4.1A) | 4 | 14,800 | 24,700 | 29,600 | 33,400 | 37,000 |
|  | With Intermittent Turn Lanes (4.1B) |  | 13,700 | 22,800 | 27,400 | 30,800 | 34,200 |
| Boulevard | With Raised Medians (4.2A) | 4 | 18,000 | 21,000 | 24,000 | 27,000 | 30,000 |
|  | With Intermittent Turn Lanes (4.2B) |  | 16,800 | 19,600 | 22,500 | 25,000 | 28,000 |
| Community Collector | With Raised Medians (2.1A) | 2 | 10,000 | 11,700 | 13,400 | 15,000 | 19,000 |
|  | With Continuous Turn Lanes (2.1B) |  | 3,000 | 6,000 | 9,500 | 13,500 | 19,000 |
|  | With Intermittent Turn Lanes (2.1C) |  | 3,000 | 6,000 | 9,500 | 13,500 | 19,000 |
|  | With Improvement Options (2.1D) |  | 3,000 | 6,000 | 9,500 | 13,500 | 19,000 |
|  | No Median (2.1E) |  | 1,900 | 4,100 | 7,100 | 10,900 | 16,200 |
| Light Collector | With Raised Medians (2.2A) | 2 | 3,000 | 6,000 | 9,500 | 13,500 | 19,000 |
|  | With Continuous Turn Lanes (2.2B) |  | 3,000 | 6,000 | 9,500 | 13,500 | 19,000 |
|  | With Intermittent Turn Lanes (2.2C) |  | 3,000 | 6,000 | 9,500 | 13,500 | 19,000 |
|  | With Improvement Options (2.2D) |  | 3,000 | 6,000 | 9,500 | 13,500 | 19,000 |
|  | No Median (2.2E) |  | 1,900 | 4,100 | 7,100 | 10,900 | 16,200 |
|  | With Reduced Shoulders (2.2F) |  | 5,800 | 6,800 | 7,800 | 8,700 | 9,700 |
| Minor Collector | With Raised Medians (2.3A) | 2 | 3,000 | 6,000 | 7,000 | 8,000 | 9,000 |
|  | With Intermittent Turn Lanes (2.3B) |  | 3,000 | 6,000 | 7,000 | 8,000 | 9,000 |
|  | No Median (2.3C) |  | 1,900 | 4,100 | 6,000 | 7,000 | 8,000 |
| Non-Mobility Element Roads |  | No. of Travel Lanes | Level of Service Capacity (ADT) |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | LOS A | LOS B | LOS C | LOS D | LOS E |
|  | Residential Collector |  | 2 | - | - | 4,500 | - | - |
| Rural Residential Collector |  | 2 | - | - | 4,500 | - | - |
| Residential Road |  | 2 | - | - | 1,500 | - | - |
| Rural Residential Road |  | 2 | - | - | 1,500 | - | - |
| Residential Cul-de-Sac or Loop Road |  | 2 | - | - | 200 | - | - |

Source: County of San Diego Public Road Standards (March 2012)

In addition to daily roadway capacities, this analysis also considers directional peak hour capacities on Gird Road. This information is provided for informational purposes only and is not considered a measure of significance. For the purposes of the analysis, the peak hour capacities are estimated to be $10 \%$ of the daily LOS capacity. Peak hour level of service for roadway segments are based on the volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratios shown in Table 2B.

Table 2B - Roadway Segment Peak Hour Level of Service Criteria | Level of Service | Volume-to-Capacity Ratio |
| :--- | :--- |

| A | $0.00-0.60$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| B | $>0.60-0.70$ |
| C | $>0.70-0.80$ |
| D | $>0.80-0.90$ |
| E | $>0.90-1.00$ |
| F | $>1.00$ |

### 2.3 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

The County of San Diego has adopted level of service "D" or better as acceptable operating conditions for intersections and roadway segments. The Transportation Concept Report for SR-76 (Caltrans, February 2016) indicates LOS " E " is considered acceptable for segments of SR-76 between the Fallbrook/Bonsall Community Planning Area and Old Highway 395.

### 2.3.1 San Diego County Thresholds

In accordance with the County guidelines, a development project is considered to have a significant impact if the addition of project related trips results in one of the following conditions as shown in Table 3.

Table 3 - County of San Diego Thresholds of Significance

| Allowable Increases on Congested Roads \& Intersections |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Road Segments |  |  |
| Level of Service | LOS E | LOS F |
| 2-Lane Road | 200 ADT | 100 ADT |
| 4-Lane Road | 400 ADT | 200 ADT |
| 6-Lane Road | 600 ADT | 300 ADT |
| Signalized | Lelay of 2 seconds or <br> less | 20 or less peak hour <br> trips on a critical <br> movement |
| Un-Signalized | Either a Delay of 1 <br> second, or 5 peak hour <br> trips or less on a <br> critical movement | 5 or less peak hour <br> trips on a critical <br> movement |

Source: County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance - Traffic and Transportation Tables 1 \& 2

### 2.3.2 Caltrans Thresholds

The intersection of SR-76 and Gird Road is a Caltrans facility. In accordance with the allowable thresholds established by Caltrans for SR-76, a traffic impact is considered significant if a development project would worsen intersection operations from level of service $E$ or better to LOS F at this location.

## 3 EXISTING CONDITIONS

### 3.1 SURROUNDING ROADWAY NETWORK

The characteristics of the roadway system in the vicinity of the project site are described below:
State Route $\mathbf{7 6}$ (SR-76) is a Caltrans facility oriented in the east-west direction connecting the I-5 freeway in Oceanside to the I-15 freeway in Fallbrook. Within the Bonsall/Fallbrook community, SR-76 is a fourlane roadway between East Vista Way and Olive Hill/Camino Del Rey; six-lanes between Olive Hill/Camino Del Rey and Mission Road; and 4-lanes with intermittent turn lanes between Mission Road and the I-15 freeway. SR-76 is classified as a Major Roadway with Raised Medians (4.1A) according to the San Diego County General Plan-Fallbrook Mobility Element Network. The posted speed limit is 55 MPH. On-street parking is prohibited in both directions within the study area. SR-76 is a bike route with Class II bike lanes on both sides of the roadway. There are no sidewalks provided within the study area.

