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Dear Mr. Ramallo,

David Evans and Associates, Inc. is pleased to submit this Traffic Impact Analysis report for your Baker Boulevard Commercial Center Project. The proposed project consists of convenience store with gas station and a stand-alone coffee shop with a drive-through window located in the unincorporated community of Baker in the County of San Bernardino.

This report was prepared in accordance with the County of San Bernardino's Traffic Impact Analysis Guidelines for Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and Level of Service Assessment (LOS) published in July 2019 and meets the county's requirements for analyzing intersection level of service to identify consistency with the county's General Plan policies and standards.

This report also summarizes the VMT screening assessment we prepared and submitted with the scoping agreement submitted to the county and Caltrans in August of 2021 and takes into account the comments we received from Caltrans on that document.

We are pleased to be of assistance to you in processing and obtaining approval for the project. If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact me at 909-912-7304.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVID EVANS AND ASSOCIATES, INC.

Janes M. Daisa, P.E.
Seniur Project Manager / Associate
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## 1 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### 1.1 San Bernardino County General Plan Consistency Requirements

San Bernardino County's General Plan includes policies that address level of service (LOS) and identifies transportation facility LOS standards the County maintains. Although environmental impacts under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) have replaced LOS with Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) as the most appropriate measures of transportation impacts, San Bernardino County still requires new development projects to prepare traffic analyses that demonstrate that the development conforms with, or can mitigate to, General Plan level of service policies and standards.

According to San Bernardino County's Transportation Impact Study Guidelines (July 2019), the minimum acceptable intersection level of service for the County's desert regions as described in the current San Bernardino County General Plan, is LOS D. The criteria for identifying operational deficiencies at unsignalized intersections are shown in Table 1-1.

Table 1-1: Criteria for Determining General Plan Level of Service Consistency at Unsignalized Intersections
At an unsignalized intersection, an operational improvement would be required if the analysis determines that the proposed project causes or contributes to conditions described in criterion (A) or criterion (B) and (C).

| (A) | (B) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

If the analysis of a development project meets the criteria above, the transportation impact study needs to identify measures that will achieve the following:

- Measures applied to unsignalized intersections impacted under Criteria A should improve peak hour level of service to a LOS D or better or,
- Measures applied to unsignalized intersections impacted under Criteria B and C should reduce delay (and associated LOS) to at least pre-project levels.


### 1.2 Project Description

The proposed project is comprised of highway-oriented land uses including a convenience store / gas station, and a drive-through coffee shop intended to serve the public traveling on Interstate 15 (I-15) between southern California and Las Vegas, Nevada, and tourist traffic destined to Death Valley National Park traveling on State Route 127. Most of the businesses on Baker Blvd serve the tourism and traveler convenience industry.

The peak hours of traffic flow on the l-15 freeway (northbound on a Friday afternoon and southbound on a Sunday afternoon) correspond to the peak flow of visitors to/from Las Vegas each weekend. Therefore, the Friday and Sunday peaks were selected as the peak hours of analysis in this study.

The project is estimated to generate about 19,000 vehicle trips per day and about 1,500 trips in each of the Friday and Sunday peak hours. Most of the trips generated by the project ( $80 \%$ ) are estimated to be diverted from I-15 and SR 127. The project will also capture a small number of trips that are passing by the site on Baker Blvd.

### 1.3 Summary of General Plan Consistency Impacts at Baker Blvd and Death Valley Rd (SR 127)

Intersections analyzed in this study include Baker Blvd and Death Valley Rd (SR 127), Baker Blvd and the I-15 southbound and northbound ramp intersections, and the project's two driveways accessing Baker Blvd. The only public street intersection in which the project causes and/or contributes to a deficient level of service is Baker Blvd and Death Valley Rd (SR 127).

Table 1-2 presents the application of the level of service deficiency criteria to the intersection of Baker Blvd and Death Valley Rd (SR 127) for all project scenarios.

The analysis finds that the proposed project causes a project-specific deficiency to the level of service of the intersection of Baker Blvd and Death Valley Rd (SR 127) under the existing + project scenario and contributes to the near-term (background + project conditions) and long-term (future 2040 + project) cumulative level of service deficiencies.

Table 1-2: Baker Blvd and Death Valley Rd (SR 127) Level of Service Deficiency Assessment

| Scenario | Criteria for General Plan LOS Deficiency Impacts (Refer to Table 1-1) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A | B | C1 | C2 |
|  | The addition of project traffic causes an intersection to degrade from an LOS D or better to a LOS E or worse. | The project adds 5.0 seconds or more of delay to an intersection that is already projected to operate without project traffic at an LOS E or F. | The project adds ten (10) or more peak hour trips to any minor street approach of the unsignalized intersection being analyzed. | The intersection, with the addition of project traffic, meets the MUTCD peak hour traffic signal warrant. |
| Existing + Project Conditions | Friday Peak: Yes Sunday Peak: Yes | Friday Peak: No Sunday Peak: No | Not Applicable | Not Applicable |
| Background + <br> Project Conditions <br> (Near-Term) | Friday Peak: Yes Sunday Peak: Yes | Friday Peak: No Sunday Peak: No |  |  |
| Future (2040) + Project Conditions (Long-Term) | Friday Peak: Yes <br> Sunday Peak: Yes | Friday Peak: No <br> Sunday Peak: No |  |  |
| [1] A traffic signal warrant analysis is not required as part of the county's deficiency criteria (C2) because the project did not satisfy criteria B. In all scenarios, the without project conditions operated at a LOS D or better, and the addition of project traffic degraded the level of service to LOS E or F, clearly satisfying criteria A. |  |  |  |  |

### 1.4 Intersection Warrant Analysis for all Study Scenarios

Most traffic signal warrants are not applicable to the intersection of Baker Blvd and Death Valley Rd (SR 127) because the intersection has multi-way stop control. Warrants are usually applied to side street stop-controlled intersections. The project did, however, satisfy criteria A in each of the scenarios-a condition requiring intersection improvements that would improve with project conditions to a level of service of $D$ or better. Installation of a traffic signal is a potential improvement but at least one traffic signal warrant must be satisfied for it to be considered. Multi-way stop control is often used as an interim form of traffic control when a signal is warranted but not yet fully funded.

## Criteria Justifying the Current Multi-Way Stop Control at Baker Blvd and Death Valley Rd (SR 127)

The fact that the intersection of Baker Blvd and Death Valley Rd (SR 127) currently has multi-way stop control indicates that the intersection wouldn't operate satisfactorily with side street stop control in the past. Refer to the criteria summarized below used in justifying the installation of multi-way stop control from the California MUTCD:
A. Where traffic control signals are justified, the multi-way stop is an interim measure that can be installed quickly to control traffic while arrangements are being made for the installation of the traffic control signal.
B. Five or more reported crashes in a 12-month period that are susceptible to correction by a multi-way stop installation. Such crashes include right-turn and left-turn collisions as well as right-angle collisions.
C. Minimum volumes:

1. The vehicular volume entering the intersection from the major street approaches (total of both approaches) averages at least 300 vehicles per hour for any 8 hours of an average day; and
2. The combined vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle volume entering the intersection from the minor street approaches (total of both approaches) averages at least 200 units per hour for the same 8 hours, with an average delay to minor-street vehicular traffic of at least 30 seconds per vehicle during the highest hour; but
3. If the 85 th-percentile approach speed of the major-street traffic exceeds 40 mph , the minimum vehicular volume warrants are 70 percent of the values provided in Items 1 and 2.
D. Where no single criterion is satisfied, but where Criteria B, C.1, and C. 2 are all satisfied to 80 percent of the minimum values. Criterion C. 3 is excluded from this condition.

The intersection of Baker Blvd and Death Valley Rd (SR 127) may have been identified for signalization in the past and the county needs to confirm if it has collected fees from new development in Baker specifically for funding a traffic signal at this intersection.

## Application of Traffic Signal Warrants for all Study Scenarios

Signal warrants are applied to the all-way-stop-controlled (AWSC) intersections Baker Blvd at Death Valley Rd (SR 127) and Death Valley Rd (SR 127) at I-15 NB Ramps. Baker Blvd as the major street and Death Valley Rd as the minor street. Death Valley Rd as the major street and I-15 NB Off-Ramp as the minor street. The signal warrants were also applied to the side-street-stop-controlled (SSSC) intersection of Death Valley Rd (SR 127) at I-15 SB Ramps. Death Valley Rd as the major street and I-15 SB Off-Ramp as the stop controlled minor street.

Under these assumptions, warrant 3 (peak hour) and warrant 7 (crash experience) were evaluated at the intersections of Baker Blvd and Death Valley Rd (SR 127), Death Valley Rd (SR 127) at I-15 SB Ramps, and Death Valley Rd (SR 127) at I-15 NB Ramps. These warrants are included as standards in the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CA MUTCD, 2014). Table 1-3 summarizes the traffic signal warrant analysis criteria to the intersection of Baker Blvd and Death Valley Rd (SR 127) for all study scenarios.

Table 1-3: Baker Blvd and Death Valley Rd (SR 127) Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis

| Warrant | Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Warrant 3 (Peak Hour) |  |  |  |  | Warrant 7 (Crash Experience) |
|  | Part A |  |  |  | Part B |  |
|  | All criteria 1,2, and 3 below must be satisfied for any four consecutive 15 minute periods |  |  |  | The plotted point falls above the applicable curve in Figure 4C-S (See Appendix D) | All Parts Must be Satisfied |
|  | 1. Total Delay | 2. Volume on minor street | 3. Total Entering volume | All Satisfied |  |  |
| Existing Conditions | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Existing + Project Conditions | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Not Applicable <br> [1] |
| Background Conditions | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes |  |
| Project Conditions | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |
| Future (2040) Conditions | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes |  |
| Future (2040) + Project Conditions | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |
| Notes: <br> [1] The crash experience in warrant 7 looks at historical crashes over a three-to-five-year period and there is no accurate way to forecast future crashes. <br> Source of warrant procedures: California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CA MUTCD), 2014 Edition (Section 4C. 01 Studies and Factors for Justifying Traffic Control Signals). <br> Source of crash data: California Highway Patrol Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) Reports. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Traffic signal warrant 3, part A is satisfied under project conditions in each scenario, and part B is satisfied under every condition in each scenario. The traffic signal warrant analysis worksheets are provided in Appendix $\mathbf{D}$.

Table 1-4 summarizes the traffic signal warrant analysis criteria to the intersection of Death Valley Rd (SR 127) and I-15 SB Ramps for all study scenarios.

Table 1-4: Death Valley Rd (SR 127) and I-15 SB Ramps Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis

| Warrant | Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Warrant 3 (Peak Hour) |  |  |  |  | Warrant 7 (Crash Experience) |
|  | Part A |  |  |  | Part B |  |
|  | All criteria 1,2, and 3 below must be satisfied for any four consecutive 15 minute periods |  |  |  | The plotted point falls above the applicable curve in Figure 4C-S (See Appendix D) | All Parts Must be Satisfied |
|  | 1. Total Delay | 2. Volume on minor street | 3. Total <br> Entering volume | $\begin{gathered} \text { All } \\ \text { Satisfied } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Existing Conditions | No | Yes | No | No | No | No |
| Existing + Project Conditions | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Not Applicable <br> [1] |
| Background Conditions | No | Yes | No | No | No |  |
| Project Conditions | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes |  |
| Future (2040) Conditions | No | Yes | No | No | No |  |
| Future (2040) + Project Conditions | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes |  |
| Notes: <br> [1] The crash experience in warrant 7 looks at historical crashes over a three-to-five-year period and there is no accurate way to forecast future crashes. <br> Source of warrant procedures: California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CA MUTCD), 2014 Edition (Section 4C. 01 Studies and Factors for Justifying Traffic Control Signals). <br> Source of crash data: California Highway Patrol Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) Reports. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Traffic signal warrant 3, part B is satisfied under project conditions in each scenario. Warrant 3 is satisfied based on approach volume and not the total delay experienced by traffic on the minor stop-controlled approaches. To satisfy the delay element of the warrant, the total delay experienced by the stop-controlled approach must exceed five vehicle hours for a two-lane approach. This part of the warrant is not satisfied. The traffic signal warrant analysis worksheets are provided in Appendix D.

Table 1-5 summarizes the traffic signal warrant analysis criteria to the intersection of Death Valley Rd (SR 127) and I-15 NB Ramps for all study scenarios.

Table 1-5: Death Valley Rd (SR 127) and I-15 NB Ramps Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis

| Warrant | Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Warrant 3 (Peak Hour) |  |  |  |  | Warrant 7 (Crash Experience) |
|  | Part A |  |  |  | Part B |  |
|  | All criteria 1,2, and 3 below must be satisfied for any four consecutive 15 minute periods |  |  |  | The plotted point falls above the applicable curve in Figure 4C-S (See Appendix D) | All Parts Must be Satisfied |
|  | 1. Total Delay | 2. Volume on minor street | 3. Total <br> Entering volume | All Satisfied |  |  |
| Existing Conditions | No | Yes | No | No | No | No |
| Existing + Project Conditions | No | Yes | No | No | No | Not Applicable [1] |
| Background Conditions | No | Yes | No | No | No |  |
| Project Conditions | No | Yes | No | No | No |  |
| Future (2040) Conditions | No | Yes | No | No | No |  |
| Future (2040) + Project Conditions | No | Yes | No | No | No |  |
| Notes: <br> [1] The crash experience in warrant 7 looks at historical crashes over a three-to-five-year period and there is no accurate way to forecast future crashes. <br> Source of warrant procedures: California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CA MUTCD), 2014 Edition (Section 4C. 01 Studies and Factors for Justifying Traffic Control Signals). <br> Source of crash data: California Highway Patrol Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) Reports. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Traffic signal warrants are not satisfied for all study scenarios. The traffic signal warrant analysis worksheets are provided in Appendix D.

### 1.5 Project Access Level of Service Assessment

## Project Access

Access to the proposed project is provided by two 40 -foot-wide driveways on Baker Blvd. Driveway " A " is located at the southwesterly edge of the project's property. Driveway " B " is located about 180 feet south and west of the project's northeasterly property edge and is separated from Driveway "A" by approximately 337 feet.

## Baker Blvd's Planning Context and Design Standards

Baker Blvd is part of San Bernardino County's Maintained Road System (CMRS) with a right of way of 104 feet and a functional classification code of 13 , according to the County Public Works Department's web map of "Roads Maintained by the County Department of Public Works - Transportation". This right of way is associated with the county's Master Plan of Highways in the Arterial Roads category as a Major Highway (104-foot RW and 80-foot curb separation). See the street section below for the county's standard for a Major Highway.


County standard plan 101 (Major Highway). Ultimately, Baker Blvd will have two lanes in each direction and a median turn lane.
The current paved width of Baker Blvd along the project's frontage is about 80 feet measured from the face of curb on the south side of the street (along the Del Taco restaurant frontage) to the edge of pavement on the north side of the street. The north side of the street is unimproved lacking curb, gutter, and sidewalk. This width is consistent with the curb separation width requirements of a Major Highway classification in the County's Master Plan. Only a portion of the existing pavement is currently used by through traffic on Baker Blvd. Pavement markings are used demarcate a 12 -foot southbound lane and 25 feet of pavement in the northbound direction operating as a single lane.

## Driveway Level of Service

In the Friday and Sunday peak hours, both Driveway "A" and Driveway "B" operate at LOS E or LOS F under all scenarios. The delay experienced by the worse movement exiting Driveway " $A$ " (southbound left turn) exceeds 300 seconds per vehicle in both the Friday and Sunday peak hours. Driveway "B"'s Friday peak hour experiences a similar level of delay, but the Sunday peak hour delay is about 35 seconds per vehicle (LOS E).

### 1.6 Recommendations

Measures to Improve Level of Service Deficiency at Baker Blvd and Death Valley Rd (SR 127)
Implementing the following improvements at the intersection of Baker Blvd and Death Valley Rd will change the deficient LOS in all scenarios from a LOS E or F to a LOS D or better.

1. Install traffic signal and widen intersection for additional lanes
a. Traffic signal is proposed to be an 8-phase signal (providing protected left-turn phasing with overlap in the east-west and north-south directions).
b. Widening of the south leg (Death Valley Rd (SR 127)) to accommodate exclusive left and right turn lanes
c. Realignment and widening of the north leg (Death Valley Rd (SR 127) to accommodate an exclusive left turn lane.
d. Set back of the east leg (Baker Blvd) to accommodate the widening of the Death Valley Rd (SR 127) approaches.

A traffic signal at the intersection of Baker Blvd and Death Valley Rd would improve the level of service to a LOS C or better under project conditions in all scenarios

The installation of the traffic signal and the reconfiguring of approach lanes should be initiated by the County and Caltrans. The development will pay its fair share of the cost of these improvements.

## Project Traffic Fair Share Calculation

Table 1-6 presents the project's calculated percentage of the growth in traffic at the intersection of Baker Blvd and Death Valley Rd (SR 127). The project's percentage of growth shown in the table multiplied by the cost of implementing the intersection improvements described above minus any fees or fair share development contributions previously collected by the county towards the cost of signalizing this intersection would be the project's share of funding the improvement.

Table 1-6: Calculation of Project Share of Growth in Traffic at Baker Blvd / Death Valley Rd (SR 127)

and ASSOCIATES INC.

## Other Recommended Measures

## 1. Construct project frontage improvements

The project will be conditioned to construct its access driveways and construct the required half-width improvements to the north side of Baker Blvd along its frontage consistent with the county's standard for Major Highway with a 104-foot right of way and 80-foot curb separation. These improvements include but are not limited to the following:
a. Dedicate right of way (if required) for the full half width of Baker Blvd.
b. Remove old asphalt and repave the required half width of Baker Blvd along the project's frontage.
c. Mark the pavement of the widened side of Baker Blvd as a single southbound lane using white edge lines that transition and channelize southbound traffic into the lane at the beginning of the project's frontage and out of the lane at the end of the project's frontage.
d. Extend the existing two way left turn lane along Baker Blvd from the project limit to the intersection of Death Valley Rd (SR 127) westbound left turn pocket.
e. Construct standard curb, gutter, and sidewalk frontage improvements on Baker Blvd.
f. Construct the two project access driveways at the locations shown on the conceptual geometric plan (see Figure ES - 1).


BAKER BOULEVARD

FIGURE ES - 1: CONCEPTUAL GEOMETRIC PLAN
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## 2 INTRODUCTION

This report identifies the effect of the proposed Baker Blvd Commercial Center on intersection level of service in accordance with the County of San Bernardino's Traffic Impact Analysis Guidelines for Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and Level of Service Assessment (LOS) and recommends improvements to address level of service deficiencies.

The proposed project consists of a of a convenience store (approximately $20,400 \mathrm{SF}$ ) and gas station with 40 fueling stations and a stand-alone coffee shop with drive-through window (approximately $3,864 \mathrm{SF}$ ). Figure 1 illustrates the vicinity map, and Figure $\mathbf{2}$ illustrates the proposed project site plan.

This report analyzes intersection level of service under the following scenarios:

- Existing Conditions - Chapter 3
- Existing plus Project Conditions - Chapter 4
- Background Conditions (Opening Year 2023 without project) - Chapter 5
- Project Conditions (Opening Year 2023 with project) - Chapter 6
- Future Year 2040 Conditions (Horizon Year 2040 without project)- Chapter 7
- Future Year Plus Project Conditions (Horizon Year 2040 with project)- Chapter 8
- Recommendations- Chapter 9
- Summary of Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Screening - Chapter 10


### 2.1 Scenario Definitions

Existing Conditions. This scenario represents existing transportation conditions at the time this report was prepared. Data includes traffic counts collected in September 2021 and current roadway and intersection geometries. This scenario is used as the baseline condition from which to measure project-specific impacts.

Existing Plus Project Conditions. This scenario represents transportation conditions as if the project were built and occupied today. This scenario is intended to identify potentially significant impact (requiring improvements) when compared to Existing Conditions without any unrelated transportation system improvements or other development. Impacts identified in this scenario are considered "project-specific"-impacts that are the sole responsibility of the project to mitigate.

Background Conditions (Year 2023). This scenario represents conditions at the time the project is anticipated to be fully constructed and occupied (known as buildout Year 2023) but without traffic generated by the project. This scenario is comprised of an ambient growth, a general rate of growth in traffic from overall regional growth and nearby development (assumed to be $2 \%$ annually for this study). The Background Conditions represents the Opening Year Cumulative Conditions - Year 2023 without project traffic.

Project Conditions (Year 2023). This scenario adds the project's estimated traffic generation at project buildout (year 2023) to the Background Conditions scenario described above. Impacts identified in this scenario are considered "cumulative" impacts-impacts that the project contributes to, but does not solely cause, and may be responsible for a fair-share of the cost to implement any mitigation measures. The Project Conditions represents the Opening Year Cumulative Conditions - Year 2023 with project traffic.
Future Year 2040 Conditions. This scenario represents regional ambient growth in traffic up to the year 2040. Ambient growth derived from forecasts from the San Bernardino Transportation Analysis Model (SBTAM).
Future Year 2040 with Project Conditions. This scenario adds the project's estimated traffic generation to the Future Conditions scenario described above. Impacts identified in this scenario are considered "cumulative" impacts-impacts that the project contributes to, but does not solely cause, and may be responsible for a fairshare of the cost to implement any mitigation measures.


FIGURE 1: VICINITY MAP BAKER BOULEVARD COMMERCIAL CENTER SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CA


FIGURE 2: SITE PLAN

## 3 EXISTING CONDITIONS

This section describes the county's level of service policy and standards and frames the criteria the county established for determining when development is considered causing, or contributing, to a level of service deficiency requiring mitigation.

### 3.1 San Bernardino County General Plan Consistency Requirements

San Bernardino County's General Plan includes policies that address level of service (LOS) and identifies transportation facility LOS standards the county maintains. Although environmental impacts under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) have replaced LOS with Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) as the most appropriate measures of transportation impacts, San Bernardino County still requires new development projects to prepare traffic analyses that demonstrate that the development conforms with, or can mitigate to, General Plan level of service policies and standards.

According to San Bernardino County's Transportation Impact Study Guidelines (July 2019), the minimum acceptable intersection level of service for the county's desert regions as described in the current San Bernardino County General Plan, is LOS D. The criteria for identifying operational deficiencies at unsignalized intersections are shown in Table 3-1.

Table 3-1: Criteria for Determining General Plan Level of Service Consistency at Unsignalized Intersections
At an unsignalized intersection, an operational improvement would be required if the analysis determines that the proposed project causes or contributes to conditions described in criterion (A) or criterion (B) and (C).

| (A) | OR | (B) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The addition of project traffic causes an intersection to degrade from a LOS D or better to a LOS E or F. |  | The project adds 5.0 seconds or more of delay to an intersection that is already projected to operate at a LOS E or F without project traffic. |  |
| Note: If Criteria A is met under the existing + project scenario, it is considered a project-specific impact and the project is solely responsible for its mitigation. If the criterion is met in the opening day or long-range scenarios (e.g., background + project, and year 2040) it is considered a cumulative impact and the project contributes its fair share to the cost of the improvement. |  | AND |  |
|  |  | (C) <br> One or both of the following conditions are met: |  |
|  |  | The project adds ten (10) or more peak hour trips to any minor street approach of the unsignalized intersection being analyzed. | The intersection, with the addition of project traffic, meets the peak hour traffic signal warrant (\#3) as defined in the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices. |

If the analysis of a development project meets the criteria above, the transportation impact study needs to identify measures that will achieve the following:

- Measures applied to unsignalized intersections impacted under Criteria A should improve peak hour level of service to a LOS D or better or,
- Measures applied to unsignalized intersections impacted under Criteria B and C should reduce delay (and associated LOS) to at least pre-project levels.


### 3.2 Local and Major Roadways

Land uses around the site consist of retail use on the east and west sides, and a dirt lot north of the project site. The street fronting the project property is a paved two-lane road. The roads pavement widths are currently within the range of 50 to 60 feet and are in good to fair condition. The following roadways provide regional access to the project within the study area:

Baker Blvd will provide the primary access to the project site. Baker Blvd is a two-lane roadway that runs parallel to the I-15 Freeway. It is the old U.S 91 Highway prior to the construction of the I-15 Freeway. Baker Blvd provides two separate interchanges at its terminus with the I-15 Freeway. The Northern Interchange, east of the project location, provides a northbound on-ramp and a southbound off-ramp to the $\mathrm{I}-15$ freeway. The Southern
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Interchange, west of the project location, provides a northbound off-ramp and a southbound on-ramp to the I-15 freeway.

Death Valley Rd (SR-127) is a two-lane state highway that provides northerly access from Baker at the l-15 Freeway to the Death Valley and Tecopa/Shoshone areas. Death Valley Rd (SR-127) provides an interchange for the Southbound I-15 freeway ramps.

Kelbaker Rd is a two-lane road that provides access to the small town of Kelso, the Mojave National Preserve, and Interstate 40 to the south of the unincorporated community of Baker. Kelbaker Rd is the southerly extension of Death Valley Rd that provides an interchange for the Northbound $\mathrm{I}-15$ freeway ramps.

Interstate 15 Freeway provides regional access within the study area. The freeway is a four-lane (two in each direction) facility with interchange access at Death Valley Rd/Kelbaker Rd interchange in the study area. This northsouth freeway is an interstate facility that provides travel between Barstow, San Bernardino, Riverside and San Diego Counties to the south and Las Vegas to the north.

### 3.3 Site Access

Access to the proposed project is provided by two 40 -foot-wide driveways on Baker Blvd. Driveway " A " is located at the southwesterly edge of the project's property. Driveway " B " is located about 180 feet south and west of the project's northeasterly property edge and is separated from Driveway "A" by approximately 337 feet. See Figure 2 for the driveway locations.

### 3.4 Study Intersections

The study intersections identified for this focused traffic study include three existing intersections and two proposed future driveways. These intersections are:

1. Baker Blvd and Death Valley Rd (SR 127)
2. Death Valley Rd (SR 127) and I-15 NB Ramps
3. Baker Blvd and Project Driveway " $B$ "

The intersection of Death Valley Rd (SR 127) / I-15 SB Ramps is currently side-street stop controlled. The intersections of Baker Blvd / Death Valley Rd (SR 127) and Death Valley Rd (SR 127) / I-15 NB Ramps are currently all-way-street-stop controlled. The westbound right turn at the intersection of Baker Blvd / Death Valley Rd (SR 127) currently operates as yield controlled.

### 3.5 Existing Traffic Volumes

Turn movement counts were conducted in September 2021 by Newport Traffic Studies, an independent traffic data collection company. These counts were collected during the Friday PM (4-6 PM) and Sunday MID-Day (1-3 PM) peak periods. The existing turn movement counts are included in Appendix A of this study.

## Average Daily Traffic (ADT)

The Sunday existing turn movement counts are utilized to calculate the Average Daily Traffic (ADT) data for study intersections by approach. The calculation to convert peak hour to Average Daily Traffic is as follows:

$$
\text { SUNDAY Peak Hour (Approach + Departure) x } 11.5=\text { Daily Leg Volume }
$$

The Average Daily Traffic calculation worksheets are provided in the Appendix C.
Figure $\mathbf{3}$ illustrates the existing peak hour traffic volumes and Average Daily Traffic volumes in the study area.

| (1) DEATH VALLEY RD |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 15/179 } \\ 106 / 96 \\ 163 / 179 \\ \hdashline \end{gathered}$ | - 4 ¢ |


| 2) $\begin{gathered}\text { I-15 SB RAMPS/ } \\ \text { DEATH VALLEY RD }\end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | ${ }^{\text {d }} L_{63 / 110}$ $-4 / 3$ $r^{1 / 5}$ |
|  |  |


| (3) $\begin{gathered}\text { I-15 NB RAMPS/ } \\ \text { DEATH VALLEY RD }\end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\stackrel{\stackrel{N}{c}}{\stackrel{N}{\omega}}$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{ccc\|} \substack{100 / 138 \\ 3 / 1 \\ 2 / 3} & \\ & 7 & 10 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |


| BAKER BLVD/ |
| :---: |
| PROJECT DRIVEWAY "A" |
|  |
| FUTURE |
| PROJECT DRIVEWAY |
|  |


| BAKER BLVDD |
| :---: |
| PROJECT DRIVEWAY "B" |
|  |
| FUTURE |
| PROJECT DRIVEWAY |
|  |



FIGURE 3: EXISTING TRAFFIC VOLUMES BAKER BOULEVARD COMMERCIAL CENTER SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CA

### 3.6 Intersection Capacity Analysis Methodology

Intersection level of service (LOS) is determined using Synchro software ${ }^{1}$ which implements the methodology in Chapter 19, Chapter 20, and Chapter 21 of the Highway Capacity Manual, $6^{\text {th }}$ Edition (HCM 6) ${ }^{2}$ and conforms to the procedures and assumptions in the county's Traffic Impact Analysis Guidelines for Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and Level of Service Assessment (LOS).

