

Countywide Regional Transportation Impact Fee Program

Final Report

Prepared for: Lake County/City Area Planning Council

Prepared by:



COUNTYWIDE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE PROGRAM

FINAL REPORT

PREPARED FOR: LAKE COUNTY/CITY AREA PLANNING COUNCIL

PREPARED BY

OMNI-MEANS, LTD. ENGINEERS & PLANNERS 943 RESERVE DRIVE, SUITE 100 ROSEVILLE, CA 95678 (916) 782-8688

MAY 30, 2008

25-4306-01 (R990TS005.DOC)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	. 1
INTRODUCTION	. 1
Study Area	. 1
LEVEL OF SERVICE METHODOLOGIES	. 3
EXISTING TRANSPORTATION CONDITIONS	. 5
Existing Roadway Network	. 5
Principal Arterial Corridor (PAC)	. 6
Roadway Classification	10
Existing Traffic Operations	11
TRAVEL DEMAND MODEL DEVELOPMENT 1	16
Data Sources1	16
Data Evaluation1	16
Existing Land Use Summaries1	17
Travel Demand Modeling Software 1	9
TAZ Map1	9
Land Use –TAZ Integration	21
Traffic Model Network Creation	21
Model Job-Stream Creation	22
Trip Generation	22
Trip Distribution	24
Trip Transformation	24
Traffic Assignment	24
Year 2030 Model Forecasts	25
YEAR 2030 TRANSPORTATION CONDITIONS	27
Growth Projections	27
Year 2030 Traffic Operations	27
YEAR 2030 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT NEEDS	39
Year Transportation Improvements Need	39
YEAR 2030 ESTIMATED IMPROVEMENT COSTS 4	12
Planning Level Cost Estimates4	12
TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS 4	46
TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE COST METHODOLOGIES 5	59
Impact Fee Methodology5	59
Initial Zone of Benefit Boundary Determination6	50
ADJACENT AGENCY COMPARATIVE FEE ANALYSIS	53
Typical Fees Levied by Lake County And Cities6	53
Comparison With Surrounding Agency Fees 6	53

Figure 1 – Lake County – Planning Areas & Boundaries	2
Figure 2 – Existing Intersection Lane Geometrics and Control	7
Figure 3 – Existing PM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes	8
Figure 4 – Lake County TAZ Map	20
Figure 5 – Lake County Gateways	23
Figure 6 – Year 2030 Summer Conditions PM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes	29
Figure 7A – Lake County - Year 2030 – Year 2007 Model Forecasts	30
Figure 7B – Lakeport Zone of Benefit - Year 2030 – Year 2007 Model Forecasts	31
Figure 7C - Clear Lake Zone of Benefit - Year 2030 - Year 2007 Model Forecasts	32
Figure 7D – Shoreline Communities Zone of Benefit - Year 2030 – Year 2007 Model Forecasts	33
Figure 8A - Year 2030 Feasible Roadway Improvements - Shoreline Communities Planning Area	47
Figure 8B - Year 2030 Feasible Roadway Improvements - City of Lakeport	48
Figure 8C - Year 2030 Feasible Roadway Improvements - Middletown Planning Area	49
Figure 8D - Year 2030 Feasible Roadway Improvements - Cobb Mountain Planning Area	50
Figure 8E – Year 2030 Feasible Roadway Improvements – Rivieras Planning Area	51
Figure 8F – Year 2030 Feasible Roadway Improvements – Kelseyville Planning Area	52
Figure 8G - Year 2030 Feasible Roadway Improvements - Upper Lake/Nice Planning Area	53
Figure 8H – Year 2030 Feasible Roadway Improvements – City of Clear Lake	54

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Level of Service (LOS) Criteria For Intersections	4
Table 2 Level of Service (LOS) Criteria for Roadways	4
Table 3 Existing Conditions Intersection LOS	11
Table 4 Existing Conditions Roadway Segment LOS	12
Table 5 Existing Land Use Summary	18
Table 6 Year 2030 Land Use Summary	26
Table 7 Lake County land use summaries	28
Table 8 Year 2030 Summer Conditions Without Improvements: Intersection LOS	34
Table 9 Year 2030 Conditions Without Improvements: Roadway Segment LOS	35
Table 10 Lake County Transportation Improvement Needs	40
Table 11 Lake County Planning Level Cost Estimates	43
Table 12 Lake County Planning Level Cost Estimates And Potential Funding Sources	55
Table 13 Transportation Impact Fee Costs - Local and Regional Zone of Benefit Totals	61
Table 14 Transportation Impact Fee Costs - Combined Local/Regional Totals	62
Table 15 Lake County/City Fee Summary (Based on Typical Single Family Residence)	63
Table 16 Lake County/City Fee Summary - Including New Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) (Based	
on Typical Single Family Residence)	63
Table 17 Adjacent Agency Fees – Typical Single-Family Residence (Based on Typical Single Family	
Residence)	64

APPENDIX

EDU Equivalents Intersection LOS Worksheets Planning Level Cost Estimates

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.



		2					/					
		\sim	IDDLETOWN	29 M		1 4	IAL	INDUSTR	MERCIAL	IAL COM	RESIDENTI	
			•					39	105		2,789	KISTING
			,	MIDDLETOWN	{ (39	164		2,945	AR 2030
			Ì	}				0	59		156	1TWO
]	c0	\mathbf{X}	June	l		ING ARE	AS PLANN	RIVIERA		
			CO	LAKE	Č,	RIAL	INDUSTRIA	IMERCIAL	TIAL COM	RESIDEN		
				J. Nam	}		0	145	8	4,788	XISTING	E>
				z	ĺ	1	0	228	9	5,329	EAR 2030	YF
	EA	PLANNING ARI		, I	į.		0	83		541	ROWTH	GF
STRIAL	INDUSTF	COMMERCIAL	RESIDENTIAL		5	REA	ANNING AR	NTAIN PL	OBB MOU	CC		
27	27	108	3,492	EXISTING		INDUSTRIAL	MERCIAL	TIAL COM	RESIDEN			
¥7	47	211	3,901	YEAR 2030		0	62	+	2,364	ISTING	EXI	
20	20	103	409	GROWTH		0	150	3	2,428	AR 2030	YE,	
						0	87		64	ROWTH	GR	
	<u>ES1</u>	Figure I			e Program	mpact Fe	tion Im	nsporta	al Trar	egiona	wide Re	ounty
	<u>= S1</u>	Figure I			e Program	mpact Fe	stion Im	nsporte	64 al Trar		wide Re	

T990TG031.DWG(28MAY08)25-4306-01

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.



T990TG022.DWG(28MAY08)25-4306-01



T990TG044.DWG(28MAY08)25-4306-01



Zone of Benefit	Improvement Number	Facility Description	Existing Conditions	Recommended Improvements	Construction Cost Estimate (1,000 \$)	Cost Imcluded in the Fee Program
0	KRC#4	Gaddy Ln Loasa Rd. to Soda Bay Rd.	Two lane rural raodway	Roadway Improvements	\$6,383	\$6,383
ieras/C Areas	KRC#10	Merritt Rd SR 29 to Big Valley Rd.	Two lane rural raodway	Safety and operational improvements	\$3,119	\$3,119
le/Riv nning	KRC#11	Highland Springs Rd SR 29 to Bell Hill Rd.	Two lane rural raodway	Improve to two-lane collector	\$2,652	\$2,652
lseyvil bb Pla	KRC#12	Main St. (Kelseyville) - Bell Hill Rd. to State St.	Two lane rural roadway	Widen to two-lane undivided arterial	\$2,679	\$2,679
Ke				Total Cost	\$14,833	\$14,833
	LP #1	Park Way. - SR 29 SB ramps to Lakeshore Blvd.	Two lane roadway	Improve to two-lane collector	\$5,270	\$5,270
eport	LP #2	S.Main St Lakeport Blvd. to SR 175	Two lane roadway	Improve to four-lane undivided arterial	\$5,511	\$5,511
ty of Lak	LP #3	11 th St SR 29 SB ramps to Main St.	Two lane roadway	Roadway improvements and signalization at some intersections	\$7,353	\$7,353
ncl. Cit	LP #4	High St 16 th St. to 20 th St.	Two lane roadway	Traffic signals at 16th St. and 20th St.	\$560	\$560
ıg Area iı	LP #5	Lakeshore Blvd city limits to Nice Lucerne Cut-off	Two lane roadway	Roadway improvements and signalization at some intersections	\$20,588	\$20,588
lannir	LP #6	Lakeport Blvd. - SR 29 SB ramps to Main St.	Two lane roadway	Roadway and intersection improvements	\$6,238	\$6,238
seport F	LP #10	Soda Bay Rd SR 175/S.Main St. to Lakeport Planning Area boundary	Two lane roadway	Roadway & intersection improvements	\$10,285	\$10,285
Lal	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	\$6,304
				Total Cost	\$62,109	\$62,109

Table ES-1Year 2030 Fee Program Improvements

Zone of Benefit	Improvement Number	Facility Description	Existing Conditions	Recommended Improvements	Construction Cost Estimate (1,000 \$)	Cost Imcluded in the Fee Program
	CL #1	Lakeshore Dr. - SR 53/W 40th Ave. to Park St./Manakee St.	Two lane roadway	Roadway widening and intersection improvements incl. parking lot construction	\$9,097	\$9,097
Area	CL #2	Old Hwy. 53 - Olympic Dr. to SR 53	Two lane roadway	Roadway widening and intersection improvements	\$8,465	\$8,465
anning	CL #3	Olympic Dr Lakeshore Dr. to SR 53	Two lane roadway	Roadway widening and intersection improvements	\$4,189	\$4,189
ke Pla	CL #4	40th Ave SR 53 to Phillips Ave.	Two lane roadway	Widen to two-lane undivided arterial	\$1,300	\$1,300
ver La	CL #5	18th Ave SR 53 to Boyles Ave.	Two lane roadway	Widen to two lane undivided arterial	\$2,658	\$2,658
ke/Lov	CL #6	Dam Rd Lake St. to SR 53	Two lane roadway	Roadway and intersection improvements	\$1,275	\$1,275
Lal	CL #7	Boyles Ave 18th Ave. to 33rd Ave.	Two lane roadway	Improve to 2-lane collector	\$2,047	\$2,047
Clear	CL #8	Burns Valley Rd - Old Hwy. 53 to Arrowhead Rd.	Two lane roadway	Roadway and intersection improvements	\$3,721	\$3,721
City of	CL #9	Arrowhead Rd. - Burns Valley Rd. to Pomo Rd.	Two lane roadway	Improve to 2-lane collector	\$828	\$828
	CL #=10	Pomo Rd. - Arrowhead Rd. to Lakeshore Dr.	Two lane roadway	Improve to 2-lane collector	\$768	\$768
				Total Cost	\$34,348	\$34,348
town g Area	MID#2	Hartmann Rd SR 29 to Stinson Ranch Rd.	Two lane rural roadway	Safety and operational improvements	\$1,343	\$1,343
Middle	MID#7	Butts Canyon Rd. - SR 29 to Loconomi Ln.	Two lane rural roadway	Widen to two-lane undivided arterial	\$9,118	\$9,118
I Id				Total Cost	\$10,461	\$10,461
Jpper ke/Nice	ULS #1	SR 20 - Nice Lucerne Cut-off to Sulphur Banks Drive	Two lane roadway	Safety and operational improvements	\$19,648	\$19,648
Lal				Total Cost	\$19,648	\$19,648

Table ES-1Year 2030 Fee Program Improvements

Zone of Benefit	Improvement Number	Facility Description	Existing Conditions	Recommended Improvements	Construction Cost Estimate (1,000 \$)	Cost Imcluded in the Fee Program
	LAK#1	SR 29 - Nice Lucerne Cut-off to Lakeport Blvd.	Four-lane freeway	Intersection improvements at ramp intersections	\$2,518	\$630
	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	\$50,000
ities	LAK#5	SR 29 - Diener Dr. to SR 53	Two lane arterial	Safety and operational improvements	\$2,032	\$2,032
ı Facil	LAK#7	SR 29 - SR 29/SR 53 to Lake/Napa County line	Two lane arterial	Safety and operational improvements	\$12,477	\$12,477
rtatior	LAK#9	SR 53 - SR 29 (Lowerlake) to SR 20/SR 53	Two lane arterial wth some sections being four-lane	Safety and operational improvements	\$5,240	\$5,240
ıodsuu	LAK#11	SR 20 - SR 53 to Lake/Yolo County line	Two lane arterial with some sections having a passing lane	Safety and operational improvements	\$8,855	\$8,855
al Tra	LAK#12	SR 20 - SR 29 jct to Lake/Mendocino County line	Two lane arterial with some sections having a passing lane	Safety and operational improvements	\$7,299	\$7,299
tegion	LAK#14	SR 175 - Lake/Mendocino County line to SR 29	Two lane roadway	Safety and operational improvements	\$4,745	\$4,745
wide F	LAK#16	SR 175 -Bottle Rock Rd. to SR 29 (Middletown)	Two lane roadway	Safety and operational improvements	\$3,462	\$3,462
ounty	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	\$13,830
Ŭ	LAK#18	Bottle Rock Rd SR 29 to SR 175	Two lane roadway	Safety and operational improvements	\$6,494	\$6,494
	LAK#19	SR 20/SR 53 intersection	Two-Way Stop Controlled	Signalization + intersection improvements	\$3,000	\$750
	LAK#20	SR 20/SR 29 intersection	Two-Way Stop Controlled	Signalization + intersection improvements	\$3,000	\$750
				Total Cost	\$272,952	\$116,564
				TOTALS	\$414,351	\$257,963

Table ES-1Year 2030 Fee Program Improvements

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

	Transportation				
	Estimates	State Facility	Total		Transportation
	(Exclding State	Cost Estimates	Transportation	Equivalent	Impact Fee
Zone of Benefit	Facilities Improvements)	Included In Fee Program	Improvement Cost Estimates	Dwelling Units (EDU's)	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-3TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE COSTS BY ZONE OF BENEFIT

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

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 dwelling unit Actual fees will differ	nd are based upon a typical	2,000 square foot	

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 TIF	Total Fees Including 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 a will differ.	re based upon a typical 2	2,000 square foot dw	elling unit. Actual fees

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.

	Local	
Location	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	\$39,190

 TABLE ES-6

 ADJACENT AGENCY TRAFFIC FEE PROGRAMS AND TOTAL FEES

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.

<u>Response</u>: 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.

<u>Response</u>: 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?

<u>Response</u>: 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?

<u>Response</u>: 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

<u>Response</u>: 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

<u>Response</u>: 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.

<u>Response</u>: 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.

<u>Response</u>: 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.

<u>Response</u>: 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.

<u>Response</u>: 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.

<u>Response</u>: 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.

<u>Response</u>: 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?

<u>Response</u>: 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?

<u>Response</u>: 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?

<u>Response</u>: 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	 Lowerlake
Nice	Cobb Mountain	 Shoreline Communities

• Lakeport

- Middletown

• 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-stop-controlled (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.

Level				Stopped Delay		/Vehicle	
of Service	Type of Flow	Delav	Maneuverability	Signalized	Un signalized	All-Way Stop	
A	Stable Flow	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	
В	Stable Flow	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.	>10.0 and < 20.0	>10.0 and < 15.0	>10.0 and < 15.0	
С	Stable Flow	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	>20.0 and < 35.0	>15.0 and < 25.0	>15.0 and < 25.0	
D	Approaching Unstable Flow	The influence of congestion becomes more noticeable. Longer delays may result from some combination of unfavorable progression, long cycle lengths, or high 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.	>35.0 and < 55.0	>25.0 and < 35.0	>25.0 and < 35.0	
E	Unstable Flow	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.	>55.0 and < 80.0	>35.0 and < 50.0	>35.0 and < 50.0	
F	Forced Flow	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 1 LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS) CRITERIA FOR INTERSECTIONS

 TABLE 2

 LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS) CRITERIA FOR ROADWAYS

Roadway Type	Average Daily Traffic (ADT) – Total of Both Directions						
Roudway Type	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 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., 11th 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) 11th Street/State Route 29 NB ramps
- 25) (Scotts Valley Road) 11th 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.





