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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Countywide Regional Transportation Impact Fee Program study was conducted by the Lake County/City Area Planning Council to facilitate adoption of an AB 1600 fee program. This program will provide partial funding for future transportation improvement needs. These needs are specifically required to support future development anticipated by Year 2030.

## Why Adopt a Transportation Impact Fee Program?

Impact fee programs are specifically designed to develop funding sources to ensure adequate infrastructure is constructed concurrent with new development. Adopting this program will help to ensure that necessary multi-modal transportation improvements are constructed as new development projects are approved.

This fee program is not intended (and restricted by AB 1600 fee program requirements) to fund improvements required to mitigate (fix) existing problems. All existing transportation system deficiencies were first identified and the costs required to mitigate these conditions removed from the fee program improvement projects.

## Is The Fee Program Consistent with Current Planning Studies?

To ensure conformance with previously prepared studies, the following planning documents are considered as support documents to this study:

- Transit Development Plan (June 2004)
- Wine Country IRP Final Report (June 30, 2004)
- Lake County Regional Transportation Plan (October 2005)
- Lake 20/29/53 Comprehensive Corridor Study (November 8, 2005)
- Highway 20 Traffic Calming and Beautification Plan (August 2006)
- Lake County Regional Bikeway Plan (August 9, 2006)
- Wine Country IRP Origin Destination Study (December 29, 2006)


## How Were Transportation Improvement needs Determined?

Future transportation improvement needs within Lake County, City of Lakeport, and City of Clear Lake were identified first by developing a travel demand model. The model included all significant transportation networks within both the County and City areas. Both existing and future land use estimates were prepared and divided into zones. Figure ES-1 provides a summary by County Planning Areas and Cities of both existing and anticipated future development estimates.

The software used to develop the travel demand model provides the ability to determine daily travel characteristics for each land use type. Origin and destination data obtained from the Wine Country IRP Jobs Housing Imbalance and Wine County IRP Origin Destination Study reports were used to calibrate these models. Existing and anticipated home-to-work trip characteristics were specifically modeled for each of the separate population areas (Cities/communities) within the County.

Daily roadway traffic volume forecasts obtained from the travel demand model were used to prepare roadway Level of Service (LOS) calculations. Transportation facilities that are anticipated to operate below adopted LOS thresholds were identified as deficient and needing improvements.


## Which Transportation Improvement Projects are included in Impact Fee Program?

Year 2030 transportation improvement needs were first determined by identifying all facilities that would operate with volumes in excess of daily LOS C capacity thresholds. Capacity thresholds were identified for each transportation facility type including facilities with sub-standard alignments and cross sections (i.e., roadways with narrow lanes and/or no shoulders). Substandard roadway configurations result in significantly lower capacities.

Future development anticipated by Year 2030 will significantly increase existing traffic volumes on most roadways within the County. The highest increases will occur on the State Highway system (i.e. State Routes 20, 29 and 53). Adding the required capacity to the State Highway system would require widening to a four-lane expressway standard. The majority of this highway system is located within areas of steep slopes, significantly increasing construction costs. Construction and full funding of many of these improvements have been determined by Caltrans to be infeasible. Total estimated costs to provide adequate Year 2030 capacity improvements are in excess of $\$ 1.97$ billion dollars.

Year 2030 capacity improvements needs that were considered infeasible to either fund and/or construct within the next twenty years were removed from the list of anticipated Year 2030 improvements. This refined list of feasible transportation projects form the basis for the transportation improvement fee program. Any facility that is currently operating at deficient daily LOS conditions was then removed from this list as required by AB 1600 fee program requirements.

Figure ES-2 illustrates Year 2030 improvement needs. Figure ES-3 illustrates the Year 2030 transportation improvements included in the Transportation Impact Fee Program. Table ES-1 provides a detailed summary of all Year 2030 transportation fee program improvement needs along with costs included within the program. Improvements are categorized by recommended transportation impact fee zone of benefit areas (as discussed the following section). Funding for projects included within the fee program totals $\$ 313$ million.

All County and City improvement projects included in the fee program are funded one hundred percent. Caltrans projects would be funded at a twenty five percent level. Partial funding of State owned transportation facilities ensures local agency support for these important projects.

## What Are Safety and Operational Improvements?

Roadways where Year 2030 improvement needs were considered infeasible, alternative short-term improvements have been included. The majority of these improvements can be characterized as "safety and operational" improvements. These projects would include improvements that include (are but not limited to); intersection and sight distance improvements, shoulder widening, and alignment improvements.

Safety and operation level improvements add an incremental amount of facility capacity by increasing comfortable and perceived safe travel speeds. Intersection and roadway alignment improvements provide the greatest added traffic carrying capacity. Safety and operational improvements have been included within the fee program consistent with nexus requirements between new development and the roadway capacity improvements required to support this new growth.

## How Were the Various Impact Fee Zones of Benefit Determined?

Impact fee zones of benefit were established based upon the nexus (direct relationship) between anticipated areas of future development and transportation facility needs required to support these development areas. Existing County Planning Area and City Limit boundaries were used to standardize
these development areas. A total of five (5) local zones have been recommended as illustrated in Figure ES-4.

In addition to the five localized zones, a sixth regional countywide zone has been recommended. This zone would include a majority of State (Caltrans) facility improvements, along with other significant regionally important roadways. Each of the five local zones would pay two different impact fees, one for local improvements, and a second regional facility fee (represented by this sixth countywide zone). Fees collected from each zone would be spent only on those facility improvements identified within that zone. The separate regional facility fee would be combined from all five local zones and spent on all regionally significant facility improvements throughout the County (as identified in the fee program).

Facility improvements within the Upper Lake/Nice/Shoreline Communities fee zone would include the beautification and traffic calming improvements along SR 20. These improvements are considered as local improvements with a direct benefit to future development within this zone. Traffic calming along this section of roadway will result in lower daily capacities. These reductions would be offset by payment of the regional facility fee that provides additional capacity along the State Route (SR) 53/SR 29 preferred Principle Arterial Corridor, consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan.

## How Were Impact Fees Calculated?

Transportation impact fees for each zone were calculated by dividing the estimated facility improvement costs by the anticipated traffic volumes associated with new development. Specifically, the fee is based upon total PM peak hour trip generation. Development projects would pay a fee directly related to the anticipated volume of PM peak hour traffic. The higher the traffic, the higher the fee. The standardized unit of measure is Equivalent Dwelling Units (EDU). The relationship between EDUs and PM peak hour trips is simple, one PM peak hour trip equals one EDU.




Table ES-1
Year 2030 Fee Program Improvements


Table ES-1
Year 2030 Fee Program Improvements

|  |  |  |  | Cost <br> Construction <br> Cost Estimate <br> (1,000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Table ES-1
Year 2030 Fee Program Improvements

|  |  |  |  | Cost <br> Construction <br> Cost Estimate <br> Imcluded in <br> the Fee <br> Program |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |

## How Much Would the Fees Cost?

The following two tables provide a summary of the local and regional impact fees by zone of benefit.
Table ES-2 contains fee costs separated into the local facility cost and regional facility cost components.
Table ES-3 contains fee costs associated with payment of both the local and regional facility fee.

TABLE ES-2
TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE ZONE OF BENEFIT COSTS PER EQUIVALENT DWELLING UNITS

| Zone of Benefit | Transportation Improvement Cost <br> Estimates (Exclding State Facilities Improvements) | State Facility Cost Estimates Included In Fee Program | Total <br> Transportation Improvement Cost <br> Estimates | Equivalent Dwelling Units (EDU's) | Transportation Impact Fee Program Cost Per EDU |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lakeport Planning Area | \$62,102,127 | \$0 | \$62,102,127 | 3,088 | \$20,111 |
| City of Clear Lake/Lower Lake Planning Area | \$34,329,075 | \$0 | \$34,329,075 | 6,560 | \$5,233 |
| Middletown Planning Area | \$10,460,640 | \$0 | \$10,460,640 | 1,966 | \$5,321 |
| Kelseyville/Rivieras/Cobb Planning Areas | \$14,831,159 | \$0 | \$14,831,159 | 3,396 | \$4,367 |
| Upper Lake/Nice/Shoreline Communities Planning Areas | \$19,647,775 | \$0 | \$19,647,775 | 2,929 | \$6,708 |
| Countywide Regional Transportation Facilities | \$0 | \$116,712,485 | \$116,712,485 | 17,939 | \$6,506 |
| Totals | \$141,370,776 | \$116,712,485 | \$258,083,261 |  |  |

TABLE ES-3
TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE COSTS BY ZONE OF BENEFIT

|  | Equivalent Dwelling <br> Units (EDU's) |  | Local Zone of <br> Benefit Cost Per | Regional Zone <br> of Benefit Cost <br> per <br> EDU | Combined <br> Local/Regional <br> Cost Per EDU |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Zone of Benefit | 3,088 | $17.2 \%$ | $\$ 20,111$ | $\$ 6,506$ | $\$ 26,617$ |
| Lakeport Planning Area | 6,560 | $36.6 \%$ | $\$ 5,233$ | $\$ 6,506$ | $\$ 11,739$ |
| City of Clear Lake/Lower Lake Planning Area | 1,966 | $11.0 \%$ | $\$ 5,321$ | $\$ 6,506$ | $\$ 11,827$ |
| Middletown Planning Area | 3,396 | $18.9 \%$ | $\$ 4,367$ | $\$ 6,506$ | $\$ 10,873$ |
| Kelseyville/Rivieras/Cobb Planning Areas | 2,929 | $16.3 \%$ | $\$ 6,708$ | $\$ 6,506$ | $\$ 13,214$ |
| Upper Lake/Nice/Shoreline Communities Planning Areas |  |  |  |  |  |

## Who Would Pay Impact Fees?

Transportation impact fees would only be charged on new development projects. Existing development within the County and Cities would not be required to pay any fees. However, fees would be charged to any significant redevelopment of existing buildings.

## How Do the Proposed Fees Compare with Other Lake County/City Fees

The transportation impact fees would be additive to existing building permit fees. Table ES-4 provides a summary of typical residential development fees for the County and both Cities. Table ES-5 provides the estimated total fee structure within inclusion of the proposed transportation impact fees.

TABLE ES-4
LAKE COUNTY/CITY FEE SUMMARY (BASED ON TYPICAL SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE)

| Fee Type | Lake County | City of Lakeport | City of Clearlake |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Building Permit | $\$ 2,200$ | $\$ 3,200$ | $\$ 1,500$ |
| Plan Check Fee | $\$ 60$ | - | $\$ 1,000$ |
| Water | $\$ 4,500$ | $\$ 4,600$ | $\$ 4,000$ |
| Sewer | $\$ 5,500$ | $\$ 7,500$ | $\$ 4,300$ |
| Fire | $\$ 2,000$ | $\$ 2,500$ | $\$ 1,100$ |
| School | $\$ 5,260$ | $\$ 4,500$ | $\$ 5,260$ |
| Construction Traffic Road Fee | $\$ 1,000$ | - | - |
| Total Existing Fees | $\$ 20,520$ | $\$ 22,300$ | $\$ 17,160$ |
| Note: These fees are estimated fees ONLY, and are based upon a typical 2,000 square foot <br> dwelling unit. Actual fees will differ. |  |  |  |

TABLE ES-5
LAKE COUNTY/CITY FEE SUMMARY

## INCLUDING NEW TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE (TIF)

(BASED ON TYPICAL SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE)

| Locations within Lake County |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Existing Fees | Proposed New <br> TIF |  | Total Fees Including <br> New TIF |
| Lakeport Planning Area | $\$ 20,520$ | $\$ 24,119$ | $\$ 44,639$ |
| City of Lakeport | $\$ 22,300$ | $\$ 24,119$ | $\$ 46,419$ |
| City of Clear Lake | $\$ 17,160$ | $\$ 11,739$ | $\$ 28,899$ |
| Lower Lake Planning Area | $\$ 20,520$ | $\$ 11,739$ | $\$ 32,259$ |
| Middletown Planning Area | $\$ 20,520$ | $\$ 11,827$ | $\$ 32,347$ |
| Kelseyville Planning Area | $\$ 20,520$ | $\$ 10,873$ | $\$ 31,393$ |
| Riveras Planning Area | $\$ 20,520$ | $\$ 10,873$ | $\$ 31,393$ |
| Cobb Planning Area | $\$ 20,520$ | $\$ 10,873$ | $\$ 31,393$ |
| Upper Lake/Nice Planning Area | $\$ 20,520$ | $\$ 13,214$ | $\$ 33,734$ |
| Shoreline Communities Planning Area | $\$ 20,520$ | $\$ 13,214$ | $\$ 33,734$ |
| Note: These fees are estimated fees ONLY, and are based upon a typical 2,000 square foot dwelling unit. Actual fees <br> will differ. |  |  |  |

## How Do the Proposed Fees Compare To Surrounding Agency Fees?

Other agencies throughout California have adopted transportation impact fees to fund future facility needs. Table ES-6 provides a summary of fees from agencies within California, and those in the vicinity of Lake County that currently have adopted this type of fee program. As identified in Table ES-6, the proposed new TIF fees for Lake County are significantly higher than those adopted by adjacent agencies. Adoption of fees lower than identified within this study would require additional transportation funding from other sources.

TABLE ES-6
ADJACENT AGENCY TRAFFIC FEE PROGRAMS AND TOTAL FEES

| Location | Local <br> Traffic Fee | Total Fees |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Sonoma County | $\$ 8,915$ | $\$ 37,009$ |
| City of Windsor | $\$ 7,552$ | $\$ 37,438$ |
| City of Vacaville | $\$ 8,047$ | $\$ 40,582$ |
| City of Napa | $\$ 6,820$ | $\$ 45,889$ |
| Yuba City | $\$ 3,318$ | $\$ 21,086$ |
| City of St. Helena | $\$ 1,337$ | $\$ 53,137$ |
| Averages | $\$ 5,998$ | $\mathbf{\$ 3 9 , 1 9 0}$ |

Source: Department of Housing and Community Development (Year
1998 data adjusted for Year 2007 values per single family dwelling units

## Transportation Impact Fee Joint Meeting Follow-up

The following are comments/questions/concerns that APC staff heard at the joint meeting. We need to ensure that the final report addresses each of these issues.

1. The biggest problem we have is street/road maintenance; we should be focusing on that. You tell us you can't use the fees for maintenance.

Response: Impact fees cannot be used to for roadway maintenance. The law requires that fees be only accessed to new construction projects and specifically fund roadway capacity projects required to support the new construction.
2. I don't understand why the fees in Lakeport would be so high.

Response: Fees within the Lakeport area were established based upon the cost of new roadway projects divided by the new traffic associated with new construction anticipated over the next twenty years. The fees within the Lakeport area are comparatively higher than other zones because the roadway project costs are higher and the new traffic volumes relatively lower.
3. If we are going to implement these, shouldn't the fees be the same all around the county?

Response: Ideally, fees within each zone of benefit should be similar. The fee amounts identified in the Draft Report represent the highest fees within each zone that could be adopted. Fees can be adjusted lower by removing projects from the list of improvements funded within a specific zone. Removing projects can create an even fee amounts.
4. Does a developer have to make improvements to the adjacent street/road and then have to pay this fee as well?

Response: If the adjacent roadway is within the fee program a developer may be required to construct an improvement, and also pay the fee. However, the developer would be ultimately reimbursed for the full cost of construction. If the adjacent roadway is not within the fee program,
and the local agency requires improvements, then these improvements would be additional to paying the fee, and no reimbursement would be provided.
5. Implementation of these fees will be a burden on development, especially now when we are experiencing a downturn

Response: Impact fee amounts can be adjusted to correspond with the economy. However, fee amounts greater than those identified in the Draft Report cannot be adopted, only lower fees.
6. This is just another tax that will feed the bureaucracy of a broken system

Response: Impact fees are a legitimate funding mechanism for roadway improvement projects. Fee programs have fairly low administrative costs.
7. I do not know why we need to create another bureaucracy to administer this fee program.

Response: Implementation of a regional fee program with multiple zones is best managed by a Joint Powers Authority. This agency would provide oversight, ensure that the adopted priority methodologies are properly followed, and manage the various impact fee accounts
8. The city should be in charge of any fees collected in the city.

Response: The zone of benefit structure identified within the proposed fee program include areas within City, County, and State jurisdictions. Administration of fees by each agency would be duplicative and result in an overly complex and confusing program.
9. The proposed fees are much too high for an area like Lake County.

Response: Fees within the Draft Report represent the highest fees that can be legally adopted. Lower fees can be adopted by removing roadway projects within certain zones.
10. One way of lowering the proposed fees is to eliminate the Regional Fee portion.

Response: Elimination of the regional fee component would reduce funding of critical State and County regional facilities within Lake County. Fees can also be lowered by removing projects from individual zones, including the regional zone.
11. The State should be paying for improvements to State highways, not us.

Response: The proposed impact fee program includes funding for twenty five percent of the feasible State highway improvements. State or Federal money would be required for the remaining seventy-five percent.
12. Who is going to decide what the priorities are for construction of these improvements?

Response: The final report would include a proposed priority methodology.
13. We need some time to look into the underlying assumptions of this fee program and understand it.

Response: The Draft Report will be circulated for review and comment.
14. There is going to be more development in Lakeport than you indicate in this program.

Response: Development assumptions used in this study were obtained directly from local agencies, and are consistent with existing general plans (including the County’s General Plan Update).
15. Who established the proposed list of projects?

Response: Transportation projects identified within the fee program were established primarily from Year 2030 roadway capacity needs. Extensive coordination with local agencies and Caltrans helped to refine this list.
16. In the ZOBs that include a city and unincorporated area it is evident that each agency will want perceive their project as a priority, so how will it be determined which are done first?

Response: The final report would include a proposed priority methodology.
17. In the ZOBs that include a city and unincorporated area, who will collect the fees if this is not a countywide effort?

Response: If a Joint Powers Authority were not established to collect fees then each local agency would collect fees within their respective jurisdictions. However, each agency would need to coordinate the funding of priority project collectively.
18. Can more projects be added to the regional list?

Response: Transportation projects that are required to provide Year 2030 capacity can be added to the regional list. Many of these projects were removed based upon feasibility and funding constraints.

## INTRODUCTION

Lake County experienced tremendous growth in the 1970's. The decades that followed have resulted in slower growth however local, State, and federal revenues have not kept pace with transportation infrastructure needs. New revenue sources are required to provide adequate transportation facilities to support growth anticipated by the Year 2030. The Countywide Regional Transportation Impact Fee Program study was conducted by the Lake County/City Area Planning Council to facilitate adoption of an AB 1600 fee program. This program will provide partial funding for future transportation improvement needs. These needs are specifically required to support future development anticipated by Year 2030.

Impact fee programs are specifically designed to develop funding sources to ensure adequate infrastructure is constructed concurrent with new development. Adopting this program will help to ensure that necessary multi-modal transportation improvements are constructed as new development projects are approved. This fee program is not intended (and restricted by AB 1600 fee program requirements) to fund improvements required to mitigate (fix) existing problems. All existing transportation system deficiencies were first identified and the costs required to mitigate these conditions removed from the fee program improvement list.

## Consistency with Current Planning Studies

To ensure conformance with previously prepared studies, the following planning documents are considered as support documents to this study:

- Transit Development Plan (June 2004)
- Wine County IRP Final Report (June 30, 2004)
- Lake County Regional Transportation Plan (October 2005)
- Lake 20/29/53 Comprehensive Corridor Study (November 8, 2005)
- Highway 20 Traffic Calming and Beautification Plan (August 2006)
- Lake County Regional Bikeway Plan (August 9, 2006)
- Wine County IRP Origin Destination Study (December 29, 2006)


## Study Area

Included in this report is a description of the existing transportation setting; the current PM peak hour and roadway ADT traffic operations at selected intersections and roadway segments. Also included in this report is an analysis and discussion of the following items:

- Summary of existing and Year 2030 land uses within different planning areas.
- The projected Year 2030 Base (Year 2030) peak hour and roadway segment traffic operations.
- Facilities which are identified to operate at unacceptable LOS including possible mitigation measures that could reduce these impacts to less than significant levels

Lake County is located in northwestern California and fall under the jurisdiction of Caltrans District 1. The California Department of Finance estimates that Lake County's year 2005 population is 65,147. State Route 29 and State Route 20 provide north-south and east west regional access to/from the County. Lake County has two incorporated` cities namely the City of Lakeport and the City of Clear Lake. It also includes the following planning areas:

- Upper Lake including
- Kelseyville
- Cobb Mountain
- Middletown
- Lowerlake
- Shoreline Communities
- Rivieras

Figure 1 illustrates the location and boundaries of Lake County including the planning areas, which it consists of.


## LEVEL OF SERVICE METHODOLOGIES

Traffic operations within this traffic impact fee study have been quantified through the determination of "Level of Service" (LOS). Level of service is a qualitative measure of traffic operating conditions, whereby, a letter grade A through F is assigned to an intersection or roadway segment representing progressively worsening traffic conditions.

Levels of Service will be calculated for all intersection control types using methods documented in the Transportation Research Board (TRB) Publication Highway Capacity Manual, Fourth Edition, 2000 (HCM-2000). For two-way-stop-controlled (TWSC) intersections, the "worst-case" movement delays and LOS will be reported, computed based on HCM-2000. For signalized intersections and all-way-stopcontrolled (AWSC) intersections, the intersection delays and LOS reported are the average values for the whole intersection, computed based on HCM-2000. The delay-based LOS criteria for different types of intersection control are identified in Table 1. The delay-based LOS criteria for different types of roadways as identified d in Table 2.

LOS C will be taken as the minimum acceptable threshold for intersection and roadway segment operations.

To determine whether "significance" should be associated with unsignalized intersection operations, a supplemental traffic signal "warrant" analysis has also been completed. The term "signal warrants" refers to the list of established criteria used by Caltrans and other public agencies to quantitatively justify or ascertain the need for installation of a traffic signal at an otherwise unsignalized intersection. This study has employed the signal warrant criteria presented in the latest edition of the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), as amended by the MUTCD 2003 California Supplement, for all study intersections. The signal warrant criteria are based upon several factors including volume of vehicular and pedestrian traffic, frequency of accidents, location of school areas etc. Both the FHWA's MUTCD and the MUTCD 2003 California Supplement indicate that the installation of a traffic signal should be considered if one or more of the signal warrants are met. Specifically, this study will utilize the Peak-Hour-Volume based Warrant 3 as one representative type of traffic signal warrant analysis. Warrant 3 criteria are basically identical for both the FHWA's MUTCD and the MUTCD 2003 California Supplement. Since Warrant 3 provides specialized warrant criteria for intersections with rural characteristics (e.g. located in communities with populations of less than 10,000 persons or with adjacent major streets operating at above 40 mph ), study intersections which use this specialized criteria will be clearly identified.

Within this study, a warrant analysis has been performed for all study intersections, which are projected to operate at unacceptable LOS.

TABLE 1
LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS) CRITERIA FOR INTERSECTIONS

| Le |  |  |  | Stopped Delay/Vehicle |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Service | Type of Flow | Delay | Maneuverability | Signalized | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Un } \\ \text { signalized } \end{array}$ | All-Way Stop |
| A |  | Very slight delay. Progression is very favorable, with most vehicles arriving during the green phase not stopping at all. | Turning movements are easily made, and nearly all drivers find freedom of operation. | < 10.0 | < 10.0 | $<10.0$ |
| B |  | Good progression and/or short cycle lengths. More vehicles stop than for LOS A, causing higher levels of average delay. | Vehicle platoons are formed. Many drivers begin to feel some what restricted within groups of vehicles. | $\begin{gathered} >10.0 \\ \text { and } \\ <20.0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} >10.0 \\ \text { and } \\ <15.0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} >10.0 \\ \text { and } \\ <15.0 \end{gathered}$ |
| C |  | Higher delays resulting from fair progression and/or longer cycle lengths. Individual cycle failures may begin to appear at this level. The number of vehicles stopping is significant, although many still pass through the intersection without stopping. | Back-ups may develop behind turning vehicles. Most drivers feel somewhat restricted | $\begin{gathered} >20.0 \\ \text { and } \\ <35.0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} >15.0 \\ \text { and } \\ <25.0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} >15.0 \\ \text { and } \\ <25.0 \end{gathered}$ |
| D |  | The influence of congestion becomes more noticeable. Longer delays may result from some combination of unfavorable 3 progression, long cycle lengths, or high I. volume-to-capacity ratios. Many vehicles stop, and the proportion of vehicles not stopping declines. Individual cycle failures are noticeable. | Maneuverability is severely limited during short periods due to temporary back-ups. | $\begin{gathered} >35.0 \\ \text { and } \\ <55.0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} >25.0 \\ \text { and } \\ <35.0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} >25.0 \\ \text { and } \\ <35.0 \end{gathered}$ |
| E |  | Generally considered to be the limit of acceptable delay. Indicative of poor progression, long cycle lengths, and high volume-to-capacity ratios. Individual cycle failures are frequent occurrences. | There are typically long queues of vehicles waiting upstream of the intersection. | $\begin{gathered} >55.0 \\ \text { and } \\ <80.0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} >35.0 \\ \text { and } \\ <50.0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} >35.0 \\ \text { and } \\ <50.0 \end{gathered}$ |
| F |  | Generally considered to be unacceptable to most drivers. Often occurs with over saturation. May also occur at high volume-to-capacity ratios. There are many individual cycle failures. Poor progression and long cycle lengths may also be major contributing factors. | Jammed conditions. Back-ups from other locations restrict or prevent movement. Volumes may vary widely, depending principally on the downstream back-up conditions. | > 80.0 | > 50.0 | > 50.0 |

TABLE 2
LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS) CRITERIA FOR ROADWAYS

| Roadway Type | Average Daily Traffic (ADT) - Total of Both Directions |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | LOS A | LOS B | LOS C | LOS D | LOS E |
| 4-Lane Freeway | 50,000 | 60,000 | 70,000 | 80,000 | 90,000 |
| 4-Lane Expressway (high access control) | 24,000 | 28,000 | 32,000 | 36,000 | 40,000 |
| 4-Lane Divided Arterial (with left-turn lane) | 22,000 | 25,000 | 29,000 | 32,500 | 36,000 |
| 4-Lane Undivided Arterial (no left-turn lane) | 18,000 | 21,000 | 24,000 | 27,000 | 30,000 |
| 2-Lane Arterial (with left-turn lane) | 11,000 | 12,500 | 14,500 | 16,000 | 18,000 |
| 2-Lane Arterial (no left-turn lane) | 9,000 | 10,500 | 12,000 | 13,500 | 15,000 |
| 4-Lane Collector | 12,000 | 15,000 | 18,000 | 21,000 | 24,000 |
| 2-Lane Collector | 6,000 | 7,500 | 9,000 | 10,500 | 12,000 |
| Sub-standard 2-Lane Collector | 900 | 1800 | 3600 | 5900 | 10100 |

Notes: 1. Based on Highway Capacity Manual, Fourth Edition, Transportation Research Board, 2000.
2. All volume thresholds are approximate and assume ideal roadway characteristics. Actual thresholds for each LOS listed above may vary depending on a variety of factors including (but not limited to) roadway curvature and grade, intersection or interchange spacing, driveway spacing, percentage of trucks and other heavy vehicles, lane widths, signal timing, on-street parking, volume of cross traffic and pedestrians, etc.

## EXISTING TRANSPORTATION CONDITIONS

## Existing Roadway Network

The following roadways form the primary roadway system within Lake County.
State Route 20 (SR 20) is a state facility that provides and east-west connection through northern California between Highway 1 on the coast and Interstate 80 in the Sierras. Regionally, SR 20 serves as an inter-regional auto and truck travel route that connects the Central Valley with the Cities of Williams, Marysville, Grass Valley, and Nevada City. Within Lake County, SR 20 provides for inter-regional through travel as well as locally based travel between the communities of Clear Lake, Clear Lake Oaks, Glenhaven, Lucerne, Nice, Upper Lake, and Lakeport.

Within the study area SR 20 is a two-lane undivided arterial with some passing lanes. The 1998 California Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan added SR 20 as a "Principal Arterial Corridor" since it provides critical accessibility for the interregional movement of people, goods, agriculture, and recreational travel across the northern part of the state. It is one of ten corridors in the state to receive the highest priority for completion to minimum four-lane expressway facility standards over the next 20 years.

State Route 29 (SR 29) is a state facility that provides a north-south connection through central and northwestern California. Within the project area, SR 29 connects the Middletown area with the Lowerlake, Kelseyville, Rivieras, Lakeport, and Upper Lake/Nice planning areas. SR 29 is predominantly a two-lane arterial with short segments of passing lanes. In the Lakeport area, there is a 7.5 mile of full four-lane freeway with interchanges at Lakeport Blvd., $11^{\text {th }}$ Street/Scotts Valley Road, Park Way, and the Nice Lucerne Cut-off.

State Route 53 (SR 53) is a rural principal arterial that provides north south circulation within Lake County, connecting SR 20 in the Shoreline Communities planning area with SR 29 in the Lowerlake Planning Area.

Bottle Rock Road and Nice Lucerne Cut-off are minor arterials providing circulation within the Lakeport and Cobb Mountain planning areas respectively.

State Route 175 (SR 175) provides east west connectivity within Lake County, and is functionally classified as a major collector between Bottle Rock Road.

The following study intersections are chosen for analysis during the PM peak hour, and were included for existing and Year 2030 traffic impact analysis.