The intersection analyses use existing intersection geometrics and existing traffic volumes in determining AM and PM peak hour intersection level of service. Table 3-3 provides LOS thresholds for signalized intersections as provided in the HCM 6 Chapter 19.

Table 3-2: HCM 6 - LOS Criteria for Signalized Intersections

| Control Delay (s/veh) | LOS by Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| $\leq 10$ | A | $>1.0$ |
| $>10-20$ | B | F |
| $>20-35$ | C | F |
| $>35-55$ | D | F |
| $>55-80$ | E | F |
| $>80$ | F | F |

[a] For approach-based and intersection-wide assessments, LOS is defined solely by control delay. Source: Highway Capacity Manual 6th Edition, Exhibit 19-8.

The level of service for a two-way stop controlled (TWSC) intersection is determined by the computed or measured control delay. The LOS is determined for each minor-street movement (or shared movement) by using the criteria provided in Table 3-3.

Table 3-3: HCM 6 - Level of Service Criteria for Two-Way Stop Controlled (TWSC) Intersections

| Control Delay (s/veh) | LOS by Volume-to-Capacity Ratio |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c} \leq 1.0$ | $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}>\mathbf{1 . 0}$ |
| $0-10$ | A | F |
| $>10-15$ | B | F |
| $>15-25$ | C | F |
| $>25-35$ | D | F |
| $>35-50$ | E | F |
| $>50$ | F | F |

Note: The LOS criteria apply to each lane on a given approach and to each approach on the minor street. LOS is not calculated for the uncontrolled major-Street approaches or for the intersection as a whole.
Source: Highway Capacity Manual 6 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Edition, Exhibit 20-2.
The level of service for an all-way (or multi-way) stop controlled (AWSC) intersection is determined by the computed or measured control delay. The LOS is determined for the intersection by using the criteria provided in Table 3-4.

Table 3-4: HCM 6 - Level of Service Criteria for All Way Stop Controlled Intersections

| Control Delay (s/veh) | LOS by Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c} \leq \mathbf{1 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{v} / \mathrm{c}>\mathbf{1 . 0}$ |
| $0-10$ | A | F |
| $>10-15$ | B | F |
| $>15-25$ | C | F |
| $>25-35$ | D | F |
| $>35-50$ | E | F |
| $>50$ | F | F |

[a] For approach-based and intersection-wide assessments, LOS is defined solely by control delay. Source: Highway Capacity Manual $6^{\text {th }}$ Edition, Exhibit 21-8.

1 Trafficware Ltd, version 10.
2 Transportation Research Board, Washington D.C., 2010.

### 3.7 Existing Traffic Analysis

Existing intersection geometrics and existing AM and PM peak hour traffic counts are used in analyzing existing intersection capacity. Table 3-4 and Appendix C provide the results of the analysis. Figure 4 illustrates the existing intersection geometrics used in the capacity analysis.

Table 3-5: Intersection Capacity Analysis - Existing Conditions

| Intersection | Intersection Control | FRI Peak |  | SUN Peak |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Delay | LOS | Delay | LOS |
| 1. Baker Blvd / Death Valley Rd (SR 127) | AWSC | 10.0 | A | 12.4 | B |
| 2. Death Valley Rd (SR 127) / I-15 SB Ramps | SSSC | 9.3 | A | 9.7 | A |
| 3. Death Valley Rd (SR 127) / I-15 NB Ramps | AWSC | 9.0 | A | 8.8 | A |
| Abbreviations: <br> TS - Traffic Signal <br> AWSC - All Way Stop Controlled Intersection <br> SSSC - Side Street Stop Controlled Intersection <br> Delay - seconds per vehicle <br> LOS - Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |

As presented in Table 3-4, under existing conditions, the existing study intersections are currently operating at LOS B or better during the peak hours.

### 3.8 Existing Conditions Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis

Signal warrants are applied to the all-way-stop-controlled (AWSC) intersections Baker Blvd at Death Valley Rd (SR 127) and Death Valley Rd (SR 127) at l-15 NB Ramps. Baker Blvd as the major street and Death Valley Rd as the minor street. Death Valley Rd as the major street and I-15 NB Off-Ramp as the minor street. The signal warrants were also applied to the side-street-stop-controlled (SSSC) intersection of Death Valley Rd (SR 127) at I-15 SB Ramps. Death Valley Rd as the major street and I-15 SB Off-Ramp as the stop controlled minor street.

Under these assumptions, warrant 3 (peak hour) and warrant 7 (crash experience) were evaluated at the intersections of Baker Blvd and Death Valley Rd (SR 127), Death Valley Rd (SR 127) at I-15 SB Ramps, and Death Valley Rd (SR 127) at I-15 NB Ramps. These warrants are included as standards in the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CA MUTCD, 2014). Table 3-6 summarizes the traffic signal warrant analysis criteria for the existing conditions scenarios.

Table 3-6: Existing Conditions Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis

| Warrant | Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Warrant 3 (Peak Hour) |  |  |  |  | Warrant 7 (Crash Experience) |
|  | Part A |  |  |  | Part B |  |
|  | All criteria 1,2, and 3 below must be satisfied for any four consecutive 15 minute periods |  |  |  | The plotted point falls above the applicable curve in Figure 4C-S <br> (See Appendix D) | All Parts Must be Satisfied |
|  | 1. Total Delay | 2. Volume on minor street | 3. Total Entering volume | All Satisfied |  |  |
| 1. Baker Blvd / Death Valley Rd (SR 127) | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| 2. Death Valley Rd (SR 127) / I-15 SB Ramps | No | Yes | No | No | No | No |
| 3. Death Valley Rd (SR 127) / I-15 NB Ramps | No | Yes | No | No | No | No |

## Notes:

Source of warrant procedures: California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CA MUTCD), 2014 Edition (Section 4C. 01 Studies and Factors for Justifying Traffic Control Signals).
Source of crash data: California Highway Patrol Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) Reports.


FIGURE 4: EXISTING INTERSECTION GEOMETRICS BAKER BOULEVARD COMMERCIAL CENTER SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CA

## 4 EXISTING PLUS PROJECT CONDITIONS

Existing plus project conditions identifies impacts to the county's level of service standards when compared to existing conditions without any unrelated transportation system improvements or other development. Impacts identified in this scenario are considered "project-specific" -impacts that are the sole responsibility of the project to mitigate.

### 4.1 Project Description and Trip Generation

The project proposes to construct a convenience store (approximately $20,400 \mathrm{SF}$ ) and gas station with 40 fueling stations and a stand-alone coffee/donut shop with drive-through window (approximately 3,864 SF) as shown on the site plan in Figure 2.

The project is highway-oriented and relies on the I-15 freeway travel patterns to and from Las Vegas, the peak periods are Friday PM (4-6 PM) and Sunday PM (1-3 PM).

Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation manual, 11th Edition trip generation estimates are presented for the PM Peak Hour of the Adjacent Street Traffic. The proposed project land uses include Convenience Market/Gas Station: subcategory Vehicle Fueling Positions 16-24 (Land Use Category ITE 945) and Coffee/Donut Shop with Drive-Through Window (Land Use Category ITE 937).

Due to the nature of highway-oriented development, the project traffic is primarily comprised of diverted link trips. Diverted-link trips are trips passing by the site but not on an immediately adjacent street and alter their path to visit the site. For example, for a gas station at an interchange, diverted link trips are those that would exit the freeway and then re-enter the freeway to continue in their original direction.

The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Handbook defines a diverted-link trip as the following:
"A diverted trip is attracted from the traffic volume on roadways within the vicinity of the generator but without direct access to the site. A diverted trip requires a diversion from a roadway not adjacent to the site to another roadway to gain direct access to the site. A diverted trip adds traffic to streets adjacent to a site and could remove a trip on streets from which it diverted. A diverted trips may be part of multiplestop chain of trips."

The ITE Trip Generation Handbook further describes diverted link trips and the application of diverted link trips to a traffic assessment.
"Diverted trips are often difficult to identify. Consequently, diverted trips should be estimated in a traffic impact study only if

- Reliable data reporting the percentage distribution of the three types of trips (primary, pass-by, and diverted trips) are available for the land use(s) being considered; and
- The travel routes for diverted trips can be clearly established.

If these conditions cannot be met, the analyst should treat all non-pass-by trips as primary trips.
In establishing travel routes for diverted trips, the analyst should consider the location and relative volume of traffic on major roadways within the study area for the traffic impact analysis. Locally established data or data from the site developer may also be helpful in identifying the travel routes for diverted trips.

Overall, diverted trips represent a change in local area travel patterns but constitute no new increase on a macroscopic scale. Within the immediate study area, diverted trips represent additional traffic on individual streets adjacent to a proposed development and could decrease traffic on the streets from which they divert, and should be analyzed that way (if diverted trips are considered in the study and if the streets from which traffic is diverted are within the study area)."

Recent approved traffic studies completed for area projects adjoining this segment of I-15 Freeway within San Bernardino County proposed project were reviewed to establish reliable data reporting the percentage distribution of the three types of trips.

- These studies consisted of $\mathbf{2 0 \%}$ primary project trips and $\mathbf{8 0 \%}$ diverted link project trips.

The proposed travel routes considered the rural nature of the study area, destination travel patterns of the adjacent highway, and the proposed highway-oriented project.

- The I-15 freeway is defined as the diverted-link travel route. The route includes the Baker Blvd ramps ( $\mathrm{I}-15$ northbound on and off-ramps, $\mathrm{I}-15$ southbound on and off-ramps at the north end of Baker), and Kelbaker Rd ramps at the south end of Baker

Table 4-1 summarizes the estimated trip generation for the proposed project site, for the Friday PM (4-6 PM) and Sunday PM (1-3 PM) peak periods based on the Peak Hour of the Adjacent Street Traffic.

Table 4-1: Project Trip Generation

| Use | Size/ Quantity | Daily | FRIDAY |  |  | SUNDAY |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |
| 1 Convenience Store/Gas Station (VFP 16-24) - Land Use Category (ITE 945) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Per 1,000 Sq. Ft. GLA | 20,400 | 1283.38 | 39.48 | 39.48 | 78.95 | 39.48 | 39.48 | 78.95 |
| Trips |  | 26,181 | 805 | 805 | 1,610 | 805 | 805 | 1,610 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 Coffee/Donut Shop with Drive-Through Window - Land Use Category (ITE 937) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Per 1,000 Sq. Ft. GLA | 3,864 | 533.57 | 19.50 | 19.50 | 38.99 | 19.50 | 19.50 | 38.99 |
| Trips |  | 2,062 | 76 | 76 | 152 | 76 | 76 | 152 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sub-Total Trips |  | 28,243 | 881 | 881 | 1,762 | 881 | 881 | 1,762 |
| Internal Trips (10\%) |  | 2,824 | 88 | 88 | 176 | 88 | 88 | 176 |
| Adjusted Sub-Total Trips |  | 25,419 | 793 | 793 | 1,586 | 793 | 793 | 1,586 |
| Diverted Link Trips (80\%) |  | 20,335 | 634 | 634 | 1,268 | 634 | 634 | 1,268 |
| Primary Trips (20\%) |  | 5,084 | 159 | 159 | 318 | 159 | 159 | 318 |

Source: "Trip Generation Manual, Institute of Transportation Engineers", 11th Edition
As presented in Table 4-1, the proposed project land use is estimated to generate 5,084 primary daily trips, 318 primary Friday PM and 318 primary Sunday PM peak hour trips during the adjacent street peak hours.

### 4.2 Project Trip Distribution and Assignment

The distribution of project trips to the surrounding street network is based on assumed origins of the project's employees and visitors. The directional distribution patterns (east, west, north, and south) are consistent with area traffic patterns, then assigned to the street system based on the most direct route on major streets.

The following exhibits illustrate both the directional distribution (percent direction) and the assignment of project traffic (peak hour trips) to the street system.

Figure 5 presents the primary project trips distribution percentages at each study intersection. Figure 6 presents the diverted-link project trips distribution percentages at each study intersection.

Figure 7 presents the primary project trips assigned to each study intersection. Figure 8 presents the diverted-link project trips to each study intersection. Figure 9 presents the total project trips assigned to each study intersection.



## FIGURE 6: DIVERTED-LINK PROJECT TRIP DISTRIBUTION BAKER BOULEVARD COMMERCIAL CENTER SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CA
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### 4.3 Existing Plus Project Level of Service Analysis

The intersection capacity analysis of existing plus project conditions uses the Friday and Sunday peak hour traffic volumes shown in Figure 10 and the existing intersection geometrics shown in Figure 11. Table 4-2 and Appendix C provide the results of the analysis.

Table 4-2: Intersection Capacity Analysis - Existing Plus Project Conditions

| Intersection | Control | Existing Conditions |  |  |  | Existing + Project Conditions |  |  |  | Increase in Delay (Seconds) |  | Exceed the Criteria |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | FRI Peak |  | SUN Peak |  | FRI Peak |  | SUN Peak |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Delay | LOS | Delay | LOS | Delay | LOS | Delay | LOS | FRI | SUN | FRI | SUN |
| 1. Baker Blvd / Death Valley Rd (SR 127) | AWSC | 10.0 | A | 12.4 | B | 151.2 | F | 175.2 | F | 141.2 | 162.8 | YES | YES |
| Proposed Improvements: Install Traffic Signal, widening NB and SB | TS | Not Applicable |  |  |  | 25.8 | C | 25.9 | C | 15.8 | 13.5 | NO | NO |
| 2. Death Valley Rd (SR 127) / <br> I-15 SB Ramps | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { SSSC } \\ {[1]} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 9.3 | A | 9.7 | A | 16.3 | C | 19.4 | C | 7.0 | 9.7 | NO | NO |
| 3. Death Valley Rd (SR 127) / I-15 NB Ramps | AWSC | 9.0 | A | 8.8 | A | 16.7 | C | 13.0 | B | 7.7 | 4.2 | NO | NO |
| Project Access Driveways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Baker Blvd / Driveway "A" | SSSC | Not Applicable |  |  |  | [2] | F | 116.7 | F | Not Applicable |  |  |  |
| 5. Baker Blvd / Driveway "B" | SSSC |  |  |  |  | 239.0 | F | 27.7 | D |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Notes: <br> [1] Side Street stop-controlled (SSSC) intersection delay and LOS presented are for the worst stop-controlled approach or <br> [2] Delay per vehicle exceeds 300 seconds. <br> Abbreviations and definitions: <br> TS - Traffic signal control, AWSC - All-way or multi-way stop control, SSSC - Side-street stop control <br> Delay - seconds per vehicle, LOS - Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

As presented in Table 4-2, under existing plus project conditions, the intersection of Baker Blvd / Death Valley Rd (SR 127) would operate at LOS F in the Friday and Sunday peak hours with the addition of project traffic. The project Driveway " $A$ " and Driveway " $B$ " are anticipated to operate at LOS F under the Friday peak period. The delay experienced by the worse movement exiting Driveway "A" (southbound left turn) exceeds 300 seconds per vehicle in the Friday peak hour. Driveway "B"'s Friday peak hour experiences a similar level of delay, but the Sunday peak hour delay is about 28 seconds per vehicle (LOS D).

### 4.4 Existing Plus Project Conditions Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis

A traffic signal warrant analysis for the Existing plus Project Conditions was performed for the intersections of Baker Blvd and Death Valley Rd (SR 127), Death Valley Rd (SR 127) at I-15 SB Ramps, and Death Valley Rd (SR 127) at I-15 NB Ramps. Table 4-4 summarizes the traffic signal warrant analysis criteria for the existing conditions scenarios.




| $\mu$ | $t$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ |  |
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Table 4-3: Existing Plus Project Conditions Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis

| Warrant | Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Warrant 3 (Peak Hour) |  |  |  |  | Warrant 7 (Crash Experience) |
|  | Part A |  |  |  | Part B |  |
|  | All criteria 1,2, and 3 below must be satisfied for any four consecutive 15 minute periods |  |  |  | The plotted point falls above the applicable curve in Figure 4C-S(See Appendix D) | All Parts Must be Satisfied |
|  | 1. Total Delay | 2. Volume on minor street | 3. Total Entering volume | All Satisfied |  |  |
| 1. Baker Blvd / Death Valley Rd (SR 127) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |
| 2. Death Valley Rd (SR 127) / I-15 SB Ramps | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Not Applicable |
| 3. Death Valley Rd (SR 127) / I-15 NB Ramps | No | Yes | No | No | No |  |
| Notes: <br> Source of warrant procedures: California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CA MUTCD), 2014 Edition (Section 4C. 01 Studies and Factors for Justifying Traffic Control Signals). <br> Source of crash data: California Highway Patrol Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) Reports. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Traffic signal warrant 3, part A and part B are satisfied for the intersection of Baker Blvd at Death Valley Rd (SR 127). Traffic signal warrant 3, part B is satisfied for the intersections of Death Valley Rd (SR 127) at I-15 SB Ramps and Death Valley Rd (SR 127) at I-15 NB Ramps.

### 4.5 Existing Plus Project Conditions Queuing Analysis

A queuing analysis for the existing plus project conditions was performed for the Death Valley Rd (SR 127) intersections with Baker Blvd, l-15 SB Ramps, and I-15 NB Ramps. The queuing analysis was performed utilizing the Trafficware SimTraffic Version 11 software package. The 95th percentile maximum queue length results for the Existing Plus Project Conditions are shown in Table 4-4 and Appendix D.

Table 4-4: Queuing Analysis - Existing Plus Project Conditions

| Intersection | Movement | Storage Length (Feet) | Existing + Project Condition |  | Existing + Project Condition with Improvements |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | FRI | SUN | FRI | SUN |
| 1. Baker Blvd / Death Valley Rd (SR 127) | EBL | 200 | 38 | 75 | 41 | 149 |
|  | EBTH |  | 118 | 84 | 183 | 142 |
|  | EBR | 200 | 78 | 75 | 75 | 90 |
|  | WBL | 225 | 161 | 357 | 208 | 309 |
|  | WBTH |  | 79 | 486 | 81 | 289 |
|  | WBR | 225 | - | - | 25 | 39 |
|  | NBL |  | - | - | 69 | 103 |
|  | NBLTHR/NBTH |  | 296 | 333 | 22 | 70 |
|  | NBR |  | - | - | 144 | 125 |
|  | SBL |  | - | - | 16 | 37 |
|  | SBLTHR/SBTHR |  | 51 | 74 | 22 | 52 |
| 2. Death Valley Rd (SR 127) / I-15 SB Ramps | WBLTHR |  | 185 | 481 | 86 | 137 |
|  | NBLTH |  | 141 | 276 | 11 | 164 |
|  | SBTHR |  | 5 | 16 | - | 15 |
| 3. Death Valley Rd (SR 127) / I-15 NB Ramps | EBLTHR |  | 118 | 113 | 119 | 116 |
|  | NBTHR |  | 29 | 37 | 29 | 37 |
|  | SBLTH |  | 83 | 67 | 90 | 73 |
| Queue - In Feet 95\% - 95 Percentile Queue Length |  |  |  |  |  |  |

### 4.6 Project Access

Access to the proposed project is provided by two 40-foot-wide driveways on Baker Blvd. Driveway " $A$ " is located at the southwesterly edge of the project's property. Driveway " $B$ " is located about 180 feet south and west of the project's northeasterly property edge and is separated from Driveway " A " by approximately 337 feet.

## Baker Blvd's Planning Context and Design Standards

Baker Blvd is part of San Bernardino County's Maintained Road System (CMRS) with a right of way of 104 feet and a functional classification code of 13 , according to the county Public Works Department's web map of "Roads Maintained by the County Department of Public Works - Transportation". This right of way is associated with the county's Master Plan of Highways in the Arterial Roads category as a Major Highway (104-foot RW and 80-foot curb separation). See the street section below for the county's standard for a Major Highway.

The current paved width of Baker Blvd along the project's frontage is about 80 feet measured from the face of curb on the south side of the street (along the Del Taco restaurant frontage) to the edge of pavement on the north side of the street. The north side of the street is unimproved lacking curb, gutter, and sidewalk. This width is consistent with the curb separation width requirements of a Major Highway classification in the county's Master Plan.

Only a portion of the existing pavement is currently used by through traffic on Baker Blvd. Pavement markings are used demarcate a 12-foot southbound lane and 25 feet of pavement in the northbound direction operating as a single lane.


TYPICAL SECTION
WITH CONTINUOUS LEFT TURN LANE
County standard plan 101 (Major Highway). Ultimately, Baker Blvd will have two lanes in each direction and a median turn lane.
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## 5 BACKGROUND CONDITIONS

This scenario represents conditions at the time the project is anticipated to be fully constructed and occupied (known as buildout Year 2023) but without traffic generated by the project. This scenario is comprised of an ambient growth, a general rate of growth in traffic from overall regional growth and nearby development (assumed to be $2 \%$ annually for this study). The Background Conditions represents the Opening Year Cumulative Conditions - Year 2023 without project traffic.

### 5.1 Background Conditions Traffic Analysis

The background conditions intersection capacity analysis uses existing intersection geometrics and the projected Friday and Sunday peak hour traffic shown in Figure 12. Table 5-1 and Appendix C provides the results of the analysis. As presented in the table, under background conditions, the study intersections would operate at a LOS A or LOS B during the Friday and Sunday peak hours.

Table 5-1: Intersection Capacity Analysis - Background Conditions

| Intersection | Intersection | FRI Peak |  | SUN Peak |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Delay | LOS | Delay | LOS |
| 1. Baker Blvd / Death Valley Rd (SR 127) | AWSC | 10.3 | B | 12.9 | B |
| 2. Death Valley Rd (SR 127) / I-15 SB Ramps | SSSC | 9.3 | A | 9.8 | A |
| 3. Death Valley Rd (SR 127) / I-15 NB Ramps | AWSC | 9.1 | A | 8.9 | A | Abbreviations and definitions:

TS - Traffic signal control, AWSC - All-way or multi-way stop control, SSSC - Side-street stop control
Delay - seconds per vehicle, LOS - Level of Service

### 5.2 Background Conditions Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis

A traffic signal warrant analysis for the Background Conditions was performed for the intersections of Baker Blvd and Death Valley Rd (SR 127), Death Valley Rd (SR 127) at I-15 SB Ramps, and Death Valley Rd (SR 127) at I-15 NB Ramps. Table 5-2 summarizes the traffic signal warrant analysis criteria for the existing conditions scenarios.

Table 5-2: Background Conditions Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis

| Warrant | Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Warrant 3 (Peak Hour) |  |  |  |  | Warrant 7 (Crash Experience) |
|  | Part A |  |  |  | Part B |  |
|  | All criteria 1,2, and 3 below must be satisfied for any four consecutive 15 minute periods |  |  |  | The plotted point falls above the applicable curve in Figure 4C-S <br> (See Appendix D) | All Parts Must be Satisfied |
|  | 1. Total Delay | 2. Volume on minor street | 3. Total <br> Entering volume | All Satisfied |  |  |
| 1. Baker Blvd / Death Valley Rd (SR 127) | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes |  |
| 2. Death Valley Rd (SR 127) / I-15 SB Ramps | No | Yes | No | No | No | Not Applicable |
| 3. Death Valley Rd (SR 127) / I-15 NB Ramps | No | Yes | No | No | No |  |
| Notes: <br> Source of warrant procedures: California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CA MUTCD), 2014 Edition (Section 4C. 01 Studies and Factors for Justifying Traffic Control Signals). <br> Source of crash data: California Highway Patrol Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) Reports. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Traffic signal warrant 3, part B is satisfied for the intersection of Baker Blvd at Death Valley Rd (SR 127).

| (1) $\begin{gathered}\text { BAKER BLVD/ } \\ \text { DEATH VALLEY RD }\end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \\| L_{25 / 10} \\ -98 / 163 \\ r^{106 / 148} \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} 16 / 186 \\ 10,1 / 100 \\ 170 / 186 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |


| (2) $\begin{aligned} & \text { I-15 SB RAMPS } \\ & \text { DEATH VALLEY RD }\end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | ${ }^{1} L_{66 / 114}$ $-4 / 3$ $r^{1 / 5}$ |
|  |  |


| I-15 NB RAMPS/DEATH VALLEY RD |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| $\begin{array}{\|cc\|} \hline 104 / 144 \\ 3 / 1 & 1 \\ 2 / 3 & -1 / 0 \\ & \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |


| BAKER BLVD/ |
| :---: |
| PROJECT DRIVEWAY "A" |
| FUTURE |
| PROJECT DRIVEWAY |
|  |


| BAKER BLVDD |
| :---: |
| PROJECT DRIVEWAY "B" |
|  |
| FUTURE |
| PROJECT DRIVEWAY |
|  |



## 6 PROJECT CONDITIONS

The project conditions scenario evaluates the potential cumulative impacts to the study intersections due to ambient growth and traffic from other area development that occurs by opening day (year 2023) with the addition of project traffic. The Project Conditions represents the Opening Year Cumulative Conditions - Year 2023 with project traffic.

This scenario adds the project's estimated traffic generation at opening day (2023) to the opening day conditions scenario. Level of service impacts identified in this scenario are considered "cumulative" impacts-impacts that the project contributes to, but does not solely cause, and may be responsible for a fair-share of the cost to implement any improvement measures.

### 6.1 Project Traffic Analysis

The traffic volumes under this scenario are illustrated in Figure 13. Intersection capacity analysis for the study intersections uses existing lanes geometries and the proposed project-specific access, roadway, and off-site intersection improvements described earlier. The results of the analysis are shown in Table 6-1 and provided in Appendix $\mathbf{C}$.

Table 6-1: Intersection Capacity Analysis - Project Conditions

| Intersection | Control | Background Conditions |  |  |  | Project Condition |  |  |  | Increase in Delay (Seconds) |  | Exceed the Criteria |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | FRI Peak |  | SUN Peak |  | FRI Peak |  | SUN Peak |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Delay | LOS | Delay | LOS | Delay | LOS | Delay | LOS | FRI | SUN | FRI | SUN |
| 1. Baker Blvd / Death Valley Rd (SR 127) | AWSC | 10.3 | B | 12.9 | B | 132.3 | F | 182.1 | F | 122.0 | 169.2 | YES | YES |
| Proposed Improvements: Install Traffic Signal, widening NB and SB | TS | Not Applicable |  |  |  | 27.3 | C | 26.6 | C | 17.0 | 13.7 | NO | NO |
| 2. Death Valley Rd (SR 127) / I-15 SB Ramps | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { SSSC } \\ {[1]} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 9.3 | A | 9.8 | A | 15.4 | C | 19.9 | C | 6.1 | 10.1 | NO | NO |
| 3. Death Valley Rd (SR 127) / <br> I-15 NB Ramps | AWSC | 9.1 | A | 8.9 | A | 15.8 | C | 13.4 | B | 6.7 | 4.5 | NO | NO |
| Project Access Driveways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Baker Blvd / Driveway "A" | SSSC | Not Applicable |  |  |  | [2] | F | [2] | F | Not Applicable |  |  |  |
| 5. Baker Blvd / Driveway "B" | SSSC |  |  |  |  | 171.0 | F | 278.5 | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Notes: <br> [1] Side Street stop-controlled (SSSC) intersection delay and LOS presented are for the worst stop-controlled approach or lane group. <br> [2] Delay per vehicle exceeds 300 seconds. <br> Abbreviations and definitions: <br> TS - Traffic signal control, AWSC - All-way or multi-way stop control, SSSC - Side-street stop control <br> Delay - seconds per vehicle, LOS - Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

As presented in Table 6-1, with the addition of project traffic, the intersection of Baker Blvd / Death Valley Rd (SR 127) would operate at LOS F in both peak hours.