Gird Road is oriented in the north-south direction and is classified as a 2-lane Light Collector (2.2E) according to the San Diego County General Plan-Fallbrook Mobility Element Network. Gird Road is currently built out to its ultimate classification. The posted speed limit is 45 (MPH). On-street parking is prohibited and there are no existing bicycle facilities or sidewalks within the study area.

Reche Road is oriented in the east-west direction and is classified a 2-lane Light Collector with Intermittent Turn Lanes (2.2C) according to the San Diego County General Plan-Fallbrook Mobility Element Network Reche Road is currently built out to its ultimate classification. Within the study area, the posted speed limit is 40 MPH with advisory speeds between 25 MPH and 30 MPH around curves. On-street parking is prohibited and there are no existing bicycle facilities or sidewalks within the study area.

Exhibit 3 shows the Fallbrook Community Planning Area Mobility Element Network.

### 3.2 EXISTING TRAFFIC VOLUMES

To determine the existing operations of the study intersections and roadway segments, peak hour intersection movement counts and daily traffic counts were collected on Saturday, April 13, 2019. PM peak period counts were collected from 4:30 PM to 6:30 PM to coincide with the peak hour of the project. The counts used in this analysis were taken from the highest hour within the peak period counted for each intersection.

Detailed count data is contained in Appendix B.
Exhibit 4 shows the Existing study intersection lane geometry. Exhibit 5 shows the daily segment volumes and PM peak hour volumes at the study intersections.


Fallbrook Mobility Element Roadway Network



### 3.3 EXISTING PEAK HOUR STUDY INTERSECTION LOS

Table 4 summarizes existing conditions PM peak hour level of service for all study intersections. Detailed analysis sheets are contained in Appendix C.

Table 4 - Existing PM Peak Hour Intersection LOS

| Study Intersection | Traffic | Existing Conditions |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | PM |
|  |  | Delay $^{1}$ - LOS |
| 1 - Live Oak Park/Gird Road / Reche Road | Signal | 17.0 - B |
| 2 - Gird Road / Project Driveway | OWSC | Not Studied Without Project |
| 3 - Gird Road / SR-76 | Signal | $14.3-B$ |

Note: Deficient intersection operation indicated in bold.
${ }^{1}$ Average seconds of delay per vehicle.
LOS = level of service.
OWSC = One-Way Stop Control

As shown in Table 4, all study intersections are currently operating at an acceptable level of service (LOS B or better) for Existing conditions during the PM peak hour on a Saturday.

### 3.4 EXISTING ROADWAY SEGMENT LOS

Table 5 summarizes existing conditions daily traffic levels of service for all study roadway segments.
Table 5 - Existing Conditions Roadway Segment LOS: Daily Assessment

| Roadway | Segment | Classification | No. Lanes | LOS E Capacity | Existing |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | ADT | V/C | LOS |
| Gird Road | Reche Road to Project Driveway | Light Collector (2.2E) | 2 | 16,200 | 3,360 | 0.21 | B |
|  | Project Driveway to SR-76 | Light Collector (2.2E) | 2 | 16,200 | 3,360 | 0.21 | B |

Note: Deficient roadway segment operations shown in bold
ADT= Average Daily Traffic
LOS= Level of Service
V/C= Volume to Capacity Ratio

As shown in Table 5, all study roadway segments are currently operating at an acceptable level of service (LOS B or better) for Existing conditions.

These roadway segments were further analyzed under peak hour conditions to determine if there is a capacity deficiency during the critical peak hour. As shown in Table 6, the studied roadway segments are forecast to operate at acceptable levels of service during the PM peak hour on a Saturday under Existing conditions.
$\qquad$
Table 6 - Existing Conditions Roadway Segment LOS: Peak Hour Assessment

|  | Segment | Direction | No. Lanes | Capacity (VPH) ${ }^{(1)}$ | Existing |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Roadway |  |  |  |  | PM Peak Hour Volume | V/C | LOS |
| Gird Road | Reche Road to Project Driveway | NB | 1 | 1,620 | 128 | 0.08 | A |
|  |  | SB | 1 | 1,620 | 119 | 0.07 | A |
|  | Project Driveway to SR-76 | NB | 1 | 1,620 | 128 | 0.08 | A |
|  |  | SB | 1 | 1,620 | 119 | 0.07 | A |

Note: Deficient roadway segment operations shown in bold
LOS= Level of Service VPH = Vehicles Per Hour

V/C= Volume to Capacity Ratio
${ }^{(1)}$ Assumes $10 \%$ of the daily LOS E capacity

## 4 OPENING YEAR 2020 WITHOUT PROJECT CONDITIONS

### 4.1 OPENING YEAR 2020 WITHOUT PROJECT TRAFFIC VOLUMES

Forecast Opening Year 2020 Without Project traffic volumes are derived by applying a 2\% per year ambient growth rate to existing traffic volumes. There were no other cumulative projects identified that are planned, approved, or under construction that would contribute a significant amount of traffic to the study area on a Saturday.

Exhibit 6 shows the Opening Year 2020 Without Project daily and PM peak hour volumes within the study area.

### 4.2 OPENING YEAR 2020 WITHOUT PROJECT PEAK HOUR STUDY INTERSECTION LOS

Table 7 summarizes Cumulative Without Project PM peak hour level of service for all study intersections. Detailed analysis sheets are contained in Appendix D.

## Table 7 - Opening Year 2020 Without Project <br> PM Реak Hour Intersection LOS

| Study Intersection | Opening Year 2020 Without <br> Project Conditions |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | PM |
|  |  | Delay ${ }^{1}$ - LOS |
| 1-Live Oak Park/Gird Road / Reche Road | Signal | $17.4-$ B |
| 2 - Gird Road / Project Driveway | OWSC | Not Studied Without Project |
| 3-Gird Road / SR-76 | Signal | $14.5-$ B |

Note: Deficient intersection operation indicated in bold.
${ }^{1}$ Average seconds of delay per vehicle.
LOS = level of service.
OWSC = One-Way Stop Control

As shown in Table 7, all study intersections are forecast to operate at an acceptable level of service (LOS D or better) during the PM peak hour on a Saturday.
$\qquad$

### 4.3 OPENING YEAR 2020 WITHOUT PROJECT ROADWAY SEGMENT LOS

Table 8 summarizes Opening Year 2020 Without Project conditions average daily traffic level of service for all study roadway segments.