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)
- State Route 53/40th Avenue (in Clear Lake)
- 3. State Route 53/18th 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. 11th Street/Forbes Street
- 4. 11th Street/Main Street
- 5. Martin Street/Forbes Street
- 6. Martin Street/Main Street
- 7. 20th Street/Hartley Road
- 8. 20th 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, 11th 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.

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

TABLE 3 XISTING CONDITIONS INTERSECTION LOS

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, 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.

Planning Area	Roadway Segment	from location	to location	Capacity Configuration	2007 Two-WayADT Count	2007 LOS
	SR 29	SR 20/SR 29 jct.	Nice Lucerne cutoff	4-Lane Freeway	6100	Α
	SR 29	Nice Lucerne cutoff	Park Way	4-Lane Freeway	9700	Α
	SR 29	Park Way.	11th St.	4-Lane Freeway	12500	Α
	SR 29	11th St.	Lakeport Blvd.	4-Lane Freeway	15100	Α
	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	Kentro Dr.	Merritt Rd.	2-Lane Undiv Art.	9000	В
	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	В
SR 20	SR 29	Cole Creek Rd.	Boule Rock Rd.	2-Lane Undiv Art.	10300	В
5K 29	SR 29	Bottle Rock Rd.	Cak Creek Ranch	2-Lane Undiv Art.	0200	В
	SR 29		SR 1/3		9300	В
	SR 29	SR 1/5 (Kelseyville)	SR 281 (Red Hills Rd.)	2-Lane Undiv Art.	8900	A
	SR 29	Dieper Dr	Eagles Nest Ln.	2-Lane Undiv Art.	8600	A
	SR 29	Diener Dr.	Pl. Lakeview Rd.	2-Lane Undiv Art.	8000	A D
	SR 29	Pt. Lakeview Rd.	Stegler Canyon Rd.	2-Lane Undiv Art.	9000	Б
	SR 29	SP20/SP 52 int	SK 29/SK 35 Jct.	2-Lane Undiv Art	10600	C
	SR 29	SR29/SR 35 JCt Spruge Grove Pd. (southern)	Hartmann Pd	2-Lane Undiv Art.	0000	D
	SR 29	Butts Canyon Rd	Diamond Panch Pd	2 Lane Undiv Art	11300	Б С
	SR 29	Butts Canyon Rd	Wardlaw St	2-Lane Undiv Art.	10900	C
	SR 29	Wardlaw St	SR 29/SR 175 ict	2-Lane Undiv Art	10900	C
	SR 29	SR 29/SR 75 ict	Douglas St	2-Lane Undiv Art	10800	C
	SR 29	Lake Ave	Dry Creek Cut off	2-Lane Undiv Art	10200	B
	SR 29	Drv Creek Cutoff	Western Mine Rd.	2-Lane Undiv Art.	9000	B
	SR 53	SR29/SR 53 ict	Anderson Ranch Pkwy.	4-Lane Div Art.	17000	А
	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	А
SR 53	SR 53	18th Ave.	40th Ave.	4-Lane Div Art.	17000	А
	SR 53	40th Ave.	Olympic Dr.	2-Lane Undiv Art.	8400	А
	SR 53	Olympic Dr.	Old Hwy. 53	2-Lane Undiv Art.	9957	В
	SR 53	Old Hwy. 53	SR20/SR 53 jct.	2-Lane Undiv Art.	7000	Α
	SR 20	LAK/YOL County Line	SR 20/SR 53 jct	2-Lane Undiv Art.	6600	А
	SR 20	SR 20/SR 53 jct	Sulphur Bank Dr.	2-Lane Undiv Art.	6600	Α
	SR 20	Sulphur Bank Dr.	Country Club Dr.(Lucerne)	2-Lane Undiv Art.	7956	Α
SR 20	SR 20	Country Club Dr. (Lucerne)	Lakeview Blvd.	2-Lane Undiv Art.	9064	В
51(20	SR 20	Lakeview Blvd.	Nice Lucerne cutoff	2-Lane Undiv Art.	11500	С
	SR 20	Nice Lucerne cutoff	SR 29/SR 20 jct.	2-Lane Undiv Art.	8000	Α
	SR 20	SR 29/SR 20 jct	Scotts Valley Rd.	2-Lane Undiv Art.	8800	Α
	SR 20	Scotts Valley Rd.	LAK/MEND County line	2-Lane Undiv Art.	8300	Α
	SR 175	SR 175 jct(Lakeport)	LAK/MEND bdy.	Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art.	2000	Α
	SR 175	SR 29 (Cobb)	Red Hills Rd.	Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art.	680	Α
	SR 175	Red Hills Rd.	Loch Lomond Rd.	Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art.	680	Α
SR175	SR 175	Loch Loomond Rd.	Bottle Rock Rd.	Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art.	4032	Α
	SR 175	Bottle Rock Rd.	Golf Rd.	Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art.	3900	Α
	SR 175	Golf Rd.	Anderson Springs Rd.	Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art.	2800	Α
	SR 175	Anderson Springs Rd.	Dry Creek Cut off	Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art.	3500	Α
<u> </u>	SR 175	Dry Creek Cutoff	SR 29	Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art.	3100	A
е	Scotts Valley Rd.	Hill Rd./Halber Rd.	Riggs Rd.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	1900	С
iN/s	Scotts Valley Rd.	Riggs Rd.	SR 29 SB ramps	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	2000	С
Lake	Elk Mtn. Rd.	SR 20	LAK/MEND County line	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	828	Α
er l	Upper Lake/Lucerne Rd	SR 20	Hillcrest Dr.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	170	Α

Planning Area	Roadway Segment	from location	to location	Capacity Configuration	2007 Two-WayADT Count	2007 LOS
Upi	Upper Lake/Lucerne Rd	SR 20	Foothill Oaks Dr.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	110 540	A
	Easth:11	SR 20	Ougell Rd.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	540	A
	Pulo	SR 20 SR 20	Old Lake County Pd	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	260	A
e	Fyle Saure Ave	SR 20	Lakeshore Blyd	Substd. 2 Lane Collector	330	A
Nic	Sayre Ave	SR 20	Broadway Ave	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	660	Δ
ake	Lakeview Dr	SR 20	north of SR 20	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	1510	B
er I	Nice Lucerne cut-off	SR 29 SB ramps	Lakeshore Blvd.	Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art.	6243	C
Upp	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	С
	16th St.	Hartley St.	High St.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	1650	В
	16th St.	N. High St.	Forbes St.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	195	Α
	11th St.	Mountview Rd.	SR 29 SB ramps	2-Lane Collector	2000	В
	11th St.	SR 29 NB ramps	Central Park Ave.	2-Lane Collector	10650	С
	11th St.	Central Park Ave.	Mellor Dr.	2-Lane Collector	11500	С
	11th St.	Mellor Dr.	Brush St.	2-Lane Collector	9820	С
	11th St.	High St.	Forbes St.	2-Lane Collector	7400	С
	11th St.	Forbes St.	Main St.(Kelseyville)	2-Lane Collector	4500	С
	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	/III St.	oui St. 5th St	Substd. 2 Lane Collector	260	A
	N Brush St	Armstrong St	Martin St	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	65	Δ
	Compton Ave	Keeling Ave	Samuelson Ct	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	420	Δ
	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
t	Forbes St	Armstrong St.	Martin St.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	2600	С
ipor	Hartley Rd	Scotts Valley Rancheria Rd.	20th St.	2-Lane Collector	760	А
ort Lake	Hartley Rd	Sunset Dr.	Boggs Ln.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	1450	В
kepa of 1	Hartley Rd	16th St.	17th St.	2-Lane Collector	2000	В
La City	High Street	17th St.	Lakeshore Blvd.	2-Lane Undiv Art.	7700	Α
ncl.	Main Street	11th St.	9th St.	2-Lane Div Art.	7021	А
ņ	Main Street	9th St.	6th St.	2-Lane Div Art.	6671	Α
	Main Street	6th St.	2nd St.	2-Lane Div Art.	6746	Α
	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.	Baying Bd	Bevins Rd.	2 Lane Undiv Art	14300	D D
	Dark Way	Hill Pd. Wost	S.Malli St.	2-Lane Undiv Art.	9900 800	
	Park Way	SR 29 SB ramps	Keeling Ave	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	2600	C A
	Park Wav	Keeling Ave	Lakeshore Blvd	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	2200	C
	Russell St.	2nd St.	Armstrong St.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	810	Ā
	Russell St.	Armstrong St.	Martin St.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	960	В
	Walnut Dr.	Lakeshore Blvd.	3rd Ave.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	410	А
	Lakeshore Blvd.	Hillview Dr.	Walnut Dr.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	3703	С
	Lakeshore Blvd.	Walnut Dr.	Lowen Ln.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	3645	С
	Lakeshore Blvd.	Lowen Ln.	Park Way	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	4595	С
	Lakeshore Blvd.	Park Way.	Wight Ln.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	5179	С
	Lakeshore Blvd.	Wight Ln.	Crystal Lake Way	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	5589	С
	Lakeshore Blvd	Crystal Lake Way.	Rainbow Rd.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	5585	С

Planning Area	Roadway Segment	from location	to location	Capacity Configuration	2007 Two-WayADT Count	2007 LOS
ille	Highland Springs	SR 29	Bell Hill Rd.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	1700	В
ылы	Highland Springs	Red Rock Rd.	Bell Hill Rd.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	280	A
Kels	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
	Konocti Bay	Dt. Lakoviow Pd	Day Lii.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	700	A
	Live Oak Dr	Main St (Kelsevville)	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	С
	Gaddy Lane	Merritt Rd.	Soda Bay Rd.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	1619	В
ille	State St.	Gaddy Ln.	Sylar Ln.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	2000	С
seyv	State St.	Sylar Ln.	Main St.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	2500	С
Kels	Main St.	Bell Hill Rd.	State St.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	1552	В
	Wight Way	Kelsey Creek Dr.	Adobe Creek Rd.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	305	Α
	Gifford Springs	SR 175	Cobb Blvd.	2-Lane Collector	740	Α
	Soda Bay Rd.	SR 175/S.Main St.	Sylva Ln.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	4257	С
	Soda Bay Rd.	Sylva Ln.	Highland Springs Rd.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	3832	С
	Soda Bay Rd.	Highland Springs Rd.	Stone Dr.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	3559	С
	Soda Bay Rd.	Stone Dr.	Park Dr.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	3210	С
	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
	Bottle Rock Rd.	Kelseyville/Cobb bdy.	Harrington Flat Rd.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	2125	С
	Bottle Rock Rd.	Harrington Flat Rd.	Sulphur Creek Rd.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	1350	В
	Bottle Rock Rd.	Sulphur Creek Rd.	SR 175	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	1650	В
Cobh	Sulphur Creek	Harrington Flat Rd.	SK 1/5 Sulphur Crook Dd	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	320	A
CODD	Harrington Flat Rd.	Sulphur Crock Rd.	Sulphur Creek Rd.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	411	A
	Golf Road	SR 175	Cobb Blvd	Substd 2-Lane Collector	890	A 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 Canvon Rd.	Siegler Springs Rd.	Harbin Springs Rd.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	132	А
	Big Canyon Rd.	Harbin Springs Rd.	SR 175	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	1137	В
	Hartmann Rd.	SR 29	Hidden Valley Rd.	2-Lane Collector	3000	В
	Butts Canyon Rd.	SR 29	Eureka Rd.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	1900	С
	Washington St.	Main St. (Middletown)	Armstrong St.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	570	Α
	Main St.	SR 29	Washington St.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	950	В
	Santa Clara	SR 175	Lake Ave.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	550	Α
	Spruce Grove Rd.	Spruce Grove Rd.	Deer Hill Rd.	2-Lane Collector	4150	С
uw	Spruce Grove Rd.	Deer Hill Rd.	Jerusalem Grade	2-Lane Collector	350	Α
lleto	Stewart St.	SR 175	Douglas St.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	320	Α
fidd	Stewart St.	Douglas St.	Pine St.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	130	Α
~	Barnes St.	Stewart St.	Wardlaw St.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	220	Α
	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	В
	Wasnington St.	Iviain St.	Armstrong St.	Substd. 2 Lane Collector	640	A
	Toung St.	SR 29	Dusfi SL.	Substd. 2 Long Collector	570	A
	Young St.	OK 27 Washington St	washingtofi St.	Substd 2 Lane Collector	140	A A
	SR 281	Cobb Rivieras bdv	SR 29	2-Lane Collector	910	A
—	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
eras	Fairway Dr	SR 281 (Soda Bay Rd.)	Pt.Lakeview Rd.	2-Lane Collector	1430	Ā
Rivi	Point Lake View Rd.	SR 281	Fairway Dr.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	2800	С

Planning Area	Roadway Segment	from location	to location	Capacity Configuration	2007 Two-WayADT Count	2007 LOS
	Point Lake View Rd.	Fairway Dr.	Konocti Vista Dr.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	960	В
	Point Lake View Rd.	Konocti Vista Dr.	SR 29	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	610	A
ike	Lake St.	Morgan Valley Rd.	Dam Rd.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	1200	B
verla	Mill St.	Morgan Valley Rd.	2nd St.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	750	A
Гон	Mill St.	Morgan Valley Rd.	Rose St.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	45	A
k	Seigler Canyon Rd	Dorni P.d. N	Perini Rd. N	Substd. 2 Lane Collector	850	D A
erla e	Seigler Canyon Rd	Perini Rd. S	Siegler Springs N. Rd	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	990	B
мо	Tish-a-tang Rd	Lake St	east of Lake St	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	410	A
7	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	А
	Boyles Avenue	40th Ave.	33rd Ave.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	40	Α
	Boyles Avenue	33rd Ave.	18th Ave.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	1070	В
	18th Avenue	SR 53	Phillips Ave.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	2710	С
	18th Avenue	Phillips Ave.	Boyles Ave.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	1710	В
	40th Ave.	SR 53	Phillips Ave.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	4100	С
	40th Ave.	Phillips Ave.	Boyles Ave.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	290	Α
	Burns Valley Road	Arrowhead Rd.	Sonoma Way	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	1280	В
	Burns Valley Road	Olympic Dr./Old Hwy 53	Bowers Ave.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	3400	С
	Cypress St.	Olympic Dr.	Austin Ave.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	460	Α
	Dam Rd.	just west of Dam Rd./Lake St.	Lake St.	2-Lane Collector	2400	В
	Davis St	Eureka Ave.	Phillips Ave.	2-Lane Collector	1775	Α
	Davis St	Phillips Ave.	Irvine Ave.	2-Lane Collector	1110	Α
	Davis St	Boyles Ave.	Konocti Ave.	2-Lane Collector	880	А
	Huntington Ave.	Pomo Rd.	Manakee St.	2-Lane Collector	220	Α
	Huntington Ave.	Manakee St.	Lakeshore Dr.	2-Lane Collector	230	Α
	Lakeshore Drive	SR 53	Old Hwy. 53	Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art.	15600	С
	Lakeshore Drive	Old Hwy. 53	Mullen Ave.	Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art.	11100	В
e	Lakeshore Drive	Mullen Ave.	Divison Ave.	Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art.	8900	С
Lak	Lakeshore Drive	Division Ave.	Olympic Dr.	Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art.	8000	В
ear	Lakeshore Drive	Olympic Dr.	Pomo Rd.	Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art.	7650	В
Cl'	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
	Did Hwy 55.	SK 55 Amouthood Rd /Domo Rd	Park Bivd.	2-Lane Collector	0620	A D
	Burns Valley Rd.	Woodlawn Dr	Rowers Ave	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	902	D
	Burns Valley Road	Bowers Ave	Olympic Dr	Substd. 2 Lane Collector	3400	D 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	С
	Olympic Dr.	Cypress St.	Old. Hwy 53	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	8250	С
	Olympic Dr.	Old Hwy. 53	Washington St.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	8150	С
	Olympic Dr.	Washington St.	SR 53	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	7500	С
	Pomo Rd.	Arrowhead Rd.	Lakeshore Dr.	2-Lane Undiv Art.	465	Α
	Arrowhead Rd.	Pomo Rd.	Burns Valley Rd.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	962	В
	West 40th St.	Mullen Ave.	Laddell Ave	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	330	А
	Woodland Dr.	Burns Valley Rd.	Koloko St.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	165	А
	Arrowhead/Pomo Rd.	Burns Valley Rd.	Lakeshore Dr.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	5600	С

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.
E	EXISTING LAND USES								
		Residential	Commercial	Industrial	Other				
Planning Area	TAZ_#	(du's)	(acres)	(acres)	(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		35,911	1,279	116	770,218				

TABLE 5 EXISTING LAND USE SUMMARY

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 "four-step" 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 "man-made" 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 non-residential 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 inter-zonal 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.