1) State Route $20 /$ Scotts Valley Road
2) State Route 20/State Route 29
3) State Route 20/Nice Lucerne Cut-off/Pyle Road
4) State Route 29/Lakeshore Blvd.
5) Country Club Drive/State Route 20
6) Foothill Drive (southern location)/State Route 20
7) State Route 20/State Route 53
8) Lakeshore Drive/Olympic Drive
9) State Route 53/Olympic Drive
10) State Route $29 /$ State Route $53 /$ Morgan Valley Road
11) State Route 29/Seigler Canyon Road
12) State Route 29/Point Lakeview Road
13) State Route 29/Butts Canyon Road
14) State Route 29/State Route 175 (in Middletown)
15) State Route 29/Dry Creek Cut-off
16) State Route 29/Red Hills Road/State Route 281(Soda Bay Road)
17) Soda Bay Road (State Route 281)/Pt. Lakeview Road
18) State Route 29/Main Street
19) State Route 29/Merrit Road
20) State Route 29/Argonaut Road
21) State Route 29/State Route 175 (in Kelseyville)
22) Lakeport Blvd./State Route 29 NB ramps
23) Lakeport Blvd./State Route 29 SB ramps
24) (Scotts Valley Road) $11^{\text {th }}$ Street/State Route 29 NB ramps
25) (Scotts Valley Road) $11^{\text {th }}$ Street/State Route 29 SB ramps
26) Nice Lucerne Cut-off/State Route 29 NB ramps
27) Nice Lucerne Cut-off/State Route 29 SB ramps
28) Nice Lucerne Cut-off/Lakeshore Blvd./Westlake Drive

Existing PM peak hour traffic counts were conducted by OMNI-MEANS on a weekday between March 14, and March 20, 2007. The PM peak hour is defined as one continuous hour of peak traffic flow counted between 4:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. under typical weekday conditions. Existing roadway counts at different locations were conducted by Dow \& Associates.

Lane geometrics and control at all study intersections are illustrated on Figure 2. Existing AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes at the study intersections are illustrated on Figure 3.

## Principal Arterial Corridor (PAC)

The Principal Arterial Corridor (PAC) starts at the Route 101/20 junction north of the community of Calpella and continues on Route 20 southeast across the remainder of Mendocino County into Lake County. The PAC then follows Route 29 southeast to Route 53, then Route 53 north back to Route 20, then follows Route 20 east into Colusa County to Route I-5.

The PAC consists of the following segments of Routes 20, 29, 53:

- MEN-20-33.2/44.1 (State Route 101 to Lake County Line)
- LAK-20-0.0/8.3 (Lake County Line to Route 20/29 intersection)
- LAK-29-20.3/52.5 (South-Shore Lake 29 to State Route 53)
- LAK-53-0.0/7.45 (All of State Route 53)
- LAK-20-31.6/46.5 (Route 20/53 intersection to Colusa County Line)
- COL-20-0.0/R22.1 (Colusa County Line to Interstate 5)


## Corridor Purpose

A Rural Principal Arterial (functional classification) serves corridor movements having trip length and travel density characteristics indicative of substantial statewide or interstate travel. This Principal Arterial was selected since major development along the North Shore of Clear Lake (Route 20) is not feasible due to environmental constraints. As the intervening Minor Arterial portion of Route 20 along the North Shore of Clear Lake becomes more congested, and improvements are made to Routes 29 and 53, it is anticipated that the PAC will be utilized by the majority of interregional traffic.

The PAC links Lake County with the Route 101 corridor near Ukiah on the west, and the Sacramento Valley on the east. Access to both of these areas is essential to Lake County's agricultural (fruit and nut orchards, vineyards) and tourist industries. In addition, the PAC provides access to communities along the Route.
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Existing PM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes

The Route 53 segments of the PAC serve moderate to high volumes of local traffic in the community of Lower Lake, and through the City of Clear Lake, the largest City in Lake County. The Route also serves Anderson Marsh State Park, which is located about one mile north of the Community of Lower Lake along Route 53.

The PAC generally experiences light to moderate volumes of non-motorized traffic, with concentrations around the populated areas adjacent to the Route.

The following additional intersections were not included for peak hour intersection analysis, but are identified as important intersections within the County.

## State Highway Intersections:

1. State Route 20/Main Street (in Upper Lake)
2. State Route $53 / 40^{\text {th }}$ Avenue (in Clear Lake)
3. State Route $53 / 18^{\text {th }}$ Avenue (in Clear Lake)
4. State Route 53/Dam Road/Old Highway 53 (in Clear Lake)
5. State Route 29/Wardlaw Street (in Middletown)
6. State Route 29/Hartmann Road (in Middletown)
7. State Route 29/Spruce Grove (southern location) (in Middletown)
8. State Route 29/Bottle Rock Road
9. State Route 29/Live Oak Drive (in Kelseyville)
10. State Route 29/Highland Springs Road (in Kelseyville)
11. State Route 175/Bottle Rock Road (in Kelseyville)
12. State Route 175/Loch Lomond (Cobb)
13. State Route 281 (Red Hills Road)/Fairway Drive (in Rivieras)

## Clear Lake Intersections:

1. Lakeshore Drive/Old Highway 53
2. Lakeshore Drive/Olympic Drive
3. Olympic Drive/Old Highway 53 (Burns Valley Road)
4. Dam Road/Dam Road Extension
5. Dam Road/Lake Street

## Lakeport Intersections:

1. Lakeport Blvd./Bevins Street
2. Lakeport Blvd./Main Street
3. $11^{\text {th }}$ Street/Forbes Street
4. $11^{\text {th }}$ Street/Main Street
5. Martin Street/Forbes Street
6. Martin Street/Main Street
7. $20^{\text {th }}$ Street/Hartley Road
8. $20^{\text {th }}$ Street/High Street

## County Intersections:

1. Lakeshore Blvd./Park Way
2. Lakeshore Blvd./Hill Road
3. Park Way/Hill Road East
4. Lake Street/Morgan Valley Road (in Lowerlake)
5. State Street/Main Street (in Kelseyville)
6. State Street/Gaddy Lane
7. Konocti Road/Main Street (in Kelseyville)
8. Big Valley Road/Merritt Road
9. Big Valley Road/Soda Bay Road
10. Big Valley Road/Highland Springs Road
11. Soda Bay Road/Gaddy Lane
12. Soda Bay Road/Westlake Road (in Rivieras)
13. Soda Bay Road/S. Main Street (Soda Bay Road (State Route 281))
14. Lakeshore Blvd./Rainbow Road
15. State Route 20/Main Street (Upper Lake)
16. Soda Bay

## ROADWAY CLASSIFICATION

Lake County contains many different types of transportation facilities. Each facility within the study area will be covered in this section, with a description of each facility and how these facilities interrelate to one another. This section provides an overview of the existing roadway classification system based on the existing Lake County General Plan Circulation plan element, the existing transportation setting and the performance methodologies used to analyze the County's existing and future transportation system. Any deficient roadway segments and intersections are identified and alternative roadway configurations are recommended.

The term "Roadway Classification" refers to the hierarchy by which streets and highways are grouped according to the type of service they are intended to provide. The following section discusses the roadway classification systems as defined in the Lake County General Plan Transportation and Circulation Element. This document currently is used by the County as a policy document for the County's roadway system.

Arterial Systems generally consist of a road network connecting regions, towns, and other major traffic generators to serve commercial, economic development and employment centers. It is intended to move people and goods into, through and out of the valley and generally be continuous from the point of entry into the Valley to the point of exit. The following classes of roadways fall under this category of road system.

- Freeways - Federally designated highway with two or more lanes in each direction separated by a barrier or median.
- Arterials - Facilities that link towns and major traffic generators. They are often heavily traveled and serve as a main street within a community. Their main function is to provide for the movement of traffic, with direct land access clearly a minor function

Collectors are facilities similar in nature to arterials where predominant travel distances are shorter when compared to the arterial route. These facilities generally originate and terminate at arterials, collectors, or neighborhood entrance with the primary purpose of moving the traffic between arterials and residential neighborhoods, or commercial/employment areas. These are again sub-divided into major and minor collectors and facilitate both through movement of traffic as well as provide for direct land access.

- Major Collectors are facilities that may be upgraded to an arterial in the future and usually limit on-street parking to maintain smooth flow. They provide travel within the County to communities not directly served by the State Highway System. Major collectors within Lake County include Lakeport Blvd, $11^{\text {th }}$ Street, Nice Lucerne Cut-off, Old Highway 53, Olympic Drive, West 40th Avenue.
- Minor Collectors are facilities that collect traffic from local roads and bring all developed areas within a reasonable distance of a collector road. This type of road accounts for less than $10 \%$ of the County road system.
- Local Roads are facilities consisting of rural and residential roads not otherwise classified, primarily serving travel over relatively short distances with a primary function of providing access to adjacent lands.


## EXISTING TRAFFIC OPERATIONS

## Intersections

Existing intersection traffic operations have been quantified using the traffic volumes, as identified in Figure 3, and the intersection lane geometrics, as identified in Figure 2. Table 3 shows the resulting intersection LOS.

TABLE 3
EXISTING CONDITIONS INTERSECTION LOS

| \# | Intersection | Control Type | Target LOS | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Delay | LOS | Warrant Met? |
| 1 | SR 20/Scotts Valley Rd. | TWSC | C | 22.5 | C | No |
| 2 | SR 20/SR 29 | TWSC | C | 62.3 | F | Yes |
| 3 | SR20/Nice Lucerne Cutoff/ Pyle Rd. | TWSC | C | 49.8 | E | Yes |
| 4 | SR 20/Lakeshore Blvd. | TWSC | C | 16.9 | C | No |
| 5 | Country Club Dr./SR 20 | TWSC | C | 13.1 | B | No |
| 6 | Foothill Dr. (southern location)/SR 20 | TWSC | C | 17.3 | C | No |
| 7 | SR 20/SR 53 | TWSC | C | 22.6 | C | No |
| 8 | Lakeshore Dr./Olympic Dr. | TWSC | C | 21.1 | C | No |
| 9 | SR 53/Olympic Dr. | TWSC | C | 35.8 | E | Yes |
| 10 | SR 29/SR 53/Morgan Valley Rd. | Signal | C | 33.6 | C | - |
| 11 | SR 29/Seigler Canyon Rd. | TWSC | C | 13.6 | B | No |
| 12 | SR 29/Point Lakeview Rd. | TWSC | C | 17.9 | C | No |
| 13 | SR 29/Butts Canyon Rd. | TWSC | C | 22.9 | C | No |
| 14 | SR 29/SR 175 | Signal | C | 15.1 | B | - |
| 15 | SR 29/Dry Creek Cutoff. | TWSC | C | 21.8 | C | No |
| 16 | SR 29/Red Hills Rd./SR 281(Soda Bay Rd.) | TWSC | C | 29.3 | D | No |
| 17 | Soda Bay Rd. (SR 281)/Pt. Lakeview Rd. | TWSC | C | 10.5 | B | No |
| 18 | SR 29/Main St. | TWSC | C | 38.8 | E | No |
| 19 | SR 29/ Merrit Rd. | TWSC | C | 29.8 | D | No |
| 20 | SR 29/ Argonaut Rd. | Signal | C | 2.9 | A | No |
| 21 | SR 29/SR 175 | Signal | C | 24.2 | C | - |
| 22 | Lakeport Blvd./SR 29 NB ramps | TWSC | C | 19.1 | C | No |
| 23 | Lakeport Blvd./SR 29 SB ramps | TWSC | C | 64.5 | F | No |
| 24 | (Scotts Valley Rd.) 11th St./SR 29 NB ramps | TWSC | C | 15.9 | C | No |
| 25 | (Scotts Valley Rd.) 11th St./SR 29 SB ramps | TWSC | C | 40.1 | E | No |
| 26 | Nice Lucerne Cut-off/ SR 29 NB ramps | TWSC | C | 10.0 | A | No |
| 27 | Nice Lucerne Cut-off/ SR 29 SB ramps | TWSC | C | 13.3 | B | No |
| 28 | Nice Lucerne Cutoff/Lakeshore Blvd./Westlake Dr. | TWSC | C | 14.5 | B | No |

Notes: TWSC = Two Way Stop Control AWSC = All Way Stop Control
LOS = Worst case movement's LOS for TWSC intersections; OVR = overflow
Warrant $=$ Caltrans Peak hour volume based sianal warrant

As shown above, several intersections are currently operating at unacceptable LOS. All intersections that are operating unacceptably are currently unsignalized.

## Roadway Segments

Roadway segment operations have been quantified using the existing ADT counts and with the existing roadway capacity configurations. Table 4 shows the roadway segment LOS for different roadways in Lake County.

TABLE 4
YEAR 2007 LOS

| Planning <br> Area | Roadway Segment |  |  | Capacity Configuration |  | O - N N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SR 29 | SR 29 | SR 20/SR 29 jct. | Nice Lucerne cutoff | 4-Lane Freeway | 6100 | A |
|  | SR 29 | Nice Lucerne cutoff | Park Way | 4-Lane Freeway | 9700 | A |
|  | SR 29 | Park Way. | 11th St. | 4-Lane Freeway | 12500 | A |
|  | SR 29 | 11th St. | Lakeport Blvd. | 4-Lane Freeway | 15100 | A |
|  | SR 29 | Lakeport Blvd. | end of freeway | 4-Lane Freeway | 12700 | A |
|  | SR 29 | enf of freeway segment | SR 175/Main St. | 4-Lane Freeway | 14200 | A |
|  | SR 29 | SR 175 jct(Lakeport) | Ackley Rd. | 2-Lane Div Art. | 12100 | B |
|  | SR 29 | Ackley Rd. | Highland Springs Rd. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 11500 | C |
|  | SR 29 | Highland Springs Rd. | Argonaut Rd. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 11400 | C |
|  | SR 29 | Argonaut Rd. | Thomas Dr. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 12200 | D |
|  | SR 29 | Renfro Dr. | Merritt Rd. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 9000 | B |
|  | SR 29 | Kelsey Creek Dr. | Live Oak Dr. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 10500 | C |
|  | SR 29 | Live Oak Dr. | Main St.(Kelseyville) | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 10200 | B |
|  | SR 29 | Cole Creek Rd. | Bottle Rock Rd. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 10300 | B |
|  | SR 29 | Bottle Rock Rd. | Oak Creek Ranch | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 10200 | B |
|  | SR 29 | Oak Creek Ranch | SR 175 | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 9300 | B |
|  | SR 29 | SR 175 (Kelseyville) | SR 281 (Red Hills Rd.) | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 8900 | A |
|  | SR 29 | SR 281(Red Hills Rd.) | Eagles Nest Ln. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 8600 | A |
|  | SR 29 | Diener Dr. | Pt. Lakeview Rd. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 8600 | A |
|  | SR 29 | Pt. Lakeview Rd. | Siegler Canyon Rd. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 9600 | B |
|  | SR 29 | Siegler Canyon Rd. | SR 29/SR 53 jct. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 10600 | C |
|  | SR 29 | SR29/SR 53 jct | Clayton Creek Rd. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 10600 | C |
|  | SR 29 | Spruce Grove Rd. (southern) | Hartmann Rd. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 9000 | B |
|  | SR 29 | Butts Canyon Rd. | Diamond Ranch Rd. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 11300 | C |
|  | SR 29 | Butts Canyon Rd. | Wardlaw St. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 10900 | C |
|  | SR 29 | Wardlaw St. | SR 29/SR 175 jct | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 10900 | C |
|  | SR 29 | SR 29/SR 75 jct | Douglas St. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 10800 | C |
|  | SR 29 | Lake Ave. | Dry Creek Cut off | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 10200 | B |
|  | SR 29 | Dry Creek Cutoff | Western Mine Rd. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 9000 | B |
| SR 53 | SR 53 | SR29/SR 53 jct | Anderson Ranch Pkwy. | 4-Lane Div Art. | 17000 | A |
|  | SR 53 | Anderson Ranch Pkwy. | Old Hwy. 53 | 4-Lane Div Art. | 17000 | A |
|  | SR 53 | Old Hwy. 53 | 18th Ave. | 4-Lane Div Art. | 16000 | A |
|  | SR 53 | 18th Ave. | 40th Ave. | 4-Lane Div Art. | 17000 | A |
|  | SR 53 | 40th Ave. | Olympic Dr. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 8400 | A |
|  | SR 53 | Olympic Dr. | Old Hwy. 53 | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 9957 | B |
|  | SR 53 | Old Hwy. 53 | SR20/SR 53 jct. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 7000 | A |
| SR 20 | SR 20 | LAK/YOL County Line | SR 20/SR 53 jct | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 6600 | A |
|  | SR 20 | SR 20/SR 53 jct | Sulphur Bank Dr. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 6600 | A |
|  | SR 20 | Sulphur Bank Dr. | Country Club Dr.(Lucerne) | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 7956 | A |
|  | SR 20 | Country Club Dr. (Lucerne) | Lakeview Blvd. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 9064 | B |
|  | SR 20 | Lakeview Blvd. | Nice Lucerne cutoff | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 11500 | C |
|  | SR 20 | Nice Lucerne cutoff | SR 29/SR 20 jct. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 8000 | A |
|  | SR 20 | SR 29/SR 20 jct | Scotts Valley Rd. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 8800 | A |
|  | SR 20 | Scotts Valley Rd. | LAK/MEND County line | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 8300 | A |
| SR175 | SR 175 | SR 175 jct(Lakeport) | LAK/MEND bdy. | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 2000 | A |
|  | SR 175 | SR 29 (Cobb) | Red Hills Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 680 | A |
|  | SR 175 | Red Hills Rd. | Loch Lomond Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 680 | A |
|  | SR 175 | Loch Loomond Rd. | Bottle Rock Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 4032 | A |
|  | SR 175 | Bottle Rock Rd. | Golf Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 3900 | A |
|  | SR 175 | Golf Rd. | Anderson Springs Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 2800 | A |
|  | SR 175 | Anderson Springs Rd. | Dry Creek Cut off | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 3500 | A |
|  | SR 175 | Dry Creek Cutoff | SR 29 | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 3100 | A |
|  | Scotts Valley Rd. | Hill Rd./Halber Rd. | Riggs Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1900 | C |
|  | Scotts Valley Rd. | Riggs Rd. | SR 29 SB ramps | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 2000 | C |
|  | Elk Mtn. Rd. | SR 20 | LAK/MEND County line | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 828 | A |
|  | Upper Lake/Lucerne Rd | SR 20 | Hillcrest Dr. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 170 | A |

TABLE 4
YEAR 2007 LOS

| Planning <br> Area | Roadway Segment |  |  | Capacity Configuration |  | n |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $0$ | Upper Lake/Lucerne Rd | SR 20 | Foothill Oaks Dr. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 110 | A |
|  | Country Club | SR 20 | Odgen Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 540 | A |
| Upper Lake/Nice | Foothill | SR 20 | Durant Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 560 | A |
|  | Pyle | SR 20 | Old Lake County Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 260 | A |
|  | Sayre Ave. | SR 20 | Lakeshore Blvd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 330 | A |
|  | Sayre Ave. | SR 20 | Broadway Ave. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 660 | A |
|  | Lakeview Dr. | SR 20 | north of SR 20 | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1510 | B |
|  | Nice Lucerne cut-off | SR 29 SB ramps | Lakeshore Blvd. | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 6243 | C |
|  | Nice Lucerne cut-off | Lakeshore Blvd. | Mackie Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 6243 | C |
|  | Nice Lucerne cut-off | Mackie Rd. | Stokes Ave. | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 6300 | C |
|  | Nice Lucerne cut-off | Stokes Ave. | SR 20 | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 6300 | C |
|  | 16th St. | Hartley St. | High St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1650 | B |
|  | 16th St. | N. High St. | Forbes St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 195 | A |
|  | 11th St. | Mountview Rd. | SR 29 SB ramps | 2-Lane Collector | 2000 | B |
|  | 11th St. | SR 29 NB ramps | Central Park Ave. | 2-Lane Collector | 10650 | C |
|  | 11th St. | Central Park Ave. | Mellor Dr. | 2-Lane Collector | 11500 | C |
|  | 11th St. | Mellor Dr. | Brush St. | 2-Lane Collector | 9820 | C |
|  | 11th St. | High St. | Forbes St. | 2-Lane Collector | 7400 | C |
|  | 11th St. | Forbes St. | Main St.(Kelseyville) | 2-Lane Collector | 4500 | C |
|  | Berry | Spurr St. | Armstrong St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 110 | A |
|  | Armstrong St. | Spurr St. | Russell St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 170 | A |
|  | Armstrong St. | Brush St. | Forbes St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 630 | A |
|  | Armstrong St. | Forbes St. | Main St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 650 | A |
|  | N.Brush St. | 11th St. | 10th St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 380 | A |
|  | N.Brush St. | 7th St. | 6th St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 310 | A |
|  | N.Brush St. | 6th St. | 5th St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 260 | A |
|  | N.Brush St. | Armstrong St. | Martin St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 65 | A |
|  | Compton Ave, | Keeling Ave. | Samuelson Ct. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 420 | A |
|  | Crystal Lake Way | Hartley St. | Keeling | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 490 | A |
|  | Crystal Lake Way | Lakeshore Blvd. | Howard Ave. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 355 | A |
|  | Forbes St | Armstrong St. | Martin St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 2600 | C |
|  | Hartley Rd | Scotts Valley Rancheria Rd. | 20th St. | 2-Lane Collector | 760 | A |
|  | Hartley Rd | Sunset Dr. | Boggs Ln. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1450 | B |
|  | Hartley Rd | 16th St. | 17th St. | 2-Lane Collector | 2000 | B |
|  | High Street | 17th St. | Lakeshore Blvd. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 7700 | A |
|  | Main Street | 11th St. | 9th St. | 2-Lane Div Art. | 7021 | A |
|  | Main Street | 9th St. | 6th St. | 2-Lane Div Art. | 6671 | A |
|  | Main Street | 6th St. | 2nd St. | 2-Lane Div Art. | 6746 | A |
|  | Main Street | 2nd St. | Martin St. | 2-Lane Div Art. | 6452 | A |
|  | Main Street | Martin St. | Lakeport Blvd. | 2-Lane Div Art. | 8805 | A |
|  | S.Main St. | Lakeport Blvd. | SR 175/Soda Bay intx. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 8191 | A |
|  | Lakeport Blvd. | Todd Rd./Parallel Dr. | SR 29 SB ramps | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 520 | A |
|  | Lakeport Blvd. | SR 29 SB ramps | Bevins Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 14300 | C |
|  | Lakeport Blvd. | Bevins Rd. | S.Main St. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 9900 | B |
|  | Park Way | Hill Rd. West | SR 29 SB ramps | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 890 | A |
|  | Park Way | SR 29 SB ramps | Keeling Ave. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 2600 | C |
|  | Park Way | Keeling Ave. | Lakeshore Blvd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 2200 | C |
|  | Russell St. | 2nd St. | Armstrong St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 810 | A |
|  | Russell St. | Armstrong St. | Martin St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 960 | B |
|  | Walnut Dr. | Lakeshore Blvd. | 3rd Ave. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 410 | A |
|  | Lakeshore Blvd. | Hillview Dr. | Walnut Dr. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 3703 | C |
|  | Lakeshore Blvd. | Walnut Dr. | Lowen Ln. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 3645 | C |
|  | Lakeshore Blvd. | Lowen Ln. | Park Way | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 4595 | C |
|  | Lakeshore Blvd. | Park Way. | Wight Ln. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 5179 | C |
|  | Lakeshore Blvd. | Wight Ln. | Crystal Lake Way | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 5589 | C |
|  | Lakeshore Blvd | Crystal Lake Way. | Rainbow Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 5585 | C |

TABLE 4
YEAR 2007 LOS

| Planning Area | Roadway Segment |  |  | Capacity Configuration |  | O - N ¢ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \cong \\ & \stackrel{\pi}{\pi} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Highland Springs | SR 29 | Bell Hill Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1700 | B |
|  | Highland Springs | Red Rock Rd. | Bell Hill Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 280 | A |
|  | Bell Hill Rd. | Highland Springs Rd. | SR 29 | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 665 | A |
|  | Bell Hill Rd. | SR 29 | Main St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 432 | A |
| $\begin{aligned} & \cong \\ & \stackrel{y}{\pi} \\ & \frac{5}{0} \\ & \end{aligned}$ | Konocti Bay | SR 281 | Bay Ln. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 85 | A |
|  | Konocti Bay | Pt. Lakeview Rd. | Sequoia Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 700 | A |
|  | Live Oak Dr. | Main St. (Kelseyville) | SR 29 | 2-Lane Collector | 2630 | B |
|  | Live Oak Dr. | SR 29 | Cruickshank Rd. | 2-Lane Collector | 1260 | A |
|  | Meritt | Renfro Dr. | SR 29 | 2-Lane Collector | 150 | A |
|  | Meritt | SR 29 | Lossa Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 3650 | C |
|  | Meritt | Big Valley Rd. | Gaddy Ln. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1881 | C |
|  | Gaddy Lane | Merritt Rd. | Soda Bay Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1619 | B |
|  | State St. | Gaddy Ln. | Sylar Ln. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 2000 | C |
|  | State St. | Sylar Ln. | Main St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 2500 | C |
|  | Main St. | Bell Hill Rd. | State St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1552 | B |
|  | Wight Way | Kelsey Creek Dr. | Adobe Creek Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 305 | A |
|  | Gifford Springs | SR 175 | Cobb Blvd. | 2-Lane Collector | 740 | A |
|  | Soda Bay Rd. | SR 175/S.Main St. | Sylva Ln. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 4257 | C |
|  | Soda Bay Rd. | Sylva Ln. | Highland Springs Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 3832 | C |
|  | Soda Bay Rd. | Highland Springs Rd. | Stone Dr. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 3559 | C |
|  | Soda Bay Rd. | Stone Dr. | Park Dr. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 3210 | C |
|  | Soda Bay Rd. | Park Dr. | Gaddy Ln. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 3210 | C |
|  | Bottle Rock Rd. | SR 29 | Kelseyville/Cobb bdy. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 2275 | C |
| Cobb | Bottle Rock Rd. | Kelseyville/Cobb bdy. | Harrington Flat Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 2125 | C |
|  | Bottle Rock Rd. | Harrington Flat Rd. | Sulphur Creek Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1350 | B |
|  | Bottle Rock Rd. | Sulphur Creek Rd. | SR 175 | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1650 | B |
|  | Sulphur Creek | Harrington Flat Rd. | SR 175 | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 320 | A |
|  | Harrington Flat Rd. | Bottle Rock Rd. | Sulphur Creek Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 172 | A |
|  | Harrington Flat Rd. | Sulphur Creek Rd. | SR 175 | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 411 | A |
|  | Golf Road | SR 175 | Cobb Blvd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 890 | A |
|  | Loch Lomond Rd. | Siegler Springs Rd. | SR 175 | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 742 | A |
|  | Red Hills Rd. (SR 281) | Rivieras Cobb Bdy. | SR 175 | 2-Lane Collector | 910 | A |
|  | Big Canyon Rd. | Siegler Springs Rd. | Harbin Springs Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 132 | A |
|  | Big Canyon Rd. | Harbin Springs Rd. | SR 175 | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1137 | B |
|  | Hartmann Rd. | SR 29 | Hidden Valley Rd. | 2-Lane Collector | 3000 | B |
|  | Butts Canyon Rd. | SR 29 | Eureka Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1900 | C |
|  | Washington St. | Main St. (Middletown) | Armstrong St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 570 | A |
|  | Main St. | SR 29 | Washington St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 950 | B |
|  | Santa Clara | SR 175 | Lake Ave. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 550 | A |
|  | Spruce Grove Rd. | Spruce Grove Rd. | Deer Hill Rd. | 2-Lane Collector | 4150 | C |
|  | Spruce Grove Rd. | Deer Hill Rd. | Jerusalem Grade | 2-Lane Collector | 350 | A |
|  | Stewart St. | SR 175 | Douglas St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 320 | A |
|  | Stewart St. | Douglas St. | Pine St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 130 | A |
|  | Barnes St. | Stewart St. | Wardlaw St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 220 | A |
|  | Wardlaw St. | SR 29 | Jefferson St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 320 | A |
|  | Washington St. | Wardlaw St. | Young St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 930 | B |
|  | Washington St. | Young St. | SR 29 (Main St.) | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1000 | B |
|  | Washington St. | Main St. | Armstrong St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 610 | A |
|  | Young St. | SR 29 | Bush St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 640 | A |
|  | Young St. | SR 29 | Washington St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 570 | A |
|  | Young St. | Washington St. | Jackson St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 140 | A |
|  | SR 281 | Cobb Rivieras bdy. | SR 29 | 2-Lane Collector | 910 | A |
| $\stackrel{\pi}{0}$ | SR 281 | SR 29 | Pt. Lakeview Rd. | 2-Lane Collector | 2600 | B |
|  | Fairway Dr | west of SR 281 | SR 281 (Soda Bay Rd.) | 2-Lane Collector | 1900 | B |
|  | Fairway Dr | SR 281 (Soda Bay Rd.) | Pt.Lakeview Rd. | 2-Lane Collector | 1430 | A |
|  | Point Lake View Rd. | SR 281 | Fairway Dr. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 2800 | C |