Table 8 - Opening Year 2020 Without Project
Roadway Segment LOS: Daily Assessment

| Roadway | Segment | Classification | No. Lanes | LOS E Capacity | Opening Year 2020 Without Project Conditions |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | ADT | V/C | LOS |
| Gird | Reche Road to Project Driveway | Light Collector (2.2E) | 2 | 16,200 | 3,430 | 0.21 | B |
| Road | Project Driveway to SR-76 | Light Collector (2.2E) | 2 | 16,200 | 3,430 | 0.21 | B |

Note: Deficient roadway segment operations shown in bold
ADT= Average Daily Traffic
LOS= Level of Service
V/C= Volume to Capacity Ratio

As shown in Table 8, all study roadway segments are currently operating at an acceptable level of service (LOS B or better) for Opening Year 2020 Without Project conditions.

These roadway segments were further analyzed under peak hour conditions to determine if there is a capacity deficiency during the critical peak hour. As shown in Table 9, the studied roadway segments are forecast to operate at acceptable levels of service during the PM peak hour on a Saturday under Opening Year 2020 Without Project conditions.

Table 9 - Opening Year 2020 Without Project
Roadway Segment LOS: Рeak Hour Assessment

| Roadway | Segment | Direction | No. Lanes | Capacity (VPH) ${ }^{(1)}$ | Opening Year 2020 Without Project Conditions |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | PM Peak Hour Volume | V/C | LOS |
| Gird Road | Reche Road to Project Driveway | NB | 1 | 1,620 | 131 | 0.08 | A |
|  |  | SB | 1 | 1,620 | 121 | 0.07 | A |
|  | Project Driveway to SR-76 | NB | 1 | 1,620 | 131 | 0.08 | A |
|  |  | SB | 1 | 1,620 | 121 | 0.07 | A |

Note: Deficient roadway segment operations shown in bold
VPH = Vehicles Per Hour
LOS= Level of Service
${ }^{(1)}$ Assumes $10 \%$ of the daily LOS E capacity
V/C= Volume to Capacity Ratio

Assumes 10\% of the daily LOS E capacity


Opening Year 2020 Without Project

## 5 PROPOSED PROJECT

As part of the proposed winery, the project will include a tasting room, restaurant, and three separate event venues. The project is located on Gird Road north of SR-76 and south of Reche Road on the site of the old Fallbrook Golf Course. The proposed winery is projected to be built out and operational by Year 2020.

The tasting room and restaurant will operate from 10 AM to 6 PM and the event venues will be open from 12 PM to 10 PM. The restaurant will not serve dinner. This analysis focuses on the peak operating conditions of the winery on a typical Saturday evening.

The project site is accessed via three driveways on Gird Road. The northernmost and southernmost driveways will be improved with the project; however, they will provide emergency vehicle access only and will not be accessible for public use.

Exhibit 1 shows the proposed project draft site plan.

### 5.1 PROJECT FORECAST TRIP GENERATION

In order to calculate vehicle trips forecast to be generated by the proposed project, the operations of the various components of the winery (tasting room, restaurant, and event venues) were evaluated as a whole.

The trip generation for the proposed project is based on a blend of SANDAG (Not So) Brief Guide to Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates (2002), Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition Trip Generation Manual (2017) rates, and engineering judgement. If SANDAG or ITE trip generation rates were not applicable, trips were manually calculated based on an estimated number of guests and an assumed vehicle occupancy. Table 10 summarizes the trip generation rates.

Table 10 - Trip Generation Rates

| Land Use | Daily Trip Rate | Evening Peak Hour Rate |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total Rate | In : Out |
| Quality Restaurant ${ }^{(1)}$ | $150.00 /$ KSF | $3.08 /$ KSF | $10 \%: 90 \%$ |
| Winery $^{(2)}$ | $203.48 /$ KSF | $9.36 /$ KSF | $10 \%: 90 \%$ |
| Event Venue $^{(3)}$ | $0.8 /$ Guest | $0.40 /$ Guest | $100 \%: 0 \%$ |

${ }^{(1)}$ Source: SANDAG (Not So) Brief Guide of Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates (2002).
Adjusted base on increased activity on a weekend.
${ }^{(2)}$ Source: ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition. Land Use Code 970 for a Saturday
${ }^{(3)}$ Trip rates calculated assuming vehicle occupancy of 2.5. PM in/out splits assumes event starts during that period.

The following assumptions were used to develop the trip generation for the proposed project:

- Trip generation for the winery is based on the square footage of the tasting room and retail storage, wine storage, and restrooms.
- Reduction of $50 \%$ was applied to the restaurant use only to account for internal capture of the winery and tasting room guests.
- Each event venue has an assumed maximum capacity of 250 guests.
- Trip generation assumes all events would begin during the same hour.
- During a worst-case weekend peak hour scenario -
- Two venues would be hosting events with typical size wedding party (125 guests each)
- One venue would be hosting an event at $100 \%$ capacity ( 250 guests).

It should be noted that an internal reduction of $50 \%$ for the restaurant is considered conservatively low; the winery, tasting room, and restaurant could potentially have a higher number of shared guests.

Table 11 summarizes the project trip generation using the rates shown in Table 10. As shown, the proposed project is forecast to generate approximately 1,237 daily trips with 232 PM peak hour trips (203 in / 29 out).

Table 11 - Monserate Winery Trip Generation

| Land Use | Intensity | Daily Trips | Evening Peak Hour |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | In $:$ Out |  |
| Restaurant | 3.00 KSF | 450 | 9 | $1: 8$ |
| Winery | 3.01 KSF | 612 | 28 | $3: 25$ |
| Event Venue | 500 Guests | 400 | 200 | $200: 0$ |
| Subtotal | 1,462 | 237 | $204: 33$ |  |
| 50\% Internal Reduction ${ }^{(1)}$ | -225 | -5 | $-1:-4$ |  |
| Total Winery (Saturday) |  | 1,237 | 232 | $203: 29$ |

${ }^{(1)}$ Internal reduction applied to restaurant trips only to account for interaction with the winery.

### 5.2 TRIP DISTRIBUTION AND TRIP ASSIGNMENT OF PROPOSED PROJECT

Exhibit 7 shows the forecast trip percent distribution of the proposed project within the study area. Project traffic was distributed on the roadway network based on existing travel patterns and discussions with County staff. As shown, $35 \%$ of traffic is estimated to travel north on Gird Road towards Reche Road and $65 \%$ south on Gird Road towards SR-76.