• 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 low-capacity, 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.

F	FUTURE LAND USES								
		Residential	Commercial	Industrial	Other				
Planning Area	TAZ_#	(du's)	(acres)	(acres)	(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				

 TABLE 6

 YEAR 2030 LAND USE SUMMARY

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.

E	XISTING L	AND USES			
		Residential	Commercial	Industrial	Other
Planning Area	TAZ_#	(du's)	(acres)	(acres)	(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		35,911	1.279	116	770.218
GR	OWTH IN	LAND USES			
		Residential	Commercial	Industrial	Other
Planning Area	TAZ_#	(du's)	(acres)	(acres)	(acres)
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
F	UTURE LA	ND USES	•	•	
		Residential	Commercial	Industrial	Other
Planning Area	TAZ #	(du's)	(acres)	(acres)	(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
Kelsevville	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
% G	ROWTH IN	LAND USES	_,	-00	
		Residential	Commercial	Industrial	Other
Planning Area	TAZ_#	(du's)	(acres)	(acres)	(acres)
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	700 700	110/	57%		0%
	/00-/33	11 70	51/0	-	0 /0
Shoreline Communities excl. City of Clear Lake	700-733 800-845	11%	28%	77%	0%
Shoreline Communities excl. City of Clear Lake City of Clear Lake	700-733 800-845 900-940	11% 10% 45%	28% 62%	77%	0%
Shoreline Communities excl. City of Clear Lake City of Clear Lake City of Lakeport	700-733 800-845 900-940 950-987	11% 10% 45% 27%	28% 62% 34%	77% 1235% 0%	0% 0% 0%

TABLE 7 LAKE COUNTY LAND USE SUMMARIES











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.

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

 TABLE 8

 YEAR 2030 SUMMER CONDITIONS WITHOUT IMPROVEMENTS: INTERSECTION LOS

Notes:

TWSC = Two Way Stop ControlAWSC = 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.

Planning Area	Roadway Segment	rom location	o location	Capacity Configuration	030 Vol. WINTER Conditions)	030 Vol. SUMMER Conditions)	ummer Conditions (ear 2030 LOS
	SR 29	SR 20/SR 29 ict.	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	А
	SR 29	11th St.	Lakeport Blvd.	4-Lane Freeway	24583	27041	А
	SR 29	Lakeport Blvd.	end of freeway	4-Lane Freeway	22922	25214	А
	SR 29	end of freeway segment	SR 175/Main St.	4-Lane Freeway	22859	25145	А
	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	SR 29	Bottle Rock Rd.	Oak Creek Ranch	2-Lane Undiv Art.	10274	11301	С
	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	С
	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 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
GD 53	SR 53	Old Hwy. 53	18th Ave.	4-Lane Div Art.	29760	32736	E
SK 53	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 55	Old Hwy. 55	SR 20/SR 55 jct.	2-Lane Undiv Art.	13966	15363	F
	SR 20	EAK/YOL County Line	SR 20/SR 53 jct.	2-Lane Undiv Art.	14047	15452	F
	SR 20	SK 20/SK 55 Jct.	Supplur Bank Dr.	2-Lane Undiv Art.	12211	13432	ע
	SR 20	Country Club Dr. (Lucorno)	Lakaviaw Blud	2-Lane Undiv Art.	12162	12110	D E
SR 20	SR 20	Lakoviow Plvd	Nice Lucerne outoff	2-Lane Undiv Art.	16480	19129	F
	SR 20	Nice Lucerne cutoff	SP 20/SP 20 jet	2-Lane Undiv Art.	12406	13647	F
	SR 20	SR 29/SR 20 jet	Scotts Valley Pd	2 Lane Undiv Art	17161	18877	F
	SR 20	Scotts Valley Rd.	LAK/MEND County line	2-Lane Undiv Art.	19887	21876	F
	SR 175	SR 175 ict (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
SR175	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	С
e)	Scotts Valley Rd.	Hill Rd./Halber Rd.	Riggs Rd.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	3962	4358	D
Nic	Scotts Valley Rd.	Riggs Rd.	SR 29 SB ramps	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	5765	6342	Е
ake/	Elk Mtn. Rd.	SR 20	LAK/MEND County line	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	1027	1130	В
r L	Upper Lake/Lucerne Rd	SR 20	Hillcrest Dr.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	119	131	Α
$_{bbe}$	Upper Lake/Lucerne Rd	SR 20	Foothill Oaks Dr.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	157	173	Α
L L	Country Club	SR 20	Odgen Rd.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	1669	1836	С
	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	Α

Planning Area	Roadway Segment	om location	olocation	Capacity Configuration	030 Vol. WINTER Conditions)	030 Vol. SUMMER Conditions)	ummer Conditions ear 2030 LOS
e	Saure Ave	SR 20		Substd 2-I ane Collector	2535	2789	s z
Nia	Sayre Ave	SR 20	Broadway Ave	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	683	751	A
ake	Lakeview Dr.	SR 20	north of SR 20	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	2648	2913	C
er I	Nice Lucerne cut-off	SR 29 SB ramps	Lakeshore Blvd.	Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art.	9707	10678	F
Upp	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	С
	16th St.	N. High St.	Forbes St.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	831	914	В
	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
	l 1th St.	Forbes St.	Main St.(Kelseyville)	2-Lane Collector	6379	121	D A
	Armstrong St	Spurr St.	Armstrong St.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	204	224	A
	Armstrong St.	Spuri St. Brush St	Forbes St	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	632	695	A 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	В
	N.Brush St.	6th St.	5th St.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	517	569	Α
	N.Brush St.	Armstrong St.	Martin St.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	259	285	А
	Compton Ave,	Keeling Ave.	Samuelson Ct.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	406	447	А
	Crystal Lake Way	Hartley St.	Keeling Ave.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	1029	1132	В
	Crystal Lake Way	Lakeshore Blvd.	Howard Ave.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	388	427	Α
)rt	Forbes St	Armstrong St.	Martin St.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	3104	3414	С
kepa	Hartley Rd	Scotts Valley Rancheria Rd.	20th St.	2-Lane Collector	1489	1638	A
port f La	Hartley Rd	Sunset Dr.	Boggs Ln.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	2961	3257	C
akel ty oj	Hartley Rd	16th St.	17th St.	2-Lane Collector	2957	3253	B
L Cit	High Street	17th St.	Lakeshore Blvd.	2-Lane Undiv Art.	9230	10153	B
incl	Main Street	11th St.	9th St.	2-Lane Div Art.	8/10	9588	A
	Main Street	9til St.	2nd St	2-Lane Div Art	8322	9154	A 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	А
	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	Е
	Park Way	Hill Rd. West	SR 29 SB ramps	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	936	1030	В
	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	С
	Russell St.	2nd St.	Armstrong St.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	1620	1782	В
	Russell St.	Armstrong St.	Martin St.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	1065	1172	В
	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 Wight Lp	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	7205	7320 8025	
	Lakeshore Blvd.	Faik way Wight I n	Crystal Lake Way	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	7253	8529	D
	Lakeshore Blvd	Crystal Lake Way.	Rainbow Rd.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	7734	8507	D
.e	Highland Springs	SR 29	Bell Hill Rd.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	4094	4503	D
will	Highland Springs	Red Rock Rd.	Bell Hill Rd.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	1004	1104	В
(<i>se</i>)	Bell Hill Rd.	Highland Springs Rd.	SR 29	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	1671	1838	С
Ke	Bell Hill Rd.	SR 29	Main St.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	1406	1547	В
	Konocti Bay	SR 281	Bay Ln.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	1341	1475	В
	Konocti Bay	Pt. Lakeview Rd.	Sequoia Rd.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	1956	2152	С
	Live Oak Dr.	Main St. (Kelseyville)	SR 29	2-Lane Collector	2630	2893	В
	Live Oak Dr.	SR 29	Cruickshank Rd.	2-Lane Collector	1260	1386	Α

Planning Area	Roadway Segment	rom location	o location	Capacity Configuration	030 Vol. WINTER Conditions)	030 Vol. SUMMER Conditions)	iummer Conditions (ear 2030 LOS
	Meritt	Renfro Dr.	SR 29	2-Lane Collector	3540	3894	C
	Meritt	SR 29	Lossa Rd.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	6852	7537	Ē
	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
ville	State St.	Gaddy Lan.	Sylar Lane.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	2742	3016	С
seyı	State St.	Sylar Ln.	Main St.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	3022	3324	С
Kel	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	7/31	E
	Soda Bay Rd.	Sylva Ln. Highland Springs Pd	Highland Springs Rd.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	4370	4807	D
	Soda Bay Rd.	Stone Dr	Stolle DL. Park Dr	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	1080	2244	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
	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	С
	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	Α
Cobb	Harrington Flat Rd.	Bottle Rock Rd.	Sulphur Creek Rd.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	213	234	Α
	Harrington Flat Rd.	Sulphur Creek Rd.	SR 175	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	847	932	В
	Golf Road	SR 175	Cobb Blvd.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	920	1012	В
	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
	Big Canyon Rd.	Siegler Springs Rd.	Harbin Springs Rd.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	2438	2682	C
	Big Canyon Rd.	Harbin Springs Rd.	SK 1/5 Hidden Velley Dd	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	3301 6202	<u>3917</u>	D
	Butts Canyon Rd	SR 29	Fureka Rd	2-Lane Collector	0292 3740	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	С
	Spruce Grove Rd.	Spruce Grove Rd.	Deer Hill Rd.	2-Lane Collector	4072	4479	С
им	Spruce Grove Rd.	Deer Hill Rd.	Jerusalem Grade	2-Lane Collector	463	509	А
letor	Stewart St.	SR 175	Douglas St.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	1736	1910	C
idd	Stewart St.	Douglas St.	Pine St.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	1401	1541	В
Z	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	В
	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
	Wasnington St.	SP 20	Armstrong St. Bush St	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	1921	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	В
	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
iera	Fairway Dr	SR 281 (Soda Bay Rd.)	Pt.Lakeview Rd.	2-Lane Collector	4387	4826	С
Riv	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
L	Point Lake View Rd.	Konocti Vista Dr.	SR 29	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	2594	2853	C
ake	Lake St.	Morgan Valley Rd.	Dam Rd.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	4471	4918	D
verh	Mill St.	Morgan Valley Rd.	2nd St.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	2500	2/50	
Гон	Willi St. Seigler Canyon Rd	sR 29	Rose St. Perini Rd N	Substd 2-Lane Collector	4376	4814	A D
а	Seigler Canyon Rd	Perni Rd N	Perini Rd S	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	4068	4475	
verl. če	Seigler Canyon Rd	Perini Rd. S	Siegler Springs N Rd	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	988	1087	B
Lov	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	С
	Arrowhead Rd.	Park St.	Pomo Rd.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	873	960	В
	Boyles Avenue	Davis Ave.	44th Ave.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	167	184	А

Planning Area	Roadway Segment	from location	lo location	Capacity Configuration	2030 Vol. (WINTER Conditions)	2030 Vol. (SUMMER Conditions)	Summer Conditions Year 2030 LOS
	Boyles Avenue	44th Ave.	40th Ave.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	107	118	А
	Boyles Avenue	40th Ave.	33rd Ave.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	1067	1174	В
	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	Е
	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	Е
	40th Ave.	Phillips Ave.	Boyles Ave.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	1240	1364	В
	Burns Valley Road	Arrowhead Rd.	Sonoma Way	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	1279	1407	В
	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	Α
	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	В
	Davis St	Phillips Ave.	Irvine Ave.	2-Lane Collector	2742	3016	В
	Davis St	Boyles Ave.	Konocti Ave.	2-Lane Collector	1752	1927	В
	Huntington Ave.	Pomo Rd.	Manakee St.	2-Lane Collector	219	241	Α
	Huntington Ave.	Manakee St.	Lakeshore Dr.	2-Lane Collector		253	Α
	Lakeshore Drive	SR 53	Old Hwy. 53 Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art.		16765	18442	D
	Lakeshore Drive	Old Hwy. 53	Mullen Ave.	Ave. Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art.		13575	D
2	Lakeshore Drive	Mullen Ave.	Divison Ave.	Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art.		11403	Е
ake	Lakeshore Drive	Division Ave.	Olympic Dr.	Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art.		10892	D
ar I	Lakeshore Drive	Olympic Dr.	Pomo Rd.	Substd. 2-Lane Undiv. Art.	10573	11630	E
Cle	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	Α
	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	С
	Burns Valley Rd.	Arrowhead Rd./Pomo Rd.	Woodlawn Dr.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	1000	1100	В
	Burns Valley Rd.	Woodlawn Dr.	Bowers Ave.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	1391	1530	В
	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.	12/61	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	10684	8037	D
	Olympic Dr.	Cypress St.	Uld. Hwy 55	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	10084	11/52	D
	Olympic Dr.	Uld Hwy. 53	wasnington St.	Substd. 2-Lane Collector	12212	13433	D
	Divilipic Di.	washington St.	SK 35	2 Lang Undig Art	11302	509	D
	romo Ku.	Pomo Pd	Burne Valloy Dd	2-Lane Undiv Art.	402	1100	A P
	West Anth St	Mullen Avo	Laddell Ave	Substd 2 Lana Collector	069	1065	В
	Woodland Dr	Burns Vallay Dd	Koloko St	Substd 2-Lane Collector	164	180	<u>Б</u>
	Arrowhead/Pomo Rd	Burns Valley Rd	Lakeshore Dr	Substd 2-Lane Collector	5562	6118	D A
	. into whead/1 onio red.	Durns , andy Ru.	Lakeonore Di.	Substa. 2 Edite Contector	5502	0110	U