TABLE 4
YEAR 2007 LOS

| Planning <br> Area | Roadway Segment |  |  | Capacity Configuration |  | O O-1 N N N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Point Lake View Rd. | Fairway Dr. | Konocti Vista Dr. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 960 | B |
|  | Point Lake View Rd. | Konocti Vista Dr. | SR 29 | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 610 | A |
|  | Lake St. | Morgan Valley Rd. | Dam Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1200 | B |
|  | Mill St. | Morgan Valley Rd. | 2nd St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 750 | A |
|  | Mill St. | Morgan Valley Rd. | Rose St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 45 | A |
|  | Seigler Canyon Rd. | SR 29 | Perini Rd. N | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1250 | B |
|  | Seigler Canyon Rd. | Perni Rd. N | Perini Rd. S | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 850 | A |
|  | Seigler Canyon Rd. | Perini Rd. S | Siegler Springs N. Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 990 | B |
|  | Tish-a-tang Rd. | Lake St. | east of Lake St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 410 | A |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { y } \\ & \text { ü } \\ & \vdots \\ & \text { む̃ } \end{aligned}$ | Arrowhead Rd. | Golf Club Rd. | Park St. | 2-Lane Collector | 3600 | C |
|  | Arrowhead Rd. | Park St. | Pomo Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 860 | A |
|  | Boyles Avenue | Davis Ave. | 44th Ave. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 90 | A |
|  | Boyles Avenue | 44th Ave. | 40th Ave. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 30 | A |
|  | Boyles Avenue | 40th Ave. | 33rd Ave. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 40 | A |
|  | Boyles Avenue | 33rd Ave. | 18th Ave. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1070 | B |
|  | 18th Avenue | SR 53 | Phillips Ave. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 2710 | C |
|  | 18th Avenue | Phillips Ave. | Boyles Ave. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1710 | B |
|  | 40th Ave. | SR 53 | Phillips Ave. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 4100 | C |
|  | 40th Ave. | Phillips Ave. | Boyles Ave. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 290 | A |
|  | Burns Valley Road | Arrowhead Rd. | Sonoma Way | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1280 | B |
|  | Burns Valley Road | Olympic Dr./Old Hwy 53 | Bowers Ave. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 3400 | C |
|  | Cypress St. | Olympic Dr. | Austin Ave. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 460 | A |
|  | Dam Rd. | just west of Dam Rd./Lake St. | Lake St. | 2-Lane Collector | 2400 | B |
|  | Davis St | Eureka Ave. | Phillips Ave. | 2-Lane Collector | 1775 | A |
|  | Davis St | Phillips Ave. | Irvine Ave. | 2-Lane Collector | 1110 | A |
|  | Davis St | Boyles Ave. | Konocti Ave. | 2-Lane Collector | 880 | A |
|  | Huntington Ave. | Pomo Rd. | Manakee St. | 2-Lane Collector | 220 | A |
|  | Huntington Ave. | Manakee St. | Lakeshore Dr. | 2-Lane Collector | 230 | A |
|  | Lakeshore Drive | SR 53 | Old Hwy. 53 | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 15600 | C |
|  | Lakeshore Drive | Old Hwy. 53 | Mullen Ave. | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 11100 | B |
|  | Lakeshore Drive | Mullen Ave. | Divison Ave. | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 8900 | C |
|  | Lakeshore Drive | Division Ave. | Olympic Dr. | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 8000 | B |
|  | Lakeshore Drive | Olympic Dr. | Pomo Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 7650 | B |
|  | Lakeshore Drive | Pomo Rd. | Park St. | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 4950 | A |
|  | Lakeshore Drive | Park St. | Country Club Dr. | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 1280 | A |
|  | Lakeshore Drive | Country Club Dr. | San Joaquin Dr. | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 1020 | A |
|  | Moss Street | Davis Ave. | 40th Ave. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 2500 | A |
|  | Old Hwy 53. | SR 53 | Park Blvd. | 2-Lane Collector | 620 | A |
|  | Burns Valley Rd. | Arrowhead Rd./Pomo Rd. | Woodlawn Dr. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 962 | B |
|  | Burns Valley Rd. | Woodlawn Dr. | Bowers Ave. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1030 | B |
|  | Burns Valley Road | Bowers Ave. | Olympic Dr. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 3400 | C |
|  | Old Hwy 53. | Olympic Dr. | Austin Dr. | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 5350 | C |
|  | Old Hwy 53. | Austin Dr. | Davis Ave. | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 7450 | C |
|  | Old Hwy 53. | Davis Ave. | W 40th St. | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 7450 | C |
|  | Old Hwy 53. | Lakeshore Dr. (W 40th St.) | Crawford Ave. | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 7200 | C |
|  | Old Hwy 53. | Crawford Ave. | 18th Ave. extn. | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 5750 | C |
|  | Old Hwy 53. | 18th Ave. extn. | SR 53 | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 5600 | C |
|  | Olympic Dr. | Lakeshore Dr. | Cypress St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 6550 | C |
|  | Olympic Dr. | Cypress St. | Old. Hwy 53 | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 8250 | C |
|  | Olympic Dr. | Old Hwy. 53 | Washington St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 8150 | C |
|  | Olympic Dr. | Washington St. | SR 53 | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 7500 | C |
|  | Pomo Rd. | Arrowhead Rd. | Lakeshore Dr. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 465 | A |
|  | Arrowhead Rd. | Pomo Rd. | Burns Valley Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 962 | B |
|  | West 40th St. | Mullen Ave. | Laddell Ave | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 330 | A |
|  | Woodland Dr. | Burns Valley Rd. | Koloko St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 165 | A |
|  | Arrowhead/Pomo Rd. | Burns Valley Rd. | Lakeshore Dr. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 5600 | C |

## TRAVEL DEMAND MODEL DEVELOPMENT

This section presents a technical discussion of the process used to create the Lake County’s countywide Traffic Model. The traffic model is being developed for a weekday under "Winter Daily" condition when tourism and vacation oriented trips are very minimal. Winter conditions traffic volumes will then be used to derive summer conditions traffic forecasts, based on which roadway improvements will be recommended.

## DATA SOURCES

The travel demand model is based on land use information at parcel level resolution as provided by Lake County in ESRI ArcView Shape file format. This data was compiled from various public and private sources by the Lake County Assessor’s Office. Parcel attributes typically found in an assessor’s database are:

- FID
- Perimeter
- Area
- APN
- Address
- City
- State
- Situs
- Land Value
- Structural Value
- Net Value
- Tax Amount
- Size of building
- Number of Bedrooms
- Land Use Code
- Land Use Description

The roads, county boundary, and city limits shape files along with AutoCAD drawing files for the General Plan land use and zoning maps were also provided by Lake County. The parcel and road shape files cover the entire county. ESRI data for counties, states, river, and interstates were also used throughout the project. The parcel, road and city limit shape file were permanently projected into California State Plane, Zone II, US Foot, coordinate systems using the Lambert Conformal Conic projection.

## DATA EVALUATION

As previously stated, the shape files provided to OMNI-MEANS covered the entire county. The resulting parcel data consisted of more then 63,800 parcels. In order to generate an accurate representation of the existing land use patterns within the study area, an evaluation of the parcel land use data was performed.

The County Assessor uses a five digit alpha-numeric code to describe the land use of parcels within the county. A county land use code legend was provided by the assessor's office. The legend consists of major land use categories as follows: Residential, Commercial, Industrial, Agricultural, Governmental, and Miscellaneous. Based on the existing Lake County General Plan, each major land use category is broken down into the following sub-categories. A brief description is included:

- Resort Commercial (CR): includes restaurants, hotels
- Local Commercial (CL): includes medical and professional offices, food services, limited retail sales, personal services (beauty/barber shop), minor repair services, such as jewelry and shoe repair
- Community Commercial (CC): Retail sales, personal services (beauty/barber shop), banking, administrative and professional offices, health care services, indoor entertainment, hotels, nurseries
- Service Commercial (CS): Warehouses and mini storage, construction-related services, retail sales of large bulky items, indoor entertainment facilities (movie theaters)
- Industrial, Heavy Commercial and Mixed Light/Heavy Commercial (I) : Manufacturing, processing of natural resources, lumber yards, welding and fabrication shops, warehouses
- Public Facilities (PF) includes publicly-owned or government-owned lands and structures, including State Forests and water treatment plants. This designation does not include offices.

After the initial review of the use codes, their formats and sources, a series of queries were performed to generalize the land use codes. A new "MODEL_EXLU" field was added to the parcel attribute table and parcels were selected based on the attribute values of the "USE_CODE" field. Intuitive land use designations were used to fill the "MODEL_EXLU" field starting with the major land use categories then followed by the generalized specific uses. The parcel attribute table was also joined to the General Plan layer, to determine the general plan designations of each parcel. The queries were saved for future use. Further analysis of the land use codes and ownership information was undertaken to establish existing land use information for parcels with ambiguous land use codes. Based on these queries, land uses in Lake County have been categorized as follows:

1) Residential land uses which include:
a) Single-family dwelling units
b) Multi-family dwelling units
c) Suburban and rural residential uses
2) Commercial land uses which are further subdivided as:
a) Community Commercial
b) Local Commercial
c) Resort Commercial
d) Service Commercial
3) Industrial land uses
4) Other land uses which include:
a) Agricultural Lands
b) Public lands
c) Public facilities

## Existing Land Use SUMMARIES

The following table, Table 5, shows the summary of land uses within each planning area and the two Cities, namely the City of Clear Lake and the City of Lakeport.

TABLE 5
EXISTING LAND USE SUMMARY

| EXISTING LAND USES |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Planning Area | TAZ_\# | Residential <br> (du's) | Commercial <br> (acres) | Industrial <br> (acres) | Other <br> (acres) |
| Upper Lake/Nice | $100-133$ | 2,387 | 107 | 6 | 290,239 |
| Lakeport excl. City of Lakeport | $200-230$ | 2,337 | 67 | 2 | 39,671 |
| Kelseyville | $300-338$ | 2,789 | 105 | 39 | 35,740 |
| Cobb Mtn | $400-436$ | 2,364 | 62 | 0 | 42,557 |
| Middletown | $500-544$ | 3,492 | 108 | 27 | 99,390 |
| Lowerlake | $600-645$ | 1,420 | 99 | 4 | 69,793 |
| Rivieras | $700-733$ | 4,788 | 145 | 0 | 14,621 |
| Shoreline Communities excl. City of Clear Lake | $800-845$ | 5,625 | 99 | 26 | 174,405 |
| City of Clear Lake | $900-940$ | 8,625 | 265 | 1 | 3,255 |
| City of Lakeport | $950-987$ | 2,083 | 221 | 11 | 546 |
| TOTAL |  | $\mathbf{3 5 , 9 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 2 7 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 7 0 , 2 1 8}$ |

As identified in Table 5, Lake County currently has 35,911 residential units, 1,279 acres of developed commercial lands, and 116 acres of developed industrial lands. These are consistent with socio-economic data stated in the U.S. Census Bureau and Department of Finance estimates.

The U.S. Census Bureau has estimated the Year 2005 population of Lake County to be approximately 65,147 people, which represents a growth of $11.7 \%$ between year 2000 and year 2005. Based on the U.S. Census Bureau, there were approximately 34,061 households in Lake County as of year 2005, and this number is consistent with the number of dwelling units estimated $(35,911)$.

## Second Homes in Lake County

Given the location of Lake County and its attraction as a resort place, it is reasonable to assume that not all of these 35,911 dwelling units will be at full occupancy on all days of the week. Some of these units are more likely to serve as second homes or vacation homes with greater occupancy during the weekend. Based on the year 2000 population and information as presented in the U.S. Census Bureau, Lake County had approximately 2.39 persons per household. Applying this factor to the 2005 population estimate we have:

- Population (year 2005)/Persons per household $=65147 / 2.39=27,258$ households.

It is reasonable to assume that these are the actual number of full occupancy households while the remaining 8,653 i.e., $(35,911-27,258)$ are only second or vacation homes. Further, it is assumed that these second homes are likely to be distributed within the following areas

- City of Lakeport
- City of Clear Lake
- Shoreline Communities excl. City of Clear Lake
- Rivieras
- Kelseyville
- Cobb Mountain

These 8,653 -second homes are assumed to be distributed within these five planning areas according in proportion to the actual number of single-family dwelling units within each area. It is noted that trip generation from second homes will not be significant during the "winter conditions model".

## Employment Characteristics

The U.S. Census Bureau estimates that approximately 25,782 people are employed in Lake County, of which 24,809 are associated with commercial and industrial type land uses (including office, administration duties, recreation, hotels etc. Thus the ratio of employees to population $=24809 / 65147=$ 0.38 , i.e., $38 \%$ of the population are employed.

Also, given that $1,395(1,279+116$, as identified in Table 5 , acres of land is assumed to be developed as commercial/industrial, this translates to $24,809 / 1,395=17.784$ employees per acre, which is less than 1 employee/1000 sq. ft (often considered as a conservative employment density for modeling purposes).

## Travel Demand Modeling Software

The integrated urban transportation planning software package called TP+ (copyright Citilabs) was used as the modeling software for the Lake County Traffic Model. The TP+ package represents a popular and powerful modeling environment that provides a Windows-based implementation of the traditional "fourstep" urban transportation planning methodology.

## TAZ MAP

The first modeling step was the creation of a land use database that can be utilized by the model. Each parcel is analyzed to determine how the traffic it generates will logically shed to the model network. The land use information, as read by the model, is organized into discrete traffic-generating units referred to as "Traffic Analysis Zones" (TAZ’s). A TAZ is defined as a geographical area that comprises of contiguous land development (parcels, subdivisions etc.) aggregated into a "traffic shed" for modeling purposes. Each TAZ would have one or more "connectors" feeding traffic generated from that TAZ on to the adjacent street system at logical but schematic access points. The TAZ definitions were developed using closed boundaries contained within natural geographic barriers like rivers, creeks etc., as well as "manmade" barriers like major street right-of-ways, railroads etc., and taking into account how traffic generated from localized development would logically "shed" to the adjacent street system.

TAZ's within the two Cities of Lakeport and Clear Lake were kept separate from the adjacent planning areas, to facilitate in the development of future fee development programs. The TAZ numbering scheme is described as follows:

- Upper Lake Planning Area - TAZ \# 100-133
- Lakeport Planning Area excluding City of Lakeport - TAZ \# 200-230
- Kelseyville Planning Area- TAZ \# 300-338
- Cobb Mountain Planning Area- TAZ \# 400-436
- Middletown Planning Area- TAZ \# 500-544
- Lowerlake Planning Area - TAZ \# 600-645
- Rivieras Planning Area- TAZ \# 700-733
- Shoreline Communities excl. City of Clear Lake - TAZ \# 800-845
- City of Clear Lake - TAZ \# 900-940
- City of Lakeport - TAZ \# 950-987

Figure 4 shows the TAZ layout for Lake County.


## LAND USE -TAZ INTEGRATION

Land use information represents the primary basis for deriving vehicular travel/traffic flow patterns on the County street system. Therefore, land use data, categorized basically in terms of residential and nonresidential uses, was summarized under each TAZ, in order to provide a basis for estimating zonal trip productions and attractions.

In order to incorporate existing land use data into the TAZs, OMNI-MEANS utilized the Lake County parcel land use database. The assessor's parcel database contained a variety of information, including Assessor's Parcel Number (APN), parcel size (in acreage/square feet), assessed land value, and existing County land use code for the parcel, property ownership and address information. As described earlier, land use codes were generalized and aggregated into four (4) major uses: residential, commercial, industrial and other; with each being sub categorized into different uses.

Using ArcView GIS, the TAZ map was geographically overlaid on top of the assessors' parcel map covering the study area, and thus a "TAZ attribute" was added to the parcel database. A TAZ-wise breakdown of existing land use data by model land use categories, was then prepared.

## Traffic Model Network Creation

The next step was the creation of a street network system that the model would utilize to distribute and assign trips generated by the zonal land uses.

The model roadway network was created using the base road data provided by the County. A review of the Lake County General and individual planning areas General Plan was performed to identify the roads to be included in the network. Additional roads were included as appropriate to facilitate accurate modeling of the existing grid road system. Network roads were classified based on their functional class and ownership. A field named "MODEL FUNC_CLASS" was added to the road network database and populated with functional class and ownership designations. The following roadway hierarchy and functional class is adopted for development of this traffic model:

- Freeway
- Major Arterial
- Minor Arterial
- Major Collector
- Minor Collector
- Local Street
- Ramps

The model's street network was first created by editing and manipulating centerlines of the assessor's parcel mapping data using AutoCAD Map and ArcView GIS software and then the "shape-files" were imported into TP+ for further editing and attribute enhancements. Each "node" in the network represents an intersection or some other intermediate point on the street system. Each "link" in the network represents a roadway segment connecting between two nodes.

Using an "overlay" of the TAZ Map on top of the street network, additional nodes that represent "TAZ centroids" and additional links that represent "centroid connectors" were defined. The TAZ centroid is a logical point within a TAZ where all land development contained within that TAZ may be assumed to be concentrated, for traffic modeling purposes. The centroid connectors are schematic links that carry traffic (in both directions) between the TAZ centroids and the adjacent street system. Special zones known as "gateways" were also coded in order that the terminal links of the model can be connected to "external"
sources of traffic generation. In all, six (6) gateways were defined for the Lake County travel demand model. These are as follows:

- Gateway 1 - State Route 20 at the Lake County/Mendocino County line
- Gateway 2 - State Route 175 at the Lake County/Mendocino County line
- Gateway 3 - State Route 29 at the Lake County/Napa County line
- Gateway 4 - Butts Canyon Road at the Lake County/Napa County line
- Gateway 5 - Morgan Valley Road at the Lake County/Napa county line
- Gateway 6 - State Route 20 at the Lake County/Colusa County line

Figure 5 shows the gateways as defined for the Lake County traffic model.
The TAZ centroids, centroid connectors, and gateways were all integrated into a single TP+ network layer. Using TP+ a database of records containing "attributes" of each link was coded and attached to the network layer. The link attributes coded include length of link segment, link travel speeds, functional capacity class, and flag variable indicating one T way/two T way link directionality, number of lanes per direction, travel capacity per lane and other traffic assignment parameters, street name, and two-way daily ADT traffic counts at critical locations where count data was obtained/available.

The GIS approach in the creation of the TP+ network represents a significant improvement over the traditional "stick figure" type representation of the street network. The GIS approach resulted in a relatively more accurate modeling of link distances and travel times, because of the ability to replicate the curvi-linearities in the street system.

## Model Job-Stream Creation

TP+ offers the capability of creating and running travel demand models in a "batch" (or script) mode. In the batch mode, the entire sequence of modeling steps can be run automatically from a script, using prespecified input data and parameters. The batch mode of running travel demand models offers greater computational speed, convenience, and efficiency in running the entire model, upon completion of the initial model setups. OMNI-MEANS first created the basic model modules and then "batched" the model processes into a model "script file" also referred to as the model's "job-stream". The term "job-stream" refers to the computer file that contains the entire set of "instructions" issued to the TP+ modeling engine as to how to perform model tasks and what methodologies, parameters, adjustments, and assumptions to apply in individual tasks. The job-stream file was written/edited using the VIPER scripting language supported by TP+, and contains the following modules.

## Trip Generation

As a "pre-processor" to the trip generation module, the land use quantities already summarized by TAZ were first grouped into broader categories for trip generation purposes. These include "trip production" categories that include single-family and multi-family residential dwelling units, and "trip attraction" categories that broadly include retail, office, industrial, educational, governmental/public, parks/recreational, agricultural, and other miscellaneous types. Within the pre-processor (which can be run using spreadsheet software like Excel), the individual zonal land use quantities were multiplied by appropriate zonal trip generation rates to obtain an estimate of total daily trip generation by TAZ. The trip generation rates were deduced based on standard reference sources like Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Publication Trip Generation (Sixth Edition). Since the Lake County traffic model was not envisioned to have a separate transit component, generic "vehicular trip generation rates" were used.


The daily trip generation tables prepared using the Excel pre-processor were exported to TP+ in a DBF format. The TP+ trip generation module disaggregates zonal trip generation by "trip purpose" using a series of linear regression equations. The Lake County traffic model utilizes five basic trip purposes, listed as follows:

- Home-based-Work (HBW)
- Home-based-Shopping (HBS)
- Home-based-Other (HBO)
- Work-based-Other (WBO)
- Other-based-Other (OBO)

For each TAZ, trip "productions" and trip "attractions" were estimated by trip purpose. Finally, a "production controlled" trip total adjustment, referred to as "trip balancing", was performed such that total zonal trip attractions were adjusted to match total zonal trip productions for each trip purpose.

## TRIP DISTRIBUTION

In order to initiate the trip distribution process an inter-zonal matrix of free-flow travel times on the shortest path between all pairs of zones was created. Special adjustments to gateway-to-gateway impedances were performed so that gateway productions and attractions would be matched with zonal productions and attractions, as either internal-external (I-X) or external-internal (X-I) trips. Gamma function parameters (from NCHRP-365, 1998) were specified for use as "friction factors" in the trip distribution process. A matrix of special zone-to-zone attractively factors (referred to as "K factors") was also built so that inter-zonal travel characteristics, which cannot be solely explained using link impedances, can be accounted for.

The trip distribution module performs trip distribution based on a 'gravity model'. The conventional "gravity model" assumes that trips between two zones are directly proportional to the number of trips produced by the production zone and the number of trips attracted by the attraction zone and inversely proportional to the impedance (travel time, travel distance, travel cost, etc.) on the shortest travel path(s) between the two zones. The inter-zonal travel time matrices, friction factor functions and K-factors were incorporated in the trip distribution process. As an end-product of the trip distribution process, an interzonal production-attraction trip matrix between all zone pairs was created, for each trip purpose.

## TRIP TRANSFORMATION

The trip matrices in a "production-attraction" format were transformed to the "origin-destination" format by using a symmetrical matrix transformation operation. Finally, the gateway-to-gateway "through" (or external-external, X-X) trip matrix was superimposed over the origin-destination trip matrix by adding the appropriate trips in the script file. This final inter-zonal daily trip matrix in origin- destination format was then used for traffic assignment.

## Traffic Assignment

The final origin-destination trip matrix was assigned to the street network within the "Assignment" module of the script file. The "User Equilibrium" assignment procedure was used. Travel capacities for network links were computed using "functional capacity class" hierarchy, daily and peak hour travel capacities per lane (in vehicles per lane) and the number of travel lanes on the facilities. The Bureau of Public Roads (BPR) function format was used for computing congested travel times as a function of volume-to-capacity ratios. "Alpha" and "Beta" parameter values for use with the BPR functions were specified by functional capacity class, for each link in the network. The assigned average daily traffic
(ADT) and peak hour volume flows by network link were saved to output tables, which were then "loaded" on to the street network.

## Model Calibration and Post-Calibration Analyses

The steps described above represent the creation of a complete but "un-validated" existing conditions model. For "calibrating" the model to available field data, several model runs with different parameter adjustments were tested in order that average daily traffic (ADT) volume at critical roadway segments and screenline analyses yielded satisfactory levels of accuracy. Localized adjustments that included specific zonal trip generation adjustments, refinement of link speeds and capacities, adjustment of congested travel time expressions/parameters etc., were tested until realistic and acceptable traffic flows were obtained. The model was essentially calibrated to achieve a reasonable simulation of ADT flows over the entire model street system.

To help with the post-assignment calibration procedure, percentage deviations are computed between model forecasts and ground counts at locations where daily traffic counts were conducted/available. Model forecasts were regarded as being acceptable if percentage deviations fell within Target Percentage Deviations, as prescribed for the particular roadway type. The target percentage is computed by expressing the ratio of the difference of existing count and year 2030 forecasts to the existing count, as s percentage.

- $\quad$ Percentage deviation $=($ Year 2030 forecast - Existing Count $) /$ Existing count $* 100$

The percentage based calibration method provides for a stricter calibration standard on high-capacity, high-volume facilities like arterial streets, while allowing for larger margins of variability on lowcapacity, low-volume facilities like collectors and local streets. However, given modeling limitations, it is often possible to not meet the target percentage threshold standards on low-volume, low capacity facilities without significantly affecting level of service and/or other improvement thresholds established for these low-volume street segments. Therefore, a difference of less than 1,000 vehicles per day in the absolute magnitude of ADT variation is generally regarded as acceptable for most low-volume facilities. Conversely, on high-volume, high capacity facilities it is possible to meet the target percentage deviation even when absolute magnitude of ADT variation is well over 1,000 vehicles per day. Therefore, often a combination of target percentage deviation and absolute magnitude of variation best meets model calibration target requirements.

## Year 2030 Model Forecasts

The calibrated existing conditions model was used to determine the Year 2030 conditions roadway ADT forecasts. Year 2030 land uses were deduced following markups provided by the County and Cities on several TAZ maps provided to them. The final Year 2030 land uses were derived in consultation with several agencies and are shown in Table 6. It is noted that these land uses are anticipated to be consistent with the proposed General Plan scenario.

TABLE 6
YEAR 2030 LAND USE SUMMARY

| FUTURE LAND USES |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Planning Area | TAZ_\# | Residential <br> (du's) | Commercial <br> (acres) | Industrial <br> (acres) | Other <br> (acres) |
| Upper Lake/Nice | $100-133$ | 2,576 | 191 | 11 | 290,251 |
| Lakeport excl. City of Lakeport | $200-230$ | 2,837 | 129 | 25 | 39,671 |
| Kelseyville | $300-338$ | 2,945 | 164 | 39 | 35,740 |
| Cobb Mtn | $400-436$ | 2,428 | 150 | 0 | 42,557 |
| Middletown | $500-544$ | 3,901 | 211 | 47 | 99,390 |
| Lowerlake | $600-645$ | 1,620 | 175 | 34 | 69,806 |
| Rivieras | $700-733$ | 5,329 | 228 | 0 | 14,621 |
| Shoreline Communities excl. City of Clear Lake | $800-845$ | 6,160 | 127 | 46 | 174,415 |
| City of Clear Lake | $900-940$ | 12,522 | 431 | 17 | 3,255 |
| City of Lakeport | $950-987$ | 2,645 | 296 | 11 | 546 |
| TOTAL |  | $\mathbf{4 2 , 9 6 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 1 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 7 0 , 2 5 3}$ |

The future year land uses shown in Table 6 were used as input into the calibrated existing conditions model described earlier to develop future year traffic forecasts.

## Floor Area Ratios

Based on discussions with Lake County Community Development, it is assumed that a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of $12.5 \%$ (i.e., .125) be applied to all commercial growth occurring within the Community Area boundaries. Outside the community area boundaries, an FAR of $5 \%$ i.e., 0.05 has been applied to the growth in commercial land uses.

## YEAR 2030 TRANSPORTATION CONDITIONS

As development occurs within Lake County, additional transportation facilities will be required to support this growth. Forecasting how this development will affect existing traffic volumes and distribution patterns is a critical component of this study. Traffic volumes and circulation patterns will change within Lake County over the next 20 years due to development within and around the County.

Forecasting the exact nature of these changes is always challenging. To assist in the process, a Countywide average daily traffic model was developed in order to project daily traffic volumes on all County roadway segments for Year 2030 (future build-out) conditions. PM peak hour turning movement counts were deduced from the Year 2030 segmental volumes. This chapter presents future traffic conditions within Lake County under Year 2030 conditions.

## Growth Projections

Traffic volumes within Lake County will change significantly over the next 25 years, primarily due to development within and around Lake County. Future year land uses for all planning areas including the two Cities were derived based on marked up maps and plots provided by different agencies.

Table 7 provides a summary of existing, as identified in Table 5, and future land uses, as identified in Table 6, within different planning areas and the two Cities of Clear Lake and Lakeport.

## Year 2030 Traffic Operations

Year 2030 daily traffic volumes were deduced by using these build-out land uses and incorporating them into the Lake County Traffic model. The daily volumes forecasted from the traffic model were used to derive the winter conditions PM peak hour turning movement volumes.

As noted earlier, Lake County and areas around the Lake are popular tourist attractions and attract visitors during the summer months. A traffic and parking analysis was completed for the City of Clear Lake by Crane Transportation Group. This study was incorporated into the Provinsalia Golf Community EIR, July 2005.

Based on this study by Crane Transportation Group, there is significant seasonal variation in traffic counts within Lake County between winter and summer conditions (when schools are still in session). To account for this variation, winter AM peak hour counts are adjusted upwards by $7 \%$, while winter PM and mid-afternoon counts are adjusted upwards by $10 \%$. Summer conditions Year 2030 intersection and roadway volumes were derived by adjusting Winter Year 2030 forecasts upward by $10 \%$. Figure 6 shows the Year 2030 summer conditions PM peak hour traffic volumes. Figure 7A, 7B, 7C and 7D show a bandwidth plot of the roadways within Lake County on which traffic volumes are expected to increase from existing conditions.