Exhibit 8 shows the corresponding forecast assignment of daily and PM peak hour project-generated trips assuming the trip percent distribution shown in Exhibit 7.


$\qquad$

## 6 OPENING YEAR 2020 WITH PROJECT

### 6.1 OPENING YEAR 2020 WITH PROJECT TRAFFIC VOLUMES

Forecast Opening Year 2020 With Project traffic volumes are derived by adding trips forecast to be generated by the proposed project to Opening Year 2020 Without Project traffic volumes.

Exhibit 9 shows the Opening Year 2020 With Project daily and PM peak hour volumes within the study area.

### 6.2 OPENING YEAR 2020 WITH PROJECT PEAK HOUR STUDY INTERSECTION LOS

Table 12 summarizes Opening Year 2020 With Project PM peak hour level of service for all study intersections. Detailed analysis sheets are contained in Appendix E.

Table 12 - Opening Year 2020 With Project PM Peak Hour Intersection LOS

| Study Intersection | Traffic Control | Opening Year 2020 Without Project Conditions | Opening Year 2020 <br> With Project Conditions | Change in Delay (sec.) | Significant Impact? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | PM | PM |  |  |
|  |  | Delay ${ }^{1}$ - LOS | Delay ${ }^{1}$ - LOS | PM | PM |
| 1 - Live Oak Park/Gird Road / Reche Road | Signal | 17.4-B | 20.0-B | 2.6 | No |
| 2 - Gird Road / Project Driveway | OWSC | Not Studied Without Project | 10.7 - B | 10.7 | No |
| 3-Gird Road / SR-76 | Signal | 14.5-B | 17.9-B | 3.4 | No |

Note: Deficient intersection operation indicated in bold.
${ }^{1}$ Seconds of delay per vehicle.
LOS = level of service.
OWSC = One-Way Stop Control

As shown in Table 12, all study intersections are forecast to operate at an acceptable level of service (LOS D or better) during the PM peak hour on a Saturday.


Opening Year 2020 With Project
$\qquad$

### 6.3 OPENING YEAR 2020 WITH PROJECT ROADWAY SEGMENT LOS

Table 13 summarizes Opening Year 2020 With Project conditions average daily traffic level of service for all study roadway segments.

Table 13 - Opening Year 2020 With Project Roadway Segment LOS: Daily Assessment

| Roadway | Segment | Classification (No. Lanes) | LOS E Capacity | Opening Year 2020 <br> Without Project Conditions |  |  | Opening Year 2020 With Project Conditions |  |  | Significant Impact? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | ADT | V/C | LOS | ADT | V/C | LOS |  |
| Gird | Reche Road to Project Driveway | Light Collector (2.2E) | 16,200 | 3,430 | 0.21 | B | 3,860 | 0.24 | B | No |
| Road | Project Driveway to SR-76 | Light Collector (2.2E) | 16,200 | 3,430 | 0.21 | B | 4,230 | 0.26 | C | No |

Note: Deficient roadway segment operations shown in bold
ADT= Average Daily Traffic
LOS= Level of Service
V/C= Volume to Capacity Ratio

As shown in Table 13, all study roadway segments are currently operating at an acceptable level of service (LOS C or better) for Opening Year 2020 With Project conditions.

These roadway segments were further analyzed under peak hour conditions to determine if there is a capacity deficiency during the critical peak hour. As shown in Table 14, the studied roadway segments are forecast to operate at acceptable levels of service during the PM peak hour on a Saturday.

Table 14 - Opening Year With Project Conditions Roadway Segment LOS: Рeak Hour Assessment

| Road way | Segment | Direction | No. <br> Lanes | Capacity$(\mathrm{VPH})^{(1)}$ | Opening Year 2020 Without Project Conditions |  |  | Opening Year 2020 With Project Conditions |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | PM Peak Hour Volume | V/C | LOS | PM Peak Hour Volume | V/C | LOS |
| Gird <br> Road | Reche Road to Project Driveway | NB | 1 | 1,620 | 131 | 0.08 | A | 141 | 0.09 | A |
|  |  | SB | 1 | 1,620 | 121 | 0.07 | A | 192 | 0.12 | A |
|  | Project Driveway to SR-76 | NB | 1 | 1,620 | 131 | 0.08 | A | 263 | 0.16 | A |
|  |  | SB | 1 | 1,620 | 121 | 0.07 | A | 140 | 0.09 | A |

Note: Deficient roadway segment operations shown in bold
VPH = Vehicles Per Hour
LOS= Level of Service
${ }^{(1)}$ Assumes $10 \%$ of the daily LOS E capacity

## SITE ACCESS \& SIGHT DISTANCE

### 7.1 SITE ACCESS

The project is located at the previous Fallbrook Golf course and takes access immediately off of Gird Road via three existing driveways. The northernmost and southernmost driveways will be improved with the project; however, they will provide emergency vehicle access only and will not be accessible for public use. All project traffic will access the site via the central driveway that also served as the main entrance to the golf course.

This main entrance is served by a southbound deceleration lane for vehicles turning right into the project as well as a southbound acceleration lane for vehicles exiting the site heading south. The existing northbound left-turn-lane will remain.

### 7.2 SIGHT DISTANCE

At the request of County of San Diego staff, this focused traffic study also evaluates the corner sight distance requirements at the project driveway. The sight distance analysis is based on County of San Diego Public Road Standards (March 2012) methodology which utilizes sight triangles to show areas that should be clear of obstructions that might block a driver's view of potentially conflicting vehicles. This methodology provides sufficient sight distance for a stopped driver on a minor road to depart the intersection and enter the major road as well as vehicles on the major road to turn left across opposing traffic. Likewise, this methodology also provides enough time for drivers of vehicles on the major road to slow or stop if vehicles on the minor road are approaching or departing.

The sight distance needed under various assumptions of physical conditions and driver behavior is directly related to vehicle speeds and to the resultant distances traversed during perception-reaction time and braking. Specific areas, known as clear sight triangles, between a driver's eye and the approaching vehicles path of travel should be cleared of obstructions that may block a driver's view.