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

Zone of Benefit	Improvement Number	Facility Description	Existing Conditions	Recommended Improvements
yville eras/ bb	KRC#11	Highland Springs Rd SR 29 to Bell Hill Rd.	Two lane rural raodway	Improve to two-lane collector
Kelse /Rivi Co	KRC#12	Main St. (Kelseyville) - Bell Hill Rd. to State St.	Two lane rural roadway	Widen to two-lane undivided arterial
	LP #1	Park Way. - SR 29 SB ramps to Lakeshore Blvd.	Two lane roadway	Improve to two-lane collector
keport	LP #2	S.Main St Lakeport Blvd. to SR 175	Two lane roadway	Improve to four-lane undivided arterial
ity of Lal	LP #3	11 th St SR 29 SB ramps to Main St.	Two lane roadway	Roadway improvements and signalization at some intersections
ncl. Ci	LP #4	High St 16 th St. to 20 th St.	Two lane roadway	Traffic signals at 16th St. and 20th St.
ıg Area i	LP #5	Lakeshore Blvd city limits to Nice Lucerne Cut-off	Two lane roadway	Roadway improvements and signalization at some intersections
Plannin	LP #6	Lakeport Blvd. - SR 29 SB ramps to Main St.	Two lane roadway	Roadway and intersection improvements
akeport l	LP #10	Soda Bay Rd SR 175/S.Main St. to Lakeport Planning Area boundary	Two lane roadway	Roadway & intersection improvements
Γ_{6}	LP #11	Scotts Valley Rd Hill Rd./Halberg Rd. to SR 29 SB ramps	Two lane roadway	Widen to two-lane undivided arterial
	CL #1	Lakeshore Dr SR 53/W 40th Ave. to Park St./Manakee St.	Two lane roadway	Roadway widening and intersection improvements incl. parking lot construction
Area	CL #2	Old Hwy. 53 - Olympic Dr. to SR 53	Two lane roadway	Roadway widening and intersection improvements
anning /	CL #3	Olympic Dr Lakeshore Dr. to SR 53	Two lane roadway	Roadway widening and intersection improvements
Lake Pla	CL #4	40th Ave SR 53 to Phillips Ave.	Two lane roadway	Widen to two-lane undivided arterial
ower]	CL #5	18th Ave SR 53 to Boyles Ave.	Two lane roadway	Widen to two lane undivided arterial
.ake/L	CL #6	Dam Rd Lake St. to SR 53	Two lane roadway	Roadway and intersection improvements
Jear I	CL #7	Boyles Ave 18th Ave. to 33rd Ave.	Two lane roadway	Improve to 2-lane collector
ity of C	CL #8	Burns Valley Rd - Old Hwy. 53 to Arrowhead Rd.	Two lane roadway	Roadway and intersection improvements
Ŭ	CL #9	Arrowhead Rd Burns Valley Rd. to Pomo Rd.	Two lane roadway	Improve to 2-lane collector
	CL #10	Pomo Rd. - Arrowhead Rd. to Lakeshore Dr.	Two lane roadway	Improve to 2-lane collector

Table 10Year 2030 Transportation Improvements Needs

Zone of Benefit	Improvement Number	Facility Description	Existing Conditions	Recommended Improvements
lletown	MID#2	Hartmann Rd. - SR 29 to Stinson Ranch Rd.	Two lane rural roadway	Safety and operational improvements
Midd	MID#7	Butts Canyon Rd. - SR 29 to Loconomi Ln.	Two lane rural roadway	Widen to two-lane undivided arterial
	LAK#1	SR 29 - Nice Lucerne Cut-off to Lakeport Blvd.	Four-lane freeway	Intersection improvements at ramp intersections
	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
	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
	LAK#4	SR 29 - Diener Dr. to SR 53	Two lane arterial	Widen to four-lane expressway
×	LAK#6	SR 29 - SR 29/SR 53 to Lake/Napa County line	Two lane arterial	Widen to four-lane expressway
ıal Facilitie	LAK#8	SR 53 - SR 29 (Lowerlake) to SR 20/SR 53	Two lane arterial wth some sections being four-lane	Widen to four-lane expressway
ywide Region	LAK#10	SR 20 - SR 53 to Lake/Yolo County line	Two lane arterial with some sections having a passing lane	Widen to four-lane Expressway
Count	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
	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
	LAK#16	SR 175 -Bottle Rock Rd. to SR 29 (Middletown)	Two lane roadway	Safety and operational improvements
	LAK#17	Nice Lucerne Cut-off -SR 29 ramps to SR 20	Two lane roadway	Widen to two lane/four lane undivided arterial
	LAK#18	Bottle Rock Rd SR 29 to SR 175	Two lane roadway	Safety and operational improvements
	LAK#19	SR 20/SR 53 intersection	Two-Way Stop Controlled	Signalization + intersection improvements
	LAK#20	SR 20/SR 29 intersection	Two-Way Stop Controlled	Signalization + intersection improvements

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

of fit	ovement ber				Construction
Zone Bene	Impr	Facility Description	Existing Conditions	Recommended Improvements	Cost Estimate (1000 \$)
	KRC#1	Pt. Lakeview Rd SR 281 to SR 29	Two lane rural roadway	Safety and operational	\$4,164
	KRC#2	Big Valley Rd. - Highland Springs	Two lane rural raodway	Safety and operational	\$1,439
	KRC#3	Bell Hill Rd Highland Springs	Two lane rural raodway	Safety and operational	\$2,307
Cobb	KRC#4	Gaddy Ln Loasa Rd. to Soda Bay	Two lane rural raodway	Roadway Improvements	\$6,383
	KRC#5	Harrington Flat Rd Bottle Rock Rd. to SR 175	Two lane rural raodway	Safety and operational improvements	\$3,223
ieras/(KRC#6	Sulphur Creek Rd Bottle Rock Rd. to Harrington Flat Rd.	Two lane rural raodway	Safety and operational improvements	\$718
le/Riv	KRC#7	Loch Lomond Rd. - Big Canyon Rd. to SR 175	Two lane rural raodway	Safety and operational improvements	\$2,433
Kelseyvi	KRC#8	Siegler Canyon Rd. - Big Canyon Rd. to SR 29	Two lane rural raodway	Safety and operational improvements	\$2,469
	KRC#9	Big Canyon Rd Siegler Canyon Rd. to USS Liberty Ln.	Two lane rural raodway	Safety and operational improvements	\$3,854
	KRC#10	Merritt Rd. - SR 29 to Big Valley Rd.	Two lane rural raodway	Safety and operational improvements	\$3,119
	KRC#11	Highland Springs Rd SR 29 to Bell Hill Rd.	Two lane rural raodway	Improve to two-lane collector	\$2,652
	KRC#12	Main St. (Kelseyville) - Bell Hill Rd. to State St.	Two lane rural roadway	Widen to two-lane undivided arterial	\$2,679
				Total Cost	\$35,440
	LP #1	Park Way. - SR 29 SB ramps to Lakeshore Blvd.	Two lane roadway	Improve to two-lane collector	\$5,270
	LP #2	S.Main St Lakeport Blvd. to SR 175	Two lane roadway	Improve to four-lane undivided arterial	\$5,511
keport	LP #3	11 th St SR 29 SB ramps to Main St.	Two lane roadway	Roadway improvements & signalization at some intersections	\$7,353
ofLa	LP #4	High St 16 th St. to 20 th St.	Two lane roadway	Traffic signals at 16th St. and 20th St.	\$560
ncl. City	LP #5	Lakeshore Blvd city limits to Nice Lucerne Cut-off	Two lane roadway	Roadway improvements and signalization at some intersections	\$20,588
Area i	LP #6	Lakeport Blvd. - SR 29 SB ramps to Main St.	Two lane roadway	Roadway and intersection improvements	\$6,238
nning	LP #7	Keeling Ave. - Crystal Lake Way to Park Way	Two lane roadway	Safety and operational improvements	\$455
ort Pla	LP #8	Howard Ave Crystal Lake Way to south of Rainbow Rd.	Two lane roadway	Safety and operational improvements	\$308
akep0,	LP #9	Rainbow Rd Howard Ave. to Lakeshore Blvd.	Two lane roadway	Safety and operational improvements	\$149
Г	LP #10	Soda Bay Rd SR 175/S.Main St. to Lakeport Planning Area boundary	Two lane roadway	Roadway & intersection improvements	\$10,285
	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
				Total Cost	\$63,021

 Table 11

 Year 2030 Transportation Improvements Needs

Zone of Benefit	Improvement Number	Facility Description	Existing Conditions	Recommended Improvements	Construction Cost Estimate (1000 \$)
	CL #1	Lakeshore Dr SR 53/W 40th Ave. to Park St./Manakee St.	Two lane roadway	Roadway widening and intersection improvements incl. parking lot construction	\$9,097
Area	CL #2	Old Hwy. 53 - Olympic Dr. to SR 53	Two lane roadway	Roadway widening and intersection improvements	\$8,465
anning	CL #3	Olympic Dr. - Lakeshore Dr. to SR 53	Two lane roadway	Roadway widening and intersection improvements	\$4,189
ake Pla	CL #4	40th Ave SR 53 to Phillips Ave.	Two lane roadway	Widen to two-lane undivided arterial	\$1,300
ower La	CL #5	18th Ave SR 53 to Boyles Ave.	Two lane roadway	Widen to two lane undivided arterial	\$2,658
ake/Lo	CL #6	Dam Rd Lake St. to SR 53	Two lane roadway	Roadway and intersection improvements	\$1,275
ear La	CL #7	Boyles Ave 18th Ave. to 33rd Ave.	Two lane roadway	Improve to 2-lane collector	\$2,047
City of Cl	CL #8	Burns Valley Rd - Old Hwy. 53 to Arrowhead Rd.	Two lane roadway	Roadway and intersection improvements	\$3,721
	CL #9	Arrowhead Rd. - Burns Valley Rd. to Pomo Rd.	Two lane roadway	Improve to 2-lane collector	\$828
	CL #10	Pomo Rd. - Arrowhead Rd. to Lakeshore Dr.	Two lane roadway	Improve to 2-lane collector	\$768
				Total Cost	\$34,348
	MID#1	Spruce Grove Rd. - SR 29 to Jerusalem Grade	Two lane rural roadway	Safety and operational improvements	\$230
	MID#2	Hartmann Rd SR 29 to Stinson Ranch Rd.	Two lane rural roadway	Safety and operational improvements	\$1,343
ц	MID#3	Stewart St SR 175 to Callayomi St.	Two lane rural roadway	Safety and operational improvements	\$101
dletow	MID#4	Santa Clara Rd. - SR 175 to Central Park Rd.	Two lane rural roadway	Safety and operational improvements	\$326
Mid	MID#5	Barnes St. - SR 175 to Big Canyon Rd./Wardlaw St.	Two lane rural roadway	Safety and operational improvements	\$102
	MID#6	Wardlaw St Barnes St./Big Canyon Rd. to St. Helena Creek Rd.	Two lane rural roadway	Safety and operational improvements	\$205
	MID#7	Butts Canyon Rd SR 29 to Loconomi Ln.	Two lane rural roadway	Widen to two-lane undivided arterial	\$9,118
				Total Cost	\$11,425
pper te/Nice	ULS #1	SR 20 - Nice Lucerne Cut-off to Sulphur Banks Drive	Two lane roadway	Safety and operational improvements	\$19,648
U Lak				Total Cost	\$19,648
de ilities	LAK#1	SR 29 - Nice Lucerne Cut-off to Lakeport Blvd.	Four-lane freeway	Intersection improvements at ramp intersections	\$2,518
Countywide Regional Facilit	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

 Table 11

 Year 2030 Transportation Improvements Needs

Zone of Benefit	Improvement Number	Facility Description	Existing Conditions	Recommended Improvements	Construction Cost Estimate (1000 \$)
Countywide Regional Facilities	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
	LAK#4	SR 29 - Diener Dr. to SR 53	Two lane arterial	Widen to four-lane expressway	\$81,883
	LAK#5	SR 29 - Diener Dr. to SR 53	Two lane arterial	Safety and operational improvements	\$2,032
	LAK#6	SR 29 - SR 29/SR 53 to Lake/Napa County line	Two lane arterial	Widen to four-lane expressway	\$793,899
	LAK#7	SR 29 - SR 29/SR 53 to Lake/Napa County line	Two lane arterial	Safety and operational improvements	\$12,477
	LAK#8	SR 53 - SR 29 (Lowerlake) to SR 20/SR 53	Two lane arterial wth some sections being four-lane	Widen to four-lane expressway	\$270,545
	LAK#9	SR 53 - SR 29 (Lowerlake) to SR 20/SR 53	Two lane arterial wth some sections being four-lane	Safety and operational improvements	\$5,240
	LAK#10	SR 20 - SR 53 to Lake/Yolo County line	Two lane arterial with some sections having a passing lane	Widen to four-lane Expressway	\$37,345
	LAK#11	SR 20 - SR 53 to Lake/Yolo County line	Two lane arterial with some sections having a passing lane	Safety and operational improvements	\$8,855
	LAK#12	SR 20 - SR 29 jct to Lake/Mendocino County line	Two lane arterial with some sections having a passing lane	Safety and operational improvements	\$7,299
	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
	LAK#14	SR 175 - Lake/Mendocino County line to SR 29	Two lane roadway	Safety and operational improvements	\$4,745
	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
	LAK#16	SR 175 -Bottle Rock Rd. to SR 29 (Middletown)	Two lane roadway	Safety and operational improvements	\$3,462
	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
	LAK#18	Bottle Rock Rd SR 29 to SR 175	Two lane roadway	Safety and operational improvements	\$6,494
	LAK#19	SR 20/SR 53 intersection	Two-Way Stop Controlled	Signalization + intersection improvements	\$3,000
	LAK#20	SR 20/SR 29 intersection	Two-Way Stop Controlled	Signalization + intersection improvements	\$3,000
				Total Cost	\$1,753,794
				TOTALS	\$1,917,676

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.



IMPROVE TO FOUR LANE DIVIDED ARTERIAL STANDARDS IMPROVE TO TWO LANE DIVIDED ARTERIAL STANDARDS IMPROVE TO TWO LANE UNDIVIDED ARTERIAL STANDARDS IMPROVE TO TWO LANE DIVIDED COLLECTOR STANDARDS IMPROVE TO TWO LANE UNDIVIDED COLLECTOR STANDARDS SAFETY AND OPERATIONAL IMPROVEMENTS BEAUTIFICATION AND TRAFFIC CALMING IMPROVEMENTS FACILITY IMPROVEMENT TO INCLUDE BIKE LANES INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS

Figure 8A





T990TG034.DWG(28MAY08)25-4306-01





T990TG038.DWG(28MAY08)25-4306-01



T990TG039.DWG(28MAY08)25-4306-01



Countywide Regional Transportation Impact Fee Program

<u>LEGEND</u>

Year 2030 Feasible Roadway Improvements Kelseyville Planning Area

T990TG040.DWG(28MAY08)25-4306-01




<u>LEGEND</u>

 IMPROVE TO FOUR LANE DIVIDED ARTERIAL STANDARDS
 IMPROVE TO TWO LANE DIVIDED ARTERIAL STANDARDS
IMPROVE TO TWO LANE UNDIVIDED ARTERIAL STANDARDS
IMPROVE TO TWO LANE DIVIDED COLLECTOR STANDARDS
 IMPROVE TO TWO LANE UNDIVIDED COLLECTOR STANDARDS
SAFETY AND OPERATIONAL IMPROVEMENTS
 BEAUTIFICATION AND TRAFFIC CALMING IMPROVEMENTS
 FACILITY IMPROVEMENT TO INCLUDE BIKE LANES
INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS



T990TG042.DWG(28MAY08)25-4306-01

					Potential Funding Sources				
Zone of Benefit	Improvement Number	Facility Description	Existing Conditions	Recommended Improvements	Construction Cost Estimate (1000 \$)	State and Federal Funding Programs	Developer Funding	Impact Fee Program	Funding Deficit (1000\$)
	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
Cobb	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
∕ieras/	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
lle/Riv	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
lseyvi	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
Ke	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
Area ort	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
nning Laker	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
eport Pla	LP #3	11 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
Lake	LP #4	High St. - 16^{th} St. to 20^{th} St.	Two lane roadway	Traffic signals at 16th St. and 20th St.	\$560	\$0	\$0	\$560	\$0