Driveway "A" and Driveway "B" operate at LOS F under all scenarios. The delay experienced by the worse movement exiting Driveway "A" (southbound left turn) exceeds 300 seconds per vehicle in both the Friday and Sunday peak hours. Driveway "B"'s Friday and Sunday peak hours experience a similar level of delay.

### 6.2 Project Conditions Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis

A traffic signal warrant analysis for the Future plus Project Conditions was performed for the intersections of Baker Blvd and Death Valley Rd (SR 127), Death Valley Rd (SR 127) at I-15 SB Ramps, and Death Valley Rd (SR 127) at l-15 NB Ramps. Table 6-2 summarizes the traffic signal warrant analysis criteria for the existing conditions scenarios.


FIGURE 13: PROJECT TRAFFIC VOLUMES BAKER BOULEVARD COMMERCIAL CENTER SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CA
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Table 6-2: Project Conditions Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis

| Warrant | Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Warrant 3 (Peak Hour) |  |  |  |  | Warrant 7 (Crash Experience) |
|  | Part A |  |  |  | Part B |  |
|  | All criteria 1,2, and 3 below must be satisfied for any four consecutive 15 minute periods |  |  |  | The plotted point falls above the applicable curve in Figure 4C-S <br> (See Appendix D) | All Parts Must be Satisfied |
|  | 1. Total Delay | 2. Volume on minor street | 3. Total <br> Entering volume | All Satisfied |  |  |
| 1. Baker Blvd / Death Valley Rd (SR 127) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |
| 2. Death Valley Rd (SR 127) / I-15 SB Ramps | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Not Applicable |
| 3. Death Valley Rd (SR 127) / I-15 NB Ramps | No | Yes | No | No | No |  | Notes:

Source of warrant procedures: California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CA MUTCD), 2014 Edition (Section 4C. 01 Studies and Factors for Justifying Traffic Control Signals).
Source of crash data: California Highway Patrol Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) Reports.
Traffic signal warrant 3, part A and part B are satisfied for the intersection of Baker Blvd at Death Valley Rd (SR 127). Traffic signal warrant 3, part B is satisfied for the intersections of Death Valley Rd (SR 127) at l-15 SB Ramps and Death Valley Rd (SR 127) at I-15 NB Ramps.

### 6.3 Project Conditions Queuing Analysis

A queuing analysis for the project conditions was performed for the Death Valley Rd (SR 127) intersections with Baker Blvd, I-15 SB Ramps, and I-15 NB Ramps. The queuing analysis was performed utilizing the Trafficware SimTraffic Version 11 software package. The 95th percentile maximum queue length results for the Existing Plus Project Conditions are shown in Table 6-3 and Appendix D.

Table 6-3: Queuing Analysis - Project Conditions

| Intersection | Movement | Storage Length (Feet) | Project Condition |  | Project Condition with Improvements |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | FRI | SUN | FRI | SUN |
| 1. Baker Blvd / Death Valley Rd (SR 127) | EBL | 200 | 38 | 45 | 39 | 138 |
|  | EBTH |  | 122 | 52 | 212 | 149 |
|  | EBR | 200 | 75 | 47 | 130 | 109 |
|  | WBL | 225 | 204 | 94 | 205 | 206 |
|  | WBTH |  | 77 | 57 | 75 | 145 |
|  | WBR | 225 | - | - | 27 | 28 |
|  | NBL |  | - | - | 67 | 85 |
|  | NBLTHR/NBTH |  | 324 | 340 | 30 | 58 |
|  | NBR |  | - | - | 155 | 143 |
|  | SBL |  | - | - | 18 | 37 |
|  | SBLTHR/SBTHR |  | 48 | 62 | 13 | 30 |
| 2. Death Valley Rd (SR 127) / I-15 SB Ramps | WBLTHR |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | NBLTH |  | 229 | 537 | 93 | 166 |
|  | SBTHR |  | 199 | 345 | 37 | 130 |
| 3. Death Valley Rd (SR 127) / I-15 NB Ramps | EBLTHR |  | - | 16 | 5 | 16 |
|  | NBTHR |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | SBLTH |  | 127 | 133 | 122 | 135 |
| Queue - In Feet 95\% - 95 Percentile Queue Length |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## 7 FUTURE CONDITIONS

The future conditions scenario represents regional ambient growth in traffic up to the year 2040. Ambient growth is derived from forecasts from the San Bernardino Transportation Analysis Model (SBTAM). Intersection turn movements were derived from post processing forecasted approach volumes and balancing the turn movement volumes for each study intersection.
The derivation of future traffic projections from the SBTAM traffic model are shown in Appendix B.

### 7.1 Future Conditions Traffic Analysis

The future conditions intersection capacity analysis uses existing intersection geometrics and the projected AM and PM peak hour traffic shown in Figure 14. Table 6-1 and Appendix C provides the results of the analysis.

Table 7-1: Intersection Capacity Analysis - Future Conditions

| Intersection | Intersection Control | FRI Peak |  | SUN Peak |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Delay | LOS | Delay | LOS |
| 1. Baker Blvd / Death Valley Rd (SR 127) | AWSC | 11.2 | B | 13.7 | B |
| 2. Death Valley Rd (SR 127) / I-15 SB Ramps | SSSC | 9.6 | A | 9.9 | A |
| 3. Death Valley Rd (SR 127) / I-15 NB Ramps | AWSC | 8.7 | A | 8.9 | A |

Abbreviations and definitions:
TS - Traffic signal control, AWSC - All-way or multi-way stop control, SSSC - Side-street stop control
Delay - seconds per vehicle, LOS - Level of Service
As presented in Table 7-1, under future conditions, the study intersections would operate at LOS A or B during the Friday and Sunday peak hours.

### 7.2 Future Conditions Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis

A traffic signal warrant analysis for the Future Conditions was performed for the intersections of Baker Blvd and Death Valley Rd (SR 127), Death Valley Rd (SR 127) at I-15 SB Ramps, and Death Valley Rd (SR 127) at I-15 NB Ramps. Table 7-2 summarizes the traffic signal warrant analysis criteria for the existing conditions scenarios.
Table 7-2: Future Conditions Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis

| Warrant | Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Warrant 3 (Peak Hour) |  |  |  |  | Warrant 7 (Crash Experience) |
|  | Part A |  |  |  | Part B |  |
|  | All criteria 1,2, and 3 below must be satisfied for any four consecutive 15 minute periods |  |  |  | The plotted point falls above the applicable curve in Figure 4C-S <br> (See Appendix D) | All Parts Must be Satisfied |
|  | 1. Total Delay | 2. Volume on minor street | 3. Total Entering volume | All Satisfied |  |  |
| 1. Baker Blvd / Death Valley Rd (SR 127) | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Not Applicable |
| 2. Death Valley Rd (SR 127) / I-15 SB Ramps | No | Yes | No | No | No |  |
| 3. Death Valley Rd (SR 127) / I-15 NB Ramps | No | Yes | No | No | No |  |
| Notes: <br> Source of warrant procedures: California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CA MUTCD), 2014 Edition (Section 4C. 01 Studies and Factors for Justifying Traffic Control Signals). <br> Source of crash data: California Highway Patrol Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) Reports. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Traffic signal warrant 3, part B is satisfied for the intersection of Baker Blvd at Death Valley Rd (SR 127).

| BAKER BLVD/ ${ }_{\text {deAT VALLEY RD }}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \mid<1 / 111 \\ -101 / 165 \\ r^{118 / 146} \end{gathered}\right.$ |
|  |  |


| (2) | I-15 SB RAMPS/ DEATH VALLEY RD |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\stackrel{N}{\infty} \stackrel{\infty}{\stackrel{\infty}{2}} \stackrel{\infty}{\circ}$ | $\begin{gathered} d L_{58 / 121} \\ -11 / 3 \\ r^{3 / 5} \end{gathered}$ |
|  | $\begin{array}{ll} - & 1 \\ \infty & 1 \\ \frac{m}{\sim} & \stackrel{m}{N} \\ \end{array}$ |


| (3) I-15 NB RAMPS/ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\stackrel{\infty}{\stackrel{\infty}{\stackrel{\infty}{8}} \stackrel{+}{6}}$ |  |
|  |  |


| BAKER BLVD/ |
| :---: |
| PROJECT DRIVEWAY "A" |


| (5) PROJECT DRIVEWAY "B" |
| :---: |
|  |
| FUTURE |
| PROJECT DRIVEWAY |
|  |



FIGURE 14: FUTURE TRAFFIC VOLUMES BAKER BOULEVARD COMMERCIAL CENTER SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CA
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## 8 FUTURE PLUS PROJECT CONDITIONS

Future plus project conditions adds the project's estimated traffic generation to the future condition scenario. As described in the previous section, the forecasted future year 2040 traffic intersection turn movements were derived from post processing forecasted SBTAM traffic model approach volumes and balancing the turn movement volumes for each study intersection.

### 8.1 Future Plus Project Traffic Analysis

The intersection capacity analysis of future plus project conditions uses existing intersection geometrics and the projected Friday and Sunday peak hour traffic volumes shown in Figure 15. Table 8-1 and Appendix C provide the results of the analysis.

Table 8-1: Intersection Capacity Analysis - Future Plus Project Conditions

| Intersection | Control | Future Conditions |  |  |  | Future + Project Condition |  |  |  | Increase in Delay (Seconds) |  | Exceed the Criteria |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | FRI Peak |  | SUN Peak |  | FRI Peak |  | SUN Peak |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Delay | LOS | Delay | LOS | Delay | LOS | Delay | LOS | FRI | SUN | FRI | SUN |
| 1. Baker Blvd / Death Valley Rd (SR 127) | AWSC | 11.2 | B | 13.7 | B | 181.7 | F | 194.5 | F | 145.8 | 157.2 | YES | YES |
| Proposed Improvements: Install Traffic Signal, widening NB and SB | TS | Not Applicable |  |  |  | 28.0 | C | 26.9 | C | 16.8 | 13.2 | NO | NO |
| 2. Death Valley Rd (SR 127) / <br> I-15 SB Ramps | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { SSSC } \\ {[1]} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 9.6 | A | 9.9 | A | 17.8 | C | 20.9 | C | 6.8 | 8.9 | NO | NO |
| 3. Death Valley Rd (SR 127) / I-15 NB Ramps | AWSC | 8.7 | A | 8.9 | A | 17.2 | C | 13.3 | B | 6.6 | 3.8 | NO | NO |
| Project Access Driveways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Baker Blvd / Driveway "A" | SSSC | Not Applicable |  |  |  | [2] | F | [2] | F | Not Applicable |  |  |  |
| 5. Baker Blvd / Driveway "B" | SSSC |  |  |  |  | 279.1 | F | 295.6 | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Notes: <br> [1] Side Street stop-controlled (SSSC) intersection delay and LOS presented are for the worst stop-controlled approach or lane group. <br> [2] Delay per vehicle exceeds 300 seconds. <br> Abbreviations and definitions: <br> TS - Traffic signal control, AWSC - All-way or multi-way stop control, SSSC - Side-street stop control <br> Delay - seconds per vehicle, LOS - Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

As presented in Table 8-1, with the addition of project traffic, the intersection of Baker Blvd / Death Valley Rd (SR 127) would operate at LOS F in both peak hours. As in the other project scenarios, Driveway "A" and Driveway " $B$ " operate at LOS F under all scenarios. The delay experienced by the worse movement exiting Driveway " $A$ " (southbound left turn) exceeds 300 seconds per vehicle in both the Friday and Sunday peak hours. Driveway " $B$ "'s Friday and Sunday peak hours experience a similar level of delay.

### 8.2 Future Plus Project Conditions Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis

A traffic signal warrant analysis for the Future plus Project Conditions was performed for the intersections of Baker Blvd and Death Valley Rd (SR 127), Death Valley Rd (SR 127) at I-15 SB Ramps, and Death Valley Rd (SR 127) at l-15 NB Ramps. Table 8-2 summarizes the traffic signal warrant analysis criteria for the existing conditions scenarios.
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Table 8-2: Future Plus Project Conditions Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis

| Warrant | Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Warrant 3 (Peak Hour) |  |  |  |  | Warrant 7 (Crash Experience) |
|  | Part A |  |  |  | Part B |  |
|  | All criteria 1,2, and 3 below must be satisfied for any four consecutive 15 minute periods |  |  |  | The plotted point falls above the applicable curve in Figure 4C-S <br> (See Appendix D) | All Parts Must be Satisfied |
|  | 1. Total Delay | 2. Volume on minor street | 3. Total <br> Entering volume | All Satisfied |  |  |
| 1. Baker Blvd / Death Valley Rd (SR 127) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Not Applicable |
| 2. Death Valley Rd (SR 127) / I-15 SB Ramps | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes |  |
| 3. Death Valley Rd (SR 127) / I-15 NB Ramps | No | Yes | No | No | No |  |
| Notes: <br> Source of warrant procedures: California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CA MUTCD), 2014 Edition (Section 4C. 01 Studies and Factors for Justifying Traffic Control Signals). <br> Source of crash data: California Highway Patrol Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) Reports. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Traffic signal warrant 3, part A and part B are satisfied for the intersection of Baker Blvd at Death Valley Rd (SR 127). Traffic signal warrant 3, part B is satisfied for the intersections of Death Valley Rd (SR 127) at I-15 SB Ramps and Death Valley Rd (SR 127) at I-15 NB Ramps.

### 8.3 Future Plus Project Conditions Queuing Analysis

A queuing analysis for the future plus project conditions was performed for the Death Valley Rd (SR 127) intersections with Baker Blvd, I-15 SB Ramps, and I-15 NB Ramps. The queuing analysis was performed utilizing the Trafficware SimTraffic Version 11 software package. The 95th percentile maximum queue length results for the Existing Plus Project Conditions are shown in Table 8-3 and Appendix D.

Table 8-3: Queuing Analysis - Future Plus Project Conditions

| Intersection | Movement | Storage Length (Feet) | Project Condition |  | Project Condition with Improvements |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | FRI | SUN | FRI | SUN |
| ```1. Baker Blvd / Death Valley Rd (SR 127)``` | EBL | 200 | 44 | 81 | 51 | 176 |
|  | EBTH |  | 120 | 82 | 196 | 123 |
|  | EBR | 200 | 77 | 79 | 87 | 86 |
|  | WBL | 225 | 173 | 190 | 203 | 200 |
|  | WBTH |  | 78 | 82 | 112 | 139 |
|  | WBR | 225 | - | - | 26 | 25 |
|  | NBL |  | - | - | 85 | 104 |
|  | NBLTHR/NBTH |  | 329 | 314 | 19 | 67 |
|  | NBR |  | - | - | 180 | 145 |
|  | SBL |  | - | - | 27 | 38 |
|  | SBLTHR/SBTHR |  | 67 | 69 | 35 | 52 |
| 2. Death Valley Rd (SR 127) / I-15 SB Ramps | WBLTHR |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | NBLTH |  | 461 | 780 | 107 | 135 |
|  | SBTHR |  | 144 | 202 | 77 | 153 |
| 3. Death Valley Rd (SR 127) / I-15 NB Ramps | EBLTHR |  | 7 | 11 | 23 | 10 |
|  | NBTHR |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | SBLTH |  | 132 | 106 | 133 | 101 |
| Queue - In Feet 95\% - 95 Percentile Queue Length |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## 9 RECOMMENDATIONS

The intersection of Baker Blvd / Death Valley Rd (SR 127) is projected to change from an acceptable level of service to a deficient level of service after project traffic is added to the intersection. This occurs in all three scenarios (existing, background opening day, and future 2040).

Measures to Improve Level of Service Deficiency at Baker Blvd and Death Valley Rd (SR 127)
Implementing the following improvements at the intersection of Baker Blvd and Death Valley Rd will change the deficient LOS in all scenarios from a LOS E or F to a LOS D or better.

## 2. Install traffic signal and widen intersection for additional lanes

a. Traffic signal is proposed to be an 8-phase signal (providing protected left-turn phasing with overlap in the east-west and north-south directions).
b. Widening of the south leg (Death Valley Rd (SR 127)) to accommodate exclusive left and right turn lanes
c. Realignment and widening of the north leg (Death Valley Rd (SR 127) to accommodate an exclusive left turn lane.
d. Set back of the east leg (Baker Blvd) to accommodate the widening of the Death Valley Rd (SR 127) approaches.

The installation of a traffic signal would improve level of service to a LOS C or better under project conditions in all scenarios, as shown in Table 9-1.

The installation of the traffic signal and the reconfiguring of approach lanes should be initiated by the County and Caltrans. The development will pay its fair share of the cost of these improvements.

Table 9-1: Mitigated Level of Service at Baker Blvd and Death Valley Rd (SR127)

| Scenario | Without Project |  |  |  | With Project |  |  |  | With Project Mitigated |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FRI Peak |  | SUN Peak |  | FRI Peak |  | SUN Peak |  | FRI Peak |  | SUN Peak |  |
|  | Delay | LOS | Delay | LOS | Delay | LOS | Delay | LOS | Delay | LOS | Delay | LOS |
| Existing Conditions | 10.0 | A | 12.4 | B | 151.2 | F | 175.2 | F | 25.8 | C | 25.9 | C |
| Background (2023) Conditions | 10.3 | B | 12.9 | B | 132.3 | F | 182.1 | F | 27.3 | C | 26.6 | C |
| Future 2040 Conditions | 11.2 | B | 13.7 | B | 181.7 | F | 194.5 | F | 28.0 | C | 26.9 | C |

Notes:
Mitigation: Install traffic signal and widen approaches to add turning lanes.

## Project Traffic Fair Share Calculation

Table $\mathbf{9 - 2}$ presents the project's calculated percentage of the growth in traffic at the intersection of Baker Blvd and Death Valley Rd (SR 127). The project's percentage of growth shown in the table multiplied by the cost of implementing the intersection improvements described above minus any fees or fair share development contributions previously collected by the county towards the cost of signalizing this intersection would be the project's share of funding the improvement.

## Other Recommended Measures

## 2. Construct project frontage improvements

The project will be conditioned to construct its access driveways and construct the required half-width improvements to the north side of Baker Blvd along its frontage consistent with the county's standard for Major Highway with a 104 -foot right of way and 80 -foot curb separation. These improvements include but are not limited to the following:
a. Dedicate right of way (if required) for the full half width of Baker Blvd.

Table 9-2: Calculation of Project Share of Growth in Traffic at Baker Blvd / Death Valley Rd (SR 127)

| Intersection | Scenario | Project Trips |  |  | Plus Project Conditions Traffic [1] |  |  | Existing Traffic |  |  | Project Percentage of Growth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Baker Blvd / Death Valley Rd | Existing + Project Conditions | FRI | 1065 | $\div$ | 1 | 1,763 | - | 698 | ) |  | 100.00\% |
|  |  | SUN | 1098 | $\div$ | 1 | 2,132 | - | 1,034 | ) | $=$ | 100.00\% |
|  | Background + Project Conditions | FRI | 1065 | $\div$ | 1 | 1,792 | - | 698 | ) | = | 97.35\% |
|  |  | SUN | 1098 | $\div$ | 1 | 2,173 | - | 1,034 | ) | $=$ | 96.40\% |
|  | Future 2040 + Project Conditions | FRI | 1065 | $\div$ | 1 | 1,872 | - |  | ) | = | 90.72\% |
|  |  | SUN | 1098 | $\div$ | 1 | 2,214 | - | 1,034 | ) | $=$ | 93.05\% |
| Notes: <br> [1] Plus project conditions traffic $=$ existing + ambient growth at $2 \%$ annually + project traffic for each scenario. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

b. Remove old asphalt and repave the required half width of Baker Blvd along the project's frontage.
c. Mark the pavement of the widened side of Baker Blvd as a single southbound lane using white edge lines that transition and channelize southbound traffic into the lane at the beginning of the project's frontage and out of the lane at the end of the project's frontage.
d. Extend the existing two way left turn lane to the south along Baker Blvd for the length of the project's frontage plus any required transition to match existing centerline south of the project's frontage improvements.
e. Construct standard curb, gutter, and sidewalk frontage improvements on Baker Blvd.
f. Construct the two project access driveways at the locations shown on the site plan (see Figure 2).

## 10 SUMMARY OF VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED (VMT) SCREENING

The County of San Bernardino guideline refers to the use of the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority (SBCTA) guidelines for analyzing a development project's VMT in conformance with SB 743.

According to the SBCTA guidelines a VMT analysis would apply to projects that have the potential to increase the average VMT per service population (e.g., population plus employment) compared to the County of San Bernardino VMT average of $32.7 \%$.

### 10.1 Project Screening from Conducting VMT Analyses

There are three types of screening that lead agencies can apply to effectively screen projects from the need to conduct a project-level VMT assessment. The two relevant screening steps are summarized below:

## Low VMT Area Screening

Residential and office projects located within a low VMT-generating area may be presumed to have a less than significant impact absent substantial evidence to the contrary. In addition, other employment-related and mixeduse land use projects may qualify for the use of screening if the project can reasonably be expected to generate VMT per resident, per worker, or per service population that is similar to the existing land uses in the low VMT area.

For low VMT screening in the SBCTA area, the SBTAM travel forecasting model was used to develop a tool that measures VMT performance for individual jurisdictions and for individual traffic analysis zones (TAZs). TAZs are geographic polygons like Census block groups used to represent areas of homogenous travel behavior. Total daily VMT per service population (population plus employment) was estimated for each TAZ. This presumption may not be appropriate if the project land uses would alter the existing built environment in such a way as to increase the rate or length of vehicle trips.

To identify if the project is in a low VMT-generating area, the SBCTA screening tool is used to compare the appropriate baseline (without project) TAZ VMT to current County of San Bernardino VMT threshold of 32.7\% VMT/Service Population. Additionally, as noted above, the analyst must identify if the project is consistent with the existing land use within that TAZ and use professional judgement that there is nothing unique about the project that would otherwise be mis-represented utilizing the data from the travel demand model.

The image below provides the SBCTA screening tool output for the project's opening year (2023) and shows that the project identified in blue. Based on this analysis, the project is not located in a low-VMT generating area.


SBCTA Screening Tool Output for Project in Opening Year (2023)

## Project Type Screening

Local serving retail projects less than 50,000 square feet may be presumed to have a less than significant impact absent substantial evidence to the contrary. Local serving retail generally improves the convenience of shopping close to home and has the effect of reducing vehicle travel.

## Highway Oriented Commercial as Locally Serving Retail for Pass-by and Diverted Trips

The definition of local serving retail can also be applied to convenience retail near interchanges that attract most of their customers from the freeway. These "diverted" customer trips from the freeway are trips that are passingby and drive a little further to the site for the provided services important to freeway travelers. When the diverted travelers are ready, they return to the freeway and continue in the same direction as their original route. The vehicle miles traveled by diverted link trips is the length of the route from the freeway to the site and the return trip.

The most recent version (11 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Edition) of the Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation manual's appendices summarizes the substantial amount of empirical data on the proportion of trips generated by convenience markets / gas station that fall into the categories of pass-by, diverted link and primary trips. Combining pass-by and diverted link trips into a single category, as was done for this study, the average proportion of trips that are non-primary exceeds 80 percent.

In addition to serving freeway travelers, the project will also serve the residents of Baker and people who work in Baker thereby meeting the traditional definition of a locally serving retail store / gas station.

## VMT Screening Conclusion

Based on the above assessment, the proposed project can be screened from requiring a VMT analysis under CEQA because the project meets the definition of "locally serving retail" under 50,000 square feet and can be presumed to have an insignificant affect on VMT by providing necessary services to vehicles already traveling very long distances unrelated to the proposed project.
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Appendix A: Traffic Counts

## INTERSECTION TURN COUNT

PEAK HOUR
NORTH-SOUTH STREET: DEATH VALLEY/KELBAKER EAST-WEST STREET: BAKER BLVD

PEAK HOUR: 04:45PM

| TOTAL: | 33 | NORTH LEG |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 14 | 14 | 5 |  |
|  |  | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1st |
|  |  | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2nd |
|  |  | 6 | 6 | 0 | 3 rd |
|  |  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4th |
|  |  | Rt | Thr | t |  |

EAST LEG TOTAL:

Total 1st 2nd 3rd 4th

| 15 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 4 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 106 | 20 | 36 | 23 | 27 |
| 163 | 35 | 44 | 35 | 49 |

Lt
Thru
Rt
WEST LEG TOTAL: 284

| Rt | 2 | 14 | 3 | 5 | 24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Thru | 17 | 26 | 23 | 28 | 94 |
| Lt | 35 | 22 | 21 | 24 | 102 |

PEAK HOUR FACTORS
NORTH LEG $=0.69$
SOUTH LEG $=0.69$
EAST LEG $=0.89$
WEST LEG $=0.86$
ALL LEGS $=0.84$

HOUR TOTAL:
698
Prepared by NEWPORT TRAFFIC STUDIES

|  SANBAG CLASSIFICATION SUMMARY  <br> NORTH-SOUTH STREET DEATH VALLEY/KELBAKER  <br> EAST-WEST STREET : BAKER BLVD BAKER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AUTOS THRU | LT | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LARG } \\ & \text { RT } \end{aligned}$ | E 2 A THRU |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \text { AXLE } \\ & \text { THRU } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | A | LT | TOTALS |
| NORTH LEG |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 7 |
| 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 8 |
| 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| 7 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| 23 | 16 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 55 |
| SOUTH LEG |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 17 |
| 15 | 3 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 |
| 8 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| 24 | 6 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |
| 21 | 3 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 58 |
| 12 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 24 |
| 24 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| 14 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| 124 | 17 | 107 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 256 |
| EAST LEG |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | 22 | 25 | 1 | . 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 56 |
| 0 | 12 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 44 |
| 0 | 16 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 52 |
| 2 | 16 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 54 |
| 14 | 23 | 20 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 62 |
| 3 | 23 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 |
| 5 | 22 | 23 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 57 |
| 2 | 11 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 57 |
| 32 | 145 | 221 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 8 | 429 |
| WEST LEG |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 33 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 |
| 30 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 |
| 24 | 14 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |
| 2 | 19 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 58 |
| 43 | 35 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 83 |
| 32 | 22 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 63 |
| 49 | 23 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 80 |
| 17 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 33 |
| 230 | 147 | 23 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 2 | 454 |

## INTERSECTION TURNING COUNT

## NORTH-SOUTH STREET: DEATH VALLEY/KELBAKER EAST-WEST STREET: BAKER BLVD <br> TIME: 04:00PM-05:00PM DATE: 09-03-21

NORTH LEG


Total 1st 2nd 3rd 4th

| 11 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 58 | 8 | 16 | 14 | 20 |
| 126 | 33 | 31 | 27 | 35 |


| Rt | 8 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Thru |  |  |  |  |
|  | 23 | 14 | 19 | 17 | 73 |
|  | 25 | 30 | 33 | 35 | 123 |
|  | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th Total |  |


|  | Lt | Thru | Rt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1st | 8 | 2 | 7 |
| 2nd | 19 | 3 | 15 |
| 3rd | 12 | 1 | 8 |
| 4th | 14 | 6 | 24 |
| Total | 53 | 12 | 54 |

Prepared by NEWPORT TRAFFIC STUDIES

## INTERSECTION TURNING COUNT

> NORTH-SOUTH STREET: DEATH VALLEY/KELBARER EAST-WEST STREET: BAKER BLVD
> TIME: 05:00PM-06:00PM
> DATE: 09-03-21

| NORTH LEG |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18 | 11 | 7 |  |
| 1 | 2 | 1 | 1st |
| 6 | 6 | 0 | 2nd |
| 4 | 3 | 2 | 3rd |
| 7 | 0 | 4 | 4th |
| Rt | Thru | Lt |  |

Total 1st 2nd 3rd 4th

| 14 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 2 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 99 | 36 | 23 | 27 | 13 |
| 146 | 44 | 35 | 49 | 18 |


| Rt | 14 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Thru | 26 | 23 | 28 | 14 | 91 |
| Lt | 22 | 21 | 24 | 41 | 108 |


|  | Lt | Thru | Rt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1st | 31 | 4 | 23 |
| 2nd | 10 | 1 | 13 |
| 3rd | 10 | 1 | 24 |
| 4 th | 4 | 2 | 14 |
| Total | 55 | 8 | 74 |

## INTERSECTION TURN COUNT

PEAK HOUR
NORTH-SOUTH STREET: DEATH VALLEY/KELBAKER EAST-WEST STREET: JURISDICTION:

BARER BLVD
BAKER
PEAK HOUR: 01:00PM

NORTH LEG
TOTAL:

62 | 13 | 25 | 24 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 8 | 13 |
| 6 | 6 | 0 |
| 2 | 3 | 7 |
| 4 | 8 | 4 |

Total
1st
2nd
3rd
4 th
Rt Thru Lt
EAST LEG TOTAL: 309

Total 1st 2nd 3rd 4th

| 179 | 26 | 48 | 49 | 56 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 96 | 24 | 22 | 29 | 21 |
| 179 | 26 | 48 | 49 | 56 |

Lt
Rt
Thru
Lt

| 1 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 10 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 8 | 39 | 56 | 54 | 157 |
| 13 | 48 | 35 | 46 | 142 |
| 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th Total |  |

Thru
Rt

WEST LEG TOTAL: 454

|  | Lt | Thru | Rt |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 38 | 34 | 2 |
| 1st | 38 | 21 | 3 |
| 2nd | 27 |  |  |
| 3rd | 17 | 15 | 16 |
| 4th | 19 | 5 | 12 |
| Total | 95 | 57 | 57 |
|  |  |  |  |

SOUTH LEG

PEAK HOUR FACTORS
NORTH LEG $=0.70$
SOUTH LEG $=0.71$
EAST LEG $=0.72$
WEST LEG $=0.85$
ALL LEGS $=0.89$

TOTAL: 209

|  SANBAG CLASSIFICATION SUMMARY  <br> NORTH-SOUTH STREET DEATH VALLEY/KELBAKER  <br> EAST-WEST STREET : BAKER BLVD BAKER <br>  BEGINNING TIME : 01:00PM  <br> $09-05-21$   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AUTOS THRU | LT | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LARG } \\ & \text { RT } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { GE } 2 \text { P } \\ & \text { THRU } \end{aligned}$ |  | $R T^{3}$ |  | LT |  | AX |  | TOTALS |
| NORTH LEG |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 6 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 22 |
| 6 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 12 |
| 2 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 12 |
| 4 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 16 |
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 18 | 25 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 79 |
| SOUTH LEG |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 33 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 74 |
| 27 | 2 | 21 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 |
| 14 | 15 | 16 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48 |
| 12 | 5 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| 23 | 1 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| 12 | 4 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| 27 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 38 |
| 21 | 7 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |
| 137 | 67 | 151 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 362 |
| EAST LEG |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 8 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 22 |
| 2 | 39 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 89 |
| 0 | 56 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 91 |
| 7 | 53 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 107 |
| 6 | 27 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 66 |
| 4 | 25 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 |
| 2 | 15 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |
| 2 | 14 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 |
| 24 | 237 | 267 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 534 |
| WEST LEG |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26 | 24 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 |
| 48 | 22 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 118 |
| 49 | 29 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 127 |
| 56 | 20 | 56 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 133 |
| 34 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 49 |
| 28 | 14 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |
| 24 | 17 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 |
| 31 | 24 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 |
| 296 | 159 | 192 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 652 |

## INTERSECTION TURNING COUNT

ORTH-SOUTH STREET: DEATH VALLEY/KELBAKER
EAST-WEST STREET: BAKER BLVD
TIME: 01:00PM-02:00PM DATE: 09-05-21

NORTH LEG

| 13 | 25 | 24 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 8 | 13 |
| Total |  |  |
| 6 | 6 | 0 |
| 2 | 3 | 7 |
| 4 | 8 | 4 |
| 2nd |  |  |
| 2rd |  |  |
| 4th | Thru | Lt |

Total 1st 2nd 3rd 4th

| 179 | 26 | 48 | 49 | 56 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 96 | 24 | 22 | 29 | 21 |
| 179 | 26 | 48 | 49 | 56 |


| Rt | 1 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Thru | 8 | 39 | 56 | 54 | 157 |
| Lt | 13 | 48 | 35 | 46 | 142 |
| 1st 2nd 3rd 4th Total |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | Lt | Thru | Rt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1st | 38 | 34 | 2 |
| 2nd | 21 | 3 | 27 |
| 3rd | 17 | 15 | 16 |
| 4th | 19 | 5 | 12 |
| Total | 95 | 57 | 57 |

## INTERSECTION TURNING COUNT

NORTH-SOUTH STREET: DEATH VALLEY/KELBAKER
EAST-WEST STREET: BAKER BLVD
TIME: 02:00PM-03:00PM DATE: 09-05-21

NORTH LEG

| 6 | 8 | 3 | Total <br> 1st |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 2 | 2 |  |
| 2 | 3 | 0 | 2nd |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 3rd |
| 3 | 2 | 1 | 4th |
| Rt | ru | t |  |

Total 1st 2nd 3rd 4th

| 16 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 5 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 65 | 10 | 14 | 17 | 24 |
| 117 | 34 | 28 | 24 | 31 |

Lt

| Rt | 7 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Thru | 28 | 25 | 15 | 14 | 82 |
| Lt | 31 | 34 | 27 | 36 | 128 |
| 1st 2nd 3rd 4th Total |  |  |  |  |  | Thru

Rt

|  | Lt | Thru | Rt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1st | 14 | 1 | 23 |
| 2nd | 17 | 4 | 12 |
| 3rd | 11 | 0 | 27 |
| 4 th | 16 | 7 | 21 |
| Total | 58 | 12 | 83 |

## PEAK HOUR

NORTH-SOUTH STREET: DEATH VALLEY/KELBAKER EAST-WEST STREET: JURISDICTION:

I-15 SB RAMPS
DATE: 09-03-21 BAKER

PEAK HOUR: 04:45PM

NORTH LEG


EAST LEG TOTAL: 68

Total 1st 2nd 3rd 4th


WEST LEG TOTAL: 0

Lt
Thru
Rt
Rt
Thru
Lt

| 19 | 20 | 10 | 14 | 63 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th Total |  |

PEAK HOUR FACTORS
NORTH LEG $=0.91$
SOUTH LEG $=0.67$
EAST LEG $=0.77$
WEST LEG =
ALL LEGS $=0.88$

TOTAL:
102
SOUTH LEG

|  SANBAG CLASSIFICATION SUMMARY   <br> NORTH-SOUTH STREET DEATH VALLEY/KELBAKER   <br> EAST-WEST STREET $:$ I-15 SB RAMPS BAKER  <br>  BEGINNING TIME : 04:00PM   <br>  $09-03-21$   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AUTOS <br> RT THRU |  |  | LARGE 2 AXLE |  |  | 3 AXLE RT THRU |  | LT | $\begin{aligned} & 4(+) \text { AXLE } \\ & \text { RT THRU LT } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | TOTALS |
| NORTH LEG |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 |
| 22 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 61 |
| 7 | 50 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 63 |
| 17 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 72 |
| 19 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 68 |
| 16 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 62 |
| 22 | 52 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 76 |
| 20 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 59 |
| 142 | 357 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 520 |
| SOUTH LEG |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 11 |
| 0 | 23 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| 0 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| 0 | 24 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| 0 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| 0 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| 0 | 156 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 167 |
| EAST LEG |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| 14 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| 10 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| 19 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| 17 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| 14 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| 6 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| 90 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 116 |
| WEST LEG |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## INTERSECTION TURNING COUNT

```
NORTH-SOUTH STREET: DEATH VALLEY/KELBAKER
EAST-WEST STREET: I-15 SB RAMPS
TIME: 04:00PM-05:00PM DATE: 09-03-21
```

NORTH LEG

| 78 | 177 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19 | 40 |  |
| 24 | 37 |  |
| 13 | 50 |  |
| 22 | 50 |  |
| 1st |  |  |
| 2nd |  |  |
| Rt |  |  |
| Thru | Lt |  |

Total 1st 2nd 3rd 4th


Lt

| Rt | 6 | 14 | 10 | 19 | 49 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 8 |
|  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |

Thru
$R t$


## INTERSECTION TURNING COUNT

NORTH-SOUTH STREET: DEATH VALLEY/KELBAKER
EAST-WEST STREET: I-15 SB RAMPS
TIME: 05:00PM-06:00PM DATE: 09-03-21

NORTH LEG

| 79 | 186 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19 | 49 |  |
| 17 | 45 |  |
| 23 | 53 |  |
| 20 | 39 |  |
| Rtal |  |  |
| 1st |  |  |
| 2nd |  |  |
| 2rd |  |  |
| 4th |  |  |

Total 1st 2nd 3rd 4th


Lt

| Rt | 20 | 10 | 14 | 6 | 50 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Thru | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
|  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|  | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th Total |  |

Thru
Rt

|  | Lt | Thru | Rt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1st | 0 | 38 |  |
| 2nd | 0 | 14 |  |
| 3 rd | 0 | 22 |  |
| 4 th | 1 | 14 |  |
| Total | 1 | 88 |  |

## INTERSECTION TURN COUNT

## PEAK HOUR

NORTH-SOUTH STREET: DEATH VALLEY/KELBAKER EAST-WEST STREET:
DATE: 09-05-21 JURISDICTION:
I-15 SB RAMPS
BAKER

PEAK HOUR: 01:00PM

TOTAL: $\quad 339$| 166 | 173 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 28 | 19 |  |
| 51 | 51 |  |
| 32 | 55 |  |
| 55 | 48 |  |
| Total |  |  |
| 1st |  |  |
| 2nd |  |  |
| 3rd |  |  |
| 4th |  |  |

|  | EAST LEG TOTAL: |  |  |  | 118 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rt | 33 | 31 | 27 | 19 | 110 |
| Thru | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Lt | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 5 |
|  | 1st | nd | rd | th | tal |

Thru
Rt
Lt

WEST LEG TOTAL:
0
Total 1st 2nd 3rd 4th


PEAK HOUR FACTORS
NORTH LEG = 0.82
SOUTH LEG $=0.63$ EAST LEG $=0.84$ WEST LEG =

ALL LEGS $=0.90$

TOTAL:
138

|  SANBAG CLASSIFICATION SUMMARY   <br> NORTH-SOUTH STREET DEATH VALLEY/KELBAKER BAKER  <br> EAST-WEST STREET : I-15 SB RAMPS   <br> BEGINNING TIME : $01: 00 \mathrm{PM}$  $09-05-21$  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LT | LARGE 2 AXLE |  |  | RT ${ }^{3 \text { A AXLE }}$ THRU |  |  | $4(+)$RT THRULTELT |  |  | TOTALS |
| NORTH LEG |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 47 |
| 51 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 102 |
| 32 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 87 |
| 55 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 103 |
| 35 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 68 |
| 33 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 |
| 22 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 53 |
| 38 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 68 |
| 292 | 291 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 593 |
| SOUTH LEG |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 39 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 |
| 0 | 19 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| 0 | 21 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| 0 | 18 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| 0 | 18 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| 0 | 22 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| 0 | 9 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 22 |
| 0 | 12 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| 0 | 158 | 88 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 249 |
| EAST LEG |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 27 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 34 |
| 31 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| 24 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| 20 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| 12 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| 32 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| 192 | 11 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 219 |
| WEST LEG |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |



## INTERSECTION TURNING COUNT

## NORTH-SOUTH STREET: DEATH VALLEY/KELBAKER <br> EAST-WEST STREET: I-15 SB RAMPS <br> TIME: 02:00PM-03:00PM DATE: 09-05-21

NORTH LEG

| 128 | 126 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 35 | 33 |  |
| 33 | 32 |  |
| 22 | 31 |  |
| 38 | 30 |  |
| Total |  |  |
| 1st |  |  |
| 2nd |  |  |
| 3rd |  |  |
| 4th |  |  |
| Rt Thru | Lt |  |

Total 1st 2nd 3rd 4th


Lt

| Rt | 20 | 12 | 27 | 32 | 91 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Thru | 2 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 8 |
| Lt | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |


|  | Lt | Thru | Rt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1st | 10 | 18 |  |
| 2nd | 16 | 22 |  |
| 3 rd | 12 | 10 |  |
| 4th | 11 | 12 |  |
| Total | 49 | 62 |  |

## PEAK HOUR

NORTH-SOUTH STREET: DEATH VALLEY/KELBAKER EAST-WEST STREET: JURISDICTION:

I-15 NB RAMPS
DATE: 09-03-21

PEAK HOUR: 04:45PM

| TOTAL: | 198 | NORTH LEG |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 | 197 |  |
|  |  | 1 | 49 | 1st |
|  |  | 0 | 49 | 2nd |
|  |  | 0 | 45 | 3rd |
|  |  | 0 | 54 | 4 th |
|  |  | ru | Lt |  |

Total 1st 2nd 3rd 4th

| 100 | 26 | 38 | 14 | 22 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

WEST LEG TOTAL:

Lt
Thru
Rt
WEST LEG TOTAL: 105
EAST LEG TOTAL: 0
Rt

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

PEAK HOUR FACTORS
NORTH LEG $=0.92$
SOUTH LEG $=0.30$ EAST LEG = WEST LEG $=0.66$

ALL LEGS $=0.87$


## INTERSECTION TURNING COUNT

```
NORTH-SOUTH STREET: DEATH VALLEY/KELBAKER
EAST-WEST STREET: I-15 NB RAMPS
TIME: 04:00PM-05:00PM DATE: 09-03-21
```

NORTH LEG

|  | 6 | 173 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total |  |  |  |
|  | 1 | 39 |  |  |
|  | 1 | 34 |  |  |
|  | 1 | 51 |  |  |
| 2nd |  |  |  |  |
| 2rd |  |  |  |  |
| 3th |  |  |  |  |
| Rt Thru |  |  |  | Lt |

Total 1st 2nd 3rd 4th

| 72 | 11 | 23 | 12 | 26 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 7 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |



Rt


## INTERSECTION TURNING COUNT

## NORTH-SOUTH STREET: DEATH VALLEY/KELBAKER

 EAST-WEST STREET: I-15 NB RAMPSTIME: 05:00PM-06:00PM
DATE: 09-03-21
NORTH LEG

|  | 1 | 184 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 49 |
|  | Total |  |
| 1st |  |  |
|  | 0 | 45 |
|  | 0 | 54 |
| 2nd |  |  |
| 3rd |  |  |
|  | 1 | 36 |

Total 1st 2nd 3rd 4th

| 89 | 38 | 14 | 22 | 15 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

Lt
Thru
Rt

| 1st | Thru | Rt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 0 |
| 2nd | 0 | 0 |
| 3rd | 0 | 1 |
| 4th | 0 | 1 |
| Total | 0 | 2 |

PEAK HOUR
NORTH-SOUTH STREET: DEATH VALLEY/KELBAKER EAST-WEST STREET: I-15 NB RAMPS
JURISDICTION: DATE: 09-05-21

PEAK HOUR: 01:00PM



WEST LEG TOTAL: 142

|  | Lt | Thru | Rt | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NORTH } \\ & \text { SOUTH } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 'H LEG } \\ & \text { H LEG } \end{aligned}$ | $=$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.79 \\ & 0.67 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1st |  | 1 | 1 | EAST LEG = <br> WEST LEG $=0.65$ |  |  |  |
| 2nd |  | 2 | 0 | ALL L | LEGS | $=$ | 0.94 |
| 3rd |  | 0 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 4th |  | 2 | 1 | TOTAL: |  |  |  |
| Total |  | 5 | 3 |  | 8 |  |  |




## INTERSECTION TURNING COUNT

```
NORTH-SOUTH STREET: DEATH VALLEY/KELBAKER
EAST-WEST STREET: I-15 NB RAMPS
TIME: 02:00PM-03:00PM
DATE: 09-05-21
```



Total 1st 2nd 3rd 4th

| 111 | 28 | 38 | 22 | 23 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 5 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Lt
Thru
Rt


Lt Thru Rt

| 1st | 0 | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2nd | 2 | 4 |
| 3 rd | 0 | 3 |
| 4th | 0 | 1 |
| tal | 2 | 9 |

Appendix B: Forecast Model Volume Development

## 2016 Base Model Directional Volumes (AM/PM)



## 2016 Base Model Directional Volumes (AM/PM)



2016 Base Model Directional Volumes (AM/PM)


2040 Forecast Model Directional Volumes (AM/PM)


2040 Forecast Model Directional Volumes (AM/PM)


2040 Forecast Model Directional Volumes (AM/PM)


## Appendix C: Intersection Capacity Analysis

| SUBJECT <br> TURN MOVEMENTS | BY <br> TM | $\begin{array}{rr} \hline \text { DATE } & \\ & 10-\mathrm{Nov}-22 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | JOB NO. OONT0004-0001 | SHEET | OF |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | OF | 2 |
| E/W STREET : BAKER BLVD |  |  | INTERSECTION |  | 1 |  |
| N/S STREET : DEATH VALLEY RD (SR 127) |  |  | PROJECTED GROWTH |  | 2.0\% |  |
| CONDITION : FRIDAY PEAK HOUR |  |  | PER YEAR |  |  |  |
| CONDITION DIAGRAMS |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## EXISTING GEOMETRICS

## TURN MOVEMENTS

| Condition | Existing <br> Condition | Project <br> Trips | Existing + <br> Project <br> Condition | Ambient <br> Growth | Background Condition | Project <br> Condition | Future <br> Condition | Future + <br> Project <br> Condition |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Scenario \# | 1 |  | 3 |  | 5 | 7 | 9 | 11 |

BAKER BLVD

| EB LEFT | 15 | 0 | 15 | 1 | 16 | 16 | 17 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EB THRU | 106 | 144 | 250 | 4 | 110 | 254 | 104 |  |
| EB RIGHT | 163 | 0 | 163 | 7 | 170 | 170 | 188 |  |
| WB LEFT | 102 | 350 | 452 | 4 | 106 | 458 |  |  |
| WB THRU | 94 | 71 | 165 | 4 | 98 | 188 |  |  |
| WB RIGHT | 24 | 8 | 32 | 1 | 25 | 169 | 18 | 101 |

DEATH VALLEY RD (SR 127)

| NB LEFT | 65 | 0 | 65 | 3 | 68 | 68 | 87 | 87 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NB THRU | 12 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | 12 | 17 | 17 |
| NB RIGHT | 84 | 484 | 568 | 3 | 87 | 571 | 101 | 585 |
| SB LEFT | 5 | 8 | 13 | 0 | 5 | 13 | 7 | 15 |
| SB THRU | 14 | 0 | 14 | 1 | 15 | 15 | 21 | 21 |
| SB RIGHT | 14 | 0 | 14 | 1 | 15 | 15 | 19 | 19 |
| TOTALS | 698 | 1065 | 1763 | 29 | 727 | 1792 | 807 | 1872 |

Los Angeles Office: 213.337.3680 ~ Ontario Office: 909.481.5750 ~ San Diego Office: 619.400.0600
Santa Clarita Office: 661.284.7400 ~ Temecula Office: 951.294.9300 ~ Tustin Office: 714.665.4500


| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 10 |
| Intersection LOS | A |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 15 | 106 | 163 | 102 | 94 | 24 | 65 | 12 | 84 | 5 | 14 | 14 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 15 | 106 | 163 | 102 | 94 | 24 | 65 | 12 | 84 | 5 | 14 | 14 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 13 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 11 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 14 | 14 |
| Mvmt Flow | 18 | 126 | 194 | 121 | 112 | 29 | 77 | 14 | 100 | 6 | 17 | 17 |
| Number of Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 9.5 |  |  | 10 |  |  | 11.2 |  |  | 9.2 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  |  | A |  |  | B |  |  | A |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | EBLn2 | EBLn3 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | WBLn3 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $40 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $15 \%$ |
| Vol Thu, \% | $7 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $42 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $52 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $42 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 161 | 15 | 106 | 163 | 102 | 94 | 24 | 33 |
| LT Vol | 65 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 102 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Through Vol | 12 | 0 | 106 | 0 | 0 | 94 | 0 | 14 |
| RT Vol | 84 | 0 | 0 | 163 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 14 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 192 | 18 | 126 | 194 | 121 | 112 | 29 | 39 |
| Geometry Grp | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.312 | 0.031 | 0.2 | 0.267 | 0.21 | 0.181 | 0.039 | 0.066 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 5.862 | 6.321 | 5.712 | 4.952 | 6.217 | 5.814 | 4.933 | 6.062 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 613 | 570 | 632 | 730 | 579 | 619 | 727 | 591 |
| Service Time | 3.589 | 4.021 | 3.412 | 2.652 | 3.939 | 3.536 | 2.655 | 3.797 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.313 | 0.032 | 0.199 | 0.266 | 0.209 | 0.181 | 0.04 | 0.066 |
| HCM Control Delay | 11.2 | 9.2 | 9.8 | 9.4 | 10.6 | 9.8 | 7.9 | 9.2 |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | A | A | A | B | A | A | A |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 1.3 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 1.1 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 0.2 |


| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 151.2 |
| Intersection LOS | F |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\uparrow$ | F | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | \$ |  |  | \$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 15 | 250 | 163 | 452 | 165 | 32 | 65 | 12 | 568 | 13 | 14 | 14 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 15 | 250 | 163 | 452 | 165 | 32 | 65 | 12 | 568 | 13 | 14 | 14 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 13 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 11 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 14 | 14 |
| Mumt Flow | 18 | 298 | 194 | 538 | 196 | 38 | 77 | 14 | 676 | 15 | 17 | 17 |
| Number of Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 24.6 |  |  | 112.9 |  |  | 282.5 |  |  | 15.1 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | C |  |  | F |  |  | F |  |  | C |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | EBLn2 | EBLn3 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | WBLn3 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $10 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $32 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $2 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $34 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $88 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $34 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 645 | 15 | 250 | 163 | 452 | 165 | 32 | 41 |
| LT Vol | 65 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 452 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Through Vol | 12 | 0 | 250 | 0 | 0 | 165 | 0 | 14 |
| RT Vol | 568 | 0 | 0 | 163 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 14 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 768 | 18 | 298 | 194 | 538 | 196 | 38 | 49 |
| Geometry Grp | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 1.561 | 0.043 | 0.662 | 0.391 | 1.23 | 0.427 | 0.074 | 0.125 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 7.629 | 10.512 | 9.864 | 9.056 | 9.814 | 9.389 | 8.461 | 10.885 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 484 | 343 | 369 | 400 | 377 | 387 | 426 | 331 |
| Service Time | 5.329 | 8.212 | 7.564 | 6.756 | 7.514 | 7.089 | 6.161 | 8.585 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 1.587 | 0.052 | 0.808 | 0.485 | 1.427 | 0.506 | 0.089 | 0.148 |
| HCM Control Delay | 282.5 | 13.7 | 29.9 | 17.5 | 154.3 | 18.9 | 11.8 | 15.1 |
| HCM Lane LOS | F | B | D | C | F | C | B | C |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 40 | 0.1 | 4.5 | 1.8 | 19.3 | 2.1 | 0.2 | 0.4 |


| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 10.3 |
| Intersection LOS | B |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{1}$ | 4 | 「 | ${ }^{1}$ | 4 | 「' |  | \& |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 16 | 110 | 170 | 106 | 98 | 25 | 68 | 12 | 87 | 5 | 15 | 15 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 16 | 110 | 170 | 106 | 98 | 25 | 68 | 12 | 87 | 5 | 15 | 15 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 13 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 11 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 14 | 14 |
| Mvmt Flow | 19 | 131 | 202 | 126 | 117 | 30 | 81 | 14 | 104 | 6 | 18 | 18 |
| Number of Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 9.8 |  |  | 10.1 |  |  | 11.5 |  |  | 9.3 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | A |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | EBLn2 | EBLn3 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | WBLn3 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $41 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, $\%$ | $7 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $43 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $52 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $43 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 167 | 16 | 110 | 170 | 106 | 98 | 25 | 35 |
| LT Vol | 68 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 106 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Through Vol | 12 | 0 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 98 | 0 | 15 |
| RT Vol | 87 | 0 | 0 | 170 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 15 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 199 | 19 | 131 | 202 | 126 | 117 | 30 | 42 |
| Geometry Grp | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.328 | 0.034 | 0.209 | 0.281 | 0.22 | 0.19 | 0.041 | 0.071 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 5.932 | 6.361 | 5.751 | 4.991 | 6.28 | 5.877 | 4.995 | 6.143 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 606 | 564 | 626 | 720 | 573 | 611 | 717 | 583 |
| Service Time | 3.66 | 4.085 | 3.475 | 2.714 | 4.007 | 3.603 | 2.722 | 3.878 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.328 | 0.034 | 0.209 | 0.281 | 0.22 | 0.191 | 0.042 | 0.072 |
| HCM Control Delay | 11.5 | 9.3 | 10 | 9.7 | 10.8 | 10 | 7.9 | 9.3 |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | A | A | A | B | A | A | A |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 1.4 | 0.1 | 0.8 | 1.2 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 0.2 |


| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 132.3 |
| Intersection LOS | F |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 | 「 | ${ }^{1}$ | 4 | 「 |  | \& |  |  | \& |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 16 | 243 | 170 | 430 | 164 | 32 | 68 | 12 | 536 | 12 | 15 | 15 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 16 | 243 | 170 | 430 | 164 | 32 | 68 | 12 | 536 | 12 | 15 | 15 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 13 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 11 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 14 | 14 |
| Mvmt Flow | 19 | 289 | 202 | 512 | 195 | 38 | 81 | 14 | 638 | 14 | 18 | 18 |
| Number of Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 23.7 |  |  | 95.6 |  |  | 253.2 |  |  | 14.9 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | C |  |  | F |  |  | F |  |  | B |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | EBLn2 | EBLn3 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | WBLn3 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $11 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $29 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $2 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $36 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $87 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $36 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 616 | 16 | 243 | 170 | 430 | 164 | 32 | 42 |
| LT Vol | 68 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 430 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Through Vol | 12 | 0 | 243 | 0 | 0 | 164 | 0 | 15 |
| RT Vol | 536 | 0 | 0 | 170 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 15 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 733 | 19 | 289 | 202 | 512 | 195 | 38 | 50 |
| Geometry Grp | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 1.493 | 0.046 | 0.65 | 0.413 | 1.169 | 0.424 | 0.074 | 0.128 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 7.594 | 10.301 | 9.655 | 8.85 | 9.659 | 9.235 | 8.31 | 10.639 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 484 | 350 | 376 | 409 | 379 | 392 | 434 | 339 |
| Service Time | 5.294 | 8.001 | 7.355 | 6.55 | 7.359 | 6.935 | 6.01 | 8.339 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 1.514 | 0.054 | 0.769 | 0.494 | 1.351 | 0.497 | 0.088 | 0.147 |
| HCM Control Delay | 253.2 | 13.5 | 28.6 | 17.6 | 131.2 | 18.6 | 11.7 | 14.9 |
| HCM Lane LOS | F | B | D | C | F | C | B | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 36.5 | 0.1 | 4.4 | 2 | 17.3 | 2.1 | 0.2 | 0.4 |


| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 11.2 |
| Intersection LOS | B |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{*}$ | 4 | 「 | ${ }^{1}$ | 4 | 「' |  | \& |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 17 | 104 | 188 | 118 | 101 | 27 | 87 | 17 | 101 | 7 | 21 | 19 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 17 | 104 | 188 | 118 | 101 | 27 | 87 | 17 | 101 | 7 | 21 | 19 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 13 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 11 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 14 | 14 |
| Mvmt Flow | 20 | 124 | 224 | 140 | 120 | 32 | 104 | 20 | 120 | 8 | 25 | 23 |
| Number of Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 10.5 |  |  | 10.8 |  |  | 13.2 |  |  | 9.9 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | A |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | EBLn2 | EBLn3 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | WBLn3 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $42 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $15 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $8 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $45 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $49 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $40 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 205 | 17 | 104 | 188 | 118 | 101 | 27 | 47 |
| LT Vol | 87 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 118 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Through Vol | 17 | 0 | 104 | 0 | 0 | 101 | 0 | 21 |
| RT Vol | 101 | 0 | 0 | 188 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 19 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 244 | 20 | 124 | 224 | 140 | 120 | 32 | 56 |
| Geometry Grp | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.415 | 0.037 | 0.208 | 0.328 | 0.256 | 0.206 | 0.047 | 0.1 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 6.128 | 6.651 | 6.039 | 5.276 | 6.567 | 6.162 | 5.278 | 6.412 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 588 | 538 | 594 | 680 | 546 | 582 | 678 | 558 |
| Service Time | 3.868 | 4.391 | 3.779 | 3.015 | 4.308 | 3.903 | 3.018 | 4.164 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.415 | 0.037 | 0.209 | 0.329 | 0.256 | 0.206 | 0.047 | 0.1 |
| HCM Control Delay | 13.2 | 9.6 | 10.4 | 10.6 | 11.6 | 10.5 | 8.3 | 9.9 |
| HCM Lane LOS | B | A | B | B | B | B | A | A |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 2 | 0.1 | 0.8 | 1.4 | 1 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 0.3 |



| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\uparrow$ | 「 | \% | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | ¢ |  |  | ${ }_{*}$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 17 | 248 | 188 | 468 | 172 | 35 | 87 | 17 | 585 | 15 | 21 | 19 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 17 | 248 | 188 | 468 | 172 | 35 | 87 | 17 | 585 | 15 | 21 | 19 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.84 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 13 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 11 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 14 | 14 |
| Mvmt Flow | 20 | 295 | 224 | 557 | 205 | 42 | 104 | 20 | 696 | 18 | 25 | 23 |
| Number of Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 25.9 |  |  | 130.7 |  |  | 347.2 |  |  | 16.3 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | D |  |  | F |  |  | F |  |  | C |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | EBLn2 | EBLn3 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | WBLn3 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $13 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $27 \%$ |
| Vol Thu, \% | $2 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $38 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $85 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $35 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 689 | 17 | 248 | 188 | 468 | 172 | 35 | 55 |
| LT Vol | 87 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 468 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Through Vol | 17 | 0 | 248 | 0 | 0 | 172 | 0 | 21 |
| RT Vol | 585 | 0 | 0 | 188 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 19 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 820 | 20 | 295 | 224 | 557 | 205 | 42 | 65 |
| Geometry Grp | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 1.708 | 0.049 | 0.663 | 0.456 | 1.292 | 0.452 | 0.082 | 0.169 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 7.877 | 10.997 | 10.344 | 9.53 | 10.27 | 9.842 | 8.908 | 11.282 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 468 | 328 | 351 | 380 | 357 | 369 | 405 | 320 |
| Service Time | 5.577 | 8.697 | 8.044 | 7.23 | 7.97 | 7.542 | 6.608 | 8.982 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 1.752 | 0.061 | 0.84 | 0.589 | 1.56 | 0.556 | 0.104 | 0.203 |
| HCM Control Delay | 347.2 | 14.3 | 31.2 | 20 | 180.1 | 20.4 | 12.4 | 16.3 |
| HCM Lane LOS | F | B | D | C | F | C | B | C |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 46.7 | 0.2 | 4.5 | 2.3 | 20.9 | 2.3 | 0.3 | 0.6 |


| SUBJECT | BY | DATE | JOB NO. | SHEET |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TURN MOVEMENTS | TM | 10-Nov-22 | OONT0004-0001 | 1 | OF | 2 |
| E/W STREET : BAKER BLVD |  |  | IN | RSECTION | 1 |  |
| N/S STREET : DEATH VALLEY RD (SR 127) |  |  | PROJECTED GROWTH |  | 2.0\% |  |
| CONDITION: SUNDAY PEAK HOUR |  |  |  | PER YEAR |  |  |