Based on County guidelines, the distance from the edge of the major-road travel way to the vertex of the clear sight distance must be a minimum of 10 feet measured from a height of 3.5 feet on the approach to an object height of 4.25 feet on the major road. The posted speed limit on Gird Road is 45 MPH . For the purposes of this analysis, a design speed of 45 MPH was used in both directions.

Based on Country guidelines, the required sight distance that needs to be kept free of visual obstructions (i.e. monuments, landscaping, berms, etc.) for vehicles turning left from the project driveway onto northbound Gird Road is 450 feet. In addition, any tree canopy within the sight triangle should also be maintained at a level no less than 10 feet above the roadway at all times. Due to the large horizontal curve on Gird Road north of the project driveway and a cluster of bushes on the west side of Gird Road, the available sight distance is approximately 480 feet (measured along the path of travel). South of the project driveway, there is approximately 940 feet of available sight distance. Therefore, the available sight distance at the project driveway is greater than the minimum required by County guidelines in both the north and south direction on Gird Road.

Exhibit 10 shows the required and available sight distance at the project driveway. See Appendix $\mathbf{F}$ for Sight Distance Certification.


## 8 FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study analyzes the forecast traffic conditions associated with the proposed Monserate Winery in the Fallbrook Community Planning Area of unincorporated San Diego County. As part of the proposed winery, the project will include a tasting room, restaurant, and three separate event venues. The project is located on Gird Road north of SR-76 and south of Reche Road on the site of the old Fallbrook Golf Course. The proposed winery is projected to be built out and operational by Year 2020.

The proposed project is forecast to generate approximately 1,237 net new daily trips on a typical Saturday which includes approximately 232 PM peak hour trips. This analysis focuses on the peak operating conditions of the winery on a typical Saturday evening.

This study considers the level of service operations for intersections and roadways as well as the corner sight distance requirements at the project driveway.

## Level of Service Analysis Results

## Intersection Analysis

The results of the Existing conditions analysis show that all study intersections currently operate at acceptable levels of service (LOS B or better).

The results of the Opening Year 2020 conditions show that all study intersections are forecast to operate at acceptable levels of service (LOS B or better).

With the addition of project related traffic, all study intersections continue to operate at acceptable levels of service for the Opening Year 2020 With Project conditions.

## Roadway Segment Analysis

The results of the Existing conditions analysis show that all study roadway segments currently operate at an acceptable level of service (LOS B or better) on a daily and peak hour basis.

The results of the Opening Year 2020 conditions show that all study roadway segments are forecast to operate at an acceptable level of service (LOS B or better) on a daily and peak hour basis.

With the addition of project related traffic, all study roadway segments continue to operate at acceptable levels of service on a daily and peak hour basis for the Opening Year 2020 With Project conditions.

## Sight Distance Requirements

Based on County guidelines, the required sight distance that needs to be kept free of visual obstructions (i.e. monuments, landscaping, berms, etc.) for vehicles turning left from the project driveway onto northbound Gird Road is 450 feet. In addition, any tree canopy within the sight triangle should also be maintained at a level no less than 10 feet above the roadway at all times. The available sight distance is approximately 480 feet (measured along the path of travel). South of the project driveway, there is approximately 940 feet of available sight distance. Therefore, the available sight distance at the project driveway is greater than the minimum required by County guidelines in both the north and south direction on Gird Road.
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Appendix A: FTIA Scoping Agreement
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## SCOPING AGREEMENT FOR FOCUSED TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

This letter acknowledges the County of San Diego Planning and Development Services Department has requested that a focused traffic impact analysis be performed for the following project. The analysis must follow the latest County Guidelines for Determining Significance - Transportation and Traffic (August 24, 2011) and Guidelines for Transportation Impact Studies in the San Diego Region (draft-January 22, 2019).
Case No. $\quad$ PDS2018-MUP74-165W1
Project Name: Monserate Winery
Project Location: Fallbrook, CA
Project Description: Winery, Restaurant, Event Venue

|  | Consultant | Developer |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Name: | Bob Davis \& Dawn Wilson - Michael Baker International | GIRD VALLEY, INC. |
| Address: | 5050 Avenida Encinas Ste 260 | 1492 Rainbow Valley Blvd. |
|  | Carlsbad, CA 92008 | Fallbrook,CA 92028 |
| Telephone: | (760) 603-6244 |  |

Fax:

## A. Trip Generation Source: (SANDAG Guide \& ITE 10th Edition), See Attachment A

| Current GP Land Use | Open Space Recreation |  | Proposed Land Use | $\underline{\text { Winery, Restaurant, and }}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Current Zoning | A70 Limited Agricultural Use |  |  | Proposed Zoning | | Event Venues |
| :--- |


|  | In | Out | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Midday Trips | 114 | 63 | 178 |
| PM Trips | 200 | 0 | 200 |
| Daily Trips | 619 | 618 | 1,237 |


| Internal Trip Allowance | $\boxed{Y e s}$ | $\square \mathrm{No}$ | $(\underline{50 \%}$ Trip Discount- Midday Only. See Attachment A) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Pass-By Trip Allowance | $\square$ Yes | $\boxtimes$ No | $(\underline{0 \quad} \%$ Trip Discount) |

B. Trip Geographic Distribution: N $35 \%$ S $65 \% \quad$ E 0 0 $\% \quad$ W 0 \% (Assume all traffic uses Gird Road to access project)

## C. Background Traffic

Project Completion Year: 2020
NOTE: New traffic counts will be conducted for segments \& intersections

Other Area Projects to be included: None were identified that generate a significant amount of traffic on Saturday in the afternoon/evening peak trip generation period for the Winery \& Event Venue project

## D. Study Scenarios:

Traffic Impact Analysis will include the following study scenarios:

- Existing Conditions
- Project Opening Year Plus Ambient Growth Rate Without Project (PM Peak Hour)
- Project Opening Year Plus Ambient Growth Rate With Project (PM Peak Hour)
E. Long-Range/Build-out Study: Does this project require a Build-Out Study: $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No Model/Forecast methodology: N.A.
F. Study intersections: (NOTE: Subject to revision after other projects, trip generation and distribution are determined, or comments from other agencies.) (Attachment B shows study intersections.)