						Pote	ential H	Funding So	ources
Zone of Benefit	Improvement Number	Facility Description	Existing Conditions	Recommended Improvements	Construction Cost Estimate (1000 \$)	State and Federal Funding Programs	Developer Funding	Impact Fee Program	Funding Deficit (1000\$)
Lakeport	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
ty of]	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
ıd. Ci	LP #7	Keeling Ave Crystal Lake Way to Park Way	Two lane roadway	Safety and operational improvements	\$455	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$455
Area in	LP #8	Howard Ave Crystal Lake Way to south of Rainbow Rd.	Two lane roadway	Safety and operational improvements	\$308	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$308
ning ∤	LP #9	Rainbow Rd. - Howard Ave. to Lakeshore Blvd.	Two lane roadway	Safety and operational improvements	\$149	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$149
t Plan	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
kepor	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
La				Total Cost	\$63,021	\$0	\$0	\$62,109	\$912
ea	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
ng Ar	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
lanni	CL #3	Olympic Dr Lakeshore Dr. to SR 53	Two lane roadway	Roadway widening and intersection improvements	\$4,189	\$0	\$0	\$4,189	\$0
ake P	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
wer L	CL #5	18th Ave SR 53 to Boyles Ave.	Two lane roadway	arterial	\$2,658	\$0	\$0	\$2,658	\$0
e/Lov	CL #6	Dam Rd Lake St. to SR 53	Two lane roadway	Roadway and intersection improvements	\$1,275	\$0	\$0	\$1,275	\$0
ak	CL #7	Boyles Ave 18th Ave. to 33rd Ave.	Two lane roadway	Improve to 2-lane collector	\$2,047	\$0	\$0	\$2,047	\$0
lear I	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
⁷ of C	CL #9	Arrowhead Rd Burns Valley Rd Pomo Rd.	Two lane roadway	Improve to 2-lane collector	\$828	\$0	\$0	\$828	\$0
City	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

						Potential Funding Sources			ources
Zone of Benefit	Improvement Number	Facility Description	Existing Conditions	Recommended Improvements	Construction Cost Estimate (1000 \$)	State and Federal Funding Programs	Developer Funding	Impact Fee Program	Funding Deficit (1000\$)
	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
uwu	MID#3	Stewart St SR 175 to Callayomi St.	Two lane rural roadway	Safety and operational improvements	\$101	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$101
ddleto	MID#4	Santa Clara Rd SR 175 to Central Park Rd.	Two lane rural roadway	Safety and operational improvements	\$326	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$326
Mi	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
Upper Lake/Nice	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
S	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
ional Facilities	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
tywide Re	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
Count	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

						Pote	ential l	Funding So	ources
Zone of Benefit	Improvement Number	Facility Description	Existing Conditions	Recommended Improvements	Construction Cost Estimate (1000 \$)	State and Federal Funding Programs	Developer Funding	Impact Fee Program	Funding Deficit (1000\$)
	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
es	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
laciliti	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
egional H	LAK#13	SR 175 - Lake/Mendocino County line to SR 29	Two lane roadway	roadway Widen to two-lane Undivided arterial and signalization at some intersections		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$67,413
vide R	LAK#14	SR 175 - Lake/Mendocino County line to SR 29	Two lane roadway	Safety and operational improvements	\$4,745	\$0	\$0	\$4,745	\$0
Countyv	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.

Zone of Benefit	Transportation Improvement Cost Estimates (Exclding State Facilities Improvements)	State Facility Cost Estimates Included In Fee Program	Total Transportation Improvement Cost 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 13

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

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

 TABLE 14

 TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE COSTS - COMBINED LOCAL/REGIONAL TOTALS

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 15LAKE 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 dwelling unit Actual fees will differ	nd are based upon a typical	2,000 square foot	

TABLE 16

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

		Proposed New	Total Fees Including
Locations within Lake County	Existing Fees	TIF	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 l will differ.	oased upon a typical 2	2,000 square foot dwe	elling unit. Actual fees

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)

Fee Type	Sonoma County (Private Well/Spectic)	Sonoma County (Public Sewer/Water)	City of Sebastopol
Transportation Impact Fee (TIF)	\$8,915	\$8,915	\$4,040
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	\$27,305	\$37,009	\$31,730
Note: These fees are estimated fees ONLY, and ar will differ.	e based upon a typical 2	2,000 square foot dwe	lling unit. Actual fees

APPENDIX

EDU Equivalents Intersection LOS Worksheets Planning Level Cost Estimates

APPENDIX TABLE 1 EDU EQUIVALENTS

Land Use ⁽¹⁾	ITE Code #	Descriptor	PM Peak Hour Trip Rate	Pass-by Reduction ⁽²⁾	EDUs (per descriptor unit)
AIRPORT	21	TT1' 1 4	5.75	00/	5.60
Commercial COMMERCIAL-RETAIL	21	Flight	5.75	0%	5.69
Automobile Services:					
Car Dealer	841	1,000 Sq. Ft.	2.64	10% ⁽³⁾	2.35
Gasoline Station (with food mart)	947	Fueling Station	13.38	56%	5.83
Gasoline Station (with food mart &				(3)	
fully automated car wash) Parts Sale	946 843	Fueling Station	13.33	80% ⁽³⁾	2.64
Repair Shop	943	1,000 Sq. Ft.	3.38	10% (3)	3.01
Tire Store	848	1,000 Sq. Ft.	4.15	28%	2.96
Convenience Market Chain:	852	1.000 Sg. Et	34.57	50% ⁽³⁾	17.11
Open 24 hours	851	1,000 Sq. Ft.	52.41	61%	20.24
Discount Store/Discount Club	861	1,000 Sq. Ft.	4.24	17%	3.48
Drugstore: With drive-through window	881	1.000 Sg. Et	8.62	53%	4.01
Without drive-through window	880	1,000 Sq. Ft.	8.42	49%	4.25
Furniture Store	890	1,000 Sq. Ft.	0.46	53%	0.21
Lomber/Home Improvement Store	812 817	1,000 Sq. Ft.	4.49	10% (3)	4.00
Restaurant:	017	1,000 54.11.	5.00	10/0	3.37
Quality	931	1,000 Sq. Ft.	7.49	44%	4.15
High Turnover (sit-down)	932	1,000 Sq. Ft.	10.92	43%	6.16
With drive-through window	934	1,000 Sq. Ft.	34.64	50%	17.15
Without drive-through window	933	1,000 Sq. Ft.	26.15	40% (3)	15.53
Shopping Center: Shopping Center (0-30 000 Sq. Et)	820	1.000 Sc. Et	13 70	66%	0.00
Shopping Center (30,001-60,000 Sq. Ft.)	820	1,000 Sq. Ft.	7.97	51%	3.87
Shopping Center (60,001-100,000 Sq. Ft.)	820	1,000 Sq. Ft.	6.77	45%	3.69
Shopping Center (100,001-200,000 Sq. Ft) Shopping Center (200,001-300,000 Sq. Ft)	820 820	1,000 Sq. Ft.	5.51 4.57	41%	3.22
Shopping Center (300,001-500,000 Sq. Ft)	820	1,000 Sq. Ft.	3.91	27%	2.83
Specialty Retail Center/Strip Commercial	814	1,000 Sq. Ft.	2.71	10%	2.41
Supermarket	850	1,000 Sq. Ft.	10.45	36%	6.62
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 Junior High/Middle School	530 522	Students Students	0.14	0%	0.14
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 Sg. Et	33.15	25% (3)	24.62
With drive-through	912	1,000 Sq. Ft.	45.74	47%	24.00
HOSPITAL			0.00	0.07	0.00
Convalescent/nursing General	620 610	Bed 1.000 Sq. Ft.	0.22	0%	0.22
HOUSE OF WORSHIP		-,			
Church	560	1,000 Sq. Ft.	0.66	0%	0.65
Synaggogue INDUSTRIAL	561	1,000 Sq. Ft.	1.69	0%	1.67
Light Industrial (Industrial Park w/o Commercial)	110	1,000 Sq. Ft.	0.98	0%	0.97
General Heavy Industrial	120	1,000 Sq. Ft.	0.68	0%	0.67
Manufacturing/Assembly	130	1,000 Sq. Ft. 1,000 Sq. Ft.	0.86	0%	0.85
Rental Storage	151	1,000 Sq. Ft.	0.26	0%	0.26
Scientific Research Development	760	1,000 Sq. Ft.	1.08	0%	1.07
Warehousing	150	1,000 Sq. Ft.	0.82	0%	0.81
LIBRARY	590	1,000 Sq. Ft.	7.09	0%	7.02
LODGING	310	Poom	0.50	0%	0.58
Motel	320	Room	0.39	0%	0.38
Resort Hotel	330	Room	0.42	0%	0.42
OFFICE General Office (0-30 000 So Et)	710	1 000 Sc. Ft	A 36	Ω%	<u>4 32</u>
General Office (30,000-55,000 Sq.Ft.)	710	1,000 Sq. Ft.	2.92	0%	2.89
General Office (55,000-100,000 Sq.Ft.)	710	1,000 Sq. Ft.	2.13	0%	2.11
General Office (>300.000 Sq.Ft.)	710	1,000 Sq. Ft. 1.000 Sa. Ft	1.54 1.27	0%	1.52
Corporate Headquarters/Single Tenant Office	714	1,000 Sq. Ft.	1.40	0%	1.39
Department of Motor Vehicles	731	1,000 Sq. Ft.	17.09	0%	16.92
Government Office	730	1,000 Sq. Ft. 1 000 Sq. Ft	1.21	0%	1.20
Post Office	732	1,000 Sq. Ft.	10.89	16% (3)	9.06
RECREATION	107	Ţ	2.54	00/	2.50
Golf Course	437	Hole	3.54	0%	3.50
Marina	420	Berth	0.19	0%	0.19
Movie Theater		Maria Carr	45.01	00/	AE AC
With Matinee on a Weekday	444	Movie Screen	45.91 20.22	0%	45.46 20.02
Park:				4.4	
City	411	Acre	1.59	0%	1.57
State	412	Acre Acre	0.06	0%	0.06
Developed (3)	N/A	Acre	4.00 (3)	0%	4.00 (3)
Undeveloped ⁽³⁾	N/A		0.40 (3)	0%	0.40 (3)
RESIDENTIAL	491	1,000 Sq. Ft.	1.06	U%	1.00
Single Family Detached	210	Dwelling Units	1.01	0%	1.00
Congragate Care Facility	253	Dwelling Units	0.17	0%	0.17
ResidentialCondominium/Townhouse	220	Dwelling Units	0.62	0%	0.51
Rental Townhouse	224	Dwelling Units	0.72	0%	0.71
Mobile Home	240	Occupied Dwelling	0.59	0%	0.58

Notes:

(1) Trip rate derived from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), <u>Trip Generation</u>, 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

Lake County 1: SR 20 & Scotts V	alley F	۲d.						EX PM Peak PM Peak Hour
	-	\mathbf{r}	4	+	•	*		
Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR		
Lane Configurations	eî			ę	Y			
Sign Control	Free			Free	Stop			
Grade	0%			0%	0%			
/olume (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								
ane Width (ft)								
Valking Speed (ft/s)								
Percent Blockage								
Right turn flare (veh)								
Median type					None			
ledian storage veh)								
Jpstream signal (ft)								
X, platoon unblocked								
C, conflicting volume			840		1098	795		
C1, stage 1 conf vol								
C2, stage 2 conf vol								
Cu, unblocked vol			840		1098	795		
C, single (s)			4.1		6.4	6.2		
C, 2 stage (s)								
F (s)			2.2		3.5	3.3		
0 queue free %			99		83	97		
M capacity (veh/h)			795		232	387		
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1					
olume Total	840	292	52					
/olume Left	0	11	39					
olume Right	90	0	13					
SH	1700	795	258					
olume to Capacity	0.49	0.01	0.20					
Queue Length 95th (ft)	0	1	18					
Control Delay (s)	0.0	0.5	22.5					
ane LOS		А	С					
Approach Delay (s)	0.0	0.5	22.5					
Approach LOS			С					
ntersection Summary								
Average Delay			1.1					
ntersection Canacity LIt	ilization		51.4%	10	CU Leve	el of Service	А	
incolocolion oupdoily of								

Lake County 2: SR 20 & SR 29							Ex PM Peak PM Peak Hou
	+	¥	4	ł	<	*	
Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR	
Lane Configurations	1	1	ľ	1	ľ	1	
Sign Control	Free			Free	Stop		
Grade	0%			0%	0%		
Volume (veh/h)	492	182	128	169	207	175	
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	
Hourly flow rate (vph)	535	198	139	184	225	190	
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			733		997	535	
vC1, stage 1 conf vol							
vC2_stage 2 conf vol							
vCu unblocked vol			733		997	535	
tC, single (s)			4.1		6.4	6.2	
tC 2 stage (s)					0	0.2	
tF (s)			22		3.5	33	
p0 queue free %			84		1	65	
cM capacity (veh/h)			872		228	545	
			0.2		220	0.0	
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	EB 2	WB 1	WB 2	NB 1	NB 2	
Volume Total	535	198	139	184	225	190	
Volume Left	0	0	139	0	225	0	
Volume Right	0	198	0	0	0	190	
cSH	1700	1700	872	1700	228	545	
Volume to Capacity	0.31	0.12	0.16	0.11	0.99	0.35	
Queue Length 95th (ft)	0	0	14	0	226	39	
Control Delay (s)	0.0	0.0	9.9	0.0	102.3	15.1	
Lane LOS			A		F	С	
Approach Delay (s)	0.0		4.3		62.3		
Approach LOS					F		
Intersection Summary							
Average Delay			18.5				
Intersection Capacity Ut	ilization		54.5%	1	CU Leve	el of Service	e A
Analysis Period (min)			15				
/							

Synchro 6 Report Page 2

Baseline Omni-Means

Lake County 3: SR 20 & Pyle Roa	ad									E	Ex PM PM Peal	Peak
	≯	+	*	4	ł	*	<	1	1	1	ţ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	ľ	1	1	1	4Î			ا	1		\$	
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	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)	4	404	70	203	453	4	96	1	354	2	5	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	458			474			1279	1277	404	1630	1345	455
vC1, stage 1 conf vol												
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			А		F	С	E				
Approach Delay (s)	0.1			2.8		36.9		49.8				
Approach LOS						E		E				
Intersection Summary	_	_			_	_						
Average Delay			11 0									
Intersection Canacity Lit	ilization		53.1%		CLLEW	el of Sei	vice		Δ			
Analysis Period (min)	mzauon		15				100		- ^			
			13									

Lake County 4: SR 20 & Lakesho	ore Blvo	d.								E	Ex PM PM Peal	Peak
	۶	+	7	4	+	*	1	1	*	×	ŧ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	٦	eî 🕺		٦	≜î ≽			4			4	
Sign Control		Free			Free			Stop			Stop	
Grade		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Volume (veh/h)	0	687	1	9	606	0	1	0	7	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)	0	747	1	10	659	0	1	0	8	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	659			748			1096	1426	747	1433	1426	329
vC1, stage 1 conf vol												
vC2, stage 2 conf vol												
vCu, unblocked vol	659			748			1096	1426	747	1433	1426	329
tC, single (s)	4.1			4.1			7.5	6.5	6.9	7.5	6.5	6.9
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			99			99	100	98	100	100	100
cM capacity (veh/h)	925			857			166	133	355	92	133	666
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	EB 2	WB 1	WB 2	WB 3	NB 1	SB 1					
Volume Total	0	748	10	439	220	9	0					
Volume Left	0	0	10	0	0	1	0					
Volume Right	0	1	0	0	0	8	0					
cSH	1700	1700	857	1700	1700	311	1700					
Volume to Capacity	0.00	0.44	0.01	0.26	0.13	0.03	0.00					
Queue Length 95th (ft)	0	0	1	0	0	2	0					
Control Delay (s)	0.0	0.0	9.3	0.0	0.0	16.9	0.0					
Lane LOS			A			С	A					
Approach Delay (s)	0.0		0.1			16.9	0.0					
Approach LOS						С	А					
Intersection Summary												
Average Delay			0.2									
Intersection Capacity U	tilization		46.2%	- D	CU Leve	el of Sei	vice		А			
Analysis Period (min)			15									