## TURN MOVEMENTS

| Condition | Existing <br> Condition | Project <br> Trips | Existing + <br> Project <br> Condition | Ambient <br> Growth | Background Condition | Project <br> Condition | Future <br> Condition | Future + <br> Project <br> Condition |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Scenario \# | 2 |  | 4 |  | 6 | 8 | 10 | 12 |

BAKER BLVD

| EB LEFT | 179 | 0 | 179 | 7 | 186 | 186 | 188 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EB THRU | 96 | 81 | 177 | 4 | 100 | 188 |  |  |
| EB RIGHT | 179 | 0 | 179 | 7 | 186 | 181 | 186 | 189 |
| WB LEFT | 142 | 382 | 524 | 6 | 148 | 530 | 189 |  |
| WB THRU | 157 | 135 | 292 | 6 | 163 | 298 | 165 |  |
| WB RIGHT | 10 | 8 | 18 | 0 | 10 | 18 | 18 | 300 |

## DEATH VALLEY RD (SR 127)

| NB LEFT | 95 | 0 | 95 | 4 | 99 | 99 | 110 | 110 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NB THRU | 57 | 0 | 57 | 2 | 59 | 59 | 64 | 64 |
| NB RIGHT | 57 | 484 | 541 | 2 | 59 | 543 | 67 | 551 |
| SB LEFT | 24 | 8 | 32 | 1 | 25 | 33 | 28 | 36 |
| SB THRU | 25 | 0 | 25 | 1 | 26 | 26 | 28 | 28 |
| SB RIGHT | 13 | 0 | 13 | 1 | 14 | 14 | 15 | 15 |
| TOTALS | 1034 | 1098 | 2132 | 41 | 1075 | 2173 | 1116 | 2214 |

Los Angeles Office: 213.337.3680 ~ Ontario Office: 909.481.5750 ~ San Diego Office: 619.400.0600
Santa Clarita Office: 661.284.7400 ~ Temecula Office: 951.294.9300 ~ Tustin Office: 714.665.4500


Los Angeles Office: 213.337.3680 ~ Ontario Office: 909.481.5750 ~ San Diego Office: 619.400.0600
Santa Clarita Office: 661.284.7400 ~ Temecula Office: $951.294 .9300 \sim$ Tustin Office: 714.665.4500

| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 12.4 |
| Intersection LOS | B |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{1}$ | 4 | 「 | ${ }^{*}$ | 4 | 「 |  | \& |  |  | * |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 179 | 96 | 179 | 142 | 157 | 10 | 95 | 57 | 57 | 24 | 25 | 13 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 179 | 96 | 179 | 142 | 157 | 10 | 95 | 57 | 57 | 24 | 25 | 13 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 28 | 8 |
| Mvmt Flow | 201 | 108 | 201 | 160 | 176 | 11 | 107 | 64 | 64 | 27 | 28 | 15 |
| Number of Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 11.6 |  |  | 12.2 |  |  | 14.9 |  |  | 11.3 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  | B |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | EBLn2 | EBLn3 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | WBLn3 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $45 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $39 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, $\%$ | $27 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $40 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $27 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $21 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 209 | 179 | 96 | 179 | 142 | 157 | 10 | 62 |
| LT Vol | 95 | 179 | 0 | 0 | 142 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Through Vol | 57 | 0 | 96 | 0 | 0 | 157 | 0 | 25 |
| RT Vol | 57 | 0 | 0 | 179 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 13 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 235 | 201 | 108 | 201 | 160 | 176 | 11 | 70 |
| Geometry Grp | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.443 | 0.373 | 0.185 | 0.305 | 0.305 | 0.311 | 0.018 | 0.141 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 6.795 | 6.678 | 6.168 | 5.455 | 6.876 | 6.348 | 5.634 | 7.266 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 528 | 537 | 579 | 656 | 520 | 563 | 632 | 490 |
| Service Time | 4.564 | 4.442 | 3.932 | 3.218 | 4.646 | 4.118 | 3.402 | 5.053 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.445 | 0.374 | 0.187 | 0.306 | 0.308 | 0.313 | 0.017 | 0.143 |
| HCM Control Delay | 14.9 | 13.4 | 10.3 | 10.6 | 12.7 | 12 | 8.5 | 11.3 |
| HCM Lane LOS | $B$ | $B$ | $B$ | $B$ | $B$ | $B$ | A | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 2.2 | 1.7 | 0.7 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 0.1 | 0.5 |


| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 175.2 |
| Intersection LOS | F |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\uparrow$ | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ | F |  | ¢ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 179 | 177 | 179 | 524 | 292 | 18 | 95 | 57 | 541 | 32 | 25 | 13 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 179 | 177 | 179 | 524 | 292 | 18 | 95 | 57 | 541 | 32 | 25 | 13 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 4 | 28 | 8 |
| Mvmt Flow | 201 | 199 | 201 | 589 | 328 | 20 | 107 | 64 | 608 | 36 | 28 | 15 |
| Number of Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | , | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 20.7 |  |  | 149.1 |  |  | 341.8 |  |  | 17.2 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | C |  |  | F |  |  | F |  |  | C |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | EBLn2 | EBLn3 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | WBLn3 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $14 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $46 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $8 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $36 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $78 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $19 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 693 | 179 | 177 | 179 | 524 | 292 | 18 | 70 |
| LT Vol | 95 | 179 | 0 | 0 | 524 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| Through Vol | 57 | 0 | 177 | 0 | 0 | 292 | 0 | 25 |
| RT Vol | 541 | 0 | 0 | 179 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 13 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 779 | 201 | 199 | 201 | 589 | 328 | 20 | 79 |
| Geometry Grp | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 1.693 | 0.485 | 0.452 | 0.418 | 1.385 | 0.725 | 0.041 | 0.211 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 8.253 | 10.567 | 10.025 | 9.267 | 10.351 | 9.795 | 9.043 | 11.5 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 452 | 344 | 362 | 392 | 359 | 374 | 398 | 315 |
| Service Time | 5.953 | 8.267 | 7.725 | 6.967 | 8.051 | 7.495 | 6.743 | 9.2 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 1.723 | 0.584 | 0.55 | 0.513 | 1.641 | 0.877 | 0.05 | 0.251 |
| HCM Control Delay | 341.8 | 22.8 | 20.7 | 18.5 | 217.8 | 34.4 | 12.1 | 17.2 |
| HCM Lane LOS | F | C | C | C | F | D | B | C |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 44.1 | 2.5 | 2.3 | 2 | 24.2 | 5.5 | 0.1 | 0.8 |


| Intersection |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 12.9 |  |
| Intersection LOS | B |  |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 4 | F | \% | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | ${ }_{*}$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 186 | 100 | 186 | 148 | 163 | 10 | 99 | 59 | 59 | 25 | 26 | 14 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 186 | 100 | 186 | 148 | 163 | 10 | 99 | 59 | 59 | 25 | 26 | 14 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 28 | 8 |
| Mumt Flow | 209 | 112 | 209 | 166 | 183 | 11 | 111 | 66 | 66 | 28 | 29 | 16 |
| Number of Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 12.1 |  |  | 12.6 |  |  | 15.6 |  |  | 11.5 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | EBLn2 | EBLn3 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | WBLn3 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $46 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $38 \%$ |
| Vol Thu, \% | $27 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $40 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $27 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $22 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 217 | 186 | 100 | 186 | 148 | 163 | 10 | 65 |
| LT Vol | 99 | 186 | 0 | 0 | 148 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Through Vol | 59 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 163 | 0 | 26 |
| RT Vol | 59 | 0 | 0 | 186 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 14 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 244 | 209 | 112 | 209 | 166 | 183 | 11 | 73 |
| Geometry Grp | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.467 | 0.393 | 0.196 | 0.322 | 0.323 | 0.328 | 0.018 | 0.15 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 6.897 | 6.776 | 6.265 | 5.551 | 6.982 | 6.454 | 5.738 | 7.389 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 519 | 529 | 570 | 644 | 512 | 553 | 619 | 482 |
| Service Time | 4.671 | 4.547 | 4.036 | 3.321 | 4.76 | 4.231 | 3.515 | 5.185 |
| HCM Lane VIC Ratio | 0.47 | 0.395 | 0.196 | 0.325 | 0.324 | 0.331 | 0.018 | 0.151 |
| HCM Control Delay | 15.6 | 13.9 | 10.6 | 11 | 13.1 | 12.4 | 8.6 | 11.5 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | B | B | B | B | B | A | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 2.5 | 1.9 | 0.7 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 0.1 | 0.5 |


| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh 182.1 |  |
| Intersection LOS | F |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\uparrow$ | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ | F' |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 186 | 181 | 186 | 530 | 298 | 18 | 99 | 59 | 543 | 33 | 26 | 14 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 186 | 181 | 186 | 530 | 298 | 18 | 99 | 59 | 543 | 33 | 26 | 14 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 28 | 8 |
| Mvmt Flow | 209 | 203 | 209 | 596 | 335 | 20 | 111 | 66 | 610 | 37 | 29 | 16 |
| Number of Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 21.3 |  |  | 156.1 |  |  | 357.4 |  |  | 17.6 |  |  |
| HCMLOS | C |  |  | F |  |  | F |  |  | C |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | EBLn2 | EBLn3 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | WBLn3 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $14 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $45 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $8 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $36 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $77 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $19 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 701 | 186 | 181 | 186 | 530 | 298 | 18 | 73 |
| LT Vol | 99 | 186 | 0 | 0 | 530 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| Through Vol | 59 | 0 | 181 | 0 | 0 | 298 | 0 | 26 |
| RT Vol | 543 | 0 | 0 | 186 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 14 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 788 | 209 | 203 | 209 | 596 | 335 | 20 | 82 |
| Geometry Grp | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 1.728 | 0.505 | 0.463 | 0.436 | 1.409 | 0.744 | 0.041 | 0.222 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 8.341 | 10.643 | 10.101 | 9.342 | 10.484 | 9.928 | 9.174 | 11.616 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 441 | 341 | 360 | 389 | 351 | 368 | 393 | 311 |
| Service Time | 6.041 | 8.343 | 7.801 | 7.042 | 8.184 | 7.628 | 6.874 | 9.316 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 1.787 | 0.613 | 0.564 | 0.537 | 1.698 | 0.91 | 0.051 | 0.264 |
| HCM Control Delay | 357.4 | 23.7 | 21.2 | 19.1 | 228.2 | 36.5 | 12.3 | 17.6 |
| HCM Lane LOS | F | C | C | C | F | E | B | C |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 45.4 | 2.7 | 2.4 | 2.1 | 24.9 | 5.8 | 0.1 | 0.8 |


| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 13.7 |
| Intersection LOS | B |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 4 | 「 | ${ }^{1}$ | 4 | 「' |  | \& |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 188 | 105 | 189 | 146 | 165 | 11 | 110 | 64 | 67 | 28 | 28 | 15 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 188 | 105 | 189 | 146 | 165 | 11 | 110 | 64 | 67 | 28 | 28 | 15 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 28 | 8 |
| Mvmt Flow | 211 | 118 | 212 | 164 | 185 | 12 | 124 | 72 | 75 | 31 | 31 | 17 |
| Number of Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 12.5 |  |  | 13.1 |  |  | 17.3 |  |  | 11.9 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  | B |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | EBLn2 | EBLn3 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | WBLn3 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $46 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $39 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, $\%$ | $27 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $39 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $28 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $21 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 241 | 188 | 105 | 189 | 146 | 165 | 11 | 71 |
| LT Vol | 110 | 188 | 0 | 0 | 146 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| Through Vol | 64 | 0 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 165 | 0 | 28 |
| RT Vol | 67 | 0 | 0 | 189 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 15 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 271 | 211 | 118 | 212 | 164 | 185 | 12 | 80 |
| Geometry Grp | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.525 | 0.407 | 0.211 | 0.337 | 0.331 | 0.347 | 0.021 | 0.17 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 7.076 | 7.048 | 6.535 | 5.818 | 7.272 | 6.742 | 6.023 | 7.654 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 512 | 513 | 552 | 622 | 497 | 538 | 598 | 471 |
| Service Time | 4.776 | 4.748 | 4.235 | 3.518 | 4.972 | 4.442 | 3.723 | 5.367 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.529 | 0.411 | 0.214 | 0.341 | 0.33 | 0.344 | 0.02 | 0.17 |
| HCM Control Delay | 17.3 | 14.5 | 11 | 11.4 | 13.5 | 13 | 8.9 | 11.9 |
| HCM Lane LOS | C | B | B | B | B | B | A | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 3 | 2 | 0.8 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 0.1 | 0.6 |


| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Intersection Delay，s／veh | 194.5 |
| Intersection LOS | F |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 4 | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 个 | 「 |  | \＆ |  |  | ＊ |  |
| Traffic Vol，veh／h | 188 | 186 | 189 | 528 | 300 | 19 | 110 | 64 | 551 | 36 | 28 | 15 |
| Future Vol，veh／h | 188 | 186 | 189 | 528 | 300 | 19 | 110 | 64 | 551 | 36 | 28 | 15 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 |
| Heavy Vehicles，\％ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 28 | 8 |
| Mvmt Flow | 211 | 209 | 212 | 593 | 337 | 21 | 124 | 72 | 619 | 40 | 31 | 17 |
| Number of Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Approach | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Opposing Approach | WB |  |  | EB |  |  | SB |  |  | NB |  |  |
| Opposing Lanes | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Left | SB |  |  | NB |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Left | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  |
| Conflicting Approach Right | NB |  |  | SB |  |  | WB |  |  | EB |  |  |
| Conflicting Lanes Right | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  |
| HCM Control Delay | 22 |  |  | 157.6 |  |  | 390.9 |  |  | 18.2 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | C |  |  | F |  |  | F |  |  | C |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | EBLn2 | EBLn3 | WBLn1 | WBLn2 | WBLn3 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left，\％ | $15 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $46 \%$ |
| Vol Thru，\％ | $9 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $35 \%$ |
| Vol Right，\％ | $76 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $19 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 725 | 188 | 186 | 189 | 528 | 300 | 19 | 79 |
| LT Vol | 110 | 188 | 0 | 0 | 528 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| Through Vol | 64 | 0 | 186 | 0 | 0 | 300 | 0 | 28 |
| RT Vol | 551 | 0 | 0 | 189 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 15 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 815 | 211 | 209 | 212 | 593 | 337 | 21 | 89 |
| Geometry Grp | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Degree of Util（X） | 1.804 | 0.513 | 0.479 | 0.445 | 1.413 | 0.755 | 0.044 | 0.241 |
| Departure Headway（Hd） | 8.424 | 10.825 | 10.281 | 9.519 | 10.711 | 10.153 | 9.398 | 11.79 |
| Convergence，Y／N | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 440 | 336 | 353 | 382 | 344 | 361 | 383 | 306 |
| Service Time | 6.124 | 8.525 | 7.981 | 7.219 | 8.411 | 7.853 | 7.098 | 9.49 |
| HCM Lane V／C Ratio | 1.852 | 0.628 | 0.592 | 0.555 | 1.724 | 0.934 | 0.055 | 0.291 |
| HCM Control Delay | 390.9 | 24.4 | 22.1 | 19.6 | 230.6 | 38.3 | 12.5 | 18.2 |
| HCM Lane LOS | F | C | C | C | F | E | B | C |
| HCM 95th－tile Q | 48.9 | 2.8 | 2.5 | 2.2 | 24.6 | 6 | 0.1 | 0.9 |

1 DAVID EVANS
AND ASSOCIATES INE.

| SUBJECT | BY | DATE | JOB NO. | SHEET | OF |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| AVERAGE DAILY VOLUME | TM | 10-Nov- 22 | OONT0004-0001 | 1 | OF | 1 |

E/W STREET : BAKER BLVD
INTERSECTION : 1
N/S STREET : DEATH VALLEY RD (SR 127)

$$
\text { Average Daily Bi-Directional Volume = SUNDAY Peak Hour (Approach+Departure) x } 11.5
$$



## Approach

| South leg (NB) | 209 | 693 | 217 | 701 | 241 | 725 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North leg (SB) | 62 | 70 | 65 | 73 | 71 | 79 |
| West leg (EB) | 454 | 535 | 472 | 553 | 482 | 563 |
| East leg (WB) | 309 | 834 | 321 | 846 | 322 | 847 |

## Departure

| South leg (NB) | 346 | 728 | 360 | 742 | 363 | 745 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North leg (SB) | 246 | 254 | 255 | 263 | 271 |  |
| West leg (EB) | 265 | 400 | 276 | 411 | 293 |  |
| East leg (WB) | 177 | 750 | 184 | 757 | 200 |  |

## Balanced Average Daily Volume

| South leg (NB) | 6,383 | 16,342 | 6,636 | 16,595 | 6,946 | 16,905 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North leg (SB) | 3,542 | 3,726 | 3,680 | 3,864 | 3,841 | 4,025 |
| West leg (EB) | 8,269 | 10,753 | 8,602 | 11,086 | 8,878 |  |
| East leg (WB) | 5,589 | 18,216 | 5,808 | 18,435 | 6,003 | 11,362 |

## CALCULATION OF FUTURE DIRECTIONAL TURN VOLUMES FROM FUTURE DIRECTIONAL LINK VOLUMES (NCHRP 255)

Intersection No.: 1
North/South Street: DEATH VALLEY RD (SR 127)
East/West Street: BAKER BLVD

Analysis Condition: YEAR 2040 FUTURE TRAFFIC

## A.M. Peak Hour

| Approach Direction |  | Base Year Count | Forecast Future Year |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Link <br> Volume |  |  | Turn Volume | Rounded Volume |
| South leg | Left | 65 | Approach | 181 | Left | 107 | 87 |
| NB | Through | 12 | Departure | 328 | Through | 23 | 17 |
|  | Right | 84 |  |  | Right | 119 | 101 |
| North leg | Left | 5 | Approach | 51 | Left | 5 | 7 |
| SB | Through | 14 | Departure | 62 | Through | 23 | 21 |
|  | Right | 14 |  |  | Right | 17 | 19 |
| West leg | Left | 15 | Approach | 318 | Left | 15 | 17 |
| EB | Through | 106 | Departure | 207 | Through | 80 | 104 |
|  | Right | 163 |  |  | Right | 188 | 188 |
| East leg | Left | 102 | Approach | 251 | Left | 117 | 118 |
| WB | Through | 94 | Departure | 204 | Through | 82 | 101 |
|  | Right | 24 |  |  | Right | 24 | 27 |

## P.M. Peak Hour

| Approach <br> Direction |  | Base Year <br> Count |  |  | Link <br> Volume |  | Turn <br> Volume |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Rounded <br> Volume |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Left | 113 | 110 |
| South leg | Left | 95 | Approach | 244 | Through | 64 | 64 |
| NB | Through | 57 | Departure | 360 | Right | 68 | 67 |
|  | Right | 57 |  |  | Left | 27 | 28 |
| North leg | Left | 24 | Approach | 70 | Through | 28 | 28 |
| SB | Through | 25 | Departure | 259 | Right | 15 | 15 |
|  | Right | 13 |  |  | Left | 185 | 188 |
| West leg | Left | 179 | Approach | 479 | Through | 105 | 105 |
| EB | Through | 96 | Departure | 290 | Right | 189 | 189 |
|  | Right | 179 |  |  | Left | 143 | 146 |
| East leg | Left | 142 | Approach | 315 | Through | 163 | 165 |
| WB | Through | 157 | Departure | 200 | Right | 10 | 11 |
|  | Right | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1 DAVID EVANS
AND ASSOCIATES INE.


## EXISTING GEOMETRICS

## TURN MOVEMENTS

| Condition | Existing <br> Condition | Project <br> Trips | Existing + <br> Project <br> Condition | Ambient <br> Growth | Background Condition | Project <br> Condition | Future <br> Condition | Future + <br> Project <br> Condition |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Scenario \# | 1 |  | 3 |  | 5 | 7 | 9 | 11 |

## I-15 SB RAMPS

| EB LEFT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EB THRU | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| EB RIGHT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WB LEFT | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| WB THRU | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 11 | 11 |
| WB RIGHT | 63 | 159 | 222 | 3 | 66 | 225 | 58 | 217 |

DEATH VALLEY RD (SR 127)

| NB LEFT | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 24 | 24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NB THRU | 98 | 326 | 424 | 4 | 102 | 428 | 127 | 453 |
| NB RIGHT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SB LEFT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SB THRU | 197 | 79 | 276 | 8 | 205 | 284 | 208 | 287 |
| SB RIGHT | 81 | 271 | 352 | 3 | 84 | 355 | 101 | 372 |
| TOTALS | 448 | 835 | 1283 | 18 | 466 | 1301 | 532 | 1367 |

Los Angeles Office: 213.337.3680 ~ Ontario Office: 909.481.5750 ~ San Diego Office: 619.400.0600
Santa Clarita Office: 661.284.7400 ~ Temecula Office: 951.294.9300 ~ Tustin Office: 714.665.4500


Los Angeles Office: 213.337.3680 ~ Ontario Office: 909.481.5750 ~ San Diego Office: 619.400.0600
Santa Clarita Office: 661.284.7400 ~ Temecula Office: $951.294 .9300 \sim$ Tustin Office: 714.665.4500



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  |  | \& |  |  | 4 |  |  | 个 |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 222 | 4 | 424 | 0 | 0 | 276 | 352 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 222 | 4 | 424 | 0 | 0 | 276 | 352 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 1 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 252 | 5 | 482 | 0 | 0 | 314 | 400 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | F |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 66 | 4 | 102 | 0 | 0 | 205 | 84 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 66 | 4 | 102 | 0 | 0 | 205 | 84 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control Stap | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 1 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 75 | 5 | 116 | 0 | 0 | 233 | 95 |





| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | F |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 58 | 24 | 127 | 0 | 0 | 208 | 101 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 58 | 24 | 127 | 0 | 0 | 208 | 101 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control Stap | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 1 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 66 | 27 | 144 | 0 | 0 | 236 | 115 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  |  | * |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 217 | 24 | 453 | 0 | 0 | 287 | 372 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 217 | 24 | 453 | 0 | 0 | 287 | 372 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 1 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 247 | 27 | 515 | 0 | 0 | 326 | 423 |



| SUBJECT | BY | DATE | JOB NO. | SHEET |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TURN MOVEMENTS | TM | 10-Nov-22 | OONT0004-0001 | 1 | OF | 2 |
| E/W STREET : I-15 SB RAMPS |  |  | INTERSECTION |  | 2 |  |
| N/S STREET : DEATH VALLEY RD (SR 127) |  |  | PROJECTED GROWTH |  | 2.0\% |  |
| CONDITION: SUNDAY PEAK HOUR |  |  | PER YEAR |  |  |  |

## TURN MOVEMENTS

| Condition | Existing <br> Condition | Project <br> Trips | Existing + <br> Project <br> Condition | Ambient <br> Growth | Background Condition | Project <br> Condition | Future <br> Condition | Future + <br> Project <br> Condition |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Scenario \# | 2 |  | 4 |  | 6 | 8 | 10 | 12 |

## I-15 SB RAMPS

| EB LEFT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EB THRU | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| EB RIGHT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WB LEFT | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| WB THRU | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| WB RIGHT | 110 | 222 | 332 | 4 | 114 | 336 | 121 | 343 |

## DEATH VALLEY RD (SR 127)

| NB LEFT | 39 | 0 | 39 | 2 | 41 | 41 | 36 | 36 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NB THRU | 99 | 263 | 362 | 4 | 103 | 366 | 113 | 376 |
| NB RIGHT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SB LEFT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SB THRU | 173 | 48 | 221 | 7 | 180 | 228 | 188 | 236 |
| SB RIGHT | 166 | 334 | 500 | 7 | 173 | 507 | 173 | 507 |
| TOTALS | 595 | 867 | 1462 | 24 | 619 | 1486 | 639 | 1506 |

Los Angeles Office: 213.337.3680 ~ Ontario Office: 909.481.5750 ~ San Diego Office: 619.400.0600
Santa Clarita Office: 661.284.7400 ~ Temecula Office: 951.294.9300 ~ Tustin Office: 714.665.4500




| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 4.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  |  | * |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 332 | 39 | 362 | 0 | 0 | 221 | 500 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 332 | 39 | 362 | 0 | 0 | 221 | 500 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 1 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 369 | 43 | 402 | 0 | 0 | 246 | 556 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  |  | \& |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | F |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 114 | 41 | 103 | 0 | 0 | 180 | 173 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 114 | 41 | 103 | 0 | 0 | 180 | 173 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control S | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 1 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 127 | 46 | 114 | 0 | 0 | 200 | 192 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 4.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  |  | \& |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | 个 |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 336 | 41 | 366 | 0 | 0 | 228 | 507 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 336 | 41 | 366 | 0 | 0 | 228 | 507 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 1 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 373 | 46 | 407 | 0 | 0 | 253 | 563 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  |  | \& |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | F |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 121 | 36 | 113 | 0 | 0 | 188 | 173 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 121 | 36 | 113 | 0 | 0 | 188 | 173 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control S | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 1 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 134 | 40 | 126 | 0 | 0 | 209 | 192 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 5.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  |  | * |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 343 | 36 | 376 | 0 | 0 | 236 | 507 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 343 | 36 | 376 | 0 | 0 | 236 | 507 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 1 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 90 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 381 | 40 | 418 | 0 | 0 | 262 | 563 |



1 DAVID EVANS
AND ASSOCIATES INE.


$$
\text { Average Daily Bi-Directional Volume = SUNDAY Peak Hour (Approach+Departure) x } 11.5
$$



## Approach

| South leg (NB) | 138 | 401 | 144 | 407 | 149 | 412 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North leg (SB) | 346 | 728 | 360 | 742 | 363 | 745 |
| West leg (EB) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| East leg (WB) | 118 | 340 | 122 | 344 | 129 | 351 |

## Departure

| South leg (NB) | 178 | 226 | 185 | 233 | 193 | 241 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North leg (SB) | 209 | 694 | 217 | 702 | 234 | 719 |
| West leg (EB) | 208 | 542 | 217 | 551 | 212 | 546 |
| East leg (WB) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## Balanced Average Daily Volume

| South leg (NB) | 3,634 | 7,211 | 3,784 | 7,360 | 3,933 | 7,510 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North leg (SB) | 6,383 | 16,353 | 6,636 | 16,606 | 6,866 | 16,836 |
| West leg (EB) | 2,392 | 6,233 | 2,496 | 6,337 | 2,438 | 6,279 |
| East leg (WB) | 1,357 | 3,910 | 1,403 | 3,956 | 1,484 | 4,037 |

## CALCULATION OF FUTURE DIRECTIONAL TURN VOLUMES FROM FUTURE DIRECTIONAL LINK VOLUMES (NCHRP 255)

Intersection No.: 2
North/South Street: DEATH VALLEY RD (SR 127)
East/West Street: I-15 SB RAMPS

Analysis Condition: YEAR 2040 FUTURE TRAFFIC

## A.M. Peak Hour

Forecast Future Year

| Approach <br> Direction |  | Base Year <br> Count |  | Link <br> Volume |  | Turn <br> Volume | Rounded <br> Volume |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| South leg | Left | 4 | Approach | 126 | Left | 58 | 24 |
| NB | Through | 98 | Departure | 199 | Through | 149 | 127 |
|  | Right | 0 |  |  | Right | 0 | 0 |
| North leg | Left | 0 | Approach | 327 | Left | 0 | 0 |
| SB | Through | 197 | Departure | 181 | Through | 194 | 208 |
|  | Right | 81 |  |  | Right | 71 | 101 |
| West leg | Left | 0 | Approach | 0 | Left | 0 | 0 |
| EB | Through | 0 | Departure | 149 | Through | 0 | 0 |
|  | Right | 0 |  |  | Right | 0 | 0 |
| East leg | Left | 1 | Approach | 76 | Left | 5 | 0 |
| WB | Through | 4 | Departure | 0 | Through | 20 | 3 |
|  | Right | 63 |  |  | Right | 32 | 11 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 58 |  |

## P.M. Peak Hour

|  |  | Forecast Future Year |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Approach <br> Direction |  | Base Year <br> Count |  | Link <br> Volume |  | Turn <br> Volume | Rounded <br> Volume |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| South leg | Left | 39 | Approach | 139 | Left | 28 | 36 |
| NB | Through | 99 | Departure | 195 | Through | 122 | 113 |
|  | Right | 0 |  |  | Right | 0 | 0 |
| North leg | Left | 0 | Approach | 353 | Left | 0 | 0 |
| SB | Through | 173 | Departure | 244 | Through | 192 | 188 |
|  | Right | 166 |  |  | Right | 178 | 173 |
| West leg | Left | 0 | Approach | 43 | Left | 0 | 0 |
| EB | Through | 0 | Departure | 208 | Through | 0 | 0 |
|  | Right | 0 |  |  | Right | 0 | 0 |
| East leg | Left | 5 | Approach | 118 | Left | 3 | 0 |
| WB | Through | 3 | Departure | 6 | Through | 2 | 5 |
|  | Right | 110 |  |  | Right | 122 | 3 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 121 |

AND ASVIDEVANS INC.

| SUBJECT <br> TURN MOVEMENTS | BY <br> TM | $\begin{aligned} \hline \text { DATE } & \\ & 10-\mathrm{Nov}-22 \end{aligned}$ | JOB NO. <br> OONT0004-0001 | Sheet of |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | 1 | OF | 2 |
| E/W STREET : I-15 SB RAMPS |  |  | INTERSECTION |  | 3 |  |
| N/S STREET : DEATH VALLEY RD (SR 127) |  |  | PROJECTED GROWTH |  | 2.0\% |  |
| CONDITION : FRIDAY PEAK HOUR |  |  | PER YEAR : |  |  |  |
| CONDITION DIAGRAMS |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## EXISTING GEOMETRICS

## TURN MOVEMENTS

| Condition | Existing <br> Condition | Project <br> Trips | Existing + <br> Project <br> Condition | Ambient <br> Growth | Background Condition | Project <br> Condition | Future <br> Condition | Future + <br> Project <br> Condition |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Scenario \# | 1 |  | 3 |  | 5 | 7 | 9 | 11 |

## I-15 SB RAMPS

| EB LEFT | 100 | 326 | 426 | 4 | 104 | 430 | 103 | 429 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EB THRU | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| EB RIGHT | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| WB LEFT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WB THRU | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WB RIGHT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

DEATH VALLEY RD (SR 127)

| NB LEFT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NB THRU | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 23 | 23 |
| NB RIGHT | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 36 | 36 |
| SB LEFT | 197 | 79 | 276 | 8 | 205 | 284 | 169 | 248 |
| SB THRU | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| SB RIGHT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTALS | 309 | 405 | 714 | 12 | 321 | 726 | 339 | 744 |

Los Angeles Office: 213.337.3680 ~ Ontario Office: 909.481.5750 ~ San Diego Office: 619.400.0600
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Los Angeles Office: 213.337.3680 ~ Ontario Office: 909.481.5750 ~ San Diego Office: 619.400.0600
Santa Clarita Office: 661.284.7400 ~ Temecula Office: $951.294 .9300 \sim$ Tustin Office: 714.665.4500

| Intersection |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 9 |
| Intersection LOS | A |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | * |  |  |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 100 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 197 | 1 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 100 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 197 | 1 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 3 | 33 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 115 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 226 | 1 | 0 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 8.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 9.3 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |  | A |  | A |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $0 \%$ | $95 \%$ | $99 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $33 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $67 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 6 | 105 | 198 |
| LT Vol | 0 | 100 | 197 |
| Through Vol | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| RT Vol | 4 | 2 | 0 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 7 | 121 | 228 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.008 | 0.157 | 0.284 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 4.063 | 4.684 | 4.485 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 882 | 768 | 806 |
| Service Time | 2.08 | 2.7 | 2.485 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.008 | 0.158 | 0.283 |
| HCM Control Delay | 7.1 | 8.6 | 9.3 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | A |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0 | 0.6 | 1.2 |


| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh $\quad 16.7$ |  |
| Intersection LOS | C |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\hat{1}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 426 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 276 | 1 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 426 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 276 | 1 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 3 | 33 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| Mumt Flow | 490 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 317 | 1 | 0 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 18.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8.5 |  | 13.6 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | C |  |  |  |  |  |  | A |  | B |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $0 \%$ | $99 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $33 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $67 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 6 | 431 | 277 |
| LT Vol | 0 | 426 | 276 |
| Through Vol | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| RT Vol | 4 | 2 | 0 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 7 | 495 | 318 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.01 | 0.693 | 0.483 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 5.421 | 5.034 | 5.459 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 664 | 713 | 653 |
| Service Time | 3.421 | 3.107 | 3.549 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.011 | 0.694 | 0.487 |
| HCM Control Delay | 8.5 | 18.8 | 13.6 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | C | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0 | 5.6 | 2.6 |


| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh $\quad 9.1$ |  |
| Intersection LOS | A |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 104 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 205 | 1 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 104 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 205 | 1 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 3 | 33 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 120 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 236 | 1 | 0 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 8.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.1 |  | 9.4 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |  | A |  | A |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $0 \%$ | $95 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $33 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $67 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 6 | 109 | 200 |
| LT Vol | 0 | 104 | 205 |
| Through Vol | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| RT Vol | 4 | 2 | 0 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 7 | 125 | 237 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.008 | 0.164 | 0.296 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 4.086 | 4.71 | 4.499 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 877 | 764 | 803 |
| Service Time | 2.105 | 2.724 | 2.499 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.008 | 0.164 | 0.295 |
| HCM Control Delay | 7.1 | 8.6 | 9.4 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | A |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0 | 0.6 | 1.2 |


| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh 15.8 |  |
| Intersection LOS | C |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  |  |  |  | $\hat{F}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 405 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 279 | 1 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 405 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 279 | 1 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 3 | 33 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | , | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 466 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 321 | 1 | 0 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 17.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8.4 |  | 13.5 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | C |  |  |  |  |  |  | A |  | B |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $0 \%$ | $99 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Vol Thu, \% | $33 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $67 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 6 | 410 | 280 |
| LT Vol | 0 | 405 | 279 |
| Through Vol | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| RT Vol | 4 | 2 | 0 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 7 | 471 | 322 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.01 | 0.659 | 0.482 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 5.346 | 5.035 | 5.397 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 674 | 712 | 663 |
| Service Time | 3.346 | 3.105 | 3.482 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.01 | 0.662 | 0.486 |
| HCM Control Delay | 8.4 | 17.4 | 13.5 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | C | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0 | 5 | 2.6 |


| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 8.7 |
| Intersection LOS | A |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 103 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 36 | 169 | 2 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 103 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 36 | 169 | 2 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 3 | 33 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 118 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 41 | 194 | 2 | 0 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 8.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.4 |  | 9.1 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |  | A |  | A |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $0 \%$ | $94 \%$ | $99 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $39 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $61 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 09 | 109 | 171 |
| LT Vol | 0 | 103 | 169 |
| Through Vol | 23 | 3 | 2 |
| RT Vol | 36 | 3 | 0 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 68 | 125 | 197 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.077 | 0.165 | 0.248 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 4.08 | 4.73 | 4.547 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 880 | 760 | 792 |
| Service Time | 2.098 | 2.746 | 2.562 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.077 | 0.164 | 0.249 |
| HCM Control Delay | 7.4 | 8.7 | 9.1 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | A |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0.2 | 0.6 | 1 |


| Intersection |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh 17.2 |  |
| Intersection LOS | C |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  |  |  |  | $\hat{}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 429 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 36 | 248 | 2 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 429 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 36 | 248 | 2 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 3 | 33 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | , | , | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 493 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 41 | 285 | 2 | 0 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 20.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9.1 |  | 13.4 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | C |  |  |  |  |  |  | A |  | B |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $0 \%$ | $99 \%$ | $99 \%$ |
| Vol Thu, \% | $39 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $61 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 59 | 435 | 250 |
| LT Vol | 0 | 429 | 248 |
| Through Vol | 23 | 3 | 2 |
| RT Vol | 36 | 3 | 0 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 68 | 500 | 287 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.103 | 0.722 | 0.453 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 5.443 | 5.2 | 5.678 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 657 | 700 | 635 |
| Service Time | 3.485 | 3.2 | 3.712 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.104 | 0.714 | 0.452 |
| HCM Control Delay | 9.1 | 20.5 | 13.4 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | C | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0.3 | 6.2 | 2.4 |

1 DAVID EVANS
AND ASSOCIATES INE.

| SUBJECT | BY | DATE | JOB NO. | SHEET |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TURN MOVEMENTS | TM | 10-Nov-22 | OONT0004-0001 | 1 | OF | 2 |
| E/W STREET : $\mathrm{l}-15$ SB RAMPS |  |  | IN | RSECTION | 3 |  |
| N/S STREET : DEATH VALLEY RD (SR 127) |  |  | PROJECT | GROWTH | 0\% |  |
| CONDITION : $\underline{\text { SUNDAY PEAK HOUR }}$ |  |  |  | PER YEAR |  |  |

## TURN MOVEMENTS

| Condition | Existing <br> Condition | Project <br> Trips | Existing + <br> Project <br> Condition | Ambient Growth | Background <br> Condition | Project <br> Condition | Future <br> Condition | Future + <br> Project <br> Condition |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Scenario \# | 2 |  | 4 |  | 6 | 8 | 10 | 12 |

## I-15 SB RAMPS

| EB LEFT | 138 | 263 | 401 | 6 | 144 | 407 | 138 | 401 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EB THRU | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| EB RIGHT | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 |
| WB LEFT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WB THRU | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WB RIGHT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

DEATH VALLEY RD (SR 127)

| NB LEFT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NB THRU | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 7 |
| NB RIGHT | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| SB LEFT | 172 | 48 | 220 | 7 | 179 | 227 | 178 | 226 |
| SB THRU | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| SB RIGHT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTALS | 323 | 311 | 634 | 13 | 336 | 647 | 336 | 647 |

Los Angeles Office: 213.337.3680 ~ Ontario Office: 909.481.5750 ~ San Diego Office: 619.400.0600
Santa Clarita Office: 661.284.7400 ~ Temecula Office: 951.294.9300 ~ Tustin Office: 714.665.4500


| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 8.8 |
| Intersection LOS | A |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 138 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 172 | 1 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 138 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 172 | 1 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 33 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 147 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 183 | 1 | 0 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 8.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.3 |  | 8.9 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |  | A |  | A |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $0 \%$ | $97 \%$ | $99 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $62 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $38 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 8 | 142 | 173 |
| LT Vol | 0 | 138 | 172 |
| Through Vol | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| RT Vol | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 9 | 151 | 184 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.01 | 0.194 | 0.233 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 4.269 | 4.612 | 4.548 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 840 | 781 | 791 |
| Service Time | 2.287 | 2.624 | 2.56 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.011 | 0.193 | 0.233 |
| HCM Control Delay | 7.3 | 8.7 | 8.9 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | A |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0 | 0.7 | 0.9 |


| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 13 |
| Intersection LOS | B |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 401 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 220 | 1 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 401 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 220 | 1 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 33 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 427 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 234 | 1 | 0 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 14.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8.3 |  | 11.1 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |  | A |  | B |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $0 \%$ | $99 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Vol Tru, \% | $62 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $38 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 8 | 405 | 221 |
| LT Vol | 0 | 401 | 220 |
| Through Vol | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| RT Vol | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 9 | 431 | 235 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.012 | 0.576 | 0.344 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 5.115 | 4.811 | 5.264 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 693 | 750 | 679 |
| Service Time | 3.196 | 2.856 | 3.319 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.013 | 0.575 | 0.346 |
| HCM Control Delay | 8.3 | 14.2 | 11.1 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | B | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0 | 3.7 | 1.5 |


| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 8.9 |
| Intersection LOS | A |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 144 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 179 | 1 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 144 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 179 | 1 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 33 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 153 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 190 | 1 | 0 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 8.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.4 |  | 9 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |  | A |  | A |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $0 \%$ | $97 \%$ | $99 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $62 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $38 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 8 | 148 | 180 |
| LT Vol | 0 | 144 | 179 |
| Through Vol | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| RT Vol | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 9 | 157 | 191 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.01 | 0.203 | 0.243 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 4.296 | 4.632 | 4.566 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 835 | 778 | 789 |
| Service Time | 2.314 | 2.644 | 2.578 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.011 | 0.202 | 0.242 |
| HCM Control Delay | 7.4 | 8.8 | 9 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | A |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0 | 0.8 | 1 |


| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 13.4 |
| Intersection LOS | B |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  |  |  |  | $\hat{F}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 407 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 227 | 1 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 407 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 227 | 1 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 33 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 433 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 241 | 1 | 0 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 14.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8.3 |  | 11.3 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |  | A |  | B |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $0 \%$ | $99 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Vol Thu, \% | $62 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $38 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Sop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 8 | 411 | 228 |
| LT Vol | 0 | 407 | 227 |
| Through Vol | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| RT Vol | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 9 | 437 | 243 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.012 | 0.587 | 0.356 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 5.148 | 4.832 | 5.284 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 688 | 743 | 677 |
| Service Time | 3.232 | 2.879 | 3.341 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.013 | 0.588 | 0.359 |
| HCM Control Delay | 8.3 | 14.6 | 11.3 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | B | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0 | 3.9 | 1.6 |


| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 8.9 |
| Intersection LOS | A |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 138 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 178 | 3 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 138 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 178 | 3 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 33 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 147 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 189 | 3 | 0 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 8.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.4 |  | 9 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | A |  |  |  |  |  |  | A |  | A |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $0 \%$ | $96 \%$ | $98 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $64 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $36 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 11 | 144 | 181 |
| LT Vol | 0 | 138 | 178 |
| Through Vol | 7 | 1 | 3 |
| RT Vol | 4 | 5 | 0 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 12 | 153 | 193 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.014 | 0.197 | 0.244 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 4.292 | 4.628 | 4.554 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 835 | 778 | 791 |
| Service Time | 2.31 | 2.641 | 2.567 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.014 | 0.197 | 0.244 |
| HCM Control Delay | 7.4 | 8.8 | 9 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | A | A |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0 | 0.7 | 1 |


| Intersection |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh | 13.3 |
| Intersection LOS | B |


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 401 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 226 | 3 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 401 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 226 | 3 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 0.94 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 33 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 427 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 240 | 3 | 0 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 14.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8.3 |  | 11.3 |  |  |
| HCM LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |  | A |  | B |  |  |


| Lane | NBLn1 | EBLn1 | SBLn1 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vol Left, \% | $0 \%$ | $99 \%$ | $99 \%$ |
| Vol Thru, \% | $64 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| Vol Right, \% | $36 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop |
| Traffic Vol by Lane | 11 | 407 | 229 |
| LT Vol | 0 | 401 | 226 |
| Through Vol | 7 | 1 | 3 |
| RT Vol | 4 | 5 | 0 |
| Lane Flow Rate | 12 | 433 | 244 |
| Geometry Grp | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Degree of Util (X) | 0.017 | 0.582 | 0.357 |
| Departure Headway (Hd) | 5.143 | 4.837 | 5.275 |
| Convergence, Y/N | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cap | 689 | 745 | 677 |
| Service Time | 3.229 | 2.886 | 3.335 |
| HCM Lane V/C Ratio | 0.017 | 0.581 | 0.36 |
| HCM Control Delay | 8.3 | 14.5 | 11.3 |
| HCM Lane LOS | A | B | B |
| HCM 95th-tile Q | 0.1 | 3.8 | 1.6 |



Average Daily Bi-Directional Volume $=$ SUNDAY Peak Hour (Approach+Departure) $\times 11.5$

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Existing + |  |  |  |  |
| Condition | Project | Background | Project | Future |  |  |
| Consting | Condition | Condition | Condition | Condition | Condition | Condition |
| Scenario\# |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Approach

| South leg (NB) | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 11 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North leg (SB) | 173 | 221 | 180 | 228 | 181 |
| West leg (EB) | 142 | 405 | 148 | 411 | 229 |
| East leg (WB) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 144 |

## Departure

| South leg (NB) | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 8 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North leg (SB) | 143 | 406 | 149 | 412 | 145 | 408 |
| West leg (EB) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| East leg (WB) | 176 | 224 | 183 | 231 | 183 |  |

## Balanced Average Daily Volume

| South leg (NB) | 138 | 138 | 138 | 138 | 219 | 219 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North leg (SB) | 3,634 | 7,211 | 3,784 | 7,360 | 3,749 | 7,326 |
| West leg (EB) | 1,633 | 4,658 | 1,702 | 4,727 | 1,656 |  |
| East leg (WB) | 2,024 | 2,576 | 2,105 | 2,657 | 2,105 | 4,681 |

## CALCULATION OF FUTURE DIRECTIONAL TURN VOLUMES FROM FUTURE DIRECTIONAL LINK VOLUMES (NCHRP 255)

Intersection No.: 3
North/South Street: DEATH VALLEY RD (SR 127)
East/West Street: I-15 SB RAMPS

Analysis Condition: YEAR 2040 FUTURE TRAFFIC

## A.M. Peak Hour

Forecast Future Year

| Approach <br> Direction |  | Base Year <br> Count |  | Link <br> Volume |  | Turn <br> Volume | Rounded <br> Volume |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| South leg | Left | 0 | Approach | 12 | Left | 0 | 0 |
| NB | Through | 2 | Departure | 5 | Through | 61 | 23 |
|  | Right | 4 |  |  | Right | 95 | 36 |
| North leg | Left | 197 | Approach | 199 | Left | 109 | 169 |
| SB | Through | 1 | Departure | 126 | Through | 2 | 2 |
|  | Right | 0 |  |  | Right | 0 | 0 |
| West leg | Left | 100 | Approach | 125 | Left | 65 | 103 |
| EB | Through | 3 | Departure | 0 | Through | 2 | 3 |
|  | Right | 2 |  |  | Right | 3 | 3 |
| East leg | Left | 0 | Approach | 0 | Left | 0 | 3 |
| WB | Through | 0 | Departure | 206 | Through | 0 | 0 |
|  | Right | 0 |  |  | Right | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |

## P.M. Peak Hour

| Approach <br> Direction |  | Base Year Count | Forecast Future Year |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Link Volume |  |  | Turn <br> Volume | Rounded <br> Volume |
| South leg | Left | 0 | Approach | 10 | Left | 0 | 0 |
| NB | Through | 5 | Departure | 8 | Through | 7 | 7 |
|  | Right | 3 |  |  | Right | 2 | 4 |
| North leg | Left | 172 | Approach | 190 | Left | 173 | 178 |
| SB | Through | 1 | Departure | 144 | Through | 3 | 3 |
|  | Right | 0 |  |  | Right | 0 | 0 |
| West leg | Left | 138 | Approach | 142 | Left | 137 | 138 |
| EB | Through | 1 | Departure | 14 | Through | 1 | 1 |
|  | Right | 3 |  |  | Right | 5 | 5 |
| East leg | Left | 0 | Approach | 2 | Left | 0 | 0 |
| WB | Through | 0 | Departure | 176 | Through | 0 | 0 |
|  | Right | 0 |  |  | Right | 0 | 0 |

1 DAVID EVANS
AND ASSOCIATES INC.

| SUBJECT | BY | DATE |  | JOB No. | SHEET |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TURN MOVEMENTS | TM |  | 7-Nov-22 | OONT0004-0001 |  | 1 | OF | 2 |
| E/W STREET : BAKER BLVD |  |  |  |  | RSECTIO |  |  |  |
| $\frac{\text { N/S STREET }}{\text { CONDITION }}:$ PROJECT DRIVEWAY "A" |  |  |  | PROJECT | GROW |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | PER YE |  |  |  |

## CONDITION DIAGRAMS



PROJECT GEOMETRICS

## TURN MOVEMENTS

| Condition | Existing <br> Condition | Project <br> Trips | Existing + <br> Project <br> Condition | Ambient Growth | Background Condition | Project <br> Condition | Future <br> Condition | Future + <br> Project <br> Condition |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Scenario \# | 1 |  | 3 |  | 5 | 7 | 9 | 11 |

BAKER BLVD

| EB LEFT | 0 | 397 | 397 | 0 | 0 | 397 | 0 | 397 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EB THRU | 284 | 239 | 523 | 12 | 296 | 535 | 309 | 548 |
| EB RIGHT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| WB LEFT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WB THRU | 173 | 135 | 308 | 8 | 181 | 316 | 207 | 342 |
| WB RIGHT | 0 | 40 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 |

## PROJECT DRIVEWAY "A"

| NB LEFT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NB THRU | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| NB RIGHT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SB LEFT | 0 | 143 | 143 | 0 | 0 | 143 | 0 | 143 |
| SB THRU | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SB RIGHT | 0 | 294 | 294 | 0 | 0 | 294 | 0 | 294 |
| TOTALS | 457 | 1248 | 1705 | 20 | 477 | 1725 | 516 | 1764 |

Los Angeles Office: 213.337.3680 ~ Ontario Office: 909.481.5750 ~ San Diego Office: 619.400.0600
Santa Clarita Office: 661.284.7400 ~ Temecula Office: 951.294.9300 ~ Tustin Office: 714.665.4500





| SUBJECT | BY | DATE | Job No. | SHEET |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TURN MOVEMENTS | TM | 7-Nov-22 | OONT0004-0001 | 1 | OF | 2 |
| E/W STREET : BAKER BLVD |  |  |  | ERSECTION | 4 |  |
| N/S STREET : PROJECT DRIVEWAY "A" |  |  | PROJECT | D GROWTH | 20\% |  |
| CONDITION : SUNDAY PEAK HOUR |  |  |  | PER YEAR |  |  |

## TURN MOVEMENTS

| Condition | Existing <br> Condition | Project <br> Trips | Project <br> Condition | Ambient Growth | Background Condition | Project <br> Condition | Future <br> Condition | Future + <br> Project <br> Condition |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Scenario \# | 2 |  | 4 |  | 6 | 8 | 10 | 12 |

BAKER BLVD

| EB LEFT | 0 | 366 | 366 | 0 | 0 | 366 | 0 | 366 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EB THRU | 454 | 207 | 207 | 18 | 472 | 679 | 482 |  |
| EB RIGHT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 089 |  |  |
| WB LEFT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| WB THRU | 265 | 199 | 199 | 11 | 276 | 0 | 475 | 0 |
| WB RIGHT | 0 | 71 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 290 | 48 |  |

PROJECT DRIVEWAY "A"

| NB LEFT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NB THRU | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| NB RIGHT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| SB LEFT | 0 | 111 | 111 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| SB THRU | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| SB RIGHT | 0 | 326 | 326 | 0 | 0 | 111 | 0 |  |
| TOTALS | $\mathbf{7 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 9}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Los Angeles Office: 213.337.3680 ~ Ontario Office: 909.481.5750 ~ San Diego Office: 619.400.0600
Santa Clarita Office: 661.284.7400 ~ Temecula Office: 951.294.9300 ~ Tustin Office: 714.665.4500





AND DAVID EVANS
AND ASSOCIATESINC.

| SUBJECT | BY | DATE |  | JOB No. | SHEET |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TURN MOVEMENTS | TM |  | 7-Nov-22 | OONT0004-0001 | 1 | OF | 2 |
| E/W STREET : BAKER BLVD |  |  |  | INTERSECTION |  | 5 |  |
| N/S STREET : PROJECT DRIVEWAY "B" |  |  |  | PROJECTED GROWTH |  | 2.0\% |  |
|  |  |  |  | PER YEAR |  |  |  |

## CONDITION DIAGRAMS



PROJECT GEOMETRICS

## TURN MOVEMENTS

| Condition | Existing <br> Condition | Project <br> Trips | Existing + <br> Project <br> Condition | Ambient Growth | Background <br> Condition | Project <br> Condition | Future <br> Condition | Future + <br> Project <br> Condition |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Scenario \# | 1 |  | 3 |  | 5 | 7 | 9 | 11 |

BAKER BLVD

| EB LEFT | 0 | 239 | 239 | 0 | 0 | 239 | 0 | 239 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EB THRU | 284 | 143 | 427 | 12 | 296 | 439 | 309 | 452 |
| EB RIGHT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| WB LEFT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| WB THRU | 173 | 40 | 213 | 8 | 181 | 221 | 207 | 247 |
| WB RIGHT | 0 | 119 | 119 | 0 | 0 | 119 | 0 | 119 |

## PROJECT DRIVEWAY "B"

| NB LEFT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NB THRU | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| NB RIGHT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SB LEFT | 0 | 222 | 222 | 0 | 0 | 222 | 0 | 222 |
| SB THRU | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SB RIGHT | 0 | 135 | 135 | 0 | 0 | 135 | 0 | 135 |
| TOTALS | 457 | 898 | 1355 | 20 | 477 | 1375 | 516 | 1414 |

Los Angeles Office: 213.337.3680 ~ Ontario Office: 909.481.5750 ~ San Diego Office: 619.400.0600
Santa Clarita Office: 661.284.7400 ~ Temecula Office: 951.294.9300 ~ Tustin Office: 714.665.4500

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 44.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |  | M |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 221 | 428 | 217 | 110 | 206 | 125 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 221 | 428 | 217 | 110 | 206 | 125 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 4 | 9 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 263 | 510 | 258 | 131 | 245 | 149 |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ |  | M |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 207 | 583 | 347 | 151 | 159 | 199 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 207 | 583 | 347 | 151 | 159 | 199 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 | 84 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 246 | 694 | 413 | 180 | 189 | 237 |



| SUBJECT | BY | DATE | Job No. | SHEET |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TURN MOVEMENTS | TM | 7-Nov-22 | OONT0004-0001 | 1 | OF | 2 |
| E/W STREET : BAKER BLVD |  |  |  | ERSECTION | 5 |  |
| N/S STREET : PROJECT DRIVEWAY "B" |  |  | PROJECT | D GROWTH | 20\% |  |
| CONDITION : SUNDAY PEAK HOUR |  |  |  | PER YEAR |  |  |

## TURN MOVEMENTS

| Condition | Existing <br> Condition | Project <br> Trips | Project <br> Condition | Ambient Growth | Background Condition | Project <br> Condition | Future <br> Condition | Future + <br> Project <br> Condition |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Scenario \# | 2 |  | 4 |  | 6 | 8 | 10 | 12 |

BAKER BLVD

| EB LEFT | 0 | 207 | 207 | 0 | 0 | 207 | 0 | 207 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EB THRU | 454 | 111 | 111 | 18 | 472 | 583 | 482 |  |
| EB RIGHT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 593 |  |  |
| WB LEFT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| WB THRU | 265 | 71 | 71 | 11 | 276 | 0 | 347 | 0 |
| WB RIGHT | 0 | 151 | 151 | 0 | 0 | 290 | 0 | 361 |

## PROJECT DRIVEWAY "B"

| NB LEFT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NB THRU | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| NB RIGHT | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SB LEFT | 0 | 159 | 159 | 0 | 0 | 159 | 0 | 159 |
| SB THRU | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SB RIGHT | 0 | 199 | 199 | 0 | 0 | 199 | 0 | 199 |
| TOTALS | 719 | 898 | 898 | 29 | 748 | 1646 | 772 | 1670 |

Los Angeles Office: 213.337.3680 ~ Ontario Office: 909.481.5750 ~ San Diego Office: 619.400.0600
Santa Clarita Office: 661.284.7400 ~ Temecula Office: 951.294.9300 ~ Tustin Office: 714.665.4500





## Appendix D: Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis

Figure 4C-101 (CA). Traffic Signal Warrants Worksheet (Sheet 1 of 5)


The satisfaction of a traffic signal warrant or warrants shall not in itself require the installation of a traffic control signal.

Figure 4C-101 (CA). Traffic Signal Warrants Worksheet (Sheet 2 of 5)
WARRANT 2 - Four Hour Vehicular Volume SATISFIED* YES $\square$ NO $\square$ N/A


| *All plotted points fall above the applicable curve in Figure 4C-1. (URBAN AREAS) | Yes $\square$ No $\square$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\underline{\text { OR, All plotted points fall above the applicable curve in Figure 4C-2. (RURALAREAS) }}$ Yes $\square$ No $\square$ |  |


| WARRANT 3-Peak Hour | SATISFIED | YES $\triangle$ NO $\square$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (Part A or Part B must be satisfied) |  |  |
| PART A | SATISFIED | YES $\square$ NO $\boxtimes$ |

(All parts 1, 2, and 3 below must be satisfied for the same one hour, for any four consecutive 15-minute periods)

| 1. The total delay experienced by traffic on one minor street approach (one direction only) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| controlled by a STOP sign equals or exceeds four vehicle-hours for a one-lane |
| approach, or five vehicle-hours for a two-lane approach; AND | Yes $\square$ No | N |
| :--- |



The satisfaction of a traffic signal warrant or warrants shall not in itself require the installation of a traffic control signal.

Figure 4C-101 (CA). Traffic Signal Warrants Worksheet (Sheet 3 of 5)
WARRANT 4 - Pedestrian Volume SATISFIED YES $\square$ NO $\square$ N/A (Parts 1 and 2 Must Be Satisfied)


Figure 4C-5 or Figure 4C-6 SATISFIED YESNO $\square$

Figure 4C-7 or Figure 4C-8 SATISFIED YESNO $\square$

## Part 2

SATISFIED YES
NO $\square$

| $\frac{\text { AND, The distance to the nearest traffic signal along the major street is greater }}{\text { than } 300 \mathrm{ft}} \mathrm{Yes} \square$ No $\square$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| OR, The proposed traffic signal will not restrict progressive traffic flow along the major street. | Yes $\square$ No $\square$ |


| WARRANT 5 - School Crossing (Parts A and B Must Be Satisfied) |  | SATISFIED | YES $\square$ | NO $\square$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Part A <br> Gap/Minutes and \# of Children |  | Hour SATISFIED | YES $\square$ | NO $\square$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Gaps } \\ \text { Minstes } \end{gathered}$ | Minutes Children Using Crossing |  |  |  |
|  | Number of Adequate Gaps | Gaps < Minutes | YES $\square$ | NO $\square$ |
| School Age Pedestrians Crossing Street/ hr |  | AND Children > 20/hr | YES $\square$ | NO $\square$ |
| AND, Consideration has been given to less restrictive remedial measures. |  |  | Yes $\square$ | No $\square$ |
| Part B |  | SATISFIED | YES $\square$ | NO $\square$ |
| The distance to the nearest traffic signal along the major street is greater than 300 ft |  |  | Yes $\square$ | No $\square$ |
| OR, The proposed signal will not restrict the progressive movement of traffic. |  |  | Yes $\square$ | No $\square$ |

The satisfaction of a traffic signal warrant or warrants shall not in itself require the installation of a traffic control signal.

Figure 4C-101 (CA). Traffic Signal Warrants Worksheet (Sheet 4 of 5)


The satisfaction of a traffic signal warrant or warrants shall not in itself require the installation of a traffic control signal.

Figure 4C-101 (CA). Traffic Signal Warrants Worksheet (Sheet 5 of 5)

WARRANT 9 - Intersection Near a Grade Crossing SATISFIED YES $\square$ NO $\square$ N/A (Both Parts A and B Must Be Satisfied)


The minor street approach volume may be multiplied by up to three following adjustment factors (AF) as described in Section 4C. 10.

1- Number of Rail Traffic per Day $\qquad$ Adjustment factor from table 4C-2 $\qquad$
2- Percentage of High-Occupancy Buses on Minor Street Approach $\qquad$ Adjustment factor from table 4C-3 $\qquad$
3- Percentage of Tractor-Trailer Trucks on Minor Street Approach $\qquad$ Adjustment factor from table 4C-4 $\qquad$
NOTE: If no data is availale or known, then use $\mathrm{AF}=1$ (no adjustment)

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.

Figure 4C-4. Warrant 3, Peak Hour (70\% Factor) (COMMUNITY LESS THAN 10,000 POPULATION OR ABOVE 40 MPH ON MAJOR STREET)

*Note: 100 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with two or more lanes and 75 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with one lane.

Figure 4C－101（CA）．Traffic Signal Warrants Worksheet（Sheet 2 of 5）
WARRANT 2 －Four Hour Vehicular Volume SATISFIED＊YES $\square$ NO $\square$ N／A


| ＊All plotted points fall above the applicable curve in Figure 4C－1．（URBAN AREAS） | Yes $\square$ No $\square$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\underline{\text { OR，All plotted points fall above the applicable curve in Figure 4C－2．（RURALAREAS）}}$ Yes $\square$ No $\square$ |  |


| WARRANT 3－Peak Hour |  | SATISFIED |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| （Part A or Part B must be satisfied）$X$ NO $\square$ |  |  |
| PART A | SATISFIED | YES $\boxtimes$ NO $\square$ |

（All parts 1，2，and 3 below must be satisfied for the same one hour，for any four consecutive 15－minute periods）

| 1．The total delay experienced by traffic on one minor street approach（one direction only） controlled by a STOP sign equals or exceeds four vehicle－hours for a one－lane approach，or five vehicle－hours for a two－lane approach；AND | Yes 区 No $\square$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2．The volume on the same minor street approach（one direction only）equals or exceeds 100 vph for one moving lane of traffic or 150 vph for two moving lanes；AND | Yes 区 No |
| 3．The total entering volume serviced during the hour equals or exceeds 800 vph for intersections with four or more approaches or 650 vph for intersections with three approaches． | Yes 区 No $\square$ |



The satisfaction of a traffic signal warrant or warrants shall not in itself require the installation of a traffic control signal．

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.

*Note: 100 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with two or more lanes and 75 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with one lane.

Figure 4C－101（CA）．Traffic Signal Warrants Worksheet（Sheet 2 of 5）
WARRANT 2 －Four Hour Vehicular Volume SATISFIED＊YES $\square$ NO $\square$ N／A


| ＊All plotted points fall above the applicable curve in Figure 4C－1．（URBAN AREAS） | Yes $\square$ No $\square$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| OR，All plotted points fall above the applicable curve in Figure 4C－2．（RURAL AREAS） | Yes $\square$ No $\square$ |


| WARRANT 3－Peak Hour | SATISFIED | YES $\boxtimes$ NO $\square$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| （Part A or Part B must be satisfied） |  |  |
| PART A | SATISFIED | YES $\square$ NO $\boxtimes$ |

（All parts 1，2，and 3 below must be satisfied for the same one hour，for any four consecutive 15－minute periods）

| 1．The total delay experienced by traffic on one minor street approach（one direction only） controlled by a STOP sign equals or exceeds four vehicle－hours for a one－lane approach，or five vehicle－hours for a two－lane approach；AND | Yes $\square$ No 区 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2．The volume on the same minor street approach（one direction only）equals or exceeds 100 vph for one moving lane of traffic or 150 vph for two moving lanes；AND | Yes 区 No |
| 3．The total entering volume serviced during the hour equals or exceeds 800 vph for intersections with four or more approaches or 650 vph for intersections with three approaches． | Yes 区 No $\square$ |



The satisfaction of a traffic signal warrant or warrants shall not in itself require the installation of a traffic control signal．

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.

Figure 4C-4. Warrant 3, Peak Hour (70\% Factor) (COMMUNITY LESS THAN 10,000 POPULATION OR ABOVE 40 MPH ON MAJOR STREET)

*Note: 100 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with two or more lanes and 75 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with one lane.

Figure 4C－101（CA）．Traffic Signal Warrants Worksheet（Sheet 2 of 5）
WARRANT 2 －Four Hour Vehicular Volume SATISFIED＊YES $\square$ NO $\square$ N／A


| ＊All plotted points fall above the applicable curve in Figure 4C－1．（URBAN AREAS） | Yes $\square$ No $\square$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\underline{\text { OR，All plotted points fall above the applicable curve in Figure 4C－2．（RURALAREAS）}}$ Yes $\square$ No $\square$ |  |


| WARRANT 3－Peak Hour |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| （Part A or Part B must be satisfied） | SATISFIED | YES $\triangle$ NO $\square$ |
| PART A | SATISFIED | YES $\boxtimes$ NO $\square$ |

（All parts 1，2，and 3 below must be satisfied for the same one hour，for any four consecutive 15－minute periods）

| 1．The total delay experienced by traffic on one minor street approach（one direction only） controlled by a STOP sign equals or exceeds four vehicle－hours for a one－lane approach，or five vehicle－hours for a two－lane approach；AND | Yes 区 No $\square$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2．The volume on the same minor street approach（one direction only）equals or exceeds 100 vph for one moving lane of traffic or 150 vph for two moving lanes；AND | Yes 区 No |
| 3．The total entering volume serviced during the hour equals or exceeds 800 vph for intersections with four or more approaches or 650 vph for intersections with three approaches． | Yes 区 No $\square$ |



The satisfaction of a traffic signal warrant or warrants shall not in itself require the installation of a traffic control signal．

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.

*Note: 100 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with two or more lanes and 75 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with one lane.

Figure 4C－101（CA）．Traffic Signal Warrants Worksheet（Sheet 2 of 5）
WARRANT 2 －Four Hour Vehicular Volume SATISFIED＊YES $\square$ NO $\square$ N／A


| ＊All plotted points fall above the applicable curve in Figure 4C－1．（URBAN AREAS） | Yes $\square$ No $\square$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\underline{\text { OR ，All plotted points fall above the applicable curve in Figure 4C－2．（RURAL AREAS）}}$ | Yes $\square$ No $\square$ |


| WARRANT 3－Peak Hour | SATISFIED | YES $\boxtimes$ NO $\square$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| （Part A or Part B must be satisfied） |  |  |
| PART A | SATISFIED | YES $\square$ NO $\boxtimes$ |

（All parts 1，2，and 3 below must be satisfied for the same one hour，for any four consecutive 15－minute periods）

| 1．The total delay experienced by traffic on one minor street approach（one direction only） controlled by a STOP sign equals or exceeds four vehicle－hours for a one－lane approach，or five vehicle－hours for a two－lane approach；AND | Yes $\square$ No 区 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2．The volume on the same minor street approach（one direction only）equals or exceeds 100 vph for one moving lane of traffic or 150 vph for two moving lanes；AND | Yes 区 No |
| 3．The total entering volume serviced during the hour equals or exceeds 800 vph for intersections with four or more approaches or 650 vph for intersections with three approaches． | Yes 区 No $\square$ |



The satisfaction of a traffic signal warrant or warrants shall not in itself require the installation of a traffic control signal．

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.

Figure 4C-4. Warrant 3, Peak Hour (70\% Factor) (COMMUNITY LESS THAN 10,000 POPULATION OR ABOVE 40 MPH ON MAJOR STREET)

*Note: 100 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with two or more lanes and 75 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with one lane.

Figure 4C－101（CA）．Traffic Signal Warrants Worksheet（Sheet 2 of 5）
WARRANT 2 －Four Hour Vehicular Volume SATISFIED＊YES $\square$ NO $\square$ N／A


| ＊All plotted points fall above the applicable curve in Figure 4C－1．（URBAN AREAS） | Yes $\square$ No $\square$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\underline{\text { OR，All plotted points fall above the applicable curve in Figure 4C－2．（RURALAREAS）}}$ Yes $\square$ No $\square$ |  |


| WARRANT 3－Peak Hour |  | SATISFIED |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| （Part A or Part B must be satisfied）$X$ NO $\square$ |  |  |
| PART A | SATISFIED | YES $\boxtimes$ NO $\square$ |

（All parts 1，2，and 3 below must be satisfied for the same one hour，for any four consecutive 15－minute periods）

| 1．The total delay experienced by traffic on one minor street approach（one direction only） controlled by a STOP sign equals or exceeds four vehicle－hours for a one－lane approach，or five vehicle－hours for a two－lane approach；AND | Yes 区 No $\square$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2．The volume on the same minor street approach（one direction only）equals or exceeds 100 vph for one moving lane of traffic or 150 vph for two moving lanes；AND | Yes 区 No |
| 3．The total entering volume serviced during the hour equals or exceeds 800 vph for intersections with four or more approaches or 650 vph for intersections with three approaches． | Yes 区 No $\square$ |



The satisfaction of a traffic signal warrant or warrants shall not in itself require the installation of a traffic control signal．

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.

*Note: 100 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with two or more lanes and 75 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with one lane.

1. Baker Blvd and Death Valley Rd (SR 127)

| Date | Primary | Secondary | Distance | Direction |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $7 / 22 / 2018$ | SR-127 | Saker Blvd | 17 E | PDO | Type | Sideswipe |
| :--- |
| $10 / 6 / 2018$ |
| Baker Blvd W/B |

Figure 4C-101 (CA). Traffic Signal Warrants Worksheet (Sheet 1 of 5)


The satisfaction of a traffic signal warrant or warrants shall not in itself require the installation of a traffic control signal.

Figure 4C-101 (CA). Traffic Signal Warrants Worksheet (Sheet 2 of 5)
WARRANT 2 - Four Hour Vehicular Volume SATISFIED* YES $\square$ NO $\square$ N/A


| *All plotted points fall above the applicable curve in Figure 4C-1. (URBAN AREAS) | Yes $\square$ No $\square$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\underline{\text { OR , All plotted points fall above the applicable curve in Figure 4C-2. (RURAL AREAS) }}$ | Yes $\square$ No $\square$ |


| WARRANT 3 - Peak Hour | SATISFIED | YES $\square$ NO $\boxtimes$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (Part A or Part B must be satisfied) |  |  |
| PART A | SATISFIED | YES $\square$ NO $\boxtimes$ |

(All parts 1, 2, and 3 below must be satisfied for the same one hour, for any four consecutive 15-minute periods)

| 1. The total delay experienced by traffic on one minor street approach (one direction only) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| controlled by a STOP sign equals or exceeds four vehicle-hours for a one-lane |
| approach, or five vehicle-hours for a two-lane approach; AND | Yes $\square$ No | Nen |
| :--- |



The satisfaction of a traffic signal warrant or warrants shall not in itself require the installation of a traffic control signal.

Figure 4C-101 (CA). Traffic Signal Warrants Worksheet (Sheet 3 of 5)
WARRANT 4 - Pedestrian Volume SATISFIED YES $\square$ NO $\square$ N/A (Parts 1 and 2 Must Be Satisfied)


Figure 4C-5 or Figure 4C-6 SATISFIED YESNO $\square$

Figure 4C-7 or Figure 4C-8 SATISFIED YESNO $\square$

## Part 2

SATISFIED YES
NO $\square$

| $\frac{\text { AND, The distance to the nearest traffic signal along the major street is greater }}{\text { than } 300 \mathrm{ft}} \mathrm{Yes} \square$ No $\square$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| OR, The proposed traffic signal will not restrict progressive traffic flow along the major street. | Yes $\square$ No $\square$ |


| WARRANT 5 - School Crossing (Parts A and B Must Be Satisfied) |  | SATISFIED | YES $\square$ | NO $\square$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Part A <br> Gap/Minutes and \# of Children |  | Hour SATISFIED | YES $\square$ | NO $\square$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Gaps } \\ \text { Minstes } \end{gathered}$ | Minutes Children Using Crossing |  |  |  |
|  | Number of Adequate Gaps | Gaps < Minutes | YES $\square$ | NO $\square$ |
| School Age Pedestrians Crossing Street/ hr |  | AND Children > 20/hr | YES $\square$ | NO $\square$ |
| AND, Consideration has been given to less restrictive remedial measures. |  |  | Yes $\square$ | No $\square$ |
| Part B |  | SATISFIED | YES $\square$ | NO $\square$ |
| The distance to the nearest traffic signal along the major street is greater than 300 ft |  |  | Yes $\square$ | No $\square$ |
| OR, The proposed signal will not restrict the progressive movement of traffic. |  |  | Yes $\square$ | No $\square$ |

The satisfaction of a traffic signal warrant or warrants shall not in itself require the installation of a traffic control signal.

Figure 4C-101 (CA). Traffic Signal Warrants Worksheet (Sheet 4 of 5)


The satisfaction of a traffic signal warrant or warrants shall not in itself require the installation of a traffic control signal.

Figure 4C-101 (CA). Traffic Signal Warrants Worksheet (Sheet 5 of 5)

WARRANT 9 - Intersection Near a Grade Crossing SATISFIED YES $\square$ NO $\square$ N/A (Both Parts A and B Must Be Satisfied)


The minor street approach volume may be multiplied by up to three following adjustment factors (AF) as described in Section 4C. 10.

1- Number of Rail Traffic per Day $\qquad$ Adjustment factor from table 4C-2 $\qquad$
2- Percentage of High-Occupancy Buses on Minor Street Approach $\qquad$ Adjustment factor from table 4C-3 $\qquad$
3- Percentage of Tractor-Trailer Trucks on Minor Street Approach $\qquad$ Adjustment factor from table 4C-4 $\qquad$
NOTE: If no data is availale or known, then use $\mathrm{AF}=1$ (no adjustment)

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.

Figure 4C-4. Warrant 3, Peak Hour (70\% Factor) (COMMUNITY LESS THAN 10,000 POPULATION OR ABOVE 40 MPH ON MAJOR STREET)

*Note: 100 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with two or more lanes and 75 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with one lane.

Figure 4C－101（CA）．Traffic Signal Warrants Worksheet（Sheet 2 of 5）
WARRANT 2 －Four Hour Vehicular Volume SATISFIED＊YES $\square$ NO $\square$ N／A


| ＊All plotted points fall above the applicable curve in Figure 4C－1．（URBAN AREAS） | Yes $\square$ No $\square$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\underline{\text { OR ，All plotted points fall above the applicable curve in Figure 4C－2．（RURAL AREAS）}}$ | Yes $\square$ No $\square$ |


| WARRANT 3－Peak Hour | SATISFIED | YES $\boxtimes$ NO $\square$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| （Part A or Part B must be satisfied） |  |  |
| PART A | SATISFIED | YES $\square$ NO $\boxtimes$ |

（All parts 1，2，and 3 below must be satisfied for the same one hour，for any four consecutive 15－minute periods）

| 1．The total delay experienced by traffic on one minor street approach（one direction only） controlled by a STOP sign equals or exceeds four vehicle－hours for a one－lane approach，or five vehicle－hours for a two－lane approach；AND | Yes $\square$ No 区 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2．The volume on the same minor street approach（one direction only）equals or exceeds 100 vph for one moving lane of traffic or 150 vph for two moving lanes；AND | Yes 区 No |
| 3．The total entering volume serviced during the hour equals or exceeds 800 vph for intersections with four or more approaches or 650 vph for intersections with three approaches． | Yes 区 No $\square$ |



The satisfaction of a traffic signal warrant or warrants shall not in itself require the installation of a traffic control signal．

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.

Figure 4C-4. Warrant 3, Peak Hour (70\% Factor) (COMMUNITY LESS THAN 10,000 POPULATION OR ABOVE 40 MPH ON MAJOR STREET)

*Note: 100 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with two or more lanes and 75 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with one lane.

Figure 4C-101 (CA). Traffic Signal Warrants Worksheet (Sheet 2 of 5)
WARRANT 2 - Four Hour Vehicular Volume SATISFIED* YES $\square$ NO $\square$ N/A


| *All plotted points fall above the applicable curve in Figure 4C-1. (URBAN AREAS) | Yes $\square$ No $\square$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| OR, All plotted points fall above the applicable curve in Figure 4C-2. (RURAL AREAS) | Yes $\square$ No $\square$ |


| WARRANT 3-Peak Hour |  | SATISFIED |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (Part A or Part B must be satisfied) $\square$ NO $\boxtimes$ |  |  |
| PART A | SATISFIED | YES $\square$ NO 凶 |

(All parts 1, 2, and 3 below must be satisfied for the same one hour, for any four consecutive 15-minute periods)

| 1. The total delay experienced by traffic on one minor street approach (one direction only) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| controlled by a STOP sign equals or exceeds four vehicle-hours for a one-lane |
| approach, or five vehicle-hours for a two-lane approach; AND | Yes $\quad$ No



| The plotted point falls above the applicable curve in Figure 4C-3. (URBAN AREAS) | Yes $\square$ No $\square$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\underline{\text { OR }, ~ T h e ~ p l o t t e d ~ p o i n t ~ f a l l s ~ a b o v e ~ t h e ~ a p p l i c a b l e ~ c u r v e ~ i n ~ F i g u r e ~ 4 C-4 . ~(R U R A L ~ A R E A S) ~}$ | Yes $\square$ No $\boxtimes$ |

The satisfaction of a traffic signal warrant or warrants shall not in itself require the installation of a traffic control signal.

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.

Figure 4C-4. Warrant 3, Peak Hour (70\% Factor) (COMMUNITY LESS THAN 10,000 POPULATION OR ABOVE 40 MPH ON MAJOR STREET)

*Note: 100 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with two or more lanes and 75 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with one lane.

Figure 4C-101 (CA). Traffic Signal Warrants Worksheet (Sheet 2 of 5)
WARRANT 2 - Four Hour Vehicular Volume SATISFIED* YES $\square$ NO $\square$ N/A


| *All plotted points fall above the applicable curve in Figure 4C-1. (URBAN AREAS) | Yes $\square$ No $\square$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\underline{\text { OR , All plotted points fall above the applicable curve in Figure 4C-2. (RURAL AREAS) }}$ | Yes $\square$ No $\square$ |


| WARRANT 3-Peak Hour | SATISFIED | YES $\boxtimes$ NO $\square$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (Part A or Part B must be satisfied) |  |  |
| PART A | SATISFIED | YES $\square$ NO $\boxtimes$ |

(All parts 1, 2, and 3 below must be satisfied for the same one hour, for any four consecutive 15-minute periods)

| 1. The total delay experienced by traffic on one minor street approach (one direction only) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| controlled by a STOP sign equals or exceeds four vehicle-hours for a one-lane |
| approach, or five vehicle-hours for a two-lane approach; AND | Yes $\square$ No $\mathbb{l}$



The satisfaction of a traffic signal warrant or warrants shall not in itself require the installation of a traffic control signal.

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.

Figure 4C-4. Warrant 3, Peak Hour (70\% Factor) (COMMUNITY LESS THAN 10,000 POPULATION OR ABOVE 40 MPH ON MAJOR STREET)

*Note: 100 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with two or more lanes and 75 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with one lane.

Figure 4C-101 (CA). Traffic Signal Warrants Worksheet (Sheet 2 of 5)
WARRANT 2 - Four Hour Vehicular Volume SATISFIED* YES $\square$ NO $\square$ N/A


| *All plotted points fall above the applicable curve in Figure 4C-1. (URBAN AREAS) | Yes $\square$ No $\square$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\underline{\text { OR , All plotted points fall above the applicable curve in Figure 4C-2. (RURAL AREAS) }}$ | Yes $\square$ No $\square$ |


| WARRANT 3-Peak Hour | SATISFIED | YES $\square$ NO $\boxtimes$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (Part A or Part B must be satisfied) |  |  |
| PART A | SATISFIED | YES $\square$ NO 凶 |

(All parts 1, 2, and 3 below must be satisfied for the same one hour, for any four consecutive 15-minute periods)

| 1. The total delay experienced by traffic on one minor street approach (one direction only) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| controlled by a STOP sign equals or exceeds four vehicle-hours for a one-lane |
| approach, or five vehicle-hours for a two-lane approach; AND | Yes $\quad$ No



The satisfaction of a traffic signal warrant or warrants shall not in itself require the installation of a traffic control signal.

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.

Figure 4C-4. Warrant 3, Peak Hour (70\% Factor) (COMMUNITY LESS THAN 10,000 POPULATION OR ABOVE 40 MPH ON MAJOR STREET)

*Note: 100 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with two or more lanes and 75 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with one lane.

Figure 4C－101（CA）．Traffic Signal Warrants Worksheet（Sheet 2 of 5）
WARRANT 2 －Four Hour Vehicular Volume SATISFIED＊YES $\square$ NO $\square$ N／A


| ＊All plotted points fall above the applicable curve in Figure 4C－1．（URBAN AREAS） | Yes $\square$ No $\square$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\underline{\text { OR ，All plotted points fall above the applicable curve in Figure 4C－2．（RURAL AREAS）}}$ | Yes $\square$ No $\square$ |


| WARRANT 3－Peak Hour | SATISFIED | YES $\boxtimes$ NO $\square$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| （Part A or Part B must be satisfied） |  |  |
| PART A | SATISFIED | YES $\square$ NO $\boxtimes$ |

（All parts 1，2，and 3 below must be satisfied for the same one hour，for any four consecutive 15－minute periods）

| 1．The total delay experienced by traffic on one minor street approach（one direction only） controlled by a STOP sign equals or exceeds four vehicle－hours for a one－lane approach，or five vehicle－hours for a two－lane approach；AND | Yes $\square$ No 区 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2．The volume on the same minor street approach（one direction only）equals or exceeds 100 vph for one moving lane of traffic or 150 vph for two moving lanes；AND | Yes 区 No |
| 3．The total entering volume serviced during the hour equals or exceeds 800 vph for intersections with four or more approaches or 650 vph for intersections with three approaches． | Yes 区 No $\square$ |



The satisfaction of a traffic signal warrant or warrants shall not in itself require the installation of a traffic control signal．

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.

Figure 4C-4. Warrant 3, Peak Hour (70\% Factor) (COMMUNITY LESS THAN 10,000 POPULATION OR ABOVE 40 MPH ON MAJOR STREET)

*Note: 100 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with two or more lanes and 75 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with one lane.
2. Death Valley Rd (SR 127) and I-15 NB Ramps

| Date | Primary | Secondary | Distance | Direction | Severity |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2/25/2019 | I-15 S/B From Kelbaker Road | Kelbaker Rd | 209 S | injury | Hit Object |
| $8 / 4 / 2020$ | I-15 SB to SR-127 | SR-127 | 105 N | PDO | Hit-Object |
| $10 / 24 / 2020$ | I-15 SB to SR-128 | SR-127 | 0 | Injury | Rear End |
| $5 / 26 / 2021$ | I15 S/B TO SR-127 | SR-127 | 250 N | Injury | Hit Object |
| $7 / 5 / 2021$ | SR-127 | I15 S/B TO SR-127 | 0 | PDO | Broadside |
| $8 / 7 / 2022$ | I-15 SB to SR-127 | SR-127 | 0 | PDO | Sideswipe |

Figure 4C-101 (CA). Traffic Signal Warrants Worksheet (Sheet 1 of 5)


The satisfaction of a traffic signal warrant or warrants shall not in itself require the installation of a traffic control signal.

Figure 4C-101 (CA). Traffic Signal Warrants Worksheet (Sheet 2 of 5)
WARRANT 2 - Four Hour Vehicular Volume SATISFIED* YES $\square$ NO $\square$ N/A


| *All plotted points fall above the applicable curve in Figure 4C-1. (URBAN AREAS) | Yes $\square$ No $\square$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\underline{\text { OR , All plotted points fall above the applicable curve in Figure 4C-2. (RURAL AREAS) }}$ | Yes $\square$ No $\square$ |


| WARRANT 3-Peak Hour | SATISFIED | YES $\square$ NO $\boxtimes$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (Part A or Part B must be satisfied) |  |  |
| PART A | SATISFIED | YES $\square$ NO $\boxtimes$ |

(All parts 1, 2, and 3 below must be satisfied for the same one hour, for any four consecutive 15-minute periods)

| 1. The total delay experienced by traffic on one minor street approach (one direction only) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| controlled by a STOP sign equals or exceeds four vehicle-hours for a one-lane |
| approach, or five vehicle-hours for a two-lane approach; AND | Yes $\square$ No | Nen |
| :--- |



The satisfaction of a traffic signal warrant or warrants shall not in itself require the installation of a traffic control signal.

Figure 4C-101 (CA). Traffic Signal Warrants Worksheet (Sheet 3 of 5)
WARRANT 4 - Pedestrian Volume SATISFIED YES $\square$ NO $\square$ N/A (Parts 1 and 2 Must Be Satisfied)


Figure 4C-5 or Figure 4C-6 SATISFIED YESNO $\square$

Figure 4C-7 or Figure 4C-8 SATISFIED YESNO $\square$

## Part 2

SATISFIED YES
NO $\square$

| $\frac{\text { AND, The distance to the nearest traffic signal along the major street is greater }}{\text { than } 300 \mathrm{ft}} \mathrm{Yes} \square$ No $\square$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| OR, The proposed traffic signal will not restrict progressive traffic flow along the major street. | Yes $\square$ No $\square$ |


| WARRANT 5 - School Crossing (Parts A and B Must Be Satisfied) |  | SATISFIED | YES $\square$ | NO $\square$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Part A <br> Gap/Minutes and \# of Children |  | Hour SATISFIED | YES $\square$ | NO $\square$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Gaps } \\ \text { Minstes } \end{gathered}$ | Minutes Children Using Crossing |  |  |  |
|  | Number of Adequate Gaps | Gaps < Minutes | YES $\square$ | NO $\square$ |
| School Age Pedestrians Crossing Street/ hr |  | AND Children > 20/hr | YES $\square$ | NO $\square$ |
| AND, Consideration has been given to less restrictive remedial measures. |  |  | Yes $\square$ | No $\square$ |
| Part B |  | SATISFIED | YES $\square$ | NO $\square$ |
| The distance to the nearest traffic signal along the major street is greater than 300 ft |  |  | Yes $\square$ | No $\square$ |
| OR, The proposed signal will not restrict the progressive movement of traffic. |  |  | Yes $\square$ | No $\square$ |

The satisfaction of a traffic signal warrant or warrants shall not in itself require the installation of a traffic control signal.

Figure 4C-101 (CA). Traffic Signal Warrants Worksheet (Sheet 4 of 5)


The satisfaction of a traffic signal warrant or warrants shall not in itself require the installation of a traffic control signal.

Figure 4C-101 (CA). Traffic Signal Warrants Worksheet (Sheet 5 of 5)

WARRANT 9 - Intersection Near a Grade Crossing SATISFIED YES $\square$ NO $\square$ N/A (Both Parts A and B Must Be Satisfied)


The minor street approach volume may be multiplied by up to three following adjustment factors (AF) as described in Section 4C. 10.

1- Number of Rail Traffic per Day $\qquad$ Adjustment factor from table 4C-2 $\qquad$
2- Percentage of High-Occupancy Buses on Minor Street Approach $\qquad$ Adjustment factor from table 4C-3 $\qquad$
3- Percentage of Tractor-Trailer Trucks on Minor Street Approach $\qquad$ Adjustment factor from table 4C-4 $\qquad$
NOTE: If no data is availale or known, then use $\mathrm{AF}=1$ (no adjustment)

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.

Figure 4C-4. Warrant 3, Peak Hour (70\% Factor) (COMMUNITY LESS THAN 10,000 POPULATION OR ABOVE 40 MPH ON MAJOR STREET)

*Note: 100 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with two or more lanes and 75 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with one lane.

Figure 4C－101（CA）．Traffic Signal Warrants Worksheet（Sheet 2 of 5）
WARRANT 2 －Four Hour Vehicular Volume SATISFIED＊YES $\square$ NO $\square$ N／A


| ＊All plotted points fall above the applicable curve in Figure 4C－1．（URBAN AREAS） | Yes $\square$ No $\square$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\underline{\text { OR ，All plotted points fall above the applicable curve in Figure 4C－2．（RURAL AREAS）}}$ | Yes $\square$ No $\square$ |


| WARRANT 3－Peak Hour | SATISFIED | YES $\square$ NO $\mathbb{}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| （Part A or Part B must be satisfied） |  |  |
| PART A | SATISFIED | YES $\square$ NO $\boxtimes$ |

（All parts 1，2，and 3 below must be satisfied for the same one hour，for any four consecutive 15－minute periods）

| 1．The total delay experienced by traffic on one minor street approach（one direction only） controlled by a STOP sign equals or exceeds four vehicle－hours for a one－lane approach，or five vehicle－hours for a two－lane approach；AND | Yes $\square$ No 区 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2．The volume on the same minor street approach（one direction only）equals or exceeds 100 vph for one moving lane of traffic or 150 vph for two moving lanes；AND | Yes 区 No |
| 3．The total entering volume serviced during the hour equals or exceeds 800 vph for intersections with four or more approaches or 650 vph for intersections with three approaches． | Yes $\square$ No 区 |



The satisfaction of a traffic signal warrant or warrants shall not in itself require the installation of a traffic control signal．

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.

Figure 4C-4. Warrant 3, Peak Hour (70\% Factor) (COMMUNITY LESS THAN 10,000 POPULATION OR ABOVE 40 MPH ON MAJOR STREET)

*Note: 100 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with two or more lanes and 75 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with one lane.

Figure 4C-101 (CA). Traffic Signal Warrants Worksheet (Sheet 2 of 5)
WARRANT 2 - Four Hour Vehicular Volume SATISFIED* YES $\square$ NO $\square$ N/A


| *All plotted points fall above the applicable curve in Figure 4C-1. (URBAN AREAS) | Yes $\square$ No $\square$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| OR, All plotted points fall above the applicable curve in Figure 4C-2. (RURAL AREAS) | Yes $\square$ No $\square$ |


| WARRANT 3-Peak Hour | SATISFIED | YES $\square$ NO $\boxtimes$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (Part A or Part B must be satisfied) |  |  |
| PART A | SATISFIED | YES $\square$ NO 凶 |

(All parts 1, 2, and 3 below must be satisfied for the same one hour, for any four consecutive 15-minute periods)

| 1. The total delay experienced by traffic on one minor street approach (one direction only) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| controlled by a STOP sign equals or exceeds four vehicle-hours for a one-lane |
| approach, or five vehicle-hours for a two-lane approach; AND | Yes $\quad$ No



The satisfaction of a traffic signal warrant or warrants shall not in itself require the installation of a traffic control signal.

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.

Figure 4C-4. Warrant 3, Peak Hour (70\% Factor) (COMMUNITY LESS THAN 10,000 POPULATION OR ABOVE 40 MPH ON MAJOR STREET)

*Note: 100 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with two or more lanes and 75 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with one lane.

Figure 4C－101（CA）．Traffic Signal Warrants Worksheet（Sheet 2 of 5）
WARRANT 2 －Four Hour Vehicular Volume SATISFIED＊YES $\square$ NO $\square$ N／A


| ＊All plotted points fall above the applicable curve in Figure 4C－1．（URBAN AREAS） | Yes $\square$ No $\square$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\underline{\text { OR ，All plotted points fall above the applicable curve in Figure 4C－2．（RURAL AREAS）}}$ | Yes $\square$ No $\square$ |


| WARRANT 3－Peak Hour | SATISFIED | YES $\triangle$ NO $\square$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| （Part A or Part B must be satisfied） |  |  |
| PART A | SATISFIED | YES $\square$ NO $\boxtimes$ |

（All parts 1，2，and 3 below must be satisfied for the same one hour，for any four consecutive 15－minute periods）

| 1．The total delay experienced by traffic on one minor street approach（one direction only） controlled by a STOP sign equals or exceeds four vehicle－hours for a one－lane approach，or five vehicle－hours for a two－lane approach；AND | Yes $\square$ No 区 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2．The volume on the same minor street approach（one direction only）equals or exceeds 100 vph for one moving lane of traffic or 150 vph for two moving lanes；AND | Yes 区 No $\square$ |
| 3．The total entering volume serviced during the hour equals or exceeds 800 vph for intersections with four or more approaches or 650 vph for intersections with three approaches． | Yes $\square$ No 区 |



The satisfaction of a traffic signal warrant or warrants shall not in itself require the installation of a traffic control signal．

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.

Figure 4C-4. Warrant 3, Peak Hour (70\% Factor) (COMMUNITY LESS THAN 10,000 POPULATION OR ABOVE 40 MPH ON MAJOR STREET)

*Note: 100 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with two or more lanes and 75 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with one lane.

Figure 4C-101 (CA). Traffic Signal Warrants Worksheet (Sheet 2 of 5)
WARRANT 2 - Four Hour Vehicular Volume SATISFIED* YES $\square$ NO $\square$ N/A


| *All plotted points fall above the applicable curve in Figure 4C-1. (URBAN AREAS) | Yes $\square$ No $\square$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\underline{\text { OR , All plotted points fall above the applicable curve in Figure 4C-2. (RURAL AREAS) }}$ | Yes $\square$ No $\square$ |


| WARRANT 3-Peak Hour | SATISFIED | YES $\square$ NO $\boxtimes$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (Part A or Part B must be satisfied) |  |  |
| PART A | SATISFIED | YES $\square$ NO 凶 |

(All parts 1, 2, and 3 below must be satisfied for the same one hour, for any four consecutive 15-minute periods)

| 1. The total delay experienced by traffic on one minor street approach (one direction only) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| controlled by a STOP sign equals or exceeds four vehicle-hours for a one-lane |
| approach, or five vehicle-hours for a two-lane approach; AND | Yes $\quad$ No



The satisfaction of a traffic signal warrant or warrants shall not in itself require the installation of a traffic control signal.

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.

Figure 4C-4. Warrant 3, Peak Hour (70\% Factor) (COMMUNITY LESS THAN 10,000 POPULATION OR ABOVE 40 MPH ON MAJOR STREET)

*Note: 100 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with two or more lanes and 75 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with one lane.

Figure 4C-101 (CA). Traffic Signal Warrants Worksheet (Sheet 2 of 5)
WARRANT 2 - Four Hour Vehicular Volume SATISFIED* YES $\square$ NO $\square$ N/A


| *All plotted points fall above the applicable curve in Figure 4C-1. (URBAN AREAS) | Yes $\square$ No $\square$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\underline{\text { OR , All plotted points fall above the applicable curve in Figure 4C-2. (RURAL AREAS) }}$ | Yes $\square$ No $\square$ |


| WARRANT 3-Peak Hour | SATISFIED | YES $\triangle$ NO $\square$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (Part A or Part B must be satisfied) |  |  |
| PART A | SATISFIED | YES $\square$ NO $\boxtimes$ |

(All parts 1, 2, and 3 below must be satisfied for the same one hour, for any four consecutive 15-minute periods)

| 1. The total delay experienced by traffic on one minor street approach (one direction only) controlled by a STOP sign equals or exceeds four vehicle-hours for a one-lane approach, or five vehicle-hours for a two-lane approach; AND | Yes $\square$ No 区 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2. The volume on the same minor street approach (one direction only) equals or exceeds 100 vph for one moving lane of traffic or 150 vph for two moving lanes; AND | Yes X No $\square$ |
| 3. The total entering volume serviced during the hour equals or exceeds 800 vph for intersections with four or more approaches or 650 vph for intersections with three approaches. | Yes $\square$ No 【 |



The satisfaction of a traffic signal warrant or warrants shall not in itself require the installation of a traffic control signal.

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.

Figure 4C-4. Warrant 3, Peak Hour (70\% Factor) (COMMUNITY LESS THAN 10,000 POPULATION OR ABOVE 40 MPH ON MAJOR STREET)

*Note: 100 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with two or more lanes and 75 vph applies as the lower threshold volume for a minor-street approach with one lane.
3. Death Valley Rd (SR 127) and I-15 SB Ramps

| Date | Primary | Secondary | Distance | Direction | Severity |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| I/27/2019 Kelbaker Rd | I-15 N/B | 20 W | PDO | Rear End |  |
| $3 / 19 / 2022$ | SR-127 | I15 NB TO SR-127 | 35 E | PDO | Sideswipe |
| $8 / 27 / 2022$ | State Route 127 | Baker Blvd | 280 N | PDO | Sideswipe |

Appendix E: Queuing Analysis

Intersection: 1: Death Valley Rd (SR-127) \& Baker Blvd

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | R | L | T | LTR | LTR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 31 | 102 | 70 | 154 | 71 | 258 | 41 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 12 | 70 | 45 | 91 | 49 | 209 | 25 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 38 | 118 | 78 | 161 | 79 | 296 | 51 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 818 |  |  | 1086 | 277 | 1052 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 200 |  | 200 | 225 |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |

Intersection: 2: Death Valley Road (SR-127)/Death Valley Rd (SR-127) \& I-15 NB on-ramp/l-15 SB off-ran

| Movement | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | LT | TR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 116 | 65 | 2 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 80 | 26 | 0 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 185 | 141 | 5 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1367 | 1169 | 277 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |

Intersection: 3: Kelbaker Rd/Death Valley Road (SR-127) \& I-15 NB off-ramp/l-15 NB on-ramp

| Movement | EB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | TR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 107 | 21 | 75 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 74 | 8 | 54 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 118 | 29 | 83 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1038 | 294 | 1169 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Zone Summary |  |  |  |

Intersection: 1: Death Valley Rd (SR-127) \& Baker Blvd

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | WB | NB | NB | NB | SB | SB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | TR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 36 | 165 | 66 | 184 | 67 | 20 | 58 | 17 | 122 | 11 | 18 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 14 | 112 | 45 | 123 | 37 | 6 | 34 | 6 | 80 | 4 | 5 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 41 | 183 | 75 | 208 | 81 | 25 | 69 | 22 | 144 | 16 | 22 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 811 |  |  | 1060 |  |  | 279 |  |  | 1017 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 200 |  | 200 | 225 |  | 225 | 200 |  | 200 | 200 |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 0 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Intersection: 2: Death Valley Road (SR-127)/Death Valley Rd (SR-127) \& I-15 NB on-ramp/l-15 SB off-ran

| Movement | WB | NB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 78 | 6 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 56 | 1 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 86 | 11 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1361 | 1168 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

Intersection: 3: Kelbaker Rd/Death Valley Road (SR-127) \& I-15 NB off-ramp/l-15 NB on-ramp

| Movement | EB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | TR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 107 | 21 | 80 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 75 | 8 | 58 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 119 | 29 | 90 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1038 | 294 | 1168 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Zone Summary |  |  |  |

Intersection: 1: Death Valley Rd (SR-127) \& Baker Blvd

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | R | L | T | LTR | LTR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 66 | 75 | 68 | 270 | 356 | 283 | 61 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 48 | 54 | 44 | 200 | 172 | 264 | 36 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 75 | 84 | 75 | 357 | 486 | 333 | 74 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 818 |  |  | 1086 | 277 | 1052 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |  | 96 |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 200 |  | 200 | 225 |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  | 29 |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  | 89 |  |  |  |

Intersection: 2: Death Valley Road (SR-127)/Death Valley Rd (SR-127) \& I-15 NB on-ramp/I-15 SB off-ran

| Movement | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | LT | TR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 370 | 202 | 14 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 235 | 84 | 4 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 481 | 276 | 16 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1367 | 1169 | 277 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |

Intersection: 3: Kelbaker Rd/Death Valley Road (SR-127) \& I-15 NB off-ramp/l-15 NB on-ramp

| Movement | EB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | TR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 105 | 30 | 60 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 71 | 10 | 46 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 113 | 37 | 67 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1038 | 294 | 1169 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Zone Summary |  |  |  |

Intersection: 1: Death Valley Rd (SR-127) \& Baker Blvd

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | WB | NB | NB | NB | SB | SB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | TR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 139 | 120 | 84 | 262 | 245 | 34 | 93 | 60 | 114 | 28 | 39 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 95 | 82 | 50 | 198 | 130 | 12 | 59 | 29 | 66 | 13 | 14 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 149 | 142 | 90 | 309 | 289 | 39 | 103 | 70 | 125 | 37 | 52 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 811 |  |  | 1060 |  |  | 279 |  |  | 1017 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 200 |  | 200 | 225 |  | 225 | 200 |  | 200 | 200 |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 0 |  | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 0 |  | 21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Intersection: 2: Death Valley Road (SR-127)/Death Valley Rd (SR-127) \& I-15 NB on-ramp/l-15 SB off-ran

| Movement | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | LT | TR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 124 | 130 | 12 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 80 | 62 | 3 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 137 | 164 | 15 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1361 | 1168 | 279 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |

Intersection: 3: Kelbaker Rd/Death Valley Road (SR-127) \& I-15 NB off-ramp/l-15 NB on-ramp

| Movement | EB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | TR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 103 | 30 | 65 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 74 | 10 | 47 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 116 | 37 | 73 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1038 | 294 | 1168 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Zone Summary |  |  |  |

## Intersection: 1: Death Valley Rd (SR-127) \& Baker Blvd

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | R | L | T | LTR | LTR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 25 | 104 | 65 | 185 | 69 | 261 | 40 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 12 | 71 | 47 | 108 | 47 | 220 | 25 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 38 | 122 | 75 | 204 | 77 | 324 | 48 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 818 |  |  | 1086 | 277 | 1052 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |  | 37 |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 200 |  | 200 | 225 |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 0 |  | 2 |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 0 |  | 4 |  |  |  |

Intersection: 2: Death Valley Road (SR-127)/Death Valley Rd (SR-127) \& I-15 NB on-ramp/l-15 SB off-ran

| Movement | WB | NB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 155 | 115 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 104 | 39 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 229 | 199 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1367 | 1169 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |

Intersection: 3: Kelbaker Rd/Death Valley Road (SR-127) \& I-15 NB off-ramp/l-15 NB on-ramp

| Movement | EB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | TR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 115 | 21 | 76 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 78 | 7 | 53 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 127 | 28 | 84 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1038 | 294 | 1169 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Zone Summary |  |  |  |

Intersection: 1: Death Valley Rd (SR-127) \& Baker Blvd

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | WB | NB | NB | NB | SB | SB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | TR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 25 | 189 | 111 | 191 | 63 | 25 | 57 | 22 | 136 | 13 | 12 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 14 | 125 | 54 | 122 | 38 | 6 | 34 | 9 | 91 | 4 | 3 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 39 | 212 | 130 | 205 | 75 | 27 | 67 | 30 | 155 | 18 | 13 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 811 |  |  | 1060 |  |  | 279 |  |  | 1017 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 200 |  | 200 | 225 |  | 225 | 200 |  | 200 | 200 |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 1 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 2 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |

Intersection: 2: Death Valley Road (SR-127)/Death Valley Rd (SR-127) \& I-15 NB on-ramp/l-15 SB off-ran

| Movement | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | LT | TR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 87 | 25 | 2 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 61 | 5 | 0 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 93 | 37 | 5 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1361 | 1168 | 279 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |

Intersection: 3: Kelbaker Rd/Death Valley Road (SR-127) \& I-15 NB off-ramp/l-15 NB on-ramp

| Movement | EB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | TR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 108 | 21 | 88 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 78 | 8 | 61 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 122 | 29 | 97 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1038 | 294 | 1168 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Zone Summary |  |  |  |

Intersection: 1: Death Valley Rd (SR-127) \& Baker Blvd

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | R | L | T | LTR | LTR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 62 | 87 | 73 | 135 | 78 | 277 | 54 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 45 | 52 | 47 | 94 | 57 | 237 | 36 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 67 | 93 | 82 | 155 | 90 | 340 | 62 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 818 |  |  | 1086 | 277 | 1052 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  | 9 | 63 |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 200 |  | 200 | 225 |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Intersection: 2: Death Valley Road (SR-127)/Death Valley Rd (SR-127) \& I-15 NB on-ramp/l-15 SB off-ran

| Movement | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | LT | TR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 355 | 187 | 12 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 226 | 91 | 2 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 537 | 345 | 16 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1367 | 1169 | 277 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |

Intersection: 3: Kelbaker Rd/Death Valley Road (SR-127) \& I-15 NB off-ramp/l-15 NB on-ramp

| Movement | EB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | TR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 112 | 34 | 61 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 78 | 9 | 46 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 133 | 39 | 68 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1038 | 294 | 1169 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Zone Summary |  |  |  |

Intersection: 1: Death Valley Rd (SR-127) \& Baker Blvd

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | WB | NB | NB | NB | SB | SB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | TR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 117 | 132 | 85 | 190 | 127 | 25 | 76 | 49 | 126 | 35 | 21 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 87 | 81 | 53 | 125 | 89 | 7 | 46 | 29 | 74 | 14 | 7 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 138 | 149 | 109 | 206 | 145 | 28 | 85 | 58 | 143 | 37 | 30 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 811 |  |  | 1060 |  |  | 279 |  |  | 1017 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 200 |  | 200 | 225 |  | 225 | 200 |  | 200 | 200 |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |

Intersection: 2: Death Valley Road (SR-127)/Death Valley Rd (SR-127) \& I-15 NB on-ramp/l-15 SB off-ran

| Movement | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | LT | TR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 140 | 118 | 9 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 89 | 47 | 3 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 166 | 130 | 16 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1361 | 1168 | 279 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |

Intersection: 3: Kelbaker Rd/Death Valley Road (SR-127) \& I-15 NB off-ramp/l-15 NB on-ramp

| Movement | EB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | TR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 116 | 34 | 70 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 79 | 9 | 49 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 135 | 39 | 79 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1038 | 294 | 1168 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Zone Summary |  |  |  |
| Zone wide Queuing Penalty: 1 |  |  |  |

Intersection: 1: Death Valley Rd (SR-127) \& Baker Blvd

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | R | L | T | LTR | LTR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 37 | 105 | 68 | 153 | 67 | 280 | 55 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 15 | 72 | 47 | 99 | 49 | 254 | 34 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 44 | 120 | 77 | 173 | 78 | 329 | 67 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 818 |  |  | 1086 | 277 | 1052 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  | 11 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |  | 73 |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 200 |  | 200 | 225 |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |

Intersection: 2: Death Valley Road (SR-127)/Death Valley Rd (SR-127) \& I-15 NB on-ramp/l-15 SB off-ran

| Movement | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | LT | TR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 314 | 124 | 4 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 175 | 52 | 1 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 461 | 144 | 7 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1367 | 1169 | 277 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |

Intersection: 3: Kelbaker Rd/Death Valley Road (SR-127) \& I-15 NB off-ramp/l-15 NB on-ramp

| Movement | EB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | TR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 122 | 38 | 66 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 81 | 28 | 48 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 132 | 50 | 72 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1038 | 294 | 1169 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Zone Summary |  |  |  |

## Intersection: 1: Death Valley Rd (SR-127) \& Baker Blvd

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | WB | NB | NB | NB | SB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | TR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 43 | 179 | 75 | 192 | 88 | 20 | 77 | 15 | 158 | 23 | 29 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 18 | 116 | 50 | 119 | 47 | 6 | 44 | 4 | 96 | 8 | 9 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 51 | 196 | 87 | 203 | 112 | 26 | 85 | 19 | 180 | 27 | 35 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 811 |  |  | 1060 |  |  | 279 |  |  | 1017 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 200 | 200 |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 200 |  | 200 | 225 |  | 225 | 200 |  | 0 |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  | 1 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  | 2 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |

## Intersection: 2: Death Valley Road (SR-127)/Death Valley Rd (SR-127) \& I-15 NB on-ramp/l-15 SB off-ran

| Movement | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | LT | TR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 99 | 70 | 15 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 63 | 18 | 3 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 107 | 77 | 23 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1361 | 1168 | 279 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |

## Intersection: 3: Kelbaker Rd/Death Valley Road (SR-127) \& I-15 NB off-ramp/l-15 NB on-ramp

| Movement | EB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | TR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 114 | 36 | 72 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 78 | 28 | 53 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 133 | 48 | 80 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1038 | 294 | 1168 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Zone Summary |  |  |  |

Intersection: 1: Death Valley Rd (SR-127) \& Baker Blvd

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | R | L | T | LTR | LTR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 71 | 70 | 71 | 162 | 70 | 283 | 62 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 50 | 51 | 49 | 106 | 52 | 270 | 42 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 81 | 82 | 79 | 190 | 82 | 314 | 69 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 818 |  |  | 1086 | 277 | 1052 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |  | 104 |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 200 |  | 200 | 225 |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |

Intersection: 2: Death Valley Road (SR-127)/Death Valley Rd (SR-127) \& I-15 NB on-ramp/l-15 SB off-ran

| Movement | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | LT | TR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 520 | 146 | 6 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 337 | 73 | 2 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 780 | 202 | 11 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1367 | 1169 | 277 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |

## Intersection: 3: Kelbaker Rd/Death Valley Road (SR-127) \& I-15 NB off-ramp/l-15 NB on-ramp

| Movement | EB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | TR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 95 | 37 | 67 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 69 | 15 | 49 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 106 | 46 | 78 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1038 | 294 | 1169 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Zone Summary |  |  |  |

Intersection: 1: Death Valley Rd (SR-127) \& Baker Blvd

| Movement | EB | EB | EB | WB | WB | WB | NB | NB | NB | SB | SB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Directions Served | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | TR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 150 | 111 | 78 | 185 | 115 | 18 | 91 | 56 | 120 | 34 | 40 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 101 | 80 | 52 | 115 | 79 | 6 | 59 | 30 | 72 | 14 | 16 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 176 | 123 | 86 | 200 | 139 | 25 | 104 | 67 | 145 | 38 | 52 |
| Link Distance (ft) |  | 811 |  |  | 1060 |  |  | 279 |  |  | 1017 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) | 200 |  | 200 | 225 |  | 225 | 200 |  | 200 | 200 |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) | 1 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) | 3 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |

Intersection: 2: Death Valley Road (SR-127)/Death Valley Rd (SR-127) \& I-15 NB on-ramp/l-15 SB off-ran

| Movement | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | LT | TR |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 116 | 126 | 6 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 84 | 44 | 2 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 135 | 153 | 10 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1361 | 1168 | 279 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |

Intersection: 3: Kelbaker Rd/Death Valley Road (SR-127) \& I-15 NB off-ramp/l-15 NB on-ramp

| Movement | EB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Directions Served | LTR | TR | LT |
| Maximum Queue (ft) | 95 | 39 | 76 |
| Average Queue (ft) | 68 | 15 | 50 |
| 95th Queue (ft) | 101 | 49 | 82 |
| Link Distance (ft) | 1038 | 294 | 1168 |
| Upstream Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
| Storage Bay Dist (ft) |  |  |  |
| Storage Blk Time (\%) |  |  |  |
| Queuing Penalty (veh) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Zone Summary |  |  |  |

Appendix F: Truck Turning Template