1. Gird Road/SR-76 (Existing Signal Control)
2. Gird Road/ Project Driveway (Side Street Stop Control)
3. Gird Road/Reche Road (Existing Signal Control)
(All project driveways are driveways that existed with the previous golf course use)
G. Study Roadway Segments: (Attachment B shows study intersections.)
A. Gird Road between Reche Road and Project Driveway
B. Gird Road between Project Driveway and SR-76

Projected roadway segment volumes will be compared to both daily capacities and directional peak hour capacities.

## H. Other Jurisdictional Impacts

Is this project within any other Agency’s Sphere of Influence or one-mile radius of boundaries? $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No If so, name of City Jurisdiction: N.A.

## I. Site Plan [see Attachment C]

J. Site Specific issues to be addressed in the Study in addition to the standard analysis.

1. Check corner sight distance at the project driveway

| Recommended by: | Approved Scoping Agreement: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bob Davis | 4/10/19 |  |  |
| Consultants Representative | Date | County of San Diego <br> Planning and Development Services Department | Date |

Scoping Agreement Submitted on: 3/28/19
Resubmitted on: 4/10/19

## Attachment A

## Monserate Winery Trip Generation Assumptions

Daily trips expected to be generated by the proposed Monserate Winery are based on the assumptions outlined below. The winery also includes a tasting room, restaurant and 3 separate event venues. The tasting room and restaurant are open until 5 o'clock PM and does not serve dinner.

Monserate Winery Assumptions:

- Trip generation for the winery is based on the square footage of the tasting room and retail storage, wine storage, and restrooms.
- Reduction of $50 \%$ applied to the restaurant use to account for internal capture of the winery and tasting room guests during the midday only.
- Each event venue has a maximum capacity of 250 guests.
- Trip generation assumes all events would begin during the same hour.
- During a worst-case midday scenario, the restaurant and tasting room would be open and one venue would be hosting an event with a typica size wedding party ( 125 guests).
- During a worst-case evening scenario -
- Two venues would be hosting events with typical size wedding party (125 guests each)
- One venue would be hosting an event at $100 \%$ capacity ( 250 guests).

The assumption of an internal reduction of $50 \%$ for restaurant trips is considered conservatively low. The winery, tasting room, and restaurant could potentially have a higher number of shared guests.

As shown in the following tables, the winery would generate 1,237 daily trips on an average Saturday. For a worst case-scenario during the midday peak hour, the winery is expected to generate 178 peak hour trips (114 in / 63 out). During the evening peak hour for a worst-case scenario, the winery is expected to generate 200 peak hour trips ( 200 in / 0 out). Therefore, this focused traffic study will concentrate on the PM peak hour traffic conditions.

Trip Generation Rates (Saturday)

| Land Use | Daily Trip Rate | Midday Peak Hour Rate |  |  |  | Evening Peak Hour Rate |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total Rate | In | . | Out |  | l Rate | In | : | Out |
| Quality Restaurant ${ }^{(1)}$ | 150.00 / KSF | 12.00 / KSF | 70\% | : | 30\% | 0.00 | / KSF | 0\% | : | 0\% |
| Winery ${ }^{(2)}$ | 203.48 / KSF | 36.50 / KSF | 47\% | : | 53\% | 0 | / KSF | 0\% | : | 0\% |
| Event Venue ${ }^{(3)}$ | 0.8 / Guest | 0.40 / Guest | 100\% | : | 0\% | 0.40 | / Guest | 100\% | : | 0\% |

${ }^{(1)}$ Source: SANDAG (Not So) Brief Guide of Vehicular Traffic Generation Rates (2002). Adjusted base on increased activity on a weekend.
${ }^{(2)}$ Source: ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition. Land Use Code 970 for a Saturday
${ }^{(3)}$ Trip rates calculated assuming vehicle occupancy of 2.5. Midday \& PM in/out splits assumes event starts during that period.

| Trip Generation (Saturday) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Intensity |  |
| Restaurant | 3.00 KSF | 450 |
| Winery | 3.01 KSF | 612 |
| Event Venue | $500 \quad$ Guests | 400 |
| Subtotal |  |  |
| 50\% Internal Reduction ${ }^{(1)}$ |  | 1,462 |
| Total Winery (Saturday) |  |  |

${ }^{(1)}$ Internal reduction applied to restaurant trips only to account for interaction with the winery.

Trip Generation (Saturday - Midday Peak Hour)

| Land Use | Intensity | Midday Peak Hour |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
|  |  | Total Volume | In | $:$ | Out |
| Restaurant | 3.00 | KSF | 36 | 25 | $:$ |
| Winery | 3.01 | KSF | 110 | 52 | $:$ |
| Event Venue | 125 Guests | 50 | 50 | $:$ | 0 |
| Subtotal | 196 | 127 | $:$ | 69 |  |
| 50\% Internal Reduction ${ }^{(1)}$ |  | -18 | -13 | $:$ | -6 |
| Total Winery (Saturday) |  | 178 | 114 | $:$ | 63 |

${ }^{(1)}$ Internal reduction applied to restaurant trips only to account for interaction with the winery.

Trip Generation (Saturday - Evening Peak Hour)

| Land Use | Intensity | Evening Peak Hour |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | Total Volume | In | $:$ | Out |
| Restaurant | 3.00 | KSF | 0 | 0 | $:$ |
| Winery | 3.01 | KSF | 0 | 0 | $:$ |
| Event Venue | $500 \quad$ Guests | 200 | 200 | $:$ | 0 |
| Subtotal | 200 | 200 | $:$ | 0 |  |
| 50\% Internal Reduction ${ }^{(1)}$ | 0 | 0 | $:$ | 0 |  |
| Total Winery (Saturday) |  | 200 | 200 | $:$ | 0 |

${ }^{(1)}$ Internal reduction applied to restaurant trips only to account for interaction with the winery.
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## Appendix B: Existing Count Data
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VOLUME
Gird Rd Bet. Laketree Dr \& Casablanca Way