Synchro 6 Report Page 4

Baseline Omni-Means

Lake County							F	Ev PM Poa	Lake County								Fv
5: Country Club Dr	2 SR 2	0					F	EX I WII Ca PM Peak Hou	6: Footbill Dr & SR 2	20							PN
5. Country Club Di	& OK 2	0							0.1 00tilli DI: & 31(2	20							
	-	•	1	1	1	Ŧ				1	•	†	1	1	ŧ		
Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT			Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT		
Lane Configurations	Y		eî			٩ ٩			Lane Configurations	Y		¢Î		1	1		
Sign Control	Stop		Free			Free			Sign Control	Stop		Free			Free		
Grade	0%		0%			0%			Grade	0%		0%			0%		
Volume (veh/h)	12	34	391	24	19	360			Volume (veh/h)	19	23	429	9	30	536		
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92			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			Hourly flow rate (vph)	21	25	466	10	33	583		
Pedestrians									Pedestrians								
Lane Width (ft)									Lane Width (ft)								
Walking Speed (ft/s)									Walking Speed (ft/s)								
Percent Blockage									Percent Blockage								
Right turn flare (veh)									Right turn flare (veh)								
Median type	None								Median type	None							
Median storage veh)									Median storage veh)								
Upstream signal (ft)									Upstream signal (ft)								
pX. platoon unblocked									pX, platoon unblocked								
vC. conflicting volume	871	438			451				vC. conflicting volume	1119	471			476			
vC1, stage 1 conf vol									vC1, stage 1 conf vol								
vC2_stage 2 conf vol									vC2_stage 2 conf vol								
vCu unblocked vol	871	438			451				vCu, unblocked vol	1119	471			476			
tC single (s)	64	6.2			4 1				tC single (s)	64	62			41			
tC, 2 stage (s)	0.4	0.2							tC, 2 stage (s)	0.4	0.2						
tE (s)	35	33			22				tE (s)	35	33			22			
n0 queue free %	96	Q.0			98				n0 queue free %	Q1	96			97			
cM capacity (veh/h)	316	619			1109				cM capacity (veh/h)	222	593			1086			
Direction Lane #	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1						Direction Lane #	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1	SB 2				
Volume Total	50	451	412						Volume Total	46	476	33	583				
Volume Left	13	0	21						Volume Left	21	0,4	33	000				
Volume Right	37	26	21						Volume Right	25	10	0	0				
cSH	195	1700	1109						cSH	338	1700	1086	1700				
Volume to Conseitu	433	0.27	0.02						Volume to Conseity	0.14	0.29	0.02	0.24				
Oucue Longth 05th (ft)	0.10	0.27	0.02						Queue Length O5th (ft)	12	0.20	0.03	0.34				
Control Doloy (c)	12.1	0.0	0.6						Control Dolou (c)	17.2	0.0	0 /	0.0				
Long LOS	13.1	0.0	0.0							17.3	0.0	0.4	0.0				
Lane LUS	12.4	0.0	A						Lane LOS	17.2	0.0	A					
Approach LOS	13.1 B	0.0	0.0						Approach LOS	17.3 C	0.0	0.4					
Intersection Summary							 		Intersection Summary								
Average Delay			1.0						Average Delay			0 0					
Intersection Canacity I	Itilization		44 4%	10		el of Service	Δ		Intersection Capacity Litil	lization		38.2%	10		of Servi	ce 0	
Analysis Pariod (min)	Juizauon		15	- N	OO Leve		A		Analysis Period (min)	nzau01		15	I.			P P	
			10						Analysis renou (mm)			10					

Synchro 6 Report Page 5 Baseline Omni-Means

Lake County 7: SR 20 & SR 53							Ex PM Peak PM Peak Hour
	-	¥	4	+	1	1	
Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR	
Lane Configurations	<u>↑</u> ↑	1	<u> </u>	↑	۰Y		
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)							
vvaiking Speed (ft/s)							
Percent Blockage							
Right turn flare (veh)					Delest		
wealan type					Raised		
wedian storage veh)					1		
upstream signal (ft)							
pA, platoon unblocked			20.4		260	22	
vC, conflicting volume			204		300	33	
					00		
VC2, stage 2 coni voi			204		301	22	
			204		300	33	
tC, Single (S)			4.1		5.0	0.9	
tC, 2 stage (s)			22		3.5	33	
n (s)			2.2		38	02	
cM capacity (yeb/b)			1364		507	1034	
			1304		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		С	
Approach Delay (s)	0.0			3.2		22.6	
Approach LOS						С	
Intersection Summary		_					
Average Delay			12.5				
Intersection Capacity LIt	ilization		41.2%	l	CU Leve	el of Servio	ce A
Analysis Deried (min)			15				

Lake County	aliaah		_							E		Peak
8: Olympic Drive & L	_akesr	iore Di	· <u> </u>		-				<u> </u>		I Pear	
	/	-	•	-	-			T	~	>	÷	*
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		÷			4			÷			÷	
Sign Control		Stop			Stop			Free			Free	
Grade		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Volume (veh/h)	1	0	2	84	0	179	1	205	98	116	216	2
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	0	2	91	0	195	1	223	107	126	235	2
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	961	820	236	768	767	276	237			329		
vC1, stage 1 conf vol												
vC2, stage 2 conf vol												
vCu, unblocked vol	961	820	236	768	767	276	237			329		
tC, single (s)	7.1	6.5	6.2	7.1	6.5	6.2	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 %	99	100	100	69	100	74	100			90		
cM capacity (veh/h)	162	278	803	292	298	763	1330			1230		
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1								
Volume Total	3	286	330	363								
Volume Left	1	91	1	126								
Volume Right	2	195	107	2								
cSH	346	504	1330	1230								
Volume to Capacity	0.01	0.57	0.00	0.10								
Queue Length 95th (ft)	1	87	0	9								
Control Delay (s)	15.5	21.1	0.0	3.5								
Lane LOS	С	С	А	А								
Approach Delay (s)	15.5	21.1	0.0	3.5								
Approach LOS	С	С										
Intersection Summary												
Average Delay			7.5									
Intersection Capacity Ut	ilization		65.0%	10	CU Leve	el of Ser	vice		С			
Analysis Period (min)			15									

Synchro 6 Report Page 8

Baseline Omni-Means

ake County	SD 53						E) PN	X PIM Peak M Peak Hour		Lake County						
	<u>)</u>	~	•	t	Ļ	4			-	10. 01(23 & 01(33	٨	→	7	1	+	•
lovement	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR				Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR
ane Configurations	۲	1	۲	•	•	1			i	Lane Configurations	ሻሻ	î,		5	•	1
lign Control	Stop			Free	Free					Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Grade	0%			0%	0%					Total Lost time (s)	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	4.0
olume (veh/h)	80	130	260	288	377	109				Lane Util. Factor	0.97	1.00		1.00	1.00	1.00
eak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92			i	Frt	1.00	0.89		1.00	1.00	0.8
lourly flow rate (vph)	87	141	283	313	410	118				Flt Protected	0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	1.00
edestrians										Satd. Flow (prot)	3433	1660		1770	1863	158
ane Width (ft)										Flt Permitted	0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	1.0
Valking Speed (ft/s)										Satd. Flow (perm)	3433	1660		1770	1863	158
ercent Blockage									1	Volume (vph)	481	44	118	32	43	90
tight turn flare (veh)										Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.9
ledian type	None									Adi Flow (vph)	523	48	128	35	47	104
ledian storage veh)										RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	84	0	0	0	8
lpstream signal (ft)										Lane Group Flow (vph)	523	92	0	35	47	19
X, platoon unblocked										Turn Type	Prot		Ŭ	Prot		Pern
C, conflicting volume	1288	410	528							Protected Phases	7	4		3	8	1 OIII
C1, stage 1 conf vol										Permitted Phases				Ŭ	0	,
C2, stage 2 conf vol										Actuated Green G (s)	24.0	34.0		8.0	18.0	18
Cu, unblocked vol	1288	410	528							Effective Green, a (s)	24.0	34.0		8.0	18.0	18
C. single (s)	6.4	6.2	4.1							Actuated a/C Ratio	0.24	0.34		0.08	0.18	0.1
C, 2 stage (s)										Clearance Time (s)	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	4
= (s)	3.5	3.3	2.2							Lane Gro Can (yph)	824	564		1/2	335	28
0 queue free %	34	78	73							v/s Ratio Prot	c0 15	0.11		0.02	0.03	20
M capacity (veh/h)	132	642	1039							v/s Ratio Prot	0.15	0.11		0.02	0.05	0.0
											0.62	0.16		0.25	0.14	0.0
virection, Lane #	EB 1	EB 2	NB 1	NB 2	SB 1	SB 2				Uniform Delay, d1	3/ 1	23.1		13.2	34.5	34
olume Total	87	141	283	313	410	118				Progression Eactor	1 00	1 00		1 00	1 00	1.0
olume Left	87	0	283	0	0	0				Incremental Delay, d2	3.7	0.6		4 1	0.0	0
olume Right	0	141	0	0	0	118				Delay (s)	37.8	23.7		47.3	35.4	34
SH	132	642	1039	1700	1700	1700				Level of Service	01.0	20.1 C		-11.0 D	D	(
olume to Capacity	0.66	0.22	0.27	0.18	0.24	0.07				Approach Delay (s)	0	34.2		0	37.1	
ueue Length 95th (ft)	89	21	28	0	0	0			í	Approach LOS		04.2			57.1 D	
Control Delay (s)	/4.1	12.2	9.8	0.0	0.0	0.0						0			U	
ane LOS	F	В	A							Intersection Summary						
pproach Delay (s)	35.8		4.6		0.0					HCM Average Control I	Delay		33.6	F	ICM Le	vel of
pproach LOS	E								1	HCM Volume to Capaci	ity ratio		0.65			
tersection Summary	_			_						Actuated Cycle Length	(s)		100.0	5	Sum of I	ost tin
verage Delay			81						i	Intersection Capacity U	tilization		48.8%	10	CU Lev	el of S
tersection Canacity Lit	ilization		48 7%	10		of Sen	Α			Analysis Period (min)			15			

Synchro 6 Report Page 10

Ex PM Peak PM Peak Hour

SBT

††

4.0 4.0

1.00 0.95 1.00

1.00

1770 3539 1583

0.92 0.92 0.92

400 414

435 450

0 324

6

28.0 28.0

28.0 28.0

29.6 28.2

435

0.15 0.28 0.28

4.0

991

0.12

0.44 0.44

5.1 1.4

43.8 31.0 29.8

31.9

С

1900 1900

~

SBR

0.85

1.00

1583

1.00

126

Perm

6

4.0

443

0.28

0.28

1.6

С

\$

SBL

1900

4.0

1.00 1.00

0.95

1770 3539

0.95 1.00

0

116

Prot

1

15.0

15.0

4.0

266

38.7

1.00 1.00 1.00

> D С

c0.07

12

С 12.0

А

NBT NBR

1

1900

59 107

64 116

0

0

0.92

Baseline

Omni-Means

Synchro 6 Report

Page 9

Baseline Omni-Means

Lake County 11: SR 29 & Seigler	Canyo	on Roa	ad						Ex PM Pea PM Peak Hou
	-	¥	4	+	1	1			
Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR			
Lane Configurations	eî 👘		ሻ	- ††	- Y				
Sign Control	Free			Free	Stop				
Grade	0%			0%	0%				
Volume (veh/h)	443	2	59	430	5	74			
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92			
Hourly flow rate (vph)	482	2	64	467	5	80			
Pedestrians									
Lane Width (ft)									
Walking Speed (ft/s)									
Percent Blockage									
Right turn flare (veh)									
Median type					None				
viedian storage veh)									
Upstream signal (ft)									
pX, platoon unblocked			40.4		0.45	400			
vC, conflicting volume			484		845	483			
VC1, stage 1 cont vol									
VC2, stage 2 cont vol			40.4		045	400			
			404		640	403			
			4.1		0.0	0.9			
E(s)			22		35	33			
n (3)			Q.Z		98	85			
cM canacity (veh/h)			1075		284	530			
			1075		204	550			
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	WB 2	WB 3	NB 1				
Volume Total	484	64	234	234	86				
Volume Left	0	64	0	0	5				
Volume Right	2	0	0	0	80				
CSH	1700	1075	1700	1700	502				
Volume to Capacity	0.28	0.06	0.14	0.14	0.17				
Queue Length 95th (ft)	0	5	0	0	15				
Control Delay (s)	0.0	8.6	0.0	0.0	13.6				
Lane LUS	0.0	A			12 C				
Approach LOS	0.0	1.0			13.0				
Approach LOS					В				
Intersection Summary									
Average Delay			1.6						
Intersection Capacity Ut	ilization		41.6%	10	CU Leve	el of Servic	e	А	
Analysis Period (min)			15						

Lake County 12: SR 29 & Point L	akevie	w Roa	ıd				Ex PM Peak PM Peak Hour
	۶	-	+	•	1	∢	
Movement	EBL	EBT	WBT	WBR	SBL	SBR	
Lane Configurations	ľ	1			Y		
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 (ft/s)							
Percent Blockage							
Right turn flare (veh)							
Median type					None		
Median storage veh)							
Upstream signal (ft)							
pX, platoon unblocked							
vC, conflicting volume	453				870	227	
vC1, stage 1 conf vol							
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	
					00.4		
Direction, Lane #	EBI	EB Z	VVB 1	VVB 2	SBI		
	1	435	275	1/8	48		
Volume Left	1	0	0	0	39		
	0	0	0	40	9		
	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		0.0		47.0		
Approach Delay (s)	0.0		0.0		17.9		
Approach LUS					C		
Intersection Summary							
Average Delay			0.9				
Intersection Capacity Ut	ilization		31.1%	10	CU Leve	el of Service	А
Analysis Period (min)			15				

Synchro 6 Report Page 12

Baseline Omni-Means

utts Canyon R	oad &							PM Peak Hou
	4	×	1	۲	1	Ļ		
vement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT		
ne Configurations	ሻ	1	¢Î,		٦.	†		
n Control	Stop		Free			Free		
ade	0%		0%			0%		
lume (veh/h)	50	54	669	32	20	410		
ak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92		
urly flow rate (vph)	54	59	727	35	22	446		
lestrians								
ne Width (ft)								
aiking Speed (tt/s)								
turn flare (veh)								
dian type	Nono							
dian storage veh)	NULLE							
stream signal (ft)								
platoon unblocked								
conflicting volume	1234	745			762			
stage 1 conf vol								
, stage 2 conf vol								
u, unblocked vol	1234	745			762			
single (s)	6.4	6.2			4.1			
2 stage (s)								
(s)	3.5	3.3			2.2			
queue free %	71	86			97			
capacity (veh/h)	190	414			850			
action Lana #		M/D 2	ND 1	CD 1	CD 2			
lume Tetel		VVD Z	760	200 1	36 2			
	54	59	/62	22	440			
lume Pight	04	50	35	22	0			
H	190	414	1700	850	1700			
lume to Canacity	0.29	0.14	0.45	0.03	0.26			
eue Length 95th (ft)	28	12	0.40	2	0.20			
ntrol Delay (s)	31.3	15.1	0.0	93	0.0			
ne LOS	D	C	0.0	A	0.0			
proach Delay (s)	22.9	J	0.0	0.4				
proach LOS	С							
	_							
section Summary								
ige Delay	41141		2.1		2111-		0	
ection Capacity U	tilization		47.2%	10	JU Leve	el of Service	A	

Synchro 6 Report Page 13

Baseline

Omni-Means

Synchro 6 Report Page 14

Ex PM Peak PM Peak Hour

SBT

4.0

1.00

0.97

1.00

1803

1.00

1795

398

39.9

39.9

0.62

4.0

3.0

1105

0.23

0.36

6.1

1.00 0.2

6.3

А

А

6.3

6

4

4 310 12

0

0

6

Perm

285880.920.92

96

0

0

\$

SBL

 ↔
 ↔

 1900
 1900
 1900
 1900

4

SBR

В

8.0

3

3

0

0

0.92 0.92

Lake County	ff &						Ex PM Peak PM Peak Hou
To: Dry brook bach	•	¥	٩	t	ţ	4	
Movement	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR	
Lane Configurations	- Y			र्भ	4Î		
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 (ft/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				
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				
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	С	А					
Approach Delay (s)	21.8	0.4	0.0				
Approach LOS	С						
Intersection Summary							
Average Delay			0.0				
Intersection Canacity L	tilization		55 4%	10	2111.01/	of Servi	R B
Analysis Period (min)	unzation		15	N N			
Analysis Fellou (IIIII)			10				