TABLE 7
LAKE COUNTY LAND USE SUMMARIES

| EXISTING LAND USES |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Planning Area | TAZ_\# | $\begin{gathered} \text { Residential } \\ \text { (du's) } \end{gathered}$ | Commercial (acres) | Industrial (acres) | Other (acres) |
| Upper Lake/Nice | 100-133 | 2,387 | 107 | , | 290,239 |
| Lakeport excl. City of Lakeport | 200-230 | 2,337 | 67 | 2 | 39,671 |
| Kelseyville | 300-338 | 2,789 | 105 | 39 | 35,740 |
| Cobb Mtn | 400-436 | 2,364 | 62 | 0 | 42,557 |
| Middletown | 500-544 | 3,492 | 108 | 27 | 99,390 |
| Lowerlake | 600-645 | 1,420 | 99 | 4 | 69,793 |
| Rivieras | 700-733 | 4,788 | 145 | 0 | 14,621 |
| Shoreline Communities excl. City of Clear Lake | 800-845 | 5,625 | 99 | 26 | 174,405 |
| City of Clear Lake | 900-940 | 8,625 | 265 | 1 | 3,255 |
| City of Lakeport | 950-987 | 2,083 | 221 | 11 | 546 |
| TOTAL |  | 35,911 | 1,279 | 116 | 770,218 |
| GROWTH IN LAND USES |  |  |  |  |  |
| Planning Area | TAZ_\# | $\begin{gathered} \text { Residential } \\ \text { (du's) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Commercial } \\ \text { (acres) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Industrial (acres) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Other } \\ & \text { (acres) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Upper Lake/Nice | 100-133 | 189 | 84 | 5 | 12 |
| Lakeport excl. City of Lakeport | 200-230 | 500 | 62 | 23 | 0 |
| Kelseyville | 300-338 | 156 | 59 | 0 | 0 |
| Cobb Mtn | 400-436 | 64 | 87 | 0 | 0 |
| Middletown | 500-544 | 409 | 103 | 20 | 0 |
| Lowerlake | 600-645 | 200 | 76 | 30 | 12 |
| Rivieras | 700-733 | 541 | 83 | 0 | 0 |
| Shoreline Communities excl. City of Clear Lake | 800-845 | 535 | 28 | 20 | 10 |
| City of Clear Lake | 900-940 | 3,897 | 165 | 16 | 0 |
| City of Lakeport | 950-987 | 561 | 76 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL |  | 7,052 | 823 | 114 | 35 |
| FUTURE LAND USES |  |  |  |  |  |
| Planning Area | TAZ_\# | $\begin{gathered} \text { Residential } \\ \text { (du's) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Commercial } \\ \text { (acres) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Industrial (acres) | Other <br> (acres) |
| Upper Lake/Nice | 100-133 | 2,576 | 191 | 11 | 290,251 |
| Lakeport excl. City of Lakeport | 200-230 | 2,837 | 129 | 25 | 39,671 |
| Kelseyville | 300-338 | 2,945 | 164 | 39 | 35,740 |
| Cobb Mtn | 400-436 | 2,428 | 150 | 0 | 42,557 |
| Middletown | 500-544 | 3,901 | 211 | 47 | 99,390 |
| Lowerlake | 600-645 | 1,620 | 175 | 34 | 69,806 |
| Rivieras | 700-733 | 5,329 | 228 | 0 | 14,621 |
| Shoreline Communities excl. City of Clear Lake | 800-845 | 6,160 | 127 | 46 | 174,415 |
| City of Clear Lake | 900-940 | 12,522 | 431 | 17 | 3,255 |
| City of Lakeport | 950-987 | 2,645 | 296 | 11 | 546 |
| TOTAL |  | 42,963 | 2,101 | 230 | 770,253 |
| \% GROWTH IN LAND USES |  |  |  |  |  |
| Planning Area | TAZ_\# | Residential (du's) | Commercial (acres) | Tndustrial (acres) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Other } \\ & \text { (acres) } \end{aligned}$ |
| Upper Lake/Nice | 100-133 | 8\% | 78\% | 83\% | 0\% |
| Lakeport excl. City of Lakeport | 200-230 | 21\% | 93\% | 1499\% | 0\% |
| Kelseyville | 300-338 | 6\% | 56\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Cobb Mtn | 400-436 | 3\% | 140\% | - | 0\% |
| Middletown | 500-544 | 12\% | 95\% | 74\% | 0\% |
| Lowerlake | 600-645 | 14\% | 77\% | 750\% | 0\% |
| Rivieras | 700-733 | 11\% | 57\% | - | 0\% |
| Shoreline Communities excl. City of Clear Lake | 800-845 | 10\% | 28\% | 77\% | 0\% |
| City of Clear Lake | 900-940 | 45\% | 62\% | 1235\% | 0\% |
| City of Lakeport | 950-987 | 27\% | 34\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| TOTAL |  | 20\% | 64\% | 98\% | 0\% |
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## Intersections

Year 2030 intersection traffic operations have been quantified using the traffic volumes in Figure 6 and the intersection lane geometrics, as identified in Figure 2. Table 8 shows the resulting intersection LOS.

TABLE 8
YEAR 2030 SUMMER CONDITIONS WITHOUT IMPROVEMENTS: INTERSECTION LOS

| \# | Intersection | Control Type | $\begin{gathered} \text { Target } \\ \text { LOS } \end{gathered}$ | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Delay | LOS | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Warrant } \\ & \text { Met? } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1 | SR 20/Scotts Valley Rd. | TWSC | C | 36.6 | E | No |
| 2 | SR 20/SR 29 | TWSC | C | 296.3 | F | Yes |
| 3 | SR20/Nice Lucerne Cutoff/ Pyle Rd. | TWSC | C | OVR | F | Yes |
| 4 | SR 20/Lakeshore Blvd. | TWSC | C | 26.8 | D | No |
| 5 | Country Club Dr./SR 20 | TWSC | C | 536.1 | F | Yes |
| 6 | Foothill Dr. (southern location)/SR 20 | TWSC | C | OVR | F | Yes |
| 7 | SR 20/SR 53 | TWSC | C | 398.8 | F | Yes |
| 8 | Lakeshore Dr./Olympic Dr. | TWSC | C | 228.7 | F | Yes |
| 9 | SR 53/Olympic Dr. | TWSC | C | OVR | F | Yes |
| 10 | SR 29/SR 53/Morgan Valley Rd. | Signal | C | 54.3 | D | - |
| 11 | SR 29/Seigler Canyon Rd. | TWSC | C | 704.2 | F | Yes |
| 12 | SR 29/Point Lakeview Rd. | TWSC | C | OVR | F | Yes |
| 13 | SR 29/Butts Canyon Rd. | TWSC | C | 131.2 | F | Yes |
| 14 | SR 29/SR 175 (in Middletown) | Signal | C | 74.2 | E | - |
| 15 | SR 29/Dry Creek Cutoff. | TWSC | C | 57.1 | F | No |
| 16 | SR 29/Red Hills Rd./SR 281(Soda Bay Rd.) | TWSC | C | OVR | F | Yes |
| 17 | Soda Bay Rd. (SR 281)/Pt. Lakeview Rd. | TWSC | C | 13.0 | B | No |
| 18 | SR 29/Main St. | TWSC | C | OVR | F | Yes |
| 19 | SR 29/ Merrit Rd. | TWSC | C | OVR | F | Yes |
| 20 | SR 29/ Argonaut Rd. | TWSC | C | OVR | F | Yes |
| 21 | SR 29/SR 175 (in Lakeport) | Signal | C | 692.4 | F | - |
| 22 | Lakeport Blvd./SR 29 NB ramps | TWSC | C | OVR | F | Yes |
| 23 | Lakeport Blvd./SR 29 SB ramps | TWSC | C | OVR | F | Yes |
| 24 | (Scotts Valley Rd.) 11th St./SR 29 NB ramps | TWSC | C | 520.1 | F | Yes |
| 25 | (Scotts Valley Rd.) 11th St./SR 29 SB ramps | TWSC | C | OVR | F | Yes |
| 26 | Nice Lucerne Cut-off/ SR 29 NB ramps | TWSC | C | 15.2 | C | No |
| 27 | Nice Lucerne Cut-off/ SR 29 SB ramps | TWSC | C | 33.4 | D | No |
| 28 | Nice Lucerne Cutoff/Lakeshore Blvd./Westlake Dr. | TWSC | C | 73.9 | F | Yes |

Notes:
TWSC = Two Way Stop Control AWSC = All Way Stop Control
LOS = Worst case movement's LOS for TWSC intersections; OVR = overflow
Warrant $=$ Caltrans Peak hour volume based signal warrant
As shown above, many intersections are projected to operate unacceptably. Improvements to mitigate operations at these intersections along with those for roadway segments (outlined below) are included in subsequent CIP cost estimate section.

## Roadway Segments

Year 2030 Roadway segment operations have been quantified using the Year 2030 ADT counts (developed from the model) and assuming the existing roadway capacity configurations. The following table, Table 9, shows the Year 2030 conditions roadway segment LOS for different roadways in Lake County.

TABLE 9
YEAR 2030 LOS

| Planning Area | Roadway Segment | Ex 0 0 0 |  | Capacity Configuration |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SR 29 | SR 29 | SR 20/SR 29 jct. | Nice Lucerne cutoff | 4-Lane Freeway | 10963 | 12059 | A |
|  | SR 29 | Nice Lucerne cutoff | Park Way | 4-Lane Freeway | 15121 | 16633 | A |
|  | SR 29 | Park Way | 11th St. | 4-Lane Freeway | 21334 | 23467 | A |
|  | SR 29 | 11th St. | Lakeport Blvd. | 4-Lane Freeway | 24583 | 27041 | A |
|  | SR 29 | Lakeport Blvd. | end of freeway | 4-Lane Freeway | 22922 | 25214 | A |
|  | SR 29 | end of freeway segment | SR 175/Main St. | 4-Lane Freeway | 22859 | 25145 | A |
|  | SR 29 | SR 175 jct. (Lakeport) | Ackley Rd. | 2-Lane Div Art. | 18302 | 20132 | F |
|  | SR 29 | Ackley Rd. | Highland Springs Rd. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 16675 | 18343 | F |
|  | SR 29 | Highland Springs Rd. | Argonaut Rd. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 15790 | 17369 | F |
|  | SR 29 | Argonaut Rd. | Thomas Dr. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 14922 | 16414 | F |
|  | SR 29 | Renfro Dr. | Merritt Rd. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 16321 | 17953 | F |
|  | SR 29 | Kelsey Creek Dr. | Live Oak Dr. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 15040 | 16544 | F |
|  | SR 29 | Live Oak Dr. | Main St.(Kelseyville) | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 13235 | 14559 | E |
|  | SR 29 | Cole Creek Rd. | Bottle Rock Rd. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 16091 | 17700 | F |
|  | SR 29 | Bottle Rock Rd. | Oak Creek Ranch | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 10274 | 11301 | C |
|  | SR 29 | Oak Creek Ranch | SR 175 | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 13880 | 15268 | F |
|  | SR 29 | SR 175 (Kelseyville) | SR 281 (Red Hills Rd.) | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 10868 | 11955 | C |
|  | SR 29 | SR 281 (Red Hills Rd.) | Eagles Nest Ln. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 13862 | 15248 | F |
|  | SR 29 | Diener Dr. | Pt. Lakeview Rd. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 14071 | 15478 | F |
|  | SR 29 | Pt. Lakeview Rd. | Siegler Canyon Rd. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 16889 | 18578 | F |
|  | SR 29 | Siegler Canyon Rd. | SR 29/SR 53 jct. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 20359 | 22395 | F |
|  | SR 29 | SR29/SR 53 jct. | Clayton Creek Rd. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 14914 | 16405 | F |
|  | SR 29 | Spruce Grove Rd. (southern) | Hartmann Rd. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 12987 | 14286 | E |
|  | SR 29 | Butts Canyon Rd. | Diamond Ranch Rd. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 17915 | 19707 | F |
|  | SR 29 | Butts Canyon Rd. | Wardlaw St. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 18181 | 19999 | F |
|  | SR 29 | Wardlaw St. | SR 29/SR 175 jct | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 15625 | 17188 | F |
|  | SR 29 | SR 29/SR 75 jct. | Douglas St. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 17559 | 19315 | F |
|  | SR 29 | Lake Ave. | Dry Creek Cut off | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 20596 | 22656 | F |
|  | SR 29 | Dry Creek Cutoff | Western Mine Rd. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 21765 | 23942 | F |
| SR 53 | SR 53 | SR 29/SR 53 jct. | Anderson Ranch Pkwy. | 4-Lane Div Art. | 27553 | 30308 | D |
|  | SR 53 | Anderson Ranch Pkwy. | Old Hwy. 53 | 4-Lane Div Art. | 28024 | 30826 | D |
|  | SR 53 | Old Hwy. 53 | 18th Ave. | 4-Lane Div Art. | 29760 | 32736 | E |
|  | SR 53 | 18th Ave. | 40th Ave. | 4-Lane Div Art. | 27122 | 29834 | D |
|  | SR 53 | 40th Ave. | Olympic Dr. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 15990 | 17589 | F |
|  | SR 53 | Olympic Dr. | Old Hwy. 53 | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 13277 | 14605 | E |
|  | SR 53 | Old Hwy. 53 | SR 20/SR 53 jct. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 13966 | 15363 | F |
| SR 20 | SR 20 | LAK/YOL County Line | SR 20/SR 53 jct . | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 14047 | 15452 | F |
|  | SR 20 | SR 20/SR 53 jct. | Sulphur Bank Dr. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 12211 | 13432 | D |
|  | SR 20 | Sulphur Bank Dr. | Country Club Dr.(Lucerne) | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 11009 | 12110 | D |
|  | SR 20 | Country Club Dr. (Lucerne) | Lakeview Blvd. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 13163 | 14479 | E |
|  | SR 20 | Lakeview Blvd. | Nice Lucerne cutoff | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 16480 | 18128 | F |
|  | SR 20 | Nice Lucerne cutoff | SR 29/SR 20 jct. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 12406 | 13647 | E |
|  | SR 20 | SR 29/SR 20 jct. | Scotts Valley Rd. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 17161 | 18877 | F |
|  | SR 20 | Scotts Valley Rd. | LAK/MEND County line | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 19887 | 21876 | F |
| SR175 | SR 175 | SR 175 jct. (Lakeport) | LAK/MEND bdy. | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 9843 | 10827 | F |
|  | SR 175 | SR 29 (Cobb) | Red Hills Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 1143 | 1257 | A |
|  | SR 175 | Red Hills Rd. | Loch Lomond Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 2585 | 2844 | A |
|  | SR 175 | Loch Loomond Rd. | Bottle Rock Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 5139 | 5653 | C |
|  | SR 175 | Bottle Rock Rd. | Golf Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 8143 | 8957 | F |
|  | SR 175 | Golf Rd. | Anderson Springs Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 6080 | 6688 | D |
|  | SR 175 | Anderson Springs Rd. | Dry Creek Cut off | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 7089 | 7798 | F |
|  | SR 175 | Dry Creek Cutoff | SR 29 | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 5033 | 5536 | C |
|  | Scotts Valley Rd. | Hill Rd./Halber Rd. | Riggs Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 3962 | 4358 | D |
|  | Scotts Valley Rd. | Riggs Rd. | SR 29 SB ramps | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 5765 | 6342 | E |
|  | Elk Mtn. Rd. | SR 20 | LAK/MEND County line | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1027 | 1130 | B |
|  | Upper Lake/Lucerne Rd | SR 20 | Hillcrest Dr. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 119 | 131 | A |
|  | Upper Lake/Lucerne Rd | SR 20 | Foothill Oaks Dr. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 157 | 173 | A |
|  | Country Club | SR 20 | Odgen Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1669 | 1836 | C |
|  | Foothill | SR 20 | Durant Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 2013 | 2214 | C |
|  | Pyle | SR 20 | Old Lake County Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 260 | 286 | A |

TABLE 9
YEAR 2030 LOS

| Planning <br> Area | Roadway Segment |  |  | Capacity Configuration |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sayre Ave. | SR 20 | Lakeshore Blvd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 2535 | 2789 | C |
|  | Sayre Ave. | SR 20 | Broadway Ave. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 683 | 751 | A |
|  | Lakeview Dr. | SR 20 | north of SR 20 | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 2648 | 2913 | C |
|  | Nice Lucerne cut-off | SR 29 SB ramps | Lakeshore Blvd. | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 9707 | 10678 | F |
|  | Nice Lucerne cut-off | Lakeshore Blvd. | Mackie Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 10204 | 11224 | F |
|  | Nice Lucerne cut-off | Mackie Rd. | Stokes Ave. | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 10262 | 11288 | F |
|  | Nice Lucerne cut-off | Stokes Ave. | SR 20 | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 12170 | 13387 | F |
|  | 16th St. | Hartley St. | High St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 2985 | 3284 | C |
|  | 16th St. | N. High St. | Forbes St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 831 | 914 | B |
|  | 11th St. | Mountview Rd. | SR 29 SB ramps | 2-Lane Collector | 5765 | 6342 | D |
|  | 11th St. | SR 29 NB ramps | Central Park Ave. | 2-Lane Collector | 13812 | 15193 | D |
|  | 11th St. | Central Park Ave. | Mellor Dr. | 2-Lane Collector | 14662 | 16128 | D |
|  | 11th St. | Mellor Dr. | Brush St. | 2-Lane Collector | 11092 | 12201 | D |
|  | 11th St. | High St. | Forbes St. | 2-Lane Collector | 9515 | 10467 | C |
|  | 11th St. | Forbes St. | Main St.(Kelseyville) | 2-Lane Collector | 6379 | 7017 | D |
|  | Berry | Spurr St. | Armstrong St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 110 | 121 | A |
|  | Armstrong St. | Spurr St. | Russell St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 204 | 224 | A |
|  | Armstrong St. | Brush St. | Forbes St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 632 | 695 | A |
|  | Armstrong St. | Forbes St. | Main St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 717 | 789 | A |
|  | N.Brush St. | 11th St. | 10th St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1544 | 1698 | B |
|  | N.Brush St. | 7th St. | 6th St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1474 | 1621 | B |
|  | N.Brush St. | 6th St. | 5th St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 517 | 569 | A |
|  | N.Brush St. | Armstrong St. | Martin St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 259 | 285 | A |
|  | Compton Ave, | Keeling Ave. | Samuelson Ct. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 406 | 447 | A |
|  | Crystal Lake Way | Hartley St. | Keeling Ave. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1029 | 1132 | B |
|  | Crystal Lake Way | Lakeshore Blvd. | Howard Ave. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 388 | 427 | A |
|  | Forbes St | Armstrong St. | Martin St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 3104 | 3414 | C |
|  | Hartley Rd | Scotts Valley Rancheria Rd. | 20th St. | 2-Lane Collector | 1489 | 1638 | A |
|  | Hartley Rd | Sunset Dr. | Boggs Ln. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 2961 | 3257 | C |
|  | Hartley Rd | 16th St. | 17th St. | 2-Lane Collector | 2957 | 3253 | B |
|  | High Street | 17th St. | Lakeshore Blvd. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 9230 | 10153 | B |
|  | Main Street | 11th St. | 9th St. | 2-Lane Div Art. | 8716 | 9588 | A |
|  | Main Street | 9th St. | 6th St. | 2-Lane Div Art. | 7735 | 8509 | A |
|  | Main Street | 6th St. | 2nd St. | 2-Lane Div Art. | 8322 | 9154 | A |
|  | Main Street | 2nd St. | Martin St. | 2-Lane Div Art. | 7691 | 8460 | A |
|  | Main Street | Martin St. | Lakeport Blvd. | 2-Lane Div Art. | 9574 | 10531 | A |
|  | S.Main St. | Lakeport Blvd. | SR 175/Soda Bay intx. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 12733 | 14006 | E |
|  | Lakeport Blvd. | Todd Rd./Parallel Dr. | SR 29 SB ramps | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 3392 | 3731 | A |
|  | Lakeport Blvd. | SR 29 SB ramps | Bevins Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 18091 | 19900 | D |
|  | Lakeport Blvd. | Bevins Rd. | S.Main St. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 12726 | 13999 | E |
|  | Park Way | Hill Rd. West | SR 29 SB ramps | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 936 | 1030 | B |
|  | Park Way | SR 29 SB ramps | Keeling Ave. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 3741 | 4115 | D |
|  | Park Way | Keeling Ave. | Lakeshore Blvd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 3158 | 3474 | C |
|  | Russell St. | 2nd St. | Armstrong St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1620 | 1782 | B |
|  | Russell St. | Armstrong St. | Martin St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1065 | 1172 | B |
|  | Walnut Dr. | Lakeshore Blvd. | 3rd Ave. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 799 | 879 | A |
|  | Lakeshore Blvd. | Hillview Dr. | Walnut Dr. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 6611 | 7272 | D |
|  | Lakeshore Blvd. | Walnut Dr. | Lowen Ln. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 6035 | 6639 | D |
|  | Lakeshore Blvd. | Lowen Ln. | Park Way | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 6660 | 7326 | D |
|  | Lakeshore Blvd. | Park Way | Wight Ln. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 7295 | 8025 | D |
|  | Lakeshore Blvd. | Wight Ln. | Crystal Lake Way | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 7754 | 8529 | D |
|  | Lakeshore Blvd | Crystal Lake Way. | Rainbow Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 7734 | 8507 | D |
| $\begin{aligned} & \cong \\ & \stackrel{0}{5} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Highland Springs | SR 29 | Bell Hill Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 4094 | 4503 | D |
|  | Highland Springs | Red Rock Rd. | Bell Hill Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1004 | 1104 | B |
|  | Bell Hill Rd. | Highland Springs Rd. | SR 29 | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1671 | 1838 | C |
|  | Bell Hill Rd. | SR 29 | Main St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1406 | 1547 | B |
|  | Konocti Bay | SR 281 | Bay Ln. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1341 | 1475 | B |
|  | Konocti Bay | Pt. Lakeview Rd. | Sequoia Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1956 | 2152 | C |
|  | Live Oak Dr. | Main St. (Kelseyville) | SR 29 | 2-Lane Collector | 2630 | 2893 | B |
|  | Live Oak Dr. | SR 29 | Cruickshank Rd. | 2-Lane Collector | 1260 | 1386 | A |
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TABLE 9
YEAR 2030 LOS

| Planning <br> Area | Roadway Segment |  |  | Capacity Configuration |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\stackrel{\pi}{3}$$\stackrel{0}{0}$$\stackrel{0}{0}$ | Meritt | Renfro Dr. | SR 29 | 2-Lane Collector | 3540 | 3894 | C |
|  | Meritt | SR 29 | Lossa Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 6852 | 7537 | E |
|  | Meritt | Big Valley Rd. | Gaddy Ln. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 3953 | 4348 | D |
|  | Gaddy Lane | Merritt Rd. | Soda Bay Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 4557 | 5013 | D |
|  | State St. | Gaddy Lan. | Sylar Lane. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 2742 | 3016 | C |
|  | State St. | Sylar Ln. | Main St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 3022 | 3324 | C |
|  | Main St. | Bell Hill Rd. | State St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 5137 | 5651 | D |
|  | Wight Way | Kelsey Creek Dr. | Adobe Creek Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 305 | 336 | A |
|  | Gifford Springs | SR 175 | Cobb Blvd. | 2-Lane Collector | 751 | 826 | A |
|  | Soda Bay Rd. | SR 175/S. Main St. | Sylva Lane. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 7028 | 7731 | E |
|  | Soda Bay Rd. | Sylva Ln. | Highland Springs Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 4370 | 4807 | D |
|  | Soda Bay Rd. | Highland Springs Rd. | Stone Dr. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 2040 | 2244 | C |
|  | Soda Bay Rd. | Stone Dr. | Park Dr. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1989 | 2188 | C |
|  | Soda Bay Rd. | Park Dr. | Gaddy Ln. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 2008 | 2209 | C |
|  | Bottle Rock Rd. | SR 29 | Kelseyville/Cobb bdy. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 3478 | 3826 | D |
| Cobb | Bottle Rock Rd. | Kelseyville/Cobb bdy. | Harrington Flat Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 3309 | 3640 | D |
|  | Bottle Rock Rd. | Harringnton Flat Rd. | Sulphur Creek Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 2497 | 2747 | C |
|  | Bottle Rock Rd. | Sulphur Creek Rd. | SR 175 | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 3363 | 3699 | D |
|  | Sulphur Creek | Harrington Flat Rd. | SR 175 | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 522 | 574 | A |
|  | Harrington Flat Rd. | Bottle Rock Rd. | Sulphur Creek Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 213 | 234 | A |
|  | Harrington Flat Rd. | Sulphur Creek Rd. | SR 175 | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 847 | 932 | B |
|  | Golf Road | SR 175 | Cobb Blvd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 920 | 1012 | B |
|  | Loch Lomond Rd. | Siegler Springs Rd. | SR 175 | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 745 | 820 | A |
|  | Red Hills Rd. (SR 281) | Rivieras Cobb Bdy. | SR 175 | 2-Lane Collector | 2310 | 2541 | B |
| $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\tilde{3}}{3} \\ & \text { 晋 } \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | Big Canyon Rd. | Siegler Springs Rd. | Harbin Springs Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 2438 | 2682 | C |
|  | Big Canyon Rd. | Harbin Springs Rd. | SR 175 | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 3561 | 3917 | D |
|  | Hartmann Rd. | SR 29 | Hidden Valley Rd. | 2-Lane Collector | 6292 | 6921 | D |
|  | Butts Canyon Rd. | SR 29 | Eureka Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 3749 | 4124 | D |
|  | Washington St. | Main St. (Middletown) | Armstrong St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1881 | 2069 | C |
|  | Main St. | SR 29 | Washington St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 3159 | 3475 | C |
|  | Santa Clara | SR 175 | Lake Ave. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 2454 | 2699 | C |
|  | Spruce Grove Rd. | Spruce Grove Rd. | Deer Hill Rd. | 2-Lane Collector | 4072 | 4479 | C |
|  | Spruce Grove Rd. | Deer Hill Rd. | Jerusalem Grade | 2-Lane Collector | 463 | 509 | A |
|  | Stewart St. | SR 175 | Douglas St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1736 | 1910 | C |
|  | Stewart St. | Douglas St. | Pine St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1401 | 1541 | B |
|  | Barnes St. | Stewart St. | Wardlaw St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 3573 | 3930 | D |
|  | Wardlaw St. | SR 29 | Jefferson St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1355 | 1491 | B |
|  | Washington St. | Wardlaw St. | Young St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 952 | 1047 | B |
|  | Washington St. | Young St. | SR 29 (Main St.) | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1800 | 1980 | C |
|  | Washington St. | Main St. | Armstrong St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1921 | 2113 | C |
|  | Young St. | SR 29 | Bush St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1021 | 1123 | B |
|  | Young St. | SR 29 | Washington St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1259 | 1385 | B |
|  | Young St. | Washington St. | Jackson St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 2801 | 3081 | C |
|  | SR 281 | Cobb Rivieras bdy. | SR 29 | 2-Lane Collector | 2310 | 2541 | B |
|  | SR 281 | SR 29 | Pt. Lakeview Rd. | 2-Lane Collector | 5393 | 5932 | D |
|  | Fairway Dr | west of SR 281 | SR 281 (Soda Bay Rd.) | 2-Lane Collector | 6414 | 7055 | D |
|  | Fairway Dr | SR 281 (Soda Bay Rd.) | Pt.Lakeview Rd. | 2-Lane Collector | 4387 | 4826 | C |
|  | Point Lake View Rd. | SR 281 | Fairway Dr. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 4053 | 4458 | D |
|  | Point Lake View Rd. | Fairway Dr. | Konocti Vista Dr. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 3947 | 4342 | D |
|  | Point Lake View Rd. | Konocti Vista Dr. | SR 29 | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 2594 | 2853 | C |
|  | Lake St. | Morgan Valley Rd. | Dam Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 4471 | 4918 | D |
|  | Mill St. | Morgan Valley Rd. | 2nd St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 2500 | 2750 | C |
|  | Mill St. | Morgan Valley Rd. | Rose St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 109 | 120 | A |
|  | Seigler Canyon Rd. | SR 29 | Perini Rd. N | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 4376 | 4814 | D |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0.0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | Seigler Canyon Rd. | Perni Rd. N | Perini Rd. S | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 4068 | 4475 | D |
|  | Seigler Canyon Rd. | Perini Rd. S | Siegler Springs N. Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 988 | 1087 | B |
|  | Tish-a-tang Rd. | Lake St. | east of Lake St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1445 | 1590 | B |
|  | Arrowhead Rd. | Golf Club Rd. | Park St. | 2-Lane Collector | 3600 | 3960 | C |
|  | Arrowhead Rd. | Park St. | Pomo Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 873 | 960 | B |
|  | Boyles Avenue | Davis Ave. | 44th Ave. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 167 | 184 | A |
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TABLE 9
YEAR 2030 LOS

| Planning <br> Area | Roadway Segment |  |  | Capacity Configuration |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Boyles Avenue | 44th Ave. | 40th Ave. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 107 | 118 | A |
|  | Boyles Avenue | 40th Ave. | 33rd Ave. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1067 | 1174 | B |
|  | Boyles Avenue | 33rd Ave. | 18th Ave. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 3843 | 4227 | D |
|  | 18th Avenue | SR 53 | Phillips Ave. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 5811 | 6392 | E |
|  | 18th Avenue | Phillips Ave. | Boyles Ave. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 4483 | 4931 | D |
|  | 40th Ave. | SR 53 | Phillips Ave. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 7233 | 7956 | E |
|  | 40th Ave. | Phillips Ave. | Boyles Ave. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1240 | 1364 | B |
|  | Burns Valley Road | Arrowhead Rd. | Sonoma Way | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1279 | 1407 | B |
|  | Burns Valley Road | Olympic Dr./Old Hwy 53 | Bowers Ave. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 3857 | 4243 | D |
|  | Cypress St. | Olympic Dr. | Austin Ave. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 553 | 608 | A |
|  | Dam Rd. | just west of Dam Rd./Lake St. | Lake St. | 2-Lane Collector | 8553 | 9408 | D |
|  | Davis St | Eureka Ave. | Phillips Ave. | 2-Lane Collector | 3235 | 3559 | B |
|  | Davis St | Phillips Ave. | Irvine Ave. | 2-Lane Collector | 2742 | 3016 | B |
|  | Davis St | Boyles Ave. | Konocti Ave. | 2-Lane Collector | 1752 | 1927 | B |
|  | Huntington Ave. | Pomo Rd. | Manakee St. | 2-Lane Collector | 219 | 241 | A |
|  | Huntington Ave. | Manakee St. | Lakeshore Dr. | 2-Lane Collector | 230 | 253 | A |
|  | Lakeshore Drive | SR 53 | Old Hwy. 53 | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 16765 | 18442 | D |
|  | Lakeshore Drive | Old Hwy. 53 | Mullen Ave. | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 12341 | 13575 | D |
|  | Lakeshore Drive | Mullen Ave. | Divison Ave. | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 10366 | 11403 | E |
|  | Lakeshore Drive | Division Ave. | Olympic Dr. | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 9902 | 10892 | D |
|  | Lakeshore Drive | Olympic Dr. | Pomo Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 10573 | 11630 | E |
|  | Lakeshore Drive | Pomo Rd. | Park St. | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 7480 | 8228 | D |
|  | Lakeshore Drive | Park St. | Country Club Dr. | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 3823 | 4205 | A |
|  | Lakeshore Drive | Country Club Dr. | San Joaquin Dr. | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 3383 | 3721 | A |
|  | Moss Street | Davis Ave. | 40th Ave. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 3062 | 3368 | A |
|  | Old Hwy 53. | SR 53 | Park Blvd. | 2-Lane Collector | 5522 | 6074 | C |
|  | Burns Valley Rd. | Arrowhead Rd./Pomo Rd. | Woodlawn Dr. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1000 | 1100 | B |
|  | Burns Valley Rd. | Woodlawn Dr. | Bowers Ave. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1391 | 1530 | B |
|  | Burns Valley Road | Bowers Ave. | Olympic Dr. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 3943 | 4337 | D |
|  | Old Hwy 53. | Olympic Dr. | Austin Dr. | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 7469 | 8216 | F |
|  | Old Hwy 53. | Austin Dr. | Davis Ave. | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 9242 | 10166 | F |
|  | Old Hwy 53. | Davis Ave. | W 40th St. | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 9242 | 10166 | F |
|  | Old Hwy 53. | Lakeshore Dr.(W 40th St.) | Crawford Ave. | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 10515 | 11567 | F |
|  | Old Hwy 53. | Crawford Ave. | 18th Ave. extn. | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 12761 | 14037 | F |
|  | Old Hwy 53. | 18th Ave. extn. | SR 53 | Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art. | 7619 | 8381 | F |
|  | Olympic Dr. | Lakeshore Dr. | Cypress St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 7306 | 8037 | D |
|  | Olympic Dr. | Cypress St. | Old. Hwy 53 | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 10684 | 11752 | D |
|  | Olympic Dr. | Old Hwy. 53 | Washington St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 12212 | 13433 | D |
|  | Olympic Dr. | Washington St. | SR 53 | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 11562 | 12718 | D |
|  | Pomo Rd. | Arrowhead Rd. | Lakeshore Dr. | 2-Lane Undiv Art. | 462 | 508 | A |
|  | Arrowhead Rd. | Pomo Rd. | Burns Valley Rd. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 1000 | 1100 | B |
|  | West 40th St. | Mullen Ave. | Laddell Ave | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 968 | 1065 | B |
|  | Woodland Dr. | Burns Valley Rd. | Koloko St. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 164 | 180 | A |
|  | Arrowhead/Pomo Rd. | Burns Valley Rd. | Lakeshore Dr. | Substd. 2-Lane Collector | 5562 | 6118 | D |

## YEAR 2030 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT NEEDS

As discussed in the previous section, many roadways within Lake County are projected to operate at unacceptable LOS on a daily ADT basis. Significant improvements are required to mitigate these projected deficiencies, most of which arise due to anticipated growth in the next 20 years.