Day: Saturday
Date: 4/13/2019

City: Fallbrook
Project \#: CA19_4181_001


National Data \& Surveying ServicesIntersection Turning Movement Count


## Gird Rd \& Reche Rd

## Peak Hour Turning Movement Count



National Data \& Surveying ServicesIntersection Turning Movement Count


## Gird Rd \& Hwy 76

## Peak Hour Turning Movement Count
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## Appendix C: <br> Existing Synchro Worksheets
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|  | $\prime$ |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\leftarrow$ |  | 4 | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{1}$ |  |  | \$ |  |  | \$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 8 | 321 | 96 | 35 | 230 | 5 | 83 | 2 | 32 | 10 | 2 | 22 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 8 | 321 | 96 | 35 | 230 | 5 | 83 | 2 | 32 | 10 | 2 | 22 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 10 | 396 | 119 | 38 | 253 | 5 | 91 | 2 | 35 | 13 | 3 | 29 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.77 | 0.77 | 0.77 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 642 | 498 | 150 | 349 | 358 | 7 | 253 | 3 | 45 | 138 | 30 | 119 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.11 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1781 | 1381 | 415 | 1781 | 1828 | 36 | 1080 | 24 | 415 | 325 | 282 | 1099 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 10 | 0 | 515 | 38 | 0 | 258 | 128 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 1781 | 0 | 1796 | 1781 | 0 | 1864 | 1519 | 0 | 0 | 1706 | 0 | 0 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.2 | 0.0 | 11.6 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 5.8 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 0.2 | 0.0 | 11.6 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 5.8 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.23 | 1.00 |  | 0.02 | 0.71 |  | 0.27 | 0.29 |  | 0.64 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 642 | 0 | 648 | 349 | 0 | 365 | 301 | 0 | 0 | 287 | 0 | 0 |
| VIC Ratio(X) | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.80 | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.71 | 0.43 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.16 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 1069 | 0 | 1078 | 701 | 0 | 734 | 790 | 0 | 0 | 847 | 0 | 0 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(I) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 9.2 | 0.0 | 12.9 | 14.9 | 0.0 | 16.9 | 19.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 18.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%oile BackOfQ( $50 \%$ ),veh/ln | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 9.3 | 0.0 | 15.2 | 15.0 | 0.0 | 19.4 | 20.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 18.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | A | A | B | B | A | B | C | A | A | B | A | A |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 525 |  |  | 296 |  |  | 128 |  |  | 45 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 15.1 |  |  | 18.8 |  |  | 20.4 |  |  | 18.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs |  | 2 |  | 4 |  | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $G+Y+R \mathrm{c}$ ), $s$ |  | 21.1 |  | 10.1 |  | 13.7 |  | 10.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s |  | 4.9 |  | * 5.3 |  | 4.9 |  | 5.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s |  | 27.0 |  | *21 |  | 17.7 |  | 20.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s |  | 13.6 |  | 3.1 |  | 7.8 |  | 5.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s |  | 2.7 |  | 0.1 |  | 1.0 |  | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrr Delay |  |  | 17.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes

* HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier.

|  | $\rangle$ |  |  | 7 |  |  |  | $\dagger$ |  | * | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | * | 个 $\uparrow$ |  | \% | 个 $\uparrow$ | F |  |  |  | \% |  | F |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 95 | 1121 | 0 | 2 | 1076 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 110 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 95 | 1121 | 0 | 2 | 1076 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 110 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 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 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  |  |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1870 | 1870 | 0 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |  |  |  | 1870 | 0 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 101 | 1193 | 0 | 2 | 1266 | 85 |  |  |  | 44 | 0 | 136 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.85 | 0.85 |  |  |  | 0.81 | 0.92 | 0.81 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  | 2 | , | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 125 | 2671 | 0 | 5 | 2387 | 1065 |  |  |  | 187 |  | 166 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.07 | 0.75 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.67 | 0.67 |  |  |  | 0.10 | 0.00 | 0.10 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1781 | 3647 | 0 | 1781 | 3554 | 1585 |  |  |  | 1781 | 0 | 1585 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 101 | 1193 | 0 | 2 | 1266 | 85 |  |  |  | 44 | 0 | 136 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/n | 1781 | 1777 | 0 | 1781 | 1777 | 1585 |  |  |  | 1781 | 0 | 1585 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 6.7 | 15.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 21.8 | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.7 | 0.0 | 10.1 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 6.7 | 15.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 21.8 | 2.2 |  |  |  | 2.7 | 0.0 | 10.1 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 125 | 2671 | 0 | 5 | 2387 | 1065 |  |  |  | 187 | 0 | 166 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.81 | 0.45 | 0.00 | 0.42 | 0.53 | 0.08 |  |  |  | 0.24 | 0.00 | 0.82 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 148 | 2671 | 0 | 74 | 2387 | 1065 |  |  |  | 594 | 0 | 528 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 55.0 | 5.6 | 0.0 | 59.7 | 10.0 | 6.8 |  |  |  | 49.3 | 0.0 | 52.6 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 23.6 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 49.1 | 0.8 | 0.1 |  |  |  | 0.6 | 0.0 | 9.5 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 3.7 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 7.1 | 0.7 |  |  |  | 1.2 | 0.0 | 9.0 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay (d),s/veh | 78.6 | 6.1 | 0.0 | 108.8 | 10.9 | 7.0 |  |  |  | 49.9 | 0.0 | 62.1 |
| LnGrp LOS | E | A | A | F | B | A |  |  |  | D | A | E |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 1294 |  |  | 1353 |  |  |  |  |  | 180 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 11.8 |  |  | 10.8 |  |  |  |  |  | 59.1 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |  | E |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $G+Y+R \mathrm{c}$ ), $s$ | 4.8 | 96.6 |  | 18.6 | 14.4 | 87.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $Y+R \mathrm{R}$ ), s | 4.5 | 6.4 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 5.0 | 58.1 |  | 40.0 | 10.0 | 51.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+1), s | 2.1 | 17.1 |  | 12.1 | 8.7 | 23.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.0 | 9.4 |  | 0.5 | 0.0 | 9.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl DelayHCM 6th LOS |  |  | 14.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Appendix D:

Opening Year 2020
Michael Baker
IN TERNATIONAL
Without Project Conditions
Synchro Worksheets
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## Notes

* HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

Appendix E:

Michael Baker
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|  | $y$ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | 4 | 4 |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ |  |  | \$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 8 | 327 | 139 | 66 | 235 | 5 | 91 | 2 | 37 | 10 | 2 | 22 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 8 | 327 | 139 | 66 | 235 | 5 | 91 | 2 | 37 | 10 | 2 | 22 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 10 | 404 | 172 | 73 | 258 | 5 | 100 | 2 | 41 | 13 | 3 | 29 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.77 | 0.77 | 0.77 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 689 | 481 | 205 | 344 | 353 | 7 | 246 | 5 | 52 | 127 | 38 | 132 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.12 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1781 | 1245 | 530 | 1781 | 1829 | 35 | 1033 | 44 | 433 | 287 | 315 | 1091 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 10 | 0 | 576 | 73 | 0 | 263 | 143 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 0 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 1781 | 0 | 1775 | 1781 | 0 | 1864 | 1510 | 0 | 0 | 1693 | 0 | 0 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.2 | 0.0 | 14.9 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 6.7 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 0.2 | 0.0 | 14.9 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 6.7 | 4.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.30 | 1.00 |  | 0.02 | 0.70 |  | 0.29 | 0.29 |  | 0.64 |
| Lane Grp Cap (c), veh/h | 689 | 0 | 686 | 344 | 0 | 360 | 304 | 0 | 0 | 297 | 0 | 0 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.84 | 0.21 | 0.00 | 0.73 | 0.47 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 953 | 0 | 949 | 625 | 0 | 654 | 705 | 0 | 0 | 757 | 0 | 0 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 9.5 | 0.0 | 14.1 | 17.1 | 0.0 | 19.1 | 21.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.9 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ( $50 \%$ ),veh/In | 0.1 | 0.0 | 5.4 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 9.6 | 0.0 | 19.0 | 17.4 | 0.0 | 22.0 | 22.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| LnGrp LOS | A | A | B | B | A | C | C | A | A | C | A | A |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 586 |  |  | 336 |  |  | 143 |  |  | 45 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 18.8 |  |  | 21.0 |  |  | 22.5 |  |  | 20.3 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs |  | 2 |  | 4 |  | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), $s$ |  | 24.4 |  | 11.4 |  | 14.6 |  | 11.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s |  | 4.9 |  | *5.3 |  | 4.9 |  | 5.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s |  | 27.0 |  | * 21 |  | 17.7 |  | 20.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s |  | 16.9 |  | 3.2 |  | 8.7 |  | 6.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s |  | 2.6 |  | 0.1 |  | 1.1 |  | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrr Delay |  |  | 20.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Notes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

* HCM 6th computational engine requires equal clearance times for the phases crossing the barrier.

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



HCM 6th Signalized Intersection Summary
3: SR-76 \& Gird Road
04/19/2019

|  | 3 |  | $\geqslant$ | 7 |  | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | $p$ |  | $\frac{1}{1}$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 中4 |  | ${ }^{1}$ | 中4 | 7 |  |  |  | ${ }^{1}$ |  | F |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 158 | 1143 | 0 | 2 | 1098 | 144 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 0 | 121 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 158 | 1143 | 0 | 2 | 1098 | 144 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 0 | 121 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  |  |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1870 | 1870 | 0 | 1870 | 1870 | 1870 |  |  |  | 1870 | 0 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 168 | 1216 | 0 | 2 | 1292 | 169 |  |  |  | 58 | 0 | 149 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.85 | 0.85 |  |  |  | 0.81 | 0.92 | 0.81 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 193 | 2640 | 0 | 5 | 2220 | 990 |  |  |  | 202 | 0 | 180 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.11 | 0.74 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.62 | 0.62 |  |  |  | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.11 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1781 | 3647 | 0 | 1781 | 3554 | 1585 |  |  |  | 1781 | 0 | 1585 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 168 | 1216 | 0 | 2 | 1292 | 169 |  |  |  | 58 | 0 | 149 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s), veh/h/ln | 1781 | 1777 | 0 | 1781 | 1777 | 1585 |  |  |  | 1781 | 0 | 1585 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 11.1 | 16.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 25.7 | 5.4 |  |  |  | 3.6 | 0.0 | 11.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 11.1 | 16.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 25.7 | 5.4 |  |  |  | 3.6 | 0.0 | 11.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 0.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 193 | 2640 | 0 | 5 | 2220 | 990 |  |  |  | 202 | 0 | 180 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.87 | 0.46 | 0.00 | 0.42 | 0.58 | 0.17 |  |  |  | 0.29 | 0.00 | 0.83 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 193 | 2640 | 0 | 74 | 2220 | 990 |  |  |  | 594 | 0 | 528 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(I) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |  |  | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 52.7 | 6.0 | 0.0 | 59.7 | 13.3 | 9.5 |  |  |  | 48.7 | 0.0 | 52.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 32.2 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 49.1 | 1.1 | 0.4 |  |  |  | 0.8 | 0.0 | 9.3 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/In | 6.5 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 9.0 | 1.7 |  |  |  | 1.6 | 0.0 | 9.8 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 84.9 | 6.6 | 0.0 | 108.8 | 14.4 | 9.8 |  |  |  | 49.5 | 0.0 | 61.3 |
| LnGrp LOS | F | A | A | F | B | A |  |  |  | D | A | E |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 1384 |  |  | 1463 |  |  |  |  |  | 207 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 16.1 |  |  | 14.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 58.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | B |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |  | E |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s | 4.8 | 95.6 |  | 19.6 | 19.0 | 81.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s | 4.5 | 6.4 |  | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 5.0 | 58.1 |  | 40.0 | 13.0 | 48.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s | 2.1 | 18.0 |  | 13.0 | 13.1 | 27.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.0 | 9.7 |  | 0.6 | 0.0 | 9.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay |  |  | 17.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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Department of Public Works
County of San Diego
Traffic Engineering
5510 Overland Ave., Suite 410
San Diego, CA 92123

## RE: Sight Distance Certification - Monserate Winery Main Gate

I certify that there is 450 feet of unobstructed intersectional sight distance in the northbound direction from the Monserate Winery main gate along Gird Road and 450 feet of unobstructed intersectional sight distance in the southbound direction from the Monserate Winery main gate along Gird Road measured in accordance with the methodology described in Table 5 of the March 2012 County of San Diego Public Road Standards.

These sight distances meet the required intersectional Sight Distance requirement of 450 feet as interpolated from Table 5 based on a speed of 45 mph , which I have verified to be the higher of the prevailing speed ( 45 mph ) and the minimum design speed ( 40 mph ) of the road classification (Light Collector 2.2E).

I have exercised responsible charge for the certification as defined in Section 6703 of the Professional Engineers Act of the California Business and Professions Code.

Sincerely,


Jay Sullivan, PE