16: SR 29 & SR 281	(Soda	а вау	Road)							1	IN Pear	
	۶	-	\mathbf{i}	4	+	*	1	Ť	۲	6	ŧ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	ሻ	ef 👘		ሻ	↑	1		4			र्भ	1
Sign Control		Free			Free			Stop			Stop	
Grade		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Volume (veh/h)	204	265	15	3	202	128	3	25	25	68	22	102
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)	222	288	16	3	220	139	3	27	27	74	24	111
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	359			304			1089	1105	296	998	974	220
vC1, stage 1 conf vol												
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	6.2
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 %	82			100			98	84	96	54	88	86
cM capacity (veh/h)	1200			1256			131	171	743	162	205	820
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	А		А			С	F	В				
Approach Delay (s)	3.7		0.1			22.6	29.3					
Approach LOS						С	D					
Intersection Summary												
Average Delay			8.1									
Intersection Capacity Ut	ilization		43.5%	10	CU Leve	el of Sei	vice		А			

Synchro 6 Report Page 16

Baseline Omni-Means

17: Point Lakeview	Road	s SR Z	81 (50	ба ва	у коас	(1	PIVI PEAK	Hour	18: Main ST & SR 2	29		
	1	•	1	1	1	Ŧ				-	•	1
Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT			Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT
Lane Configurations	Y		4Î			۹ ۲			Lane Configurations	Y		
Sign Control	Stop		Free			Free			Sign Control	Stop		Fre
Grade	0%		0%			0%			Grade	0%		0%
Volume (veh/h)	65	17	95	113	7	81			Volume (veh/h)	117	38	27
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92			Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.9
Hourly flow rate (vph)	71	18	103	123	8	88			Hourly flow rate (vph)	127	41	29
Pedestrians									Pedestrians			
Lane Width (ft)									Lane Width (ft)			
Walking Speed (ft/s)									Walking Speed (ft/s)			
Percent Blockage									Percent Blockage			
Right turn flare (veh)									Right turn flare (veh)			
Median type	None								Median type	None		
Median storage veh)									Median storage veh)			
Upstream signal (ft)									Upstream signal (ft)			
X, platoon unblocked									pX, platoon unblocked			
C, conflicting volume	268	165			226				vC, conflicting volume	1087	299	
/C1, stage 1 conf vol									vC1, stage 1 conf vol			
C2, stage 2 conf vol									vC2, stage 2 conf vol			
Cu, unblocked vol	268	165			226				vCu, unblocked vol	1087	299	
C, single (s)	6.4	6.2			4.1				tC, single (s)	6.4	6.2	
C, 2 stage (s)									tC, 2 stage (s)			
F (s)	3.5	3.3			2.2				tF (s)	3.5	3.3	
00 queue free %	90	98			99				p0 queue free %	43	94	
cM capacity (veh/h)	717	880			1342				cM capacity (veh/h)	222	741	
Direction, Lane #	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1						Direction, Lane #	WB 1	NB 1	NB
/olume Total	89	226	96						Volume Total	168	299	14
/olume Left	71	0	8						Volume Left	127	0	
/olume Right	18	123	0						Volume Right	41	0	14
SH	746	1700	1342						cSH	268	1700	170
/olume to Capacity	0.12	0.13	0.01						Volume to Capacity	0.63	0.18	0.0
Queue Length 95th (ft)	10	0	0						Queue Length 95th (ft)	97	0	
Control Delay (s)	10.5	0.0	0.7						Control Delay (s)	38.8	0.0	0.
ane LOS	В		А						Lane LOS	E		
Approach Delay (s)	10.5	0.0	0.7						Approach Delay (s)	38.8	0.0	
Approach LOS	В								Approach LOS	E		
ntersection Summary									Intersection Summary			
Average Delay			2.4						Average Delay			5.
Internetion Consoit / L	tilization		22 20/	10		of Service	٨		Intersection Canacity II	tilization		15 80

Synchro 6 Report Page 17

Ex PM Peak PM Peak Hour ► **►** ↓ R SBL SBT **↑** Free ۳. 0% 74 577 2 0.92 0.92 9 80 627 448 448 4.1 2.2 93 1112 SB 2 627 0 0 1700 0.37 2 0 0.0 ICU Level of Service А

Baseline Omni-Means

19: Merrit Rd & SR 2	29									F	PM Peal	<pre>reak</pre>
	۶	-	\mathbf{F}	¥	•	•	•	Ť	۲	1	ŧ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		4			, भी	1	- ሽ	≜ ⊅		ሻ	≜ ⊅	
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	4
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Hourly flow rate (vph)	3	10	9	20	11	123	4	313	7	129	785	4
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	4000	4074	205	000	4070	400	700			000		
vC, conflicting volume	1339	1374	395	990	13/3	160	789			320		
vC1, stage 1 conti vol												
vCz, stage z com vol	1220	1074	205	000	1070	160	790			220		
tC single (s)	7.5	65	595	390	1373	6.0	109			320		
tC, single (s)	7.5	0.5	0.9	7.5	0.5	0.9	4.1			4.1		
tE (s)	35	4.0	33	35	4.0	33	22			22		
n (3)	96	92	0.0 QQ	80	92	86	00			90		
cM canacity (veh/h)	82	129	605	171	129	857	826			1237		
	02	125	000		125	007	020			1207		
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	1700	0	0	4			
Volume to Consolt	107	153	0.1.4	826	0.10	1700	1237	0.24	0.10			
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)	20.0	24.0	12	0.4	0	0	9	0	0			
Long LOS	29.6	34.3	9.9	9.4	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0			
Approach Delay (c)	20.8	147	A	A 0.1			A 1 2					
Approach LOS	29.0 D	14.7 B		0.1			1.2					
Intersection Summary	-	-										_
Average Delay			2.0									
Intersection Canacity Lit	ilization		2.0	1/	<u> </u>	al of Sor	vice		٨			
Analysis Period (min)	mzauon		15	1			NCE		A			
			13									

Lake County 20: Argonaut Road	& SR 2	29								E	Ex PM PM Pea	Peak k Hour
0	≯	-	\mathbf{r}	1	+	×.	•	Ť	1	1	ţ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		\$			4		۲.	4Î		<u> </u>	eî	
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	
Lane Util. Factor		1.00			1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Frt		0.95			0.96		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Flt Protected		0.99			0.99		0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	
Satd. Flow (prot)		1760			1778		1770	1859		1770	1861	
Flt Permitted		0.95			0.92		0.31	1.00		0.45	1.00	
Satd. Flow (perm)		1678			1657		582	1859		845	1861	
Volume (vph)	4	13	9	3	7	4	22	495	7	14	795	4
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
Adi, Flow (vph)	4	14	10	3	8	4	24	538	8	15	864	4
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	10	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lane Group Flow (vph)	0	18	0	0	11	0	24	546	0	15	868	0
Turn Type	Perm			Perm			Perm			Perm		
Protected Phases	1 Onn	4		1 Onn	8		1 Onn	2		1 Onn	6	
Permitted Phases	4			8	Ŭ		2	-		6	Ŭ	
Actuated Green G (s)		39		Ū	39		84.6	84.6		84.6	84.6	
Effective Green g (s)		3.9			3.9		84.6	84.6		84.6	84.6	
Actuated g/C Ratio		0.04			0.04		0.88	0.88		0.88	0.88	
Clearance Time (s)		4.0			4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Vehicle Extension (s)		3.0			3.0		3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0	
Lane Grn Can (vnh)		68			67		510	1630		741	1632	
v/s Ratio Prot		00			01		010	0.29			c0.47	
v/s Ratio Perm		c0 02			0.01		0.04	0.20		0.02	00.47	
v/c Ratio		0.27			0.17		0.05	0.33		0.02	0.53	
Uniform Delay, d1		44.9			44.7		0.00	1.0		0.02	1 4	
Progression Eactor		1 00			1.00		1 00	1.00		1 00	1 00	
Incremental Delay d2		21			1.2		0.0	0.1		0.0	0.3	
Delay (s)		47 1			45.9		0.8	12		0.8	17	
Level of Service		D			D		Δ	Δ		Δ	Δ	
Approach Delay (s)		47 1			45.9			11			17	
Approach LOS		D			D			A			A	
Intersection Summary												
HCM Average Control D	elay		2.8	F	ICM Lev	vel of Se	ervice		A			
HCM Volume to Capaci	tv ratio		0.53									
Actuated Cycle Length	S)		96.5	S	um of le	ost time	(s)		8.0			
Intersection Capacity Ut	ilization		52.1%	10	CU Leve	el of Ser	vice		A			
Analysis Period (min)			15									
c Critical Lane Group												

Synchro 6 Report Page 20

Baseline Omni-Means

Lake County										I	Ex PM	Peak
21: SR 175 & SR 29											PM Pea	k Hour
	≯	+	7	4	+	*	1	Ť	1	1	Ŧ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		ŧ	1	1	1	1	ľ	1	1	ľ	1	1
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	4.0
Lane Util. Factor		1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Frt		1.00	0.85	1.00	1.00	0.85	1.00	1.00	0.85	1.00	1.00	0.85
Flt Protected		0.98	1.00	0.95	1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00	1.00
Satd. Flow (prot)		1823	1583	1770	1863	1583	1770	1863	1583	1770	1863	1583
Flt Permitted		0.88	1.00	0.71	1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00	1.00
Satd. Flow (perm)		1635	1583	1317	1863	1583	1770	1863	1583	1770	1863	1583
Volume (vph)	31	40	31	212	41	109	41	560	91	126	654	19
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)	34	43	34	230	45	118	45	609	99	137	711	21
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	0	27	0	0	93	0	0	44	0	0	8
Lane Group Flow (vph)	0	77	7	230	45	25	45	609	55	137	711	13
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			6
Actuated Green, G (s)		20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	3.4	51.8	51.8	9.8	58.2	58.2
Effective Green, g (s)		20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	3.4	51.8	51.8	9.8	58.2	58.2
Actuated g/C Ratio		0.21	0.21	0.21	0.21	0.21	0.04	0.55	0.55	0.10	0.62	0.62
Clearance Time (s)		4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Vehicle Extension (s)		3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Lane Grp Cap (vph)		349	338	281	398	338	64	1031	876	185	1158	984
v/s Ratio Prot					0.02		0.03	0.33		c0.08	c0.38	
v/s Ratio Perm		0.05	0.02	c0.17		0.07			0.06			0.01
v/c Ratio		0.22	0.02	0.82	0.11	0.07	0.70	0.59	0.06	0.74	0.61	0.01
Uniform Delay, d1		30.4	29.1	35.1	29.7	29.4	44.6	13.9	9.7	40.7	10.8	6.7
Progression Factor		1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Incremental Delay, d2		0.3	0.0	16.7	0.1	0.1	29.5	2.5	0.1	14.7	2.4	0.0
Delay (s)		30.7	29.1	51.8	29.8	29.5	74.1	16.4	9.8	55.4	13.3	6.8
Level of Service		С	С	D	С	C	F	В	A	F	B	A
Approach Delay (s)		30.2	Ū	_	42.6	Ŭ	_	18.9		_	19.7	,,
Approach LOS		C			D			B			В	
Intersection Summary												
HCM Average Control D	elay		24.2	H	ICM Le	vel of Se	ervice		С			
HCM Volume to Capacit	y ratio		0.66									
Actuated Cycle Length (s)		93.6	S	um of l	ost time	(s)		8.0			
Intersection Capacity Ut	ilization		66.2%	10	CU Leve	el of Ser	vice		С			
Analysis Period (min)			15									
c Critical Lane Group												

Lake County Ex PM Peak 22: Lakeport Blvd & Lakeport Blvd/SR 29 NB Entry Ramp PM Peak Hour ۶ ٠ * ┛ EBL EBR WBL WBT NBT Movement EBT WBR NBL NBR SBL SBT SBR Lane Configurations \$ ٦ . 🕈 Þ Stop Sign Control Free Free Stop Grade 0% 0% 0% 0% 127 Volume (veh/h) 291 0 0 415 170 30 1 155 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) 138 316 0 0 451 185 33 168 0 0 1 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 636 316 1136 1228 316 1305 1136 543 vC1, stage 1 conf vol vC2, stage 2 conf vol vCu, unblocked vol 316 636 1136 1228 316 1305 1136 543 tC, single (s) 4.1 4.1 7.1 6.5 6.2 7.1 6.5 6.2 tC, 2 stage (s) 2.2 2.2 tF (s) 3.5 4.0 3.3 3.5 4.0 3.3 p0 queue free % 85 100 80 99 77 100 100 100 1244 159 152 cM capacity (veh/h) 948 724 93 173 539 EB1 EB2 WB1 NB 1 Direction, Lane # Volume Total 138 316 636 202 Volume Left 138 33 0 0 Volume Right 185 168 0 0 cSH 948 1700 1700 455 Volume to Capacity 0.15 0.44 0.19 0.37 Queue Length 95th (ft) 13 0 0 56 Control Delay (s) 0.0 0.0 19.1 9.4 Lane LOS С Α Approach Delay (s) 2.9 0.0 19.1 Approach LOS С Intersection Summary 4.0 Average Delay ICU Level of Service Intersection Capacity Utilization 60.5% B Analysis Period (min) 15

Baseline Omni-Means Synchro 6 Report Page 22

Baseline **Omni-Means** Synchro 6 Report

Page 21

	٦	-	\mathbf{F}	4	+	•	•	1	1	1	Ŧ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		4Î		<u>۲</u>	↑						4	
Sign Control		Free			Free			Stop			Stop	
Grade		0%	=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 (ft/s)												
Percent Blockage												
Right turn flare (ven)								Maria			Mana	
Median type								None			None	
linedian storage ven)												
Destream signal (II)												
vC conflicting volume	302			111			1126	1032	371	1032	1075	302
vC1 stage 1 conf vol	302			414			1120	1032	571	1032	1075	302
vC2 stage 2 conf vol												
vCu, unblocked vol	302			414			1126	1032	371	1032	1075	302
tC single (s)	4 1			41			7 1	6.5	62	7 1	65	6.2
tC 2 stage (s)								0.0	0.2		0.0	0.2
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 #	FR 1	W/B 1	WB 2	SB 1								
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		А		F								
Approach Delay (s)	0.0	3.3		64.5								
Approach LOS				F								
Intersection Summary												
Average Delay			14.5									
Intersection Capacity Ut	ilization	ı	60.5%	10	CU Leve	el of Ser	vice		В			

Lake County 24: 11th ST & SR 29) NB ra	amps								E	Ex PM PM Peal	Peak
	≯	-	\mathbf{F}	4	+	*	1	Ť	۲	1	Ŧ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		4			4			4				
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	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)	11	212	0	0	325	299	62	2	253	0	0	0
Pedestrians												
Lane Width (ft)												
Walking Speed (ft/s)												
Percent Blockage												
Right turn flare (ven)								Maria			Mana	
Median type								None			None	
linetroom signal (ft)												
nX platoon upblocked												
vC conflicting volume	624			212			708	858	212	062	708	171
vC1_stage 1 conf vol	024			212			700	000	212	302	700	- 17
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	А		С									
Approach Delay (s)	0.5	0.0	15.9									
Approach LOS			С									
Intersection Summary												
Average Delay			4.4									
Intersection Capacity Uti	ilization		56.8%	10	CU Leve	el of Ser	vice		В			
Analysis Period (min)			15									