## Year Transportation Improvements Need

Based on delay and level of service conditions on both roadway segment and intersections for future year conditions as presented in previous section of this report, roadway improvements for Lake County along with their planning level cost estimates are identified in Table 10.

Table 10
Year 2030 Transportation Improvements Needs

|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
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## YEAR 2030 ESTIMATED IMPROVEMENT COSTS

## Planning Level Cost Estimates

Planning level cost estimates have been prepared for all transportation improvements required by Year 2030. These estimates represent very rough planning level costs based primarily upon additional roadway widening widths and overall roadway segment lengths to be improved. Based upon this data approximate square footage of additional surface improvements were calculated. Surface improvement areas were then multiplied by a square footage unit cost.

Square footage unit costs were divided into two categories as follows; level, sloping and steep. Unit cost estimates were determined for each of these segment types by development of typical cross section costs for a typical roadway construction project. Unit cost data has been updated to current unit cost information. Steep slope improvement costs were derived from representative project bid data.

The detailed cost estimate worksheets associated with each preliminary planning level cost estimate are presented in the appendix. Table 11 provides a summary of the planning level cost estimates associated with each improvement including safety and operational improvement needs.

Table 11
Year 2030 Transportation Improvements Needs
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## TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS

Year 2030 transportation improvement needs identified in the previous section are required to provide adequate roadway capacity to meet the County and Cities LOS C threshold for acceptable congestion conditions. As identified in Table 10 many of the improvements to regional state (Caltrans) facilities are very costly. As a result, many any of these improvements are beyond the Caltrans District 1 planning horizon and are not considered feasible for construction by Year 2030.

During the preparation of the fee program study, discussions with each of the affected agencies including Caltrans and the Lake County/City APC have provided direction regarding specifically which transportation capacity improvements should be considered as candidates for Capital Improvement Programs, and therefore inclusion into this fee program.

Table 12 provides a summary of Year 2030 improvement needs along with their potential funding sources and potential funding deficits (if any). Figures 8A through 8H show the roadway improvements for different planning areas within Lake County.
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## Year 2030 Feasible Roadway Improvements

 Upperlake/Nice Planning Area

Table 12
Year 2030 Transportation Improvements Needs

|  |  | Facility Description | Existing Conditions | Recommended Improvements | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Construction } \\ \text { Cost Estimate } \\ (1000 \$) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Potential Funding Sources |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | State and <br> Federal <br> Funding <br> Programs |  |  | 品范 |
|  | KRC\#1 | Pt. Lakeview Rd. - SR 281 to SR 29 | Two lane rural roadway | Safety and operational improvements | \$4,164 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$4,164 |
|  | KRC\#2 | Big Valley Rd. - Highland Springs Rd. to Merritt Rd./Gaddy Ln. | Two lane rural raodway | Safety and operational improvements | \$1,439 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,439 |
|  | KRC\#3 | Bell Hill Rd. - Highland Springs Rd.to SR 29 | Two lane rural raodway | Safety and operational improvements | \$2,307 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,307 |
|  | KRC\#4 | Gaddy Ln. - Loasa Rd. to Soda Bay Rd. | Two lane rural raodway | Roadway Improvements | \$6,383 | \$0 | \$0 | \$6,383 | \$0 |
|  | KRC\#5 | Harrington Flat Rd. - Bottle Rock Rd. to SR 175 | Two lane rural raodway | Safety and operational improvements | \$3,223 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$3,223 |
|  | KRC\#6 | Sulphur Creek Rd. - Bottle Rock Rd. to Harrington Flat Rd. | Two lane rural raodway | Safety and operational improvements | \$718 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$718 |
|  | KRC\#7 | Loch Lomond Rd. - Big Canyon Rd. to SR 175 | Two lane rural raodway | Safety and operational improvements | \$2,433 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,433 |
|  | KRC\#8 | Siegler Canyon Rd. - Big Canyon Rd. to SR 29 | Two lane rural raodway | Safety and operational improvements | \$2,469 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,469 |
|  | KRC\#9 | Big Canyon Rd. - Siegler Canyon Rd. to USS Liberty Ln. | Two lane rural raodway | Safety and operational improvements | \$3,854 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$3,854 |
|  | KRC\#10 | Merritt Rd. - SR 29 to Big Valley Rd. | Two lane rural raodway | Safety and operational improvements | \$3,119 | \$0 | \$0 | \$3,119 | \$0 |
|  | KRC\#11 | Highland Springs Rd. - SR 29 to Bell Hill Rd. | Two lane rural raodway | Improve to two-lane collector | \$2,652 | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,652 | \$0 |
|  | KRC\#12 | Main St. (Kelseyville) - Bell Hill Rd. to State St. | Two lane rural roadway | Widen to two-lane undivided arterial | \$2,679 | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,679 | \$0 |
|  |  |  |  | Total Cost | \$35,440 | \$0 | \$0 | \$14,833 | \$20,607 |
|  | LP \#1 | Park Way. - SR 29 SB ramps to Lakeshore Blvd. | Two lane roadway | Improve to two-lane collector | \$5,270 | \$0 | \$0 | \$5,270 | \$0 |
|  | LP \#2 | S.Main St. - Lakeport Blvd. to SR 175 | Two lane roadway | Improve to four-lane undivided arterial | \$5,511 | \$0 | \$0 | \$5,511 | \$0 |
|  | LP \#3 | 11 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ St. - SR 29 SB ramps to Main St. | Two lane roadway | Roadway improvements and signalization at some intersections | \$7,353 | \$0 | \$0 | \$7,353 | \$0 |
|  | LP \#4 | High St. - $16^{\text {th }}$ St. to $20^{\text {th }}$ St. | Two lane roadway | Traffic signals at 16th St. and 20th St. | \$560 | \$0 | \$0 | \$560 | \$0 |

Table 12
Year 2030 Transportation Improvements Needs

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 흘 } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \text { N } \end{aligned}$ |  | Facility Description | Existing Conditions | Recommended Improvements | $\begin{gathered} \text { Construction } \\ \text { Cost Estimate } \\ (1000 \text { \$) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Potential Funding Sources |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | State and <br> Federal <br> Funding <br> Programs |  |  |  |
|  | LP \#5 | Lakeshore Blvd. - city limits to Nice Lucerne Cut-off | Two lane roadway | Roadway improvements and signalization at some intersections | \$20,588 | \$0 | \$0 | \$20,588 | \$0 |
|  | LP \#6 | Lakeport Blvd. - SR 29 SB ramps to Main St. | Two lane roadway | Roadway and intersection improvements | \$6,238 | \$0 | \$0 | \$6,238 | \$0 |
|  | LP \#7 | Keeling Ave. - Crystal Lake Way to Park Way | Two lane roadway | Safety and operational improvements | \$455 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$455 |
|  | LP \#8 | Howard Ave. - Crystal Lake Way to south of Rainbow Rd. | Two lane roadway | Safety and operational improvements | \$308 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$308 |
|  | LP \#9 | Rainbow Rd. - Howard Ave. to Lakeshore Blvd. | Two lane roadway | Safety and operational improvements | \$149 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$149 |
|  | LP \#10 | Soda Bay Rd. - SR 175/S.Main St. to Lakeport Planning Area boundary | Two lane roadway | Roadway \& intersection improvements | \$10,285 | \$0 | \$0 | \$10,285 | \$0 |
|  | LP \#11 | Scotts Valley Rd. - Hill Rd./Halberg Rd. to SR 29 SB ramps | Two lane roadway | Widen to two-lane undivided arterial | \$6,304 | \$0 | \$0 | \$6,304 | \$0 |
|  |  |  |  | Total Cost | \$63,021 | \$0 | \$0 | \$62,109 | \$912 |
|  | CL \#1 | Lakeshore Dr. - SR 53/W 40th Ave. to Park St./Manakee St. | Two lane roadway | Roadway improvements incl. parking lot construction | \$9,097 | \$0 | \$0 | \$9,097 | \$0 |
|  | CL \#2 | Old Hwy. 53 - Olympic Dr. to SR 53 | Two lane roadway | Roadway widening and intersection improvements | \$8,465 | \$0 | \$0 | \$8,465 | \$0 |
|  | CL \#3 | Olympic Dr. - Lakeshore Dr. to SR 53 | Two lane roadway | Roadway widening and intersection improvements | \$4,189 | \$0 | \$0 | \$4,189 | \$0 |
|  | CL \#4 | 40th Ave. - SR 53 to Phillips Ave. | Two lane roadway | Widen to two-lane undivided arterial | \$1,300 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,300 | \$0 |
|  | CL \#5 | 18th Ave. - SR 53 to Boyles Ave. | Two lane roadway | Widen to two lane undivided arterial | \$2,658 | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,658 | \$0 |
|  | CL \#6 | Dam Rd. - Lake St. to SR 53 | Two lane roadway | Roadway and intersection improvements | \$1,275 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,275 | \$0 |
|  | CL \#7 | Boyles Ave. - 18th Ave. to 33rd Ave. | Two lane roadway | Improve to 2-lane collector | \$2,047 | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,047 | \$0 |
|  | CL \#8 | Burns Valley Rd - Old Hwy. 53 to Arrowhead Rd. | Two lane roadway | Roadway and intersection improvements | \$3,721 | \$0 | \$0 | \$3,721 | \$0 |
|  | CL \#9 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Arrowhead Rd. - Burns Valley Rd. - Pomo } \\ & \text { Rd. } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Two lane roadway | Improve to 2-lane collector | \$828 | \$0 | \$0 | \$828 | \$0 |
|  | CL \#10 | Pomo Rd. - Arrowhead Rd. - Lakeshore Dr. | Two lane roadway | Improve to 2-lane collector | \$768 | \$0 | \$0 | \$768 | \$0 |
|  |  |  |  | Total Cost | \$34,348 | \$0 | \$0 | \$34,348 | \$0 |

Table 12
Year 2030 Transportation Improvements Needs

|  |  | Facility Description | Existing Conditions | Recommended Improvements | $\qquad$ | Potential Funding Sources |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | State and <br> Federal <br> Funding <br> Programs |  |  | 号会 |
|  | MID\#1 | Spruce Grove Rd. - SR 29 to Jerusalem Grade | Two lane rural roadway | Safety and operational improvements | \$230 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$230 |
|  | MID\#2 | Hartmann Rd. - SR 29 to Stinson Ranch Rd. | Two lane rural roadway | Safety and operational improvements | \$1,343 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,343 | \$0 |
|  | MID\#3 | Stewart St. - SR 175 to Callayomi St. | Two lane rural roadway | Safety and operational improvements | \$101 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$101 |
|  | MID\#4 | Santa Clara Rd. - SR 175 to Central Park Rd. | Two lane rural roadway | Safety and operational improvements | \$326 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$326 |
|  | MID\#5 | Barnes St. - SR 175 to Big Canyon Rd./Wardlaw St. | Two lane rural roadway | Safety and operational improvements | \$102 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$102 |
|  | MID\#6 | Wardlaw St. - Barnes St./Big Canyon Rd. to St. Helena Creek Rd. | Two lane rural roadway | Safety and operational improvements | \$205 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$205 |
|  | MID\#7 | Butts Canyon Rd. - SR 29 to Loconomi Ln. | Two lane rural roadway | Widen to two-lane undivided arterial | \$9,118 | \$0 | \$0 | \$9,118 | \$0 |
|  |  |  |  | Total Cost | \$11,425 | \$0 | \$0 | \$10,461 | \$964 |
|  | ULS \#1 | SR 20 - Nice Lucerne Cut-off to Sulphur Banks Drive | Two lane roadway | Safety and operational improvements | \$19,648 | \$0 | \$0 | \$19,648 | \$0 |
|  |  |  |  | Total Cost | \$19,648 | \$0 | \$0 | \$19,648 | \$0 |
|  | LAK\#1 | SR 29 - Nice Lucerne Cut-off to Lakeport Blvd. | Four-lane freeway | Intersection improvements at ramp intersections | \$2,518 | \$0 | \$0 | \$630 | \$1,888 |
|  | LAK\#2 | SR 29 - SR 175 (Lakeport) to SR 175 (Cobb) | Two lane arterial with some sections having a passing lane | Widen to four-lane expressway and improvements at major intersections including signalization | \$180,765 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$180,765 |
|  | LAK\#3 | SR 29 (SR 175 to Diener Dr.) | Two lane arterial with some sections having a passing lane | Widen to a four-lane expressway | \$200,000 | \$150,000 | \$0 | \$50,000 | \$0 |
|  | LAK\#4 | SR 29 - Diener Dr. to SR 53 | Two lane arterial | Widen to four-lane expressway | \$81,883 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$81,883 |
|  | LAK\#5 | SR 29 - Diener Dr. to SR 53 | Two lane arterial | Safety and operational improvements | \$2,032 | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,032 | \$0 |

Table 12
Year 2030 Transportation Improvements Needs

|  |  | Facility Description | Existing Conditions | Recommended Improvements | Construction Cost Estimate （1000 \＄） | Potential Funding Sources |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | State and <br> Federal <br> Funding <br> Programs |  |  | 辟會 |
| 然 | LAK\＃6 | SR 29 －SR 29／SR 53 to Lake／Napa County line | Two lane arterial | Widen to four－lane expressway | \＄793，899 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄793，899 |
|  | LAK\＃7 | SR 29 －SR 29／SR 53 to Lake／Napa County line | Two lane arterial | Safety and operational improvements | \＄12，477 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄12，477 | \＄0 |
|  | LAK\＃8 | SR 53 －SR 29 （Lowerlake）to SR 20／SR 53 | Two lane arterial wth some sections being | Widen to four－lane expressway | \＄270，545 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄270，545 |
|  | LAK\＃9 | SR 53 －SR 29 （Lowerlake）to SR 20／SR 53 | Two lane arterial wth some sections being | Safety and operational improvements | \＄5，240 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄5，240 | \＄0 |
|  | LAK\＃10 | SR 20 －SR 53 to Lake／Yolo County line | Two lane arterial with some sections having a | Widen to four－lane Expressway | \＄37，345 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄37，345 |
|  | LAK\＃11 | SR 20 －SR 53 to Lake／Yolo County line | Two lane arterial with some sections having a | Safety and operational improvements | \＄8，855 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄8，855 | \＄0 |
|  | LAK\＃12 | SR 20 －SR 29 jct to Lake／Mendocino County line | Two lane arterial with some sections having a | Safety and operational improvements | \＄7，299 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄7，299 | \＄0 |
|  | LAK\＃13 | SR 175 －Lake／Mendocino County line to SR 29 | Two lane roadway | Widen to two－lane Undivided arterial and signalization at some intersections | \＄67，413 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄67，413 |
|  | LAK\＃14 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { SR } 175 \text { - Lake/Mendocino County line to SR } \\ & 29 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Two lane roadway | Safety and operational improvements | \＄4，745 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄4，745 | \＄0 |
|  | LAK\＃15 | SR 175 －Bottle Rock Rd．to SR 29 （Middletown） | Two lane roadway | Widen to two－lane Undivided arterial and signalization at some intersections | \＄48，992 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄48，992 |
|  | LAK\＃16 | SR 175 －Bottle Rock Rd．to SR 29 （Middletown） | Two lane roadway | Safety and operational improvements | \＄3，462 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄3，462 | \＄0 |
|  | LAK\＃17 | Nice Lucerne Cut－off－SR 29 ramps to SR 20 | Two lane roadway | Widen to two lane／four lane undivided arterial | \＄13，830 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄13，830 | \＄0 |
|  | LAK\＃18 | Bottle Rock Rd．－SR 29 to SR 175 | Two lane roadway | Safety and operational improvements | \＄6，494 | \＄0 | \＄0 | \＄6，494 | \＄0 |
|  | LAK\＃19 | SR 20／SR 53 intersection | Two－Way Stop Controlled | Signalization＋intersection improvements | \＄3，000 | \＄2，250 | \＄0 | \＄750 | \＄0 |
|  | LAK\＃20 | SR 20／SR 29 intersection | Two－Way Stop Controlled | Signalization＋intersection improvements | \＄3，000 | \＄2，250 | \＄0 | \＄750 | \＄0 |
|  | Total Cost |  |  |  | \＄1，753，794 \＄154，500 |  | \＄0 | \＄116，564 | \＄1，482，730 |
|  | TOTALS |  |  |  | \＄1，917，676 | \＄154，500 | \＄0 | \＄257，963 | \＄1，505，213 |

## TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE COST METHODOLOGIES

The Countywide Regional Transportation Impact Fee Program study was conducted by the Lake County/City Area Planning Council to facilitate adoption of an AB 1600 fee program. This program will provide partial funding for future transportation improvement needs. These needs are specifically required to support future development anticipated by Year 2030.

## IMPACT FEE METHODOLOGY

Impact fee programs are specifically designed to develop funding sources to ensure adequate infrastructure is constructed concurrent with new development. A development impact fee is a monetary exaction other than a tax or special assessment that is charged by a local governmental agency to an applicant in connection with approval of a development project for the purpose of defraying all or a portion of the cost of public facilities related to the development project. Adopting this program will help to ensure that necessary multi-modal transportation improvements are constructed as new development projects are approved.

This fee program is not intended (and restricted by AB 1600 fee program requirements) to fund improvements required to mitigate (fix) existing problems. All existing transportation system deficiencies were first identified and the costs required to mitigate these conditions removed from the fee program improvement list.

AB 1600 requires that all public agencies satisfy the following requirements when establishing, increasing, or imposing a fee as a condition of approval for a development project:

1. Identify the purpose of the fee.
2. Identify the specific use of the fee.
3. Determine that there is a reasonable relationship between the fees and the type of development on which the fee is being imposed.
4. Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the need for the public facility and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed.
5. Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the amount of the fee and the cost of the public facility or portion of the public facility attributable to the development on which the fee is imposed.

A number of findings must be made to ensure that there is a reasonable relationship or a rough proportionality between the fee imposed and the development on which that fee is imposed. Although the U.S. Supreme Court specifically stated that "no precise mathematical calculation is required...," an analysis should be presented in enough detail to demonstrate that logical, thorough consideration was applied in the process of defining the fee levied on new development. There are several generally accepted methodologies to determine fees for new development. The choice of methodology used depends on the type of facility for which a fee is being calculated. Following is a brief discussion of the methodology used to calculate the new TIMF for Lake County and the Cities of Clear Lake and Lakeport.

## Plan Based Methodology

The plan-based methodology is used for facilities that must be designed based on future demand projections and the geographic location of anticipated growth. The need for road improvements depends specifically on the projected number of trips that must be accommodated from development occurring in a growth area, in this case anywhere within Lake County. The need for roadways and other transportation facilities does not increase proportionately for each residential unit or nonresidential acre developed in an area. Existing facilities, geographic constraints, and current levels of service must be considered to
identify future facility needs. Therefore, to develop a facilities plan for road improvements, a projection for the amount and location of future development is required. The steps to calculate the fee under the plan-based methodology are as follows:

Step 1 Identify the time horizon and the development growth projections within the time horizon.
Step 2 Determine the transportation facilities needed to serve the projected growth.
Step 3 Estimate the gross cost of facilities needed to serve projected growth; the costs of facilities needed to correct existing deficiencies in the transportation system should be excluded from the total cost.
Step 4 Subtract revenues available from alternative funding sources to identify a total net facilities cost.
Step 5 Assign PM peak hour trip rates generated by each land use category; these will be used to determine the benefit received by each development type and also to allocate facilities costs to each development type/land use.
Step 6 Determine the total projected trips that will be generated by future development by multiplying the expected future development by it's respective PM peak hour trip rate.
Step 7 Divide the total net facilities cost by the total projected trips from Step 6 to calculate a cost per trip.
Step 8 Finally, multiply the cost per trip by the trip rate assigned to each land use category in Step 5 to determine the fee for each land use category

## Initial Zone of Benefit Boundary Determination

As noted in the previous chapter, per AB 1600 requirements, a reasonable relationship or a rough proportionality between the fee imposed and the development on which that fee is imposed is required. A Zone of Benefit (ZOB) can be broadly categorized as a geographic area/boundary that would "largely" benefit from the proposed improvements, and therefore would be either entirely or partially responsible for the cost of the improvements.

Impact fee zones of benefit were established based upon the nexus (direct relationship) between anticipated areas of future development and transportation facility needs required to support these development areas. Existing County Planning Area boundaries were used to standardize these development areas. A total of five (5) local zones have been recommended as illustrated in Figure ES-4 (in the Executive Summary). These are outlined below:

- Lakeport Planning Area including City of Lakeport
- Lowerlake Planning Area and the City of Clear Lake
- Middletown Planning Area
- Kelseyville, Rivieras \& Cobb Planning Areas
- Upper Lake/Nice \& Shoreline Communities

In addition to the five localized zones, a sixth regional countywide zone has been recommended. This zone would include a majority of State (Caltrans) facility improvements. Each of the five local zones would also pay a second regional facility fee, represented by this sixth countywide zone. Fees obtained from each zone would be spent on those facility improvements identified within that zone. The separate regional facility fee would be combined from all five local zones and spent on State (Caltrans) facility improvements throughout the County (as identified in the fee program).

Facility improvements within the Upper Lake/Nice/Shoreline Communities fee zone would include the beautification and traffic calming improvements along SR 20. These improvements are considered as local improvements with a direct benefit to future development within this zone. Traffic calming along
this section of roadway will result in lower daily capacities. These reductions would be offset by payment of the regional facility fee that provides additional capacity along the SR 53/SR 29 preferred Principle Arterial Corridor, consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan.

## Fee Calculations

Transportation fee calculations for Lake County and the two Cities were based upon anticipated peak hour traffic generation for future development, as identified in Table 6. This analysis uses the PM peak hour trip generation to calculate the impacts of new development. PM peak hour periods are generally observed to be the busiest period of the day. Therefore, the usage of the PM peak hour trip rates accounts for the heightened level of usage of the transportation facilities.

Transportation impact fees for each Zone of Benefit were calculated by dividing the estimated facility improvement costs by the anticipated traffic volumes associated with new development. Specifically, the fee is based upon total PM peak hour trip generation. Development projects would pay a fee directly related to the anticipated volume of PM peak hour traffic. The higher the traffic, the higher the fee.

The amount of fee that can be justified for each development type is calculated by dividing the total cost of transportation improvements by the equivalent number of dwelling units. The equivalent number of dwelling units is calculated based on the PM peak hour trip generation for the single family-dwelling units. One PM peak hour trip is equivalent to one dwelling unit. The number of equivalent dwelling units for the commercial and industrial land use types is calculated by dividing the PM peak hour trips of each land use type by the single-family dwelling unit PM peak hour trip generation rate (1 trip/DU).

The PM peak hour trip generation rates for the various land uses were calculated based on the PM peak hour trips shown in the trip generation tables for each scenario (provided within the Appendix) and the land use quantities. It is noted that the commercial category trip generation rate was reduced to account for "pass-by" trips. Pass-by trips are those trips that are already assigned to another land-use category and are already present on the current roadway facilities. An example of a pass-by trip would be a stop at a pharmacy on the way to home from work.

The following two tables, Table 13 and Table 14, provide a summary of the local and regional impact fees by zone of benefit. Table 13 contains fee costs separated into the local facility cost and regional facility cost components. Table 14 contains fee costs associated with payment of both the local and regional facility fee.

TABLE 13
TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE COSTS - LOCAL AND REGIONAL ZONE OF BENEFIT TOTALS

| Zone of Benefit | Transportation Improvement Cost <br> Estimates <br> (Exclding State <br> Facilities <br> Improvements) | State Facility Cost Estimates Included In Fee Program | Total <br> Transportation Improvement Cost <br> Estimates | Equivalent Dwelling Units (EDU's) | Transportation Impact Fee Program Cost Per EDU |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lakeport Planning Area | \$62,102,127 | \$0 | \$62,102,127 | 3,088 | \$20,111 |
| City of Clear Lake/Lower Lake Planning Area | \$34,329,075 | \$0 | \$34,329,075 | 6,560 | \$5,233 |
| Middletown Planning Area | \$10,460,640 | \$0 | \$10,460,640 | 1,966 | \$5,321 |
| Kelseyville/Rivieras/Cobb Planning Areas | \$14,831,159 | \$0 | \$14,831,159 | 3,396 | \$4,367 |
| Upper Lake/Nice/Shoreline Communities Planning Areas | \$19,647,775 | \$0 | \$19,647,775 | 2,929 | \$6,708 |
| Countywide Regional Transportation Facilities | \$0 | \$116,712,485 | \$116,712,485 | 17,939 | \$6,506 |
| Totals | \$141,370,776 | \$116,712,485 | \$258,083,261 |  |  |

TABLE 14
TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE COSTS - COMBINED LOCAL/REGIONAL TOTALS

|  | Equivalent Dwelling <br> Units (EDU's) |  | Local Zone of <br> Benefit Cost Per <br> EDU | Regional Zone of <br> Benefit Cost per <br> EDU | Combined <br> Local/Regional <br> Cost Per EDU |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Zone of Benefit | 3,088 | $17.2 \%$ | $\$ 20,111$ | $\$ 6,506$ | $\$ 26,617$ |
| Lakeport Planning Area | 6,560 | $36.6 \%$ | $\$ 5,233$ | $\$ 6,506$ | $\$ 11,739$ |
| City of Clear Lake/Lower Lake Planning Area | 1,966 | $11.0 \%$ | $\$ 5,321$ | $\$ 6,506$ | $\$ 11,827$ |
| Middletown Planning Area | 3,396 | $18.9 \%$ | $\$ 4,367$ | $\$ 6,506$ | $\$ 10,873$ |
| Kelseyville/Rivieras/Cobb Planning Areas | 2,929 | $16.3 \%$ | $\$ 6,708$ | $\$ 6,506$ | $\$ 13,214$ |
| Upper Lake/Nice/Shoreline Communities Planning Are |  |  |  |  |  |

A table has been included in the Appendix, which details the EDU equivalents for different types of land uses. Calculation of EDU's per project within this study should be consistent with this table.

## ADJACENT AGENCY COMPARATIVE FEE ANALYSIS

## Typical Fees Levied by Lake County And Cities

The transportation impact fees computed in Table 14 would be additive to the existing building permit fees. Table 15 provides a summary of typical residential development fees for Lake County and the two cities of Clear Lake and Lakeport.

TABLE 15
LAKE COUNTY/CITY FEE SUMMARY
(BASED ON TYPICAL SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE)

| Fee Type | Lake County | City of Lakeport | City of Clearlake |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Building Permit | $\$ 2,200$ | $\$ 3,200$ | $\$ 1,500$ |
| Plan Check Fee | $\$ 60$ | - | $\$ 1,000$ |
| Water | $\$ 4,500$ | $\$ 4,600$ | $\$ 4,000$ |
| Sewer | $\$ 5,500$ | $\$ 7,500$ | $\$ 4,300$ |
| Fire | $\$ 2,000$ | $\$ 2,500$ | $\$ 1,100$ |
| School | $\$ 5,260$ | $\$ 4,500$ | $\$ 5,260$ |
| Construction Traffic Road Fee | $\$ 1,000$ | - | - |
| Total Existing Fees | $\$ 20,520$ | $\$ 22,300$ | $\$ 17,160$ |
| Note: These fees are estimated fees ONLY, and are based upon a typical 2,000 square foot <br> dwelling unit. Actual fees will differ. |  |  |  |

TABLE 16
LAKE COUNTY/CITY FEE SUMMARY - INCLUDING NEW TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE (TIF) (BASED ON TYPICAL SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE)

| Locations within Lake County | Existing Fees |  | Proposed New <br> TIF |  | Total Fees Including <br> New TIF |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lakeport Planning Area | $\$ 20,520$ | $\$ 24,119$ | $\$ 44,639$ |  |  |
| City of Lakeport | $\$ 22,300$ | $\$ 24,119$ | $\$ 46,419$ |  |  |
| City of Clear Lake | $\$ 17,160$ | $\$ 11,739$ | $\$ 28,899$ |  |  |
| Lower Lake Planning Area | $\$ 20,520$ | $\$ 11,739$ | $\$ 32,259$ |  |  |
| Middletown Planning Area | $\$ 20,520$ | $\$ 11,827$ | $\$ 32,347$ |  |  |
| Kelseyville Planning Area | $\$ 20,520$ | $\$ 10,873$ | $\$ 31,393$ |  |  |
| Riveras Planning Area | $\$ 20,520$ | $\$ 10,873$ | $\$ 31,393$ |  |  |
| Cobb Planning Area | $\$ 20,520$ | $\$ 10,873$ | $\$ 31,393$ |  |  |
| Upper Lake/Nice Planning Area | $\$ 20,520$ | $\$ 13,214$ | $\$ 33,734$ |  |  |
| Shoreline Communities Planning Area | $\$ 20,520$ | $\$ 13,214$ | $\$ 33,734$ |  |  |

Note: These fees are estimated fees ONLY, and are based upon a typical 2,000 square foot dwelling unit. Actual fees will differ.

## Comparison With Surrounding Agency Fees

Other agencies throughout California have adopted transportation impact fees to fund future facility needs. Table 17 provides a summary of fees from agencies in the vicinity of Lake County that currently have adopted this type of fee program.

TABLE 17
ADJACENT AGENCY FEES - TYPICAL SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE
(BASED ON TYPICAL SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE)

|  | Sonoma County <br> (Private <br> Fee Type |  | Sonoma County <br> (Public |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) | $\mathbf{\$ 8 , 9 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 8 , 9 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 4 , 0 4 0}$ |  |
| Building Permit | $\$ 4,107$ | $\$ 4,107$ | $\$ 4,500$ |  |
| Plan Check Fee | $\$ 2,528$ | $\$ 2,528$ | $\$ 1,430$ |  |
| Park Fee | $\$ 2,830$ | $\$ 2,830$ | $\$ 6,500$ |  |
| Water/Well | $\$ 600$ | $\$ 7,000$ | $\$ 3,970$ |  |
| Sewer/Septic | $\$ 2,756$ | $\$ 6,060$ | $\$ 6,360$ |  |
| Fire | $\$ 800$ | $\$ 800$ | $\$ 1,070$ |  |
| School | $\$ 4,770$ | $\$ 4,770$ | $\$ 3,860$ |  |
| Total | $\$ 27, \mathbf{3 0 5}$ | $\$ 37,009$ | $\$ \mathbf{3 1 , 7 3 0}$ |  |

Note: These fees are estimated fees ONLY, and are based upon a typical 2,000 square foot dwelling unit. Actual fees will differ.

## APPENDIX

## EDU Equivalents <br> Intersection LOS Worksheets Planning Level Cost Estimates

Appendix Table 1

| Land Use ${ }^{(1)}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { ITE } \\ \text { Code } \end{gathered}$ | Descriptor | PM Peak Hour Trip Rate | $\begin{gathered} \text { Pass-by } \\ \text { Reduction }{ }^{(2)} \end{gathered}$ | EDUs <br> (per descriptor unit) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AIRPORT |  |  |  |  |  |
| Commercial | 21 | Flight | 5.75 | 0\% | 5.69 |
| COMMERCIAL-RETAIL |  |  |  |  |  |
| Automobile Services: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Car Dealer | 841 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq} . \mathrm{Ft}$. | 2.64 | 10\% ${ }^{(1)}$ | 2.35 |
| Car Wash (Self Service) | 947 | Wash Stall | 5.54 | 50\% ${ }^{(5)}$ | 2.74 |
| Gasoline Station (with food mart) | 945 | Fueling Station | 13.38 | 56\% | 5.83 |
| Gasoline Station (with food mart \& fully automated car wash) | 946 | Fueling Station | 13.33 | 80\% ${ }^{(3)}$ | 2.64 |
| Parts Sale | 843 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq}$. Ft. | 5.98 | 43\% | 3.37 |
| Repair Shop | 943 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq}$. Ft. | 3.38 | $10 \%{ }^{(0)}$ | 3.01 |
| Tire Store | 848 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq}$. Ft. | 4.15 | 28\% | 2.96 |
| Convenience Market Chain: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Open up to 16 Hours per day | 852 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq}$. Ft. | 34.57 | 50\% ${ }^{(0)}$ | 17.11 |
| Open 24 hours | 851 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq}. \mathrm{Ft}$. | 52.41 | 61\% | 20.24 |
| Discount Store/Discount Club | 861 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq}$. Ft. | 4.24 | 17\% | 3.48 |
| Drugstore: |  |  |  |  |  |
| With drive-through window | 881 | 1,000 Sq. Ft. | 8.62 | 53\% | 4.01 |
| Without drive-through window | 880 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq}. \mathrm{Ft}$. | 8.42 | 49\% | 4.25 |
| Furniture Store | 890 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq}$. . Ft. | 0.46 | 53\% | 0.21 |
| Lomber/Home Improvement Store | 812 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq} . \mathrm{Ft}$. | 4.49 | $10 \%{ }^{(3)}$ | 4.00 |
| Nursery | 817 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq}$. Ft. | 3.80 | 10\% ${ }^{(0)}$ | 3.39 |
| Restaurant: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Quality | 931 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq}$. Ft. | 7.49 | 44\% | 4.15 |
| High Turnover (sit-down) | 932 | 1,000 Sq. Ft. | 10.92 | 43\% | 6.16 |
| Fast Food: |  |  |  |  |  |
| With drive-through window | 934 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq}$. Ft. | 34.64 | 50\% | 17.15 |
| Without drive-through window | 933 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq}$. Ft. | 26.15 | 40\% ${ }^{(3)}$ | 15.53 |
| Shopping Center: |  |  |  |  | 0.00 |
| Shopping Center ( $0-30,000$ Sq. Ft.) | 820 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq}$. Ft. | 13.70 | 66\% | 4.61 |
| Shopping Center ( $30,001-60,000$ Sq. Ft.) | 820 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq}$. Ft. | 7.97 | 51\% | 3.87 |
| Shopping Center (60,001-100,000 Sq. Ft.) | 820 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq}$. Ft. | 6.77 | 45\% | 3.69 |
| Shopping Center ( $100,001-200,000 \mathrm{Sq}$. Ft) | 820 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq}$. Ft. | 5.51 | 41\% | 3.22 |
| Shopping Center (200, 001-300,000 Sq. Ft) | 820 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq}$. Ft. | 4.57 | 33\% | 3.03 |
| Shopping Center ( $3000,001-500,000 \mathrm{Sq} . \mathrm{Ft}$ ) | 820 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq}$. Ft. | 3.91 | 27\% | 2.83 |
| Specialty Retail Center/Strip Commercial | 814 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq}$. Ft. | 2.71 | 10\% | 2.41 |
| Supermarket | 850 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq}$. Ft. | 10.45 | 36\% | 6.62 |
| EdUCATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| University (4 years or higher) | 550 | Students | 0.21 | 0\% | 0.21 |
| Community College ( 2 years) | 540 | Students | 0.12 | 0\% | 0.12 |
| Hight School | 530 | Students | 0.14 | 0\% | 0.14 |
| Junior High/Middle School | 522 | Students | 0.15 | 0\% | 0.15 |
| Elementary School | 520 | Students | 0.42 | 0\% | 0.42 |
| Day Care Center | 565 | Students | 0.82 | 0\% | 0.81 |
| FINANCIAL INSTITUTION (Bank or Credit Union) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Excluding Drive-through | 911 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq}$. Ft. | 33.15 | $25 \%{ }^{\text {(J) }}$ | 24.62 |
| With drive-through | 912 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq}$. Ft. | 45.74 | 47\% | 24.00 |
| HOSPITAL |  |  |  |  |  |
| Convalescent/nursing | 620 | Bed | 0.22 | 0\% | 0.22 |
| General | 610 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq} . \mathrm{Ft}$. | 1.18 | 0\% | 1.17 |
| HOUSE OF WORSHIP |  |  |  |  |  |
| Church | 560 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq} . \mathrm{Ft}$. | 0.66 | 0\% | 0.65 |
| Synaggogue | 561 | 1,000 Sq. Ft. | 1.69 | 0\% | 1.67 |
| Industrial |  |  |  |  |  |
| Light Industrial (Industrial Park w/o Commercial) | 110 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq} . \mathrm{Ft}$. | 0.98 | 0\% | 0.97 |
| General Heavy Industrial | 120 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq}$. Ft. | 0.68 | 0\% | 0.67 |
| Industrial/Business Park | 130 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq}$. Ft. | 0.86 | 0\% | 0.85 |
| Manufacturing/Assembly | 140 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq}$. Ft. | 0.74 | 0\% | 0.73 |
| Rental Storage | 151 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq}$. Ft. | 0.26 | 0\% | 0.26 |
| Scientific Research Development | 760 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq} . \mathrm{Ft}$. | 1.08 | 0\% | 1.07 |
| Truck Terminal | 30 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq}. \mathrm{Ft}$. | 0.82 | 0\% | 0.81 |
| Warehousing | 150 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq}$. Ft. | 0.47 | 0\% | 0.47 |
| LIBRARY | 590 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq}$. Ft. | 7.09 | 0\% | 7.02 |
| LODGING |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hotel (w/convention facilities/restaurant) | 310 | Room | 0.59 | 0\% | 0.58 |
| Motel | 320 | Room | 0.47 | 0\% | 0.47 |
| Resort Hotel | 330 | Room | 0.42 | 0\% | 0.42 |
| OFFICE |  |  |  |  |  |
| General Office ( $0-30,000$ Sq.Ft.) | 710 | 1,000 Sq. Ft. | 4.36 | 0\% | 4.32 |
| General Office ( $30,000-55,000 \mathrm{Sq}$ S.Ft.) | 710 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq} . \mathrm{Ft}$. | 2.92 | 0\% | 2.89 |
| General Office ( $55,000-100,000 \mathrm{Sq} . \mathrm{Ft}$. ) | 710 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq}. \mathrm{Ft}$. | 2.13 | 0\% | 2.11 |
| General Office (100,000-300,000 Sq.Ft.) | 710 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq}$. Ft. | 1.54 | 0\% | 1.52 |
| General Office ( $>3000000$ Sq.F.t.) | 710 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq}$. Ft. | 1.27 | 0\% | 1.26 |
| Corporate Headquarter/Single Tenant Office | 714 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq}$. Ft. | 1.40 | 0\% | 1.39 |
| Department of Motor Vehicles | 731 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq}$. Ft. | 17.09 | 0\% | 16.92 |
| Government Offcie | 730 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq}$. Ft. | 1.21 | 0\% | 1.20 |
| Medical Office | 720 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq}$. Ft. | 3.72 | 0\% | 3.68 |
| Post Office | 732 | $1,000 \mathrm{Sq}$. Ft. | 10.89 | $16 \%{ }^{(0)}$ | 9.06 |
| RECREATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bowling Center | 437 | Lane | 3.54 | 0\% | 3.50 |
| Golf Course | 430 | Hole | 2.74 | 0\% | 2.71 |
| Marina | 420 | Berth | 0.19 | 0\% | 0.19 |
| Movie Theater |  |  |  |  |  |
| With Matinee on a Friday | 444 | Movie Screen | 45.91 | 0\% | 45.46 |
| With Matinee on a Weekday | 444 | Movie Screen | 20.22 | 0\% | 20.02 |
| Park: |  |  |  |  |  |
| City | 411 | Acre | 1.59 | 0\% | 1.57 |
| County | 412 | Acre | 0.06 | 0\% | 0.06 |
| State | 413 | Acre | 0.65 | 0\% | 0.64 |
| Developed ${ }^{\text {(J) }}$ | N/A | Acre | $4.00{ }^{\text {(0) }}$ | 0\% | $4.00{ }^{(0)}$ |
| Undeveloped ${ }^{\text {(3) }}$ | N/A | Acre | $0.40{ }^{(3)}$ | 0\% | $0.40{ }^{(3)}$ |
| Racquetball/Tennis/Health Club | 491 | 1,000 Sq. Ft. | 1.06 | 0\% | 1.06 |
| RESIDENTIAL |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single Family Detached | 210 | Dwelling Units | 1.01 | 0\% | 1.00 |
| Congragate Care Facility | 253 | Dwelling Units | 0.17 | 0\% | 0.17 |
| Apartments | 220 | Dwelling Units | 0.62 | 0\% | 0.61 |
| ResidentialCondominium/Townhouse | 230 | Dwelling Units | 0.52 | 0\% | 0.51 |
| Rental Townhouse | 224 | Dwelling Units | 0.72 | 0\% | 0.71 |
| Mobile Home | 240 | Scupied Dwelling | 0.59 | 0\% | 0.58 |

Notes:
(1) Trip rate derived from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), Trip Generation, 7th Edition, Washington, District of Columbia, 2003, unless otherwise noted. (2) Pass-by reduction derived from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), "Trip Generation Handbook," Washington, District of Columbia, 2001, unless otherwise noted (3) Land use, trip rate or pass-by reduction referenced from (SANDAG) - San Diego Municipal Code. 2003. Land Development Code, Trip Generation Manual. May.

## Intersection LOS Worksheets

|  | $\rightarrow$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  | 4 | $p$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | $\stackrel{ }{ }$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | \% |  |  |
| Sign Control | Free |  |  | Free | Stop |  |  |
| Grade | 0\% |  |  | 0\% | 0\% |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 690 | 83 | 10 | 259 | 36 | 12 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 750 | 90 | 11 | 282 | 39 | 13 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (ft/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  |  |  | None |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VC , conflicting volume |  |  | 840 |  | 1098 | 795 |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol |  |  | 840 |  | 1098 | 795 |  |
| tC , single (s) |  |  | 4.1 |  | 6.4 | 6.2 |  |
| $\mathrm{tc}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) |  |  | 2.2 |  | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |
| p0 queue free \% |  |  | 99 |  | 83 | 97 |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) |  |  | 795 |  | 232 | 387 |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 840 | 292 | 52 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 0 | 11 | 39 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 90 | 0 | 13 |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 1700 | 795 | 258 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.49 | 0.01 | 0.20 |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 0 | 1 | 18 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.5 | 22.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS |  | A | C |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.5 | 22.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 1.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 51.4\% |  | ICU Leve | of Service | A |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |
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| 3: SR 20 \& Pyle Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ |  |  |  | $\downarrow$ |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | 7 | $\uparrow$ | F' | $\dagger$ | F |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | ¢ |  |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 4 | 372 | 64 | 187 | 417 | 4 | 88 | 1 | 326 | 2 | 5 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 4 | 404 | 70 | 203 | 453 | 4 | 96 | 1 | 354 | 2 | 5 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (fts) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | None |  |  | None |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX , platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 458 |  |  | 474 |  |  | 1279 | 1277 | 404 | 1630 | 1345 | 455 |
| vC1, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 458 |  |  | 474 |  |  | 1279 | 1277 | 404 | 1630 | 1345 | 455 |
| tC, single (s) | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| p0 queue free \% | 100 |  |  | 81 |  |  | 19 | 99 | 45 | 93 | 96 | 99 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 1103 |  |  | 1088 |  |  | 117 | 135 | 646 | 31 | 123 | 605 |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | EB 2 | EB 3 | WB 1 | WB 2 | NB 1 | NB 2 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 4 | 404 | 70 | 203 | 458 | 97 | 354 | 11 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 4 | 0 | 0 | 203 | 0 | 96 | 0 | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 354 | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 1103 | 1700 | 1700 | 1088 | 1700 | 118 | 646 | 91 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.00 | 0.24 | 0.04 | 0.19 | 0.27 | 0.82 | 0.55 | 0.12 |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 122 | 83 | 10 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 8.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.1 | 0.0 | 109.4 | 17.1 | 49.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | A |  |  | A |  | F | C | E |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.1 |  |  | 2.8 |  | 36.9 |  | 49.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  | E |  | E |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 11.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 53.1\% |  | CU Lev | of Se | vice |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Lake County
4: SR 20 \& Lakeshore Blvd.


## Baseline
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| Lake County <br> 5: Country Club Dr \& SR 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Ex PM Peak PM Peak Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 7 |  | $\uparrow$ | $p$ | $\checkmark$ | $\dagger$ |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |  |  |
| Lane Configurations | Y |  | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  |
| Grade | 0\% |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 12 | 34 | 391 | 24 | 19 | 360 |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 13 | 37 | 425 | 26 | 21 | 391 |  |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (ft/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type | None |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 871 | 438 |  |  | 451 |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 871 | 438 |  |  | 451 |  |  |  |
| tC, single (s) | 6.4 | 6.2 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 96 | 94 |  |  | 98 |  |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 316 | 619 |  |  | 1109 |  |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# WB 1 NB 1 SB 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 50 | 451 | 412 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 13 | 0 | 21 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 37 | 26 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 495 | 1700 | 1109 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.10 | 0.27 | 0.02 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 8 | 0 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 13.1 | 0.0 | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | B |  | A |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 13.1 | 0.0 | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 1.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 44.4\% |  | ICU Leve | of Service | A |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |
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| :--- | ---: |
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| Lake County <br> 6: Foothill Dr. \& SR 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Ex PM Peak PM Peak Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\downarrow$ |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |  |  |
| Lane Configurations | Y |  | $\dagger$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  |
| Grade | 0\% |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 19 | 23 | 429 | 9 | 30 | 536 |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 21 | 25 | 466 | 10 | 33 | 583 |  |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width ( t ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (ft/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type | None |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 1119 | 471 |  |  | 476 |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 1119 | 471 |  |  | 476 |  |  |  |
| tC , single (s) | 6.4 | 6.2 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 91 | 96 |  |  | 97 |  |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 222 | 593 |  |  | 1086 |  |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# WB 1 NB 1 SB 1 SB 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 46 | 476 | 33 | 583 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 21 | 0 | 33 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 25 | 10 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 338 | 1700 | 1086 | 1700 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.14 | 0.28 | 0.03 | 0.34 |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 12 | 0 | 2 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 17.3 | 0.0 | 8.4 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | C |  | A |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 17.3 | 0.0 | 0.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 0.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 38.2\% |  | ICU Level | of Service | A |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |


| Baseline | Synchro 6 Report |
| :--- | ---: |
| Omni-Means | Page 6 |

Synchro 6 Repor
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| Lake County <br> 7: SR 20 \& SR 53 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Ex PM Peak <br> PM Peak Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\rightarrow$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  | 4 | $p$ |  |  |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |  |  |
| Lane Configurations | ¢ $\uparrow$ | F' | \% | $\uparrow$ | M |  |  |  |
| Sign Control | Free |  |  | Free | Stop |  |  |  |
| Grade | 0\% |  |  | 0\% | 0\% |  |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 60 | 128 | 80 | 117 | 342 | 73 |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 65 | 139 | 87 | 127 | 372 | 79 |  |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (tt/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  |  |  | Raised |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume |  |  | 204 |  | 366 | 33 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  | 65 |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  | 301 |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol |  |  | 204 |  | 366 | 33 |  |  |
| tC , single (s) |  |  | 4.1 |  | 6.8 | 6.9 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  | 5.8 |  |  |  |
| tF (s) |  |  | 2.2 |  | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% |  |  | 94 |  | 38 | 92 |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) |  |  | 1364 |  | 597 | 1034 |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | EB 2 | EB 3 | WB 1 | WB 2 | NB 1 |  |  |
| Volume Total | 33 | 33 | 139 | 87 | 127 | 451 |  |  |
| Volume Left | 0 | 0 | 0 | 87 | 0 | 372 |  |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 0 | 139 | 0 | 0 | 79 |  |  |
| cSH | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 | 1364 | 1700 | 644 |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.08 | 0.06 | 0.07 | 0.70 |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 142 |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.8 | 0.0 | 22.6 |  |  |
| Lane LOS |  |  |  | A |  | C |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.0 |  |  | 3.2 |  | 22.6 |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  | C |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 12.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Ut | lization |  | 41.2\% |  | CU Leve | of Service | A |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |


| Baseline | Synchro 6 Report |
| :--- | ---: |
| Omni-Means | Page 7 |



| Baseline | Synchro 6 Report |
| :--- | ---: |
| Omni-Means | Page 8 |
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| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 「 | \％ | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  |  | Free | Free |  |  |
| Grade | 0\％ |  |  | 0\％ | 0\％ |  |  |
| Volume（veh／h） | 80 | 130 | 260 | 288 | 377 | 109 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |
| Hourly flow rate（vph） | 87 | 141 | 283 | 313 | 410 | 118 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width（ft） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed（tt／s） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare（veh） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type | None |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal（ft） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX，platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VC ，conflicting volume | 1288 | 410 | 528 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$ ，stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$ ，stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 1288 | 410 | 528 |  |  |  |  |
| tC ，single（s） | 6.4 | 6.2 | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage（s） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF（s） | 3.5 | 3.3 | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |
| p0 queue free \％ | 34 | 78 | 73 |  |  |  |  |
| cM capacity（veh／h） | 132 | 642 | 1039 |  |  |  |  |
| Direction，Lane \＃ | EB 1 | EB 2 | NB 1 | NB 2 | SB 1 | SB 2 |  |
| Volume Total | 87 | 141 | 283 | 313 | 410 | 118 |  |
| Volume Left | 87 | 0 | 283 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 141 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 118 |  |
| cSH | 132 | 642 | 1039 | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.66 | 0.22 | 0.27 | 0.18 | 0.24 | 0.07 |  |
| Queue Length 95th（tt） | 89 | 21 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Control Delay（s） | 74.1 | 12.2 | 9.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Lane LOS | F | B | A |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay（s） | 35.8 |  | 4.6 |  | 0.0 |  |  |
| Approach LOS | E |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 8.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 48．7\％ |  | CU Leve | of Service | A |
| Analysis Period（min） |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |

Lake County

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | \％＊ | $\hat{}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ | F＇ | ${ }^{4}$ | 个t |  | ${ }_{1}$ | 个个 |  |
| Ideal Flow（vphpl） | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time（s） | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Lane Util．Factor | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 |  | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| Frt | 1.00 | 0.89 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 1.00 | 0.98 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.8 |
| Flt Protected | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 3433 | 1660 |  | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 | 1770 | 3468 |  | 1770 | 3539 | 158 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 3433 | 1660 |  | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 | 1770 | 3468 |  | 1770 | 3539 | 158 |
| Volume（vph） | 481 | 44 | 118 | 32 | 43 | 96 | 96 | 383 | 59 | 107 | 400 | 414 |
| Peak－hour factor，PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Adj．Flow（vph） | 523 | 48 | 128 | 35 | 47 | 104 | 104 | 416 | 64 | 116 | 435 | 450 |
| RTOR Reduction（vph） | 0 | 84 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | － | 324 |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 523 | 92 | 0 | 35 | 47 | 19 | 104 | 468 | 0 | 116 | 435 | 126 |
| Turn Type | Prot |  |  | Prot |  | Perm | Prot |  |  | Prot |  | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Green，G（s） | 24.0 | 34.0 |  | 8.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 | 14.0 | 27.0 |  | 15.0 | 28.0 | 28 |
| Effective Green，g（s） | 24.0 | 34.0 |  | 8.0 | 18.0 | 18.0 | 14.0 | 27.0 |  | 15.0 | 28.0 | 28 |
| Actuated g／C Ratio | 0.24 | 0.34 |  | 0.08 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.14 | 0.27 |  | 0.15 | 0.28 | 0.28 |
| Clearance Time（s） | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Lane Grp Cap（vph） | 824 | 564 |  | 142 | 335 | 285 | 248 | 936 |  | 266 | 991 | 443 |
| v／s Ratio Prot | c0．15 | 0.11 |  | 0.02 | 0.03 |  | 0.06 | 0.14 |  | c0．07 | 0.12 |  |
| v／s Ratio Perm |  |  |  |  |  | 0.07 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.28 |
| v／c Ratio | 0.63 | 0.16 |  | 0.25 | 0.14 | 0.07 | 0.42 | 0.50 |  | 0.44 | 0.44 | 0.2 |
| Uniform Delay，d1 | 34.1 | 23.1 |  | 43.2 | 34.5 | 34.0 | 39.3 | 30.8 |  | 38.7 | 29.6 | 28 |
| Progression Factor | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Incremental Delay，d2 | 3.7 | 0.6 |  | 4.1 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 5.1 | 1.9 |  | 5.1 | 1.4 | 1.6 |
| Delay（s） | 37.8 | 23.7 |  | 47.3 | 35.4 | 34.5 | 44.4 | 32.7 |  | 43.8 | 31.0 | 29 |
| Level of Service | D | C |  | D | D | C | D | C |  | D | C |  |
| Approach Delay（s） |  | 34.2 |  |  | 37.1 |  |  | 34.8 |  |  | 31.9 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |

> Approach LOS

| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| HCM Average Control Delay | 33.6 | HCM Level of Service | C |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio | 0.65 | Sum of lost time（s） | 12.0 |
| Actuated Cycle Lenth（s） | 10.0 | ICU Level of Service | A |

Intersection Capacity Utilization $48.8 \% \quad$ ICU Level of Service
Analysis Period（min）
c Critical Lane Group

## Baseline

Omni－Means

11: SR 29 \& Seigler Canyon Road


Lake County

| 12: SR 29 \& Point Lakeview Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM Peak Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\rangle$ |  | $\leftarrow$ | 4 |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |  |  |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\uparrow$ | 中 |  | M |  |  |  |
| Sign Control |  | Free | Free |  | Stop |  |  |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% |  |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 1 | 400 | 380 | 37 | 36 | 8 |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 1 | 435 | 413 | 40 | 39 | 9 |  |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (fts) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  |  |  | None |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 453 |  |  |  | 870 | 227 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 453 |  |  |  | 870 | 227 |  |  |
| tC, single (s) | 4.1 |  |  |  | 6.8 | 6.9 |  |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 100 |  |  |  | 87 | 99 |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 1104 |  |  |  | 290 | 776 |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# EB 1 EB 2 WB 1 WB 2 SB 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 1 | 435 | 275 | 178 | 48 |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 9 |  |  |  |
| cSH | 1104 | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 | 328 |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.00 | 0.26 | 0.16 | 0.10 | 0.15 |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 8.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 17.9 |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | A |  |  |  | C |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 17.9 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  | C |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 0.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 31.1\% |  | ICU Leve | of Service | A |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |

## Baseline <br> Baseline Omni-Means

Synchro 6 Report
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| Lake County <br>  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Ex PM Peak PM Peak Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\checkmark$ |  | $\uparrow$ | $p$ |  | $\dagger$ |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |  |  |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 7 | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | ${ }_{7}$ | $\uparrow$ |  |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  |
| Grade | 0\% |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 50 | 54 | 669 | 32 | 20 | 410 |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 54 | 59 | 727 | 35 | 22 | 446 |  |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (tt/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type | None |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VC , conflicting volume | 1234 | 745 |  |  | 762 |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 1234 | 745 |  |  | 762 |  |  |  |
| tC, single (s) | 6.4 | 6.2 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 71 | 86 |  |  | 97 |  |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 190 | 414 |  |  | 850 |  |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# WB 1 WB 2 NB 1 SB 1 SB 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 54 | 59 | 762 | 22 | 446 |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 54 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 59 | 35 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| cSH | 190 | 414 | 1700 | 850 | 1700 |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.29 | 0.14 | 0.45 | 0.03 | 0.26 |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 28 | 12 | 0 | 2 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 31.3 | 15.1 | 0.0 | 9.3 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | D | C |  | A |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 22.9 |  | 0.0 | 0.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 2.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 47.2\% |  | CU Leve | of Service | A |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |

Baseline
Baseline
Omni-Means
Synchro 6 Report
Page 13

Lake County
Ex PM Peak
14: SR 175 \&


## Baseline

Omni-Means
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## Lake County

15: Dry Creek Cutoff \&

| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | M |  |  | $\uparrow$ | A |  |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  |  | Free | Free |  |  |
| Grade | 0\% |  |  | 0\% | 0\% |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 27 | 6 | 17 | 602 | 390 | 31 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 29 | 7 | 18 | 654 | 424 | 34 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (tt/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type | None |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC, conflicting volume | 1132 | 441 | 458 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 1132 | 441 | 458 |  |  |  |  |
| tC , single (s) | 6.4 | 6.2 | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 87 | 99 | 98 |  |  |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 221 | 616 | 1103 |  |  |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 36 | 673 | 458 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 29 | 18 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 7 | 0 | 34 |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 250 | 1103 | 1700 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.14 | 0.02 | 0.27 |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 12 | 1 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 21.8 | 0.4 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | C | A |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 21.8 | 0.4 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 0.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 55.4\% |  | CU Leve | of Service | B |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |

Lake County
Ex PM Peak
16: SR 29 \& SR 281 (Soda Bay Road) PM Peak Hour
 $\begin{array}{llllllllllllll} & 27\end{array}$ Pedestrians
Walking Speed (ft/s)
Percent Blockage
Right turn flare (veh)

| Median type None None <br> Median storage veh)  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX , platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VC, conflicting volume | 359 | 304 | 1089 | 1105 | 296 | 998 | 974 | 220 |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 359 | 304 | 1089 | 1105 | 296 | 998 | 974 | 220 |
| tC, single (s) | 4.1 | 4.1 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6 |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 2.2 | 2.2 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3. |
| p0 queue free \% | 82 | 100 | 98 | 84 | 96 | 54 | 88 | 86 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 1200 | 1256 | 131 | 171 | 743 | 162 | 205 |  |


| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | EB 2 | WB 1 | WB 2 | WB 3 | NB 1 | SB 1 | SB 2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume Total | 222 | 304 | 3 | 220 | 139 | 58 | 98 | 111 |  |
| Volume Left | 222 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 74 | 0 |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 139 | 27 | 0 | 111 |  |
| cSH | 1200 | 1700 | 1256 | 1700 | 1700 | 262 | 171 | 820 |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.00 | 0.13 | 0.08 | 0.22 | 0.57 | 0.14 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 76 | 12 |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 8.7 | 0.0 | 7.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 22.6 | 51.2 | 10.1 |  |
| Lane LOS | A |  | A |  |  | C | F | B |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 3.7 |  | 0.1 |  |  | 22.6 | 29.3 |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  | C | D |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 8.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 43.5\% |  |  |  |  | A |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  | ICU Level of Service |  |  |  |  |


| Baseline | Synchro 6 Report |
| :--- | ---: |
| Omni-Means | Page 16 |

Synchro 6 Report

## Lake County

17: Point Lakeview Road \& SR 281 (Soda Bay Road)


| Lake County <br> 18: Main ST \& SR 29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Ex PM Peak PM Peak Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\downarrow$ |  | $\uparrow$ | $p$ | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |  |  |
| Lane Configurations | Y |  | $\uparrow$ | 7 | $\dagger$ | $\uparrow$ |  |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  |
| Grade | 0\% |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 117 | 38 | 275 | 137 | 74 | 577 |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 127 | 41 | 299 | 149 | 80 | 627 |  |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (ft/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type | None |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 1087 | 299 |  |  | 448 |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 1087 | 299 |  |  | 448 |  |  |  |
| tC , single (s) | 6.4 | 6.2 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 43 | 94 |  |  | 93 |  |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 222 | 741 |  |  | 1112 |  |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | WB 1 | NB 1 | NB 2 | SB 1 | SB 2 |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 168 | 299 | 149 | 80 | 627 |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 127 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 41 | 0 | 149 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| cSH | 268 | 1700 | 1700 | 1112 | 1700 |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.63 | 0.18 | 0.09 | 0.07 | 0.37 |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 97 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 38.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.5 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | E |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 38.8 | 0.0 |  | 1.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 5.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 45.8\% |  | ICU Leve | of Service | A |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |


| Baseline | Synchro 6 Report |
| :--- | ---: |
| Omni-Means | Page 18 |

Synchro 6 Report
Page 18

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | 个t |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 个 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |
| Grade |  | 0\％ |  |  | 0\％ |  |  | 0\％ |  |  | 0\％ |  |
| Volume（veh／h） | 3 | 9 | 8 | 18 | 10 | 113 | 4 | 288 | 6 | 119 | 722 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate（vph） | 3 | 10 | 9 | 20 | 11 | 123 | 4 | 313 | 7 | 129 | 785 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width（ft） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed（ft／s） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare（veh） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  | None |  |  | None |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal（ft） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX ，platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC ，conflicting volume | 1339 | 1374 | 395 | 990 | 1373 | 160 | 789 |  |  | 320 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$ ，stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$ ，stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu ，unblocked vol | 1339 | 1374 | 395 | 990 | 1373 | 160 | 789 |  |  | 320 |  |  |
| tC，single（s） | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| tC， 2 stage（s） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF（s） | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| p0 queue free \％ | 96 | 92 | 99 | 89 | 92 | 86 | 99 |  |  | 90 |  |  |
| cM capacity（veh／h） | 82 | 129 | 605 | 171 | 129 | 857 | 826 |  |  | 1237 |  |  |
| Direction，Lane \＃ | EB 1 | WB 1 | WB 2 | NB 1 | NB 2 | NB 3 | SB 1 | SB 2 | SB 3 |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 22 | 30 | 123 | 4 | 209 | 111 | 129 | 523 | 266 |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 3 | 20 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 129 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 9 | 0 | 123 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 4 |  |  |  |
| cSH | 167 | 153 | 857 | 826 | 1700 | 1700 | 1237 | 1700 | 1700 |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.13 | 0.20 | 0.14 | 0.01 | 0.12 | 0.07 | 0.10 | 0.31 | 0.16 |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th（ft） | 11 | 18 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Control Delay（s） | 29.8 | 34.3 | 9.9 | 9.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | D | D | A | A |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay（s） | 29.8 | 14.7 |  | 0.1 |  |  | 1.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | D | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 2.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 38．2\％ |  | CU Lev | of Se | vice |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period（min） |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Lake County
20：Argonaut Road \＆SR 29



Lake County
22: Lakeport Blvd \& Lakeport Blvd/SR 29 NB Entry Ramp


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | F |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 302 | 79 | 165 | 278 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 123 | 1 | 86 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 0 | 328 | 86 | 179 | 302 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 134 | 1 | 93 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (tt/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | None |  |  | None |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VC , conflicting volume | 302 |  |  | 414 |  |  | 1126 | 1032 | 371 | 1032 | 1075 | 302 |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 302 |  |  | 414 |  |  | 1126 | 1032 | 371 | 1032 | 1075 | 302 |
| tC , single (s) | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| tc, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| p0 queue free \% | 100 |  |  | 84 |  |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 28 | 99 | 87 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 1259 |  |  | 1145 |  |  | 139 | 196 | 675 | 186 | 185 | 737 |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | WB 2 | SB1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 414 | 179 | 302 | 228 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 0 | 179 | 0 | 134 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 86 | 0 | 0 | 93 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 1700 | 1145 | 1700 | 268 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.24 | 0.16 | 0.18 | 0.85 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 0 | 14 | 0 | 178 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 0.0 | 8.7 | 0.0 | 64.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS |  | A |  | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.0 | 3.3 |  | 64.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 14.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 60.5\% |  | Lev | of Se | vice |  | B |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Baseline | Synchro 6 Report |
| :--- | ---: |
| Omni-Means | Page 23 |

24: 11th ST \& SR 29 NB ramps PM Peak Hour

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | 今 |  |  | ${ }_{\text {¢ }}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 10 | 195 | 0 | 0 | 299 | 275 | 57 | 2 | 233 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 11 | 212 | 0 | 0 | 325 | 299 | 62 |  | 253 |  |  |  |

Pedestrians
Pedestrians
Walking Speed (ft/s)
Percent Blockage
Right turn flare (veh)

| Median type |  |  | None |  |  | None |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 624 | 212 | 708 | 858 | 212 | 962 | 708 | 474 |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 624 | 212 | 708 | 858 | 212 | 962 | 708 | 474 |
| tC, single (s) | 4.1 | 4.1 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 2.2 | 2.2 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| p0 queue free \% | 99 | 100 | 82 | 99 | 69 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 957 | 1358 | 346 | 291 | 828 | 161 | 355 | 590 |


| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Volume Total | 223 | 624 | 317 |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 11 | 0 | 62 |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 299 | 253 |  |  |  |
| cSH | 957 | 1700 | 645 |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.01 | 0.37 | 0.49 |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 1 | 0 | 68 |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 0.5 | 0.0 | 15.9 |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | A | C |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.5 | 0.0 | 15.9 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  | C |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  | 4.4 |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  | $56.8 \%$ | ICU Level of Service |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Baseline | Synchro 6 Report |
| :--- | ---: |
| Omni-Means | Page 24 |

25: Scotts Valley Rd. \& SR 29 SB ramps

|  | $\Rightarrow$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\stackrel{ }{1}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{\dagger}$ |  |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 63 | 50 | 295 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 146 | 1 | 10 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 0 | 68 | 54 | 321 | 61 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 159 | 1 | 11 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width ( t ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (t/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | None |  |  | None |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 61 |  |  | 123 |  |  | 809 | 798 | 96 | 798 | 825 | 61 |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 61 |  |  | 123 |  |  | 809 | 798 | 96 | 798 | 825 | 61 |
| tC , single (s) | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| p0 queue free \% | 100 |  |  | 78 |  |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 37 | 100 | 99 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 1542 |  |  | 1464 |  |  | 245 | 249 | 961 | 253 | 240 | 1004 |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 123 | 382 | 171 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 0 | 321 | 159 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 54 | 0 | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 1700 | 1464 | 265 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.07 | 0.22 | 0.64 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 0 | 21 | 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 0.0 | 7.1 | 40.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS |  | A | E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.0 | 7.1 | 40.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  | E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 14.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 41.4\% | ICU Level of Service |  |  |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Lake County <br> 26: Lyons Rd./Nice | ucern |  | off \& N | ce Lu | ucerne/ | $\text { SR } 29$ |  |  |  |  | Ex PM PM Peal | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Peak } \\ & \text { Hou } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ | $>$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SB |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | A |  |  | ${ }_{\dagger}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 1 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 155 | 15 | 1 | 3 | 198 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 1 | 103 | 0 | 0 | 168 | 16 | 1 | 3 | 215 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (ft/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | None |  |  | None |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 185 |  |  | 103 |  |  | 282 | 290 | 103 | 499 | 282 | 177 |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 185 |  |  | 103 |  |  | 282 | 290 | 103 | 499 | 282 | 177 |
| tC , single (s) | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| p0 queue free \% | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 100 | 99 | 77 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 1390 |  |  | 1489 |  |  | 670 | 620 | 952 | 371 | 626 | 866 |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 104 | 185 | 220 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 1 | 0 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 16 | 215 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 1390 | 1700 | 942 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.23 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 0 | 0 | 23 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 0.1 | 0.0 | 10.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | A |  | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.1 | 0.0 | 10.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 4.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Ut | lization |  | 28.2\% |  | ICU Leve | of Ser |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Baseline | Synchro 6 Report |
| :--- | ---: |
| Omni-Means | Page 26 |
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Lake County
27: Lyons Rd./Nice Lucerne Cutoff \& SR 29 SB ramp
PM Peak Hou

|  | $\rangle$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | F |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |  |  |  | ¢ |  |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 1 | 1 | 172 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 87 | 1 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 0 | 1 | 1 | 187 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95 | 1 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (tt/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | None |  |  | None |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX , platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 379 | 378 | 2 | 378 | 378 |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 379 | 378 | 2 | 378 | 378 | 2 |
| tC, single (s) | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| p0 queue free \% | 100 |  |  | 88 |  |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 82 | 100 | 100 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 1620 |  |  | 1620 |  |  | 526 | 490 | 1083 | 529 | 490 | 1082 |



Lake County
28: Nice Lucerne Cutoff \& West Lake Road


## Baseline <br> Omni-Means
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59: Lakeport Blvd/SR 29 NB Entry Ramp \& SR 29 PM Peak Hour

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Frt |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FIt Permitted |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Turn Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clearance Time (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Progression Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay |  |  | 0.0 |  | HCM Le | el of S | vice |  | A |  |  |  |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 80.0 |  | Sum of | st time |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 0.0\% |  | CU Lev | of Se |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Analysis Ceriod (min)
Critical Lane Group

Lake County

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Frt |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Turn Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clearance Time (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{s}$ Ratio Prot |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Progression Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay |  |  | 0.0 |  | HCM Le | el of S | vice |  | A |  |  |  |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 80.0 |  | Sum of | st time |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 0.0\% |  | CU Lev | of Se |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

C Critical Lane Group

## Baseline

Omni-Means
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65: SR 29 SB Ramp \& SR 29 NB ramp

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Frt |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Turn Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clearance Time (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Progression Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay |  |  | 0.0 |  | HCM Le | el of | vice |  | A |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 80.0 |  | Sum of | st time |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 0.0\% |  | ICU Lev | of Se |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Analysis Period (min)

Lake County


| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Frt |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Turn Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clearance Time (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Progression Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay |  |  | 0.0 |  | HCM Le | el of S | rvice |  | A |  |  |  |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 80.0 |  | Sum of | st time |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 0.0\% |  | CU Lev | of Se | vice |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Critical Lane Group

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Frt |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FIt Protected |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FIt Permitted |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Turn Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clearance Time (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Progression Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay |  |  | 0.0 |  | HCM Lev | el of S | rvice |  | A |  |  |  |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 80.0 |  | Sum of lo | st time |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 0.0\% |  | CU Leve | of Se |  |  | A |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

c Critical Lane Group

Lake County


\section*{Movement <br> | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Lane Configurations } \\ \text { Ideal Flow (vphpl) }\end{array}$ | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | otal Lost time (s)}

Lane Util. Factor
Frt
FIt Protected
Satd. Flow (prot)
Satd. Flow (perm)
Volume (vph)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Volume (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| 0.92 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Adj. Flow (vph)
Turn Type
Protected Phases
Permitted Phases
Actuated Green, G (s)
Effective Green, g (s)
Actuated g/C Ratio
Clearance Time (s)
Lane Grp Cap (vph)
$\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{s}$ Ratio Prot
$\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{s}$ Ratio P
/c Ratio
Uniform Delay, d1
Progression Factor
Incrementa
Delay (s)
Level of Service


C Critical Lane Group

## Baseline

Omni-Means

74: SR 29 \& Park Way/SR 29 Entry Ramp

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Frt |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Turn Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clearance Time (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Progression Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay |  |  | 0.0 |  | HCM Le | el of S | rvice |  | A |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  | 80.0 |  | Sum of | st time |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 0.0\% |  | CU Lev | of Se | vice |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Analysis Period (min)

Lake County
75: Park Way/SR 29 NB Exit Ramp \& Park Way/SR 29 NB Entry Ramp PM Peak Hour

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Frt |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Turn Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clearance Time (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Progression Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay |  |  | 0.0 |  | HCM Le | el of S | vice |  | A |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 80.0 |  | Sum of | st time |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 0.0\% |  | CU Lev | of Se |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

c Critical Lane Group

## Baseline

Omni-Means

Synchro 6 Report
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76: Park Way/SR 29 SB Exit Ramp \& SR $29 \quad$ PM Peak Hour

| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ideal Flow (vphpl) | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 |
| Total Lost time (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Util. Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Frt |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flt Protected |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (prot) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FIt Permitted |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Adj. Flow (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Turn Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Green, G (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Effective Green, g (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clearance Time (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Grp Cap (vph) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/s Ratio Prot |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/s Ratio Perm |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Uniform Delay, d1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Progression Factor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Incremental Delay, d2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM Average Control Delay |  |  | 0.0 |  | HCM Le | el of S | vice |  | A |  |  |  |
| HCM Volume to Capacity ratio |  |  | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length (s) |  |  | 80.0 |  | Sum of | st time |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 0.0\% |  | CU Lev | of Se |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

c Critical Lane Group
77. Park Way \& Park WaylSR 29 SB Fxit Ramp PM Peak Hour



Lane Configurations
deal Flow (vphpl)
$\begin{array}{lllllllllllll}\text { Ideal Flow (vphpl) } & 1900 & 1900 & 1900 & 1900 & 1900 & 1900 & 1900 & 1900 & 1900 & 1900 & 1900 & 1900\end{array}$ Total Lost time (s)
Frt Util. Fac
Flt Protected
Satd. Flow (prot)
Fatd. Flow (perm)
Volume (vph)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Volume (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak-hour factor, PHF | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Adj. FRow (vvh) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| RTOR Reduction (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Adj. Flow (vph)
Turn Type
Protected Phases
Permitted Phases
Actuated Green, G (s)
Effective Green, g (s)
Actuated g/C Ratio
Clearance Time (s)
Lane Grp Cap (vph)
v/s Ratio Prot
$\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{s}$ Ratio P
/c Ratio
Uniform Delay, d1
Progression Factor
Incrementa
Delay (s)
Level of Service


Critical Lane Group

## Baseline

Omni-Means
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Page 38


|  | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 |  |  | 1 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBR |  |
| Lane Configurations | $\uparrow$ | 「 | * | $\uparrow$ | ${ }^{7}$ | F' |  |
| Sign Control | Free |  |  | Free | Stop |  |  |
| Grade | 0\% |  |  | 0\% | 0\% |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 615 | 228 | 86 | 114 | 449 | 380 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 668 | 248 | 93 | 124 | 488 | 413 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (ft/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  |  |  | None |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC, conflicting volume |  |  | 916 |  | 979 | 668 |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol |  |  | 916 |  | 979 | 668 |  |
| tC, single (s) |  |  | 4.1 |  | 6.4 | 6.2 |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) |  |  | 2.2 |  | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |
| p0 queue free \% |  |  | 87 |  | 0 | 10 |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) |  |  | 744 |  | 242 | 458 |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | EB 2 | WB 1 | WB 2 | NB 1 | NB 2 |  |
| Volume Total | 668 | 248 | 93 | 124 | 488 | 413 |  |
| Volume Left | 0 | 0 | 93 | 0 | 488 | 0 |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 248 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 413 |  |
| cSH | 1700 | 1700 | 744 | 1700 | 242 | 458 |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.39 | 0.15 | 0.13 | 0.07 | 2.01 | 0.90 |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 895 | 249 |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.5 | 0.0 | 503.6 | 51.5 |  |
| Lane LOS |  |  | B |  | F | F |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.0 |  | 4.5 |  | 296.3 |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  | F |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 131.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 72.0\% |  | CU Leve | I of Service | C |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |

[^0]| 3: SR 20 \& Pyle Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | * | $\uparrow$ | $\bar{\square}$ | \% | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | F' |  | ${ }_{4}$ |  |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 7 | 611 | 106 | 295 | 658 | 7 | 285 | 3 | 1056 | 2 | 6 | 3 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 8 | 664 | 115 | 321 | 715 | 8 | 310 | 3 | 1148 | 2 | 7 | 3 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (ft/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | None |  |  | None |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 723 |  |  | 779 |  |  | 2042 | 2043 | 664 | 3189 | 2155 | 719 |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 723 |  |  | 779 |  |  | 2042 | 2043 | 664 | 3189 | 2155 | 719 |
| tC, single (s) | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| p0 queue free \% | 99 |  |  | 62 |  |  | 0 | 91 | 0 | 0 | 78 | 99 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 879 |  |  | 838 |  |  | 24 | 34 | 461 | 0 | 29 | 428 |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | EB 2 | EB 3 | WB 1 | WB 2 | NB 1 | NB 2 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 8 | 664 | 115 | 321 | 723 | 313 | 1148 | 12 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 8 | 0 | 0 | 321 | 0 | 310 | 0 | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 0 | 115 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 1148 | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 879 | 1700 | 1700 | 838 | 1700 | 24 | 461 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.01 | 0.39 | 0.07 | 0.38 | 0.43 | 12.89 | 2.49 | Err |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 0 | Err | 2267 | Err |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 9.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.9 | 0.0 | Err | 697.2 | Err |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | A |  |  | B |  | F | F | F |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.1 |  |  | 3.7 |  | 2690.5 |  | Err |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  | F |  | F |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | Err |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 110.9\% |  | CU Lev | l of Se | vice |  | H |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



[^1]

| $5: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ Baseline | Synchro 6 Report |
| :--- | ---: |
| Omni-Means | Page 5 |

Lake County

| 6: Foothill Dr. \& SR 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM Peak Hour |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\checkmark$ |  | $\uparrow$ | 1 |  | $\downarrow$ |  |  |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |  |  |
| Lane Configurations | M |  | $\stackrel{ }{\text { F }}$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ |  |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  |
| Grade | 0\% |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 112 | 135 | 760 | 15 | 66 | 1178 |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 122 | 147 | 826 | 16 | 72 | 1280 |  |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (ft/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type | None |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 2258 | 834 |  |  | 842 |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 2258 | 834 |  |  | 842 |  |  |  |
| tC , single (s) | 6.4 | 6.2 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 0 | 60 |  |  | 91 |  |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 41 | 368 |  |  | 793 |  |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | WB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 | SB 2 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 268 | 842 | 72 | 1280 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 122 | 0 | 72 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 147 | 16 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 80 | 1700 | 793 | 1700 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 3.36 | 0.50 | 0.09 | 0.75 |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | Err | 0 | 7 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | Err | 0.0 | 10.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | F |  | A |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | Err | 0.0 | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 1090.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Ut | lization |  | 83.2\% |  | ICU Level | l of Service | E |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |
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Lake County
2030 Summer Conditions PM Peak
8: Olympic Drive \& Lakeshore Dr.
PM Peak Hour
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| ke County 2030 Summer Conditions PM Peak |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 4 |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |  |  |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | 「 | \％ | $\uparrow$ | $\uparrow$ | 7 |  |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  |  | Free | Free |  |  |  |
| Grade | 0\％ |  |  | 0\％ | 0\％ |  |  |  |
| Volume（veh／h） | 156 | 254 | 497 | 551 | 672 | 195 |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |  |
| Hourly flow rate（vph） | 170 | 276 | 540 | 599 | 730 | 212 |  |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width（ft） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed（ft／s） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare（veh） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type | None |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal（ft） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX，platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC ，conflicting volume | 2410 | 730 | 942 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$ ，stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$ ，stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu ，unblocked vol | 2410 | 730 | 942 |  |  |  |  |  |
| tC，single（s） | 6.4 | 6.2 | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage（s） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF（s） | 3.5 | 3.3 | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| p0 queue free \％ | 0 | 35 | 26 |  |  |  |  |  |
| cM capacity（veh／h） | 9 | 422 | 728 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Direction，Lane \＃ | EB 1 | EB 2 | NB 1 | NB 2 | SB 1 | SB 2 |  |  |
| Volume Total | 170 | 276 | 540 | 599 | 730 | 212 |  |  |
| Volume Left | 170 | 0 | 540 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 276 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 212 |  |  |
| cSH | 9 | 422 | 728 | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 18.17 | 0.65 | 0.74 | 0.35 | 0.43 | 0.12 |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th（ft） | Err | 114 | 168 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Control Delay（s） | Err | 28.3 | 22.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Lane LOS | F | D | C |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay（s） | 3822.0 |  | 10.8 |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 678.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 81．5\％ |  | CU Leve | of Service |  |  |
| Analysis Period（min） |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |

5：00 pm Baseline

Synchro 6 Report

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \％＊ | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | \％ | $\uparrow$ | F | \％ | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | \％ | 个 $\uparrow$ | T |
| Total Lost Time（s） | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 3433 | 1660 | 0 | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 | 1770 | 3468 | 0 | 1770 | 3539 | 1583 |
| FIt Permitted | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 3433 | 1660 | 0 | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 | 1770 | 3468 | 0 | 1770 | 3539 | 1583 |
| Satd．Flow（RTOR） |  | 156 |  |  |  | 229 |  | 16 |  |  |  | 759 |
| Volume（vph） | 1099 | 100 | 270 | 79 | 107 | 239 | 172 | 684 | 106 | 223 | 836 | 866 |
| Confl．Peds．（\＃／hr） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Confl．Bikes（\＃／hr） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Growth Factor | 100\％ | 100\％ | 100\％ | 100\％ | 100\％ | 100\％ | 100\％ | 100\％ | 100\％ | 100\％ | 100\％ | 100\％ |
| Heavy Vehicles（\％） | 2\％ | 2\％ | 2\％ | 2\％ | 2\％ | 2\％ | 2\％ | 2\％ | 2\％ | 2\％ | 2\％ | 2\％ |
| Bus Blockages（\＃／hr） | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Parking（\＃／hr） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mid－Block Traffic（\％） |  | 0\％ |  |  | 0\％ |  |  | 0\％ |  |  | 0\％ |  |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 1195 | 402 | 0 | 86 | 116 | 260 | 187 | 858 | 0 | 242 | 909 | 941 |
| Turn Type | Prot |  |  | Prot |  | Perm | Prot |  |  | Prot |  | Perm |
| Protected Phases | 7 | 4 |  | 3 | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |
| Total Split（s） | 36.0 | 42.0 | 0.0 | 14.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 | 14.0 | 27.0 | 0.0 | 17.0 | 30.0 | 30.0 |
| Act Effct Green（s） | 32.0 | 36.5 |  | 8.9 | 11.2 | 11.2 | 10.0 | 23.0 |  | 13.0 | 26.0 | 26.0 |
| Actuated g／C Ratio | 0.34 | 0.38 |  | 0.09 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.10 | 0.24 |  | 0.14 | 0.27 | 0.27 |
| v／c Ratio | 1.04 | 0.55 |  | 0.53 | 0.53 | 0.67 | 1.01 | 1.01 |  | 1.00 | 0.94 | 0.96 |
| Control Delay | 68.6 | 17.3 |  | 51.1 | 43.3 | 13.6 | 112.7 | 69.9 |  | 102.0 | 52.9 | 28.3 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 68.6 | 17.3 |  | 51.1 | 43.3 | 13.6 | 112.7 | 69.9 |  | 102.0 | 52.9 | 28.3 |
| LOS | E | B |  | D | D | B | F | E |  | F | D | C |
| Approach Delay |  | 55.6 |  |  | 28.1 |  |  | 77.6 |  |  | 47.5 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | C |  |  | E |  |  | D |  |

Approach LOS
intersection Summary

## Cycle Length： 100 <br> Actuated Cycle Length： 953

Control Type：Actuated－Uncoordinated
Maximum v／c Ratio： 1.04
Intersection Signal Delay： $54.3 \quad$ Intersection LOS：D
Intersection Capacity Utilization $85.0 \% \quad$ ICU Level of Service
Analysis Period（min） 15



| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ | 个t |  | M |  |  |
| Sign Control |  | Free | Free |  | Stop |  |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% | 0\% |  | 0\% |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 2 | 870 | 1004 | 98 | 147 | 33 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 2 | 946 | 1091 | 107 | 160 | 36 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (ft/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  |  |  | None |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX , platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VC, conflicting volume | 1198 |  |  |  | 2095 | 599 |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 1198 |  |  |  | 2095 | 599 |  |
| tC, single (s) | 4.1 |  |  |  | 6.8 | 6.9 |  |
| tC, 2 stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 100 |  |  |  | 0 | 92 |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 578 |  |  |  | 45 | 445 |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | EB 2 | WB 1 | WB 2 | SB 1 |  |  |
| Volume Total | 2 | 946 | 728 | 470 | 196 |  |  |
| Volume Left | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 160 |  |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 0 | 0 | 107 | 36 |  |  |
| cSH | 578 | 1700 | 1700 | 1700 | 54 |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.00 | 0.56 | 0.43 | 0.28 | 3.65 |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Err |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 11.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Err |  |  |
| Lane LOS | B |  |  |  | F |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | Err |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  | F |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 835.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 62.6\% |  | ICU Leve | of Service | B |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |
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## Lake County

|  | $\dagger$ |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | WBL | WBR | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT |  |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 「 | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{1}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |
| Grade | 0\% |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 74 | 79 | 1053 | 51 | 30 | 605 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 80 | 86 | 1145 | 55 | 33 | 658 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (ft/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type | None |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 1895 | 1172 |  |  | 1200 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 1895 | 1172 |  |  | 1200 |  |  |
| tC, single (s) | 6.4 | 6.2 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 0 | 63 |  |  | 94 |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 72 | 234 |  |  | 582 |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | WB 1 | WB 2 | NB 1 | SB 1 | SB 2 |  |  |
| Volume Total | 80 | 86 | 1200 | 33 | 658 |  |  |
| Volume Left | 80 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 0 |  |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 86 | 55 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| cSH | 72 | 234 | 1700 | 582 | 1700 |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 1.11 | 0.37 | 0.71 | 0.06 | 0.39 |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 151 | 40 | 0 | 4 | 0 |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 240.2 | 29.0 | 0.0 | 11.6 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Lane LOS | F | D |  | B |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 131.2 |  | 0.0 | 0.5 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 10.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 70.1\% |  | CU Leve | of Service | C |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | ${ }_{\text {¢ }}$ |  |  | ${ }_{4}$ |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1725 | 0 | 0 | 1811 | 0 | 0 | 1844 | 0 | 0 | 1801 | 0 |
| FIt Permitted |  | 0.752 |  |  | 0.729 |  |  | 0.789 |  |  | 0.989 |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1334 | 0 | 0 | 1354 | 0 | 0 | 1468 | 0 | 0 | 1783 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  | 33 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 38 |  |
| Volume (vph) | 222 | 37 | 142 | 66 | 62 | 3 | 177 | 803 | 4 | 6 | 410 | 127 |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Growth Factor | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% |
| Bus Blockages (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Parking (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mid-Block Traffic (\%) |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 435 | 0 | 0 | 142 | 0 | 0 | 1069 | 0 | 0 | 591 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm |  |  | Perm |  |  | Perm |  |  | Perm |  |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 25.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 55.0 | 55.0 | 0.0 | 55.0 | 55.0 | 0.0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 21.0 |  |  | 21.0 |  |  | 51.0 |  |  | 51.0 |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.26 |  |  | 0.26 |  |  | 0.64 |  |  | 0.64 |  |
| v/c Ratio |  | 1.16 |  |  | 0.40 |  |  | 1.14 |  |  | 0.51 |  |
| Control Delay |  | 126.0 |  |  | 28.2 |  |  | 95.2 |  |  | 9.2 |  |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay |  | 126.0 |  |  | 28.2 |  |  | 95.2 |  |  | 9.2 |  |
| LOS |  | F |  |  | C |  |  | F |  |  | A |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 126.0 |  |  | 28.2 |  |  | 95.2 |  |  | 9.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  | C |  |  | F |  |  | A |  |