Synchro 6 Report Page 24

Baseline Omni-Means

Lake County 25: Scotts Valley Rd	. & SF	R 29 SE	3 ramp	os						E	Ex PM PM Peal	Peak k Hour
	۶	-	\mathbf{F}	4	+	•	•	Ť	۲	1	ŧ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		4Î			, भी							
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	0	159	1	11
Pedestrians												
Lane Width (ft)												
vvaiking Speed (tt/s)												
Percent Blockage												
Right turn flare (ven)												
Median type								None			None	
Median storage ven)												
Upstream signal (π)												
pA, platoon unblocked	61			100			000	700	06	700	025	61
vC, connicting volume	01			123			609	790	90	790	020	01
vC1, stage 1 confivel												
vCu, unblocked vol	61			123			809	798	96	798	825	61
tC single (s)	4 1			4 1			7 1	65	62	7 1	6.5	6.2
tC 2 stage (s)								0.0	0.2		0.0	0.2
tE (s)	22			22			3.5	40	33	3.5	4.0	33
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 #	FB 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		А	E									
Approach Delay (s)	0.0	7.1	40.1									
Approach LOS			E									
Intersection Summary												
Average Delay			14.2									
Intersection Capacity Uti	lization		41.4%	10	CU Leve	el of Ser	vice		А			
			15									

Lake County 26: Lyons Rd./Nice	Lucerr	ne Cute	off & N	ice Lu	cerne/	SR 29	NB En	itry Ra	mp	E	Ex PM PM Peal	Peak
-	۶	-	*	4	ł	×	<	1	1	*	Ŧ	1
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		ا			el el			\$				
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	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	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
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
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
D	FD 4											
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1									
Volume I otal	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	ilization		28.2%	10	CU Leve	el of Ser	vice		А			
Analysis Period (min)			15									

Synchro 6 Report Page 26

Baseline Omni-Means

						· .						
	٠	-	\mathbf{F}	4	-	•	•	1	1	1	Ŧ	-
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		4Î			4						4	
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	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	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	2			2			379	378	2	378	378	2
vC1, stage 1 conf vol												
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
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	SB 1									
Volume Total	2	189	97									
Volume Left	0	187	95									
Volume Right	1	0	1									
cSH	1700	1620	531									
Volume to Capacity	0.00	0.12	0.18									
Queue Length 95th (ft)	0	10	17									
Control Delay (s)	0.0	7.4	13.3									
Lane LOS		Α	В									
Approach Delay (s)	0.0	7.4	13.3									
Approach LOS			В									
Intersection Summary												
Average Delay			9.3									
Intersection Capacity Ut	ilization		27.9%	10	CU Leve	el of Ser	vice		А			

Lake County 28: Nice Lucerne Cu	utoff &	West I	Lake F	Road						E	Ex PM PM Peal	Peak k Hour
	≯	+	*	•	ł	×.	<	1	1	*	Ŧ	1
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	ľ	•	1	5	¢Î,			ę	1		\$	
Sign Control		Free			Free			Stop			Stop	
Grade		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Volume (veh/h)	2	260	31	14	159	3	9	3	76	5	1	0
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Hourly flow rate (vph)	2	283	34	15	173	3	10	3	83	5	1	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	176			316			491	493	283	576	526	174
vC1, stage 1 conf vol												
vC2, stage 2 conf vol												
vCu, unblocked vol	176			316			491	493	283	576	526	174
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			99			98	99	89	99	100	100
cM capacity (veh/h)	1400			1244			482	470	756	375	451	869
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	EB 2	EB 3	WB 1	WB 2	NB 1	NB 2	SB 1				
Volume Total	2	283	34	15	176	13	83	7				
Volume Left	2	0	0	15	0	10	0	5				
Volume Right	0	0	34	0	3	0	83	0				
cSH	1400	1700	1700	1244	1700	479	756	386				
Volume to Capacity	0.00	0.17	0.02	0.01	0.10	0.03	0.11	0.02				
Queue Length 95th (ft)	0	0	0	1	0	2	9	1				
Control Delay (s)	7.6	0.0	0.0	7.9	0.0	12.7	10.3	14.5				
Lane LOS	A			A		В	В	В				
Approach Delay (s)	0.1			0.6		10.7		14.5				
Approach LOS						В		В				
Intersection Summary												
Average Delay			2.0									
Intersection Capacity Ut	ilization		31.7%	1	CU Leve	el of Sei	vice		А			
Analysis Period (min)			15									
i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i												

Synchro 6 Report Page 27 Baseline Omni-Means

Lake County 59: Lakeport Blvd/Sl	R 29 N	IB Enti	ry Ran	1p & S	R 29					E	Ex PM PM Peal	Peak k Hour
	۶	-	\mathbf{F}	4	+	•	1	Ť	1	1	ŧ	~
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	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)												
		0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0	
Approach LOS		0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0	
Approach LOS		A			A			A			A	
Intersection Summary												
HCM Average Control D	elay		0.0	F	ICM Lev	vel of Se	ervice		A			
HCM Volume to Capacit	ty ratio		0.00									
Actuated Cycle Length (s)		80.0	S	Sum of l	ost time	(s)		0.0			
Intersection Capacity Ut	ilization		0.0%	10	CU Leve	el of Sei	rvice		A			_
Analysis Period (min)			15									

Baseline Omni-Means Synchro 6 Report Page 29

Lake County 61: SR 29 SB ramps	s & SR	29								E	Ex PM PM Pea	Peak k Hour
	۶	+	7	4	ł	×.	<	1	1	×	ţ	4
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	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		А			А			А			А	
Intersection Summary												
HCM Average Control D	Delay		0.0	H	ICM Lev	vel of Se	ervice		А			
HCM Volume to Capacit	ty ratio		0.00									
Actuated Cycle Length ((s)		80.0	S	Sum of le	ost time	(S)		0.0			
Intersection Capacity Ut	ilization		0.0%	10	CU Leve	el of Sei	vice		А			
Analysis Period (min)			15									
c Critical Lane Group												

c Critical Lane Group

Baseline Omni-Means

Lake County 65: SR 29 SB Ramp	& SR	29 NE	3 ramp							E	Ex PM PM Peal	Peak k Hour
	≯	+	*	4	ł	*	<	1	1	*	ţ	~
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	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		0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0	
Approach Delay (s)		0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0	
Approach LOS		A			A			A			A	
Intersection Summary												
HCM Average Control D	elay		0.0	H	ICM Le	vel of Se	ervice		А			
HCM Volume to Capacit	y ratio		0.00									
Actuated Cycle Length (s)		80.0	S	Sum of I	ost time	(s)		0.0			
Intersection Capacity Ut	ilization		0.0%	10	CU Lev	el of Sei	vice		А			
Analysis Period (min)			15									

Baseline Omni-Means Synchro 6 Report Page 31

Lake County 67: SR 29 & SR 29	SB rar	np								E	Ex PM PM Pea	Peak k Hour
	۶	-	\mathbf{F}	•	•	•	1	1	۲	1	ţ	~
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 (vpn)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Peak-nour 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
RIOR Reduction (vpn)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lane Group Flow (vpn)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Turn Type												
Protected Phases												
Actuated Crean C (a)												
Effective Green, G (S)												
Actuated a/C Patio												
Clearance Time (s)												
Lane Grn Can (yph)												
v/s Ratio Prot												
v/s Ratio Porm												
v/c Ratio												
Uniform Delay, d1												
Progression Eactor												
Incremental Delay, d2												
Delay (s)												
Level of Service												
Approach Delay (s)		0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0	
Approach LOS		А			А			А			Α	
Intersection Summary												
HCM Average Control D	Delay		0.0	F	ICM Lev	vel of Se	ervice		A			
HCM Volume to Capaci	ty ratio		0.00									
Actuated Cycle Length ((s)		80.0	S	Sum of le	ost time	(S)		0.0			
Intersection Capacity Ut	tilization		0.0%	10	CU Leve	el of Sei	vice		A			
Analysis Period (min)			15									

c Critical Lane Group

Baseline Omni-Means

Lake County 68: SR 29 SB ramps	s & SR	29								E	Ex PM PM Peal	Peak k Hour
	۶	+	*	4	ł	×.	<	1	1	*	ţ	~
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	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 D	elay		0.0	F	ICM Le	vel of Se	ervice		A			
HCM Volume to Capacit	y ratio		0.00									
Actuated Cycle Length (s)		80.0	S	Sum of I	ost time	(S)		0.0			
Intersection Capacity Ut	ilization		0.0%	10	CU Lev	el of Sei	vice		А			
Analysis Period (min)			15									

Baseline Omni-Means Synchro 6 Report Page 33

Lake County 71: SR 29 SB ramps	s & SR	29								E	Ex PM PM Pea	Peak k Hour
	۶	+	*	4	ł	×	<	1	1	×	ţ	4
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	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		А			А			А			А	
Intersection Summary												
HCM Average Control D)elay		0.0	F	ICM Le	vel of Se	ervice		A			
HCM Volume to Capacit	ty ratio		0.00									
Actuated Cycle Length ((s)		80.0	S	Sum of I	ost time	(S)		0.0			
Intersection Capacity Ut	ilization		0.0%	10	CU Leve	el of Sei	vice		А			
Analysis Period (min)			15									
a Critical Lana Group												

c Critical Lane Group

Baseline Omni-Means

Lake County 74: SR 29 & Park W	/av/SR	29 Er	itrv Ra	mp						E	Ex PM PM Peal	Peak k Hour
	٨	-	\mathbf{r}	1	+	•	1	Ť	1	1	ţ	~
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	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 D	elay		0.0	H	ICM Le	vel of Se	ervice		А			
HCM Volume to Capacit	ty ratio		0.00									
Actuated Cycle Length (s)		80.0	S	Sum of I	ost time	(s)		0.0			
Intersection Capacity Ut	ilization		0.0%	10	CU Lev	el of Sei	vice		А			
Analysis Period (min)			15									

Baseline Omni-Means Synchro 6 Report Page 35

Lake County 75: Park Way/SR 29	NB E	xit Rai	mp & F	Park W	/ay/SR	29 NE	3 Entry	Ramp)	E	Ex PM PM Pea	Peał k Hou
	≯	-	7	4	+	•	1	1	1	1	ţ	4
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	C
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 D	elay		0.0	H	ICM Lev	vel of Se	ervice		А			
HCM Volume to Capacit	y ratio		0.00									
Actuated Cycle Length (s)		80.0	S	Sum of le	ost time	(s)		0.0			
Intersection Capacity Ut	ilization		0.0%	10	CU Leve	el of Sei	vice		A			
Analysis Period (min)			15									
c Critical Lane Group												

Baseline Omni-Means

Lake County										E	Ex PM	Peak
76: Park Way/SR 29	9 SB E	xit Rar	mp & S	SR 29						ŀ	PM Pea	< Hour
	۶	-	\mathbf{F}	4	+	•	•	Ť	۲	1	Ļ	~
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	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 D	elay		0.0	F	ICM Le	vel of Se	ervice		A			
HCM Volume to Capacit	ty ratio		0.00									
Actuated Cycle Length (s)		80.0	S	Sum of I	ost time	(s)		0.0			
Intersection Capacity Ut	ilization		0.0%	10	CU Lev	el of Sei	vice		А			
Analysis Period (min)			15									

Baseline Omni-Means Synchro 6 Report Page 37

Lake County 77: Park Way & Par	k Way	/SR 29) SB E	xit Rar	np					E	Ex PM PM Pea	Peak k Hour
	۶	+	*	4	+	•	1	1	1	1	ţ	~
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	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												
Delay (a)												
Delay (S)												
Approach Delay (a)		0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0	
Approach LOS		0.0			0.0			0.0			0.0	
Approach LOS		A			A			A			A	
Intersection Summary												
HCM Average Control D	Delay		0.0	H	ICM Lev	vel of Se	ervice		A			
HCM Volume to Capacit	ty ratio		0.00									
Actuated Cycle Length (s)		80.0	S	Sum of le	ost time	(s)		0.0			
Intersection Capacity Ut	ilization		0.0%	10	CU Leve	el of Sei	vice		A			_
Analysis Period (min)			15									
c Critical Lane Group												

Baseline Omni-Means

Lake County 1: SR 20 & Scotts V	alley F	۲d.					2030 Summer Conditions PM Peak PM Peak Hour
	+	7	4	+	<	*	
Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR	
Lane Configurations	eî			ŧ	Y		
Sign Control	Free			Free	Stop		
Grade	0%			0%	0%		
Volume (veh/h)	768	92	12	299	72	24	
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	
Hourly flow rate (vph)	835	100	13	325	78	26	
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			935		1236	885	
vC1, stage 1 conf vol							
vC2, stage 2 conf vol							
vCu, unblocked vol			935		1236	885	
tC, single (s)			4.1		6.4	6.2	
tC, 2 stage (s)							
tF (s)			2.2		3.5	3.3	
p0 queue free %			98		59	92	
cM capacity (veh/h)			732		191	344	
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1				
Volume Total	935	338	104				
Volume Left	0	13	78				
Volume Right	100	0	26				
cSH	1700	732	215				
Volume to Capacity	0.55	0.02	0.49				
Queue Length 95th (ft)	0	1	60				
Control Delay (s)	0.0	0.6	36.6				
Lane LOS	_	A	E				
Approach Delay (s)	0.0	0.6	36.6				
Approach LOS			E				
Intersection Summary							
Average Delay			2.9				
Intersection Capacity Ut	ilization		58.1%	10	CU Leve	el of Ser	vice B
Analysis Period (min)			15				

						2030 Summer Conditions PM Peal PM Peak Hou
-	\mathbf{r}	4	+	•	1	
EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR	
•	1	۲	•	7	1	
Free			Free	Stop		
0%			0%	0%		
615	228	86	114	449	380	
0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	
668	248	93	124	488	413	
				None		
		916		979	668	
		916		979	668	
		4.1		6.4	6.2	
		2.2		2 5	2.2	
		2.2		3.5	3.3	
		744		242	10	
		/44		242	400	
EB 1	EB 2	WB 1	WB 2	NB 1	NB 2	
668	248	93	124	488	413	
0	0	93	0	488	0	
1700	248	744	1700	0	413	
0.20	0.15	0 12	0.07	242	400	
0.39	0.15	0.13	0.07	2.01	240	
0.0	0.0	10.5	0.0	690 502 6	249 51 5	
0.0	0.0	10.5 B	0.0	505.0 F	51.5 F	
0.0		4.5		296.3		
0.0		4.0		230.5 F		
		131 7				
lization		72.0%	1	CU Leve	l of Servi	ce C
	→ EBT Free 0% 615 0.92 668 668 0 0.92 668 0 0.92 668 0 0.92 668 0 0 0.92 668 0 0 0.92 668 0 0 0.92 668 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		→ → ✓ EBT EBR WBL ↑ ↑ ↑ Free 0% 6 015 228 860 0.92 0.92 0.92 668 248 933 0 0.92 0.92 668 248 933 0 916 4.1 2.2 87 744 EB 1 EB 2 WB 1 668 248 933 0 0 933 0 0 933 0 0 933 0 0.113 0.131 0 0.15 0.13 0 0.15 0.13 0 0.15 87 0.00 1.05 87 0 0.15 0.13 0 0.15 0.13 0 0.15 87 0.00 1.5 <	Image: bit is a	EBT EBR WBL WBT NBL Image: Constraint of the state of the s	LEBT LEBR WBL WBT NBL NBR Image: Free Stop 0% 0% 1 1 1 Free Image: Free Stop 0% 0% 0% 1 <t< td=""></t<>

5:00 pm Baseline Omni-Means Synchro 6 Report Page 1

5:00 pm Baseline Omni-Means

3' SR ZU & PVIE R02	be									H	PM Peal	k Hour
	≯	-	\mathbf{r}	4	+	×.	1	t	1	1	Ļ	4
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	٦.	↑	1	<u>۲</u>	4			ب ا	1		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
vC1, stage 1 conf vol												
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
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	А			В		F	F	F				
Approach Delay (s)	0.1			3.7		2690.5		Err				
Approach LOS						F		F				
Intersection Summary												
Average Delay			Err									
Intersection Capacity Ut	ilization	1	10.9%	10	CU Leve	el of Sei	rvice		Н			
Analysis Pariod (min)			15									

Lake County 2030 Summer Conditions PM Peak 4: SR 20 & Lakeshore Blvd. PM Peak Hour ۶ ۰