Approach LOS
intersection Summary
Cycle Length: 80
Actuated Cycle Lenth 80
Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.16
intersection Signal Delay: 74.2
Intersection Capacity Utilization 121.5\%
Intersection LOS: E
Analysis Period (min) 15


5:00 pm Baseline

| Lake County <br> 15: Dry Creek Cutoff \& SR 29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ons PM Peak PM Peak Hou |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\Rightarrow$ |  | 4 | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |  |  |
| Lane Configurations | M |  |  | $\uparrow$ | F |  |  |  |
| Sign Control | Stop |  |  | Free | Free |  |  |  |
| Grade | 0\% |  |  | 0\% | 0\% |  |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 100 | 22 | 20 | 706 | 455 | 36 |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |  |  |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 109 | 24 | 22 | 767 | 495 | 39 |  |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (ft/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type | None |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC, conflicting volume | 1325 | 514 | 534 |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC 1 , stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 1325 | 514 | 534 |  |  |  |  |  |
| tC, single (s) | 6.4 | 6.2 | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 3.3 | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 35 | 96 | 98 |  |  |  |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 168 | 560 | 1034 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | NB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 133 | 789 | 534 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 109 | 22 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 24 | 0 | 39 |  |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 192 | 1034 | 1700 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.69 | 0.02 | 0.31 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 106 | 2 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 57.1 | 0.6 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | F | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 57.1 | 0.6 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | 5.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 66.8\% |  | CU Leve | of Service | c |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |

5:00 pm Baseline
Omni-Means

Synchro 6 Report

Lake County

| (ad) PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\Rightarrow$ |  |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | 4 | $p$ |  | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | $\hat{\beta}$ |  | * | $\uparrow$ | 「 |  | ¢ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 7 |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 392 | 508 | 29 | 7 | 477 | 303 | 7 | 58 | 58 | 189 | 62 | 284 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 426 | 552 | 32 | 8 | 518 | 329 | 8 | 63 | 63 | 205 | 67 | 309 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (ft/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | None |  |  | None |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 848 |  |  | 584 |  |  | 2296 | 2283 | 568 | 2033 | 1970 | 518 |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 848 |  |  | 584 |  |  | 2296 | 2283 | 568 | 2033 | 1970 | 518 |
| tC , single (s) | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| p0 queue free \% | 46 |  |  | 99 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 45 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 790 |  |  | 991 |  |  | 0 | 18 | 522 | 0 | 29 | 557 |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | EB 2 | WB 1 | WB 2 | WB 3 | NB 1 | SB 1 | SB 2 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 426 | 584 | 8 | 518 | 329 | 134 | 273 | 309 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 426 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 205 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 329 | 63 | 0 | 309 |  |  |  |  |
| cSH | 790 | 1700 | 991 | 1700 | 1700 | 0 | 0 | 557 |  |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.54 | 0.34 | 0.01 | 0.30 | 0.19 | Err | Err | 0.55 |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 82 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | Err | Err | 84 |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 14.8 | 0.0 | 8.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Err | Err | 19.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | B |  | A |  |  | F | F | C |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 6.2 |  | 0.1 |  |  | Err | Err |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  | F | F |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  | Err |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 77.2\% |  | CU Leve | of Ser | vice |  | D |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

$5: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ Baseline

Synchro 6 Report



[^5]|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $p$ |  |  | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | ${ }_{\dagger}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | F' | 7 | 个t |  | 7 | 个 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |
| Sign Control |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 9 | 25 | 22 | 51 | 28 | 316 | 6 | 436 | 9 | 172 | 1042 |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 10 | 27 | 24 | 55 | 30 | 343 | 7 | 474 | 10 | 187 | 1133 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (ft/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  | None |  |  | None |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 2118 | 2007 | 570 | 1470 | 2005 | 242 | 1139 |  |  | 484 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 2118 | 2007 | 570 | 1470 | 2005 | 242 | 1139 |  |  | 484 |  |  |
| tC, single (s) | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |
| p0 queue free \% | 0 | 43 | 95 | 0 | 37 | 55 | 99 |  |  | 83 |  |  |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 7 | 48 | 465 | 41 | 48 | 759 | 609 |  |  | 1075 |  |  |
| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | WB 2 | NB 1 | NB 2 | NB 3 | SB 1 | SB 2 | SB 3 |  |  |  |
| Volume Total | 61 | 86 | 343 | 7 | 316 | 168 | 187 | 755 | 384 |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 10 | 55 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 187 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 24 | 0 | 343 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 7 |  |  |  |
| cSH | 30 | 43 | 759 | 609 | 1700 | 1700 | 1075 | 1700 | 1700 |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 2.06 | 2.00 | 0.45 | 0.01 | 0.19 | 0.10 | 0.17 | 0.44 | 0.23 |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 178 | 224 | 59 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 777.4 | 669.3 | 13.6 | 11.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS | F | F | B | B |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 777.4 | 144.7 |  | 0.1 |  |  | 1.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | F | F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Delay Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 48.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization |  |  | 53.3\% | ICU Level of Service |  |  |  |  | A |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Lake County 20: Argonaut Road \& SR $29 \quad$ PM Peak Hour


| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SB |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ | F | \% | $\uparrow$ | 7 | \% | $\uparrow$ | F | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 1824 | 1583 | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 |
| FIt Permitted |  | 0.635 |  | 0.313 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 1183 | 1583 | 583 | 1863 | 1583 | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 | 1770 | 1863 | 1583 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  | 113 |  |  | 189 |  |  | 104 |  |  | 19 |
| Volume (vph) | 187 | 241 | 187 | 1277 | 246 | 657 | 105 | 1427 | 232 | 264 | 1370 | 40 |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Growth Factor | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% |
| Bus Blockages (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Parking (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mid-Block Traffic (\%) |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 465 | 203 | 1388 | 267 | 714 | 114 | 1551 | 252 | 287 | 1489 | 43 |
| Turn Type | Perm |  | Perm | Perm |  | Perm | Prot |  | Perm | Prot |  | Perm |
| Protected Phases |  | 4 |  |  | 8 |  | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 4 |  | 4 | 8 |  | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 47.0 | 47.0 | 47.0 | 47.0 | 47.0 | 47.0 | 8.0 | 42.0 | 42.0 | 11.0 | 45.0 | 45.0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  | 43.0 | 43.0 | 43.0 | 43.0 | 43.0 | 4.0 | 38.0 | 38.0 | 7.0 | 41.0 | 41.0 |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  | 0.43 | 0.43 | 0.43 | 0.43 | 0.43 | 0.04 | 0.38 | 0.38 | 0.07 | 0.41 | 0.41 |
| v/c Ratio |  | 0.91 | 0.27 | 5.53 | 0.33 | 0.91 | 1.61 | 2.19 | 0.38 | 2.31 | 1.95 | 0.07 |
| Control Delay |  | 51.9 |  | 2057.0 | 20.5 | 36.6 | 361.5 | 561.8 | 14.7 | 639.5 | 454.6 | 12.0 |
| Queue Delay |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay |  | 51.9 | 9.3 | 2057.0 | 20.5 | 36.6 | 361.5 | 561.8 | 14.7 | 639.5 | 454.6 | 12.0 |
| LOS |  | D | A | F | C | D | F | F | B | F | F |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 39.0 |  |  | 1218.5 |  |  | 478.0 |  |  | 473.3 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | F |  |  | F |  |  | F |  |

Intersection Summary

## yctuated Cycle Length: 100

Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated
Maximum v/c Ratio: 5.53
Intersection Signal Delay: 692.4
Intersection Capacity Utilization 196.8\%
Analysis Period (min) 15


22: Lakeport Blvd \& Lakeport Blvd/SR 29 NB Entry Ramp



Lake County


[^6]

Lake County
26: Lyons Rd./Nice Lucerne Cutoff \& Nice Lucerne/SR 29 NB Entry Ramp PM Peak Hour

|  | $\Rightarrow$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ | 7 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |  | ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 2 | 177 | 0 | 0 | 327 | 32 | 2 | 7 | 437 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 2 | 192 | 0 | 0 | 355 | 35 | 2 | 8 | 475 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (ft/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | None |  |  | None |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 390 |  |  | 192 |  |  | 570 | 587 | 192 | 1048 | 570 | 373 |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC2, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu, unblocked vol | 390 |  |  | 192 |  |  | 570 | 587 | 192 | 1048 | 570 | 373 |
| tC , single (s) | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| p0 queue free \% | 100 |  |  | 100 |  |  | 99 | 98 | 44 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 1168 |  |  | 1381 |  |  | 432 | 421 | 849 | 89 | 431 | 673 |


| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | NB 1 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Volume Total | 195 | 390 | 485 |  |  |
| Volume Left | 2 | 0 | 2 |  |  |
| Volume Right | 0 | 35 | 475 |  |  |
| cSH | 1168 | 1700 | 832 |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.00 | 0.23 | 0.58 |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 0 | 0 | 96 |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 0.1 | 0.0 | 15.2 |  |  |
| Lane LOS | A | C |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.1 | 0.0 | 15.2 |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  | C |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  | 6.9 |  |  |
| Average Delay |  |  |  |  |  |
| ICtersection Capacity Utilization | $53.3 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  | 15 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^7]| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{4}$ |  |
| Sign Control |  | Free |  |  | Free |  |  | Stop |  |  | Stop |  |
| Grade |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 0 | 2 | 2 | 363 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 114 | 1 | 1 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Hourly flow rate (vph) | 0 | 2 | 2 | 395 | , | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 124 | 1 |  |
| Pedestrians |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lane Width (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Walking Speed (ft/s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Blockage |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right turn flare (veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | None |  |  | None |  |
| Median storage veh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upstream signal (ft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| pX, platoon unblocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vC , conflicting volume | 4 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 798 | 797 | 3 | 797 | 798 | 4 |
| $\mathrm{vC1}$, stage 1 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{vC2}$, stage 2 conf vol |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vCu , unblocked vol | 4 |  |  | 4 |  |  | 798 | 797 | 3 | 797 | 798 | 4 |
| tC , single (s) | 4.1 |  |  | 4.1 |  |  | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 7.1 | 6.5 | 6.2 |
| $\mathrm{tC}, 2$ stage (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tF (s) | 2.2 |  |  | 2.2 |  |  | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| p0 queue free \% | 100 |  |  | 76 |  |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 50 | 100 | 100 |
| cM capacity (veh/h) | 1617 |  |  | 1617 |  |  | 246 | 242 | 1081 | 247 | 241 | 1079 |


| cM capacity (veh/h) | 1617 |  | 1617 | 246 | 242 | 1081 | 247 | 241 | 1079 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Direction, Lane \# | EB 1 | WB 1 | SB 1 |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Volume Total | 4 | 399 | 126 |  |  |  |
| Volume Left | 0 | 395 | 124 |  |  |  |
| Volume Right | 2 | 0 | 1 |  |  |  |
| cSH | 1700 | 1617 | 249 |  |  |  |
| Volume to Capacity | 0.00 | 0.24 | 0.51 |  |  |  |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 0 | 24 | 66 |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s) | 0.0 | 7.9 | 33.4 |  |  |  |
| Lane LOS |  | A | D |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s) | 0.0 | 7.9 | 33.4 |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  | D |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Anerage Delay |  | 13.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization | $40.1 \%$ | ICU Level of Service |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Lake County 28: Nice Lucerne Cutoff \& West Lake Road PM Peak Hour


[^8]Lake County
2030 Summer Conditions PM Peak
59: Lakeport BIvd/SR 29 NB Entry Ramp \& SR 29 PM Peak Hour

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Growth Factor | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% |
| Bus Blockages (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Parking (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mid-Block Traffic (\%) |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Turn Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Delay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Delay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Offset: 0 (0\%), Referenced to phase 2: and 6:, Start of Green |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Pretimed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 0.0 |  |  |  | Intersection LOS: A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 0.0\% |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 59: Lakeport Blvd/SR 29 NB Entry Ramp \& SR 29

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| FIt Permitted |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Growth Factor | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% |
| Bus Blockages (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Parking (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mid-Block Traffic (\%) |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Turn Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Delay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Delay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Offset: 0 (0\%), Referenced to phase 2: and 6:, Start of Green |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Pretimed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 0.0 Intersection LOS: A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 0.0\% ICU Level of Service A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 61: SR 29 SB ramps \& SR 29

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| FIt Permitted |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Growth Factor | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% |
| Bus Blockages (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Parking (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mid-Block Traffic (\%) |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Turn Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Delay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Delay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Offset: 0 (0\%), Referenced to phase 2: and 6:, Start of Green |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Pretimed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 0.0 |  |  |  |  | Intersection LOS: A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 0.0\% ICU Level of Service A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

.
Splits and Phases: 65: SR 29 SB Ramp \& SR 29 NB ramp

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Growth Factor | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% |
| Bus Blockages (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Parking (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mid-Block Traffic (\%) |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Turn Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Delay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Delay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Offset: 0 (0\%), Referenced to phase 2: and 6:, Start of Green |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Pretimed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 0.0 |  |  |  | Intersection LOS: A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 0.0\% |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^9]| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Growth Factor | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% |
| Bus Blockages (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Parking (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mid-Block Traffic (\%) |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Turn Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Delay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Delay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Offset: 0 (0\%), Referenced to phase 2: and 6:, Start of Green |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Pretimed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 0.0 |  |  |  | Intersection LOS: A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 0.0\% |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 68: SR 29 SB ramps \& SR 29

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\text { Satd. Flow (perm) } & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |

Confl. Peds. (\#/h
Confl. Peds. (\#/hr)
$\begin{array}{lllllllllllll}\text { Peak Hour Factor } & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92\end{array}$
Growth Factor $\quad 100 \%$ 100\% $100 \%$ 100\% $100 \%$ 100\% $100 \%$ 100\% $100 \%$ 100\% $100 \%$ 100\% $\begin{array}{llllllllllllll}\text { Heavy Vehicles (\%) } & 2 \% & 2 \% & 2 \% & 2 \% & 2 \% & 2 \% & 2 \% & 2 \% & 2 \% & 2 \% & 2 \% & 2 \%\end{array}$
Bus Blockages (\#/hr)
Parking (\#/hr)
Mid-Block Traffic (\%)
$\begin{array}{lrrrrrrrrrrrr} \\ \text { Lane Group Flow (vph) } & 0 & 0 \% & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}$ Turn Type
Protected Phases
Permitted Phase
otal Split (s)
Actuated g/C Ratio
v/c Ratio
V/c Ratio
Control Delay
Queue Delay
LOS
Approach Delay
Intersection Summary
Cycle Length: 80
Actuated Cycle Length: 80
Offset: 0 ( $0 \%$ ), Referenced to phase 2: and 6:, Start of Green
Control Type: Pretimed
Control Type: Pretimed
Intersection Signal Delay: 0.0 Intersection LOS: A
intersection Capacity Utilization 0.0\% ICU Level of Service A
Analysis Period (min) 15
Splits and Phases: 71: SR 29 SB ramps \& SR 29

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| FIt Permitted |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Growth Factor | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% |
| Bus Blockages (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Parking (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mid-Block Traffic (\%) |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Turn Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Delay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Delay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Offset: 0 (0\%), Referenced to phase 2: and 6:, Start of Green |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Pretimed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 0.0 |  |  |  | Intersection LOS: A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 0.0\%Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


Splits and Phases: 74: SR 29 \& Park Way/SR 29 Entry Ramp

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| FIt Permitted | Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Volume (vph)
Conffl. Beds. (\#/hr
$\begin{array}{lllllllllllll}\text { Peak Hour Factor } & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92 & 0.92\end{array}$
 $\begin{array}{llllllllllllll}\text { Heavy Vehicles (\%) } & 2 \% & 2 \% & 2 \% & 2 \% & 2 \% & 2 \% & 2 \% & 2 \% & 2 \% & 2 \% & 2 \% & 2 \%\end{array}$
Bus Blockages (\#/hr)
Parking (\#/hr)
Mid-Block Traffic (\%)
 Turn Type
Protected Phases
Permitted Phase
otal Split (s)
Actuated gic Ratio
clc Ratio
V/C Ratio
Control Delay
Total Delay
Lotal
Approach Delay
intersection Summary
Cycle Length: 80
Cycle Length: 80
Offset: $0(0 \%)$, Referenced to phase 2: and 6:, Start of Green
Control Type: Pretimed
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.00
Intersection Signal Delay: $0.0 \ldots$ Intersection LOS: A
Intersection Capacity Utilization 0.0\% ICU Level of Service A
Analysis Period (min) 15
Splits and Phases: 75: Park Way/SR 29 NB Exit Ramp \& Park Way/SR 29 NB Entry Ramp

5:00 pm Baselin

| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Growth Factor | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% |
| Bus Blockages (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Parking (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mid-Block Traffic (\%) |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Turn Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Delay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Delay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Offset: 0 (0\%), Referenced to phase 2: and 6:, Start of Green |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type: Pretimed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 0.0 |  |  |  | Intersection LOS: A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 0.0\% |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 76: Park Way/SR 29 SB Exit Ramp \& SR 29

77: Park Way \& Park Way/SR 29 SB Exit Ramp

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Lost Time (s) | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Satd. Flow (prot) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Flt Permitted |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Satd. Flow (perm) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Satd. Flow (RTOR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Confl. Peds. (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Confl. Bikes (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 |
| Growth Factor | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% | 2\% |
| Bus Blockages (\#/hr) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Parking (\#/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mid-Block Traffic (\%) |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |  | 0\% |  |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Turn Type |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Protected Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Permitted Phases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Split (s) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Act Effct Green (s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated g/C Ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| v/c Ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue Delay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Delay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length: 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length: 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Offset: $0(0 \%)$, Referenced to phase 2: and 6:, Start of Green |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay: 0.0 Intersection LOS: A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 0.0\% ICU Level of Service A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period (min) 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases: 77: Park Way \& Park Way/SR 29 SB Exit Ramp



|  |  |  |  |  | Exising Condions |  |  |  | Roaduay | Cosstructio | mReomstruciic |  |  |  |  | elopect RW | Acquisition |  |  | S250,000 | S10,000 | S50,000 | mific Signasa | $\frac{\text { madestriping }}{\text { Stoon }}$ | s50,000 |  | siov,000 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Facility Name | Roadway Segments |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Intersections } \\ & \text { \& Interchanges } \end{aligned}$ |  | ${ }^{\text {Improvenent }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {Premed }}^{\text {Prowed }}$ Rowntu |  |  |  |  | $\xrightarrow{\text { nsatal }}$ | coin |  |  |  |  | Cumer feen) | Sismem |  | (ex | (e) |  |
| MDPA | Spruce Grove Rd. | eassof SR 29 (bath locations) | 2,000 |  | $\cdots 2$ | Sfaty \& Opeational Impus | 5230 | 2,000 | 5 | 10,000 | ${ }_{523}$ | 230,00 | 2,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | sio | so |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8230,000 | Yes | \% | so |
| MIDN2 | Harmam Rd. | SR 2960 Stinson Reach Rd. | 11,676 |  | 2 | Satey \& Operational Impus | $\mathrm{s}_{1,383}$ | ${ }^{11,676}$ | 5 | ${ }_{\text {58,380 }}$ | ${ }^{523}$ | ${ }^{1,3427,70}$ | 11,976 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | s10 | so |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{51,324,740}$ | Yes | Ves | ${ }^{51,342,740}$ |
| MDIS | Stewar st. |  | 875 |  | - | Safey \& Peperaional Impvs | s101 | ${ }^{875}$ | 5 | 4,375 | ${ }_{523}$ | 100,25 | ${ }^{875}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 510 | so |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | si00,625 | Yes | No | ${ }_{50}$ |
| MIDM | Sama Clara Rd. | Cental Pauk R.t. OSR 175 | 2.830 |  | $2 \cdots$ | Sfaty \& Opearional Impus | s226 | 2,830 | 5 | ${ }^{14,150}$ | ${ }^{523}$ | 325,550 | 2,830 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 510 | so |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{5325,550}$ | Yes | ко | so |
| MiDF5 | Barne st. |  | 880 |  | $2 \ldots$ | Sadey \& Opeational Impus | 5102 | ${ }^{88}$ | 5 | 4,400 | ${ }^{523}$ | 101,200 | ${ }^{880}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | s10 | ${ }_{50}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | si01,200 | Yes | мо | so |
| MDIG | Wardlaw st. |  | 1,780 |  | $\cdots 2$ | Safey \& Opeational Imprs | 5205 | 1,780 | 5 | 8,900 | 523 | 204,700 | 1,780 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | S10 | so |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5204, | Yes | vo | so |
| M10\% | Buts Canyon Rd. | SR 29 to Loconomi St. | 9,210 |  | $\cdots 2$ | Widen to 2 lane undivided arteria according to County Stds. | s9,118 | 9,210 | ${ }^{30}$ | ${ }^{276,300}$ | ${ }^{523}$ | ${ }^{6,354,900}$ | 9,210 | ${ }^{28}$ | ${ }^{58}$ | ${ }^{30}$ | 27,300 | ${ }^{\text {sio }}$ | 52,76,300 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 89,117,900 | yes | yes | 59,17,900 |
|  |  |  |  | tal Cost |  |  | S1, 225 |  |  |  |  | S6,65 |  |  |  |  |  |  | S2773,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | S11,422 |  |  | S10,460,640 |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | （ex |  |
| $\mathrm{KrCH1}^{1}$ | P．Lake View Rd． | SR2811 S SR 29 | ${ }_{36,25}$ |  | 2 | Safey \＆Operaional mpps | S4，164 | ${ }_{36} 205$ | 5 | 181,025 | ${ }^{523}$ | 4，163，575 | 36,25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | s10 | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{54,16,575}$ |  | Yes | no | so |
| квСС2 | Bis valey Rd ． |  | 12，505 |  | 2 | Sfaty \＆Operational inpls | S51，49 | 12，505 | 5 | 62,25 | 523 | 1，483，75 | 12，505 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | s10 | so |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Yes | vo | so |
| ккснз | Bell | ${ }_{29}^{\text {Highand Springs d．．t．SR }}$ | 20.55 |  | $\cdots 2$ | Satey \＆Operaional Impls | ${ }_{5}^{52307}$ | ${ }^{20,056}$ | 5 | 100，280 | ${ }^{523}$ | 2，306，40 | 20，56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ${ }^{10}$ | so |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $5_{52,36,40}$ | Yes | мо | so |
| ккст4 | ${ }^{\text {ciadur Ln．}}$ | Lossa Rd． 10 Sutue St． | ${ }^{\text {3，083 }}$ |  | $\cdots 2$ ． |  | 53，053 | 3，083 | ${ }^{30}$ | 92,40 | ${ }_{523}$ | 2，127，770 | 3，083 | ${ }^{28}$ | 58 | 30 | 92，490 | S10 | S924，900 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{\text {s，} 5 \text { 25，} 170}$ | Yes | Yes | ${ }^{53,052,170}$ |
|  |  | Sure St． 0 Soded Bye Rd． | 11，95 |  | $\cdots 2$ | Widen to 2 lane collector according to County Stds． | ${ }^{53,30}$ | ${ }^{11,095}$ | ${ }^{30}$ | ${ }_{58}$ | ${ }^{523}$ | ${ }^{1,334}$ | 11，095 | ${ }^{28}$ | ${ }_{58}$ | ${ }^{30}$ | ${ }^{332,850}$ | ${ }^{510}$ | s，3，32，500 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{53,32,934}$ | Yes | Yes | ¢3，29，384 |
| ккс木5 | ${ }^{\text {Harringeom fat erd．}}$ |  | 22,34 |  | $2 \ldots$ | Sfaty \＆Opearaional Inpy | s2，557 | ${ }^{22,234}$ | 5 | 111，70 | ${ }_{523}$ | 2，556，910 | 22,34 | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | s10 | so |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{\text {s2，56，9，90 }}$ | yes | мо | so |
|  |  | Sulphur Creek Rd． 1.5 SR 175 | 5，790 |  | $2 \ldots$ | Satey \＆Operaional Impls | S666 | 5，790 | 5 | 28，50 | 523 | 665，50 | 5，90 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | s10 | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5665，50 | Yes | vo | so |
| Kरса66 | Sulphur Creek Rd． |  | ${ }_{6,236}$ |  | $2 \ldots$ | Sfaly \＆Opearaional mpvs | 5718 | ${ }_{6}^{6,236}$ | 5 | 31，180 | ${ }_{5}^{523}$ | 717，140 | ${ }_{6}^{6,36}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | s10 | so |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 577， 40 | Yes | \％ | so |
| кरCC7 7 | Loch Lomonor R． | Big Canyon Rd．to Siegler Springs N．Rd | 4，041 |  | $\cdots 2$ | Satey \＆Opeational Impls | 5465 | 4041 | 5 | 20,25 | ${ }^{523}$ | 464,715 | 4041 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | s10 | so |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{\text {S64，7，715 }}$ | yes | мo | so |
|  |  |  | 17，13 |  | $\cdots$ | Sfaty \＆Opearaional inpls | s1，968 | 17，13 | 5 | 85，65 | 523 | 1，967，995 | 17，13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | s10 | so |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \＄1，967，995 | Yes | ко | so |
| KксС8 | Sieger Canyon Rd． | Big Canyon R．t．os R 29 | 21，611 |  | 2 | Sfaly \＆Opearaional mpys | S2，469 | ${ }^{21,461}$ | 5 | 107，055 | ${ }_{5} 53$ | 2，48，915 | 21，41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | s10 | so |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | S2，46，${ }^{\text {a }}$ ， 15 | Yes | мо | so |
| кксн9 | Big Canyon Rd． | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Siegler Canyon Rd./Loch } \\ & \text { Lomond Rd. to } \\ & \text { Middletown/Lowerlake bdy. } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 33，509 |  |  | Staey \＆Opeational Impls | S3，54 | 3，509 | 5 | 167，545 | ${ }^{523}$ | 3，35，3，35 | ${ }^{33,509}$ | 。 | 。 | 。 | 。 |  | so |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{5,3,55,3,35}$ | yes | мо | so |
| кксс10 | Meritu R． | SR290 Lossas Rd． | ${ }^{3,150}$ |  | $\cdots 2$ |  | 53，119 | ${ }^{3,150}$ | ${ }^{30}$ | 94，500 | ${ }^{523}$ | 2，173，500 | 3，150 | ${ }^{28}$ | ${ }_{58}$ | ${ }^{30}$ | 94，500 | ${ }_{510}$ | 5995，000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 53，118，500 | Yes | Yes | 53，118，500 |
| ккс¢11 | Highand Spring Rd． |  | 16,71 |  | $\cdots$ | Sfaly \＆Operaional mpys | 52，522 | 16,071 | 5 | ${ }^{80,355}$ | 523 | 1，48， 165 | 16，071 | ， | 5 | 5 | 88,355 | s10 | 5803，500 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | s2，56，715 | Yes | Yes | S2，51，715 |
| $\mathrm{KrCH}_{12}$ | Main 5. | Bell fill Rd． 10 Stale St． | 2，706 |  | $\cdots 2$ |  | \＄2679 | 2，706 | 30 | ${ }_{81,180}$ | ${ }_{523}$ | ${ }^{1.897,40}$ | 2,706 | ${ }^{28}$ | ${ }_{58}$ | 30 | 88,180 | s10 | s81，300 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 52，68，990 | Yes | Yes | 52678，900 |
| es |  |  |  | cost |  |  | $\stackrel{\text { S35，40 }}{ }$ |  |  |  |  | S22，610，699 |  |  |  |  |  |  | S6，813，50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | S35，43，499 |  |  | S14，331，159 |
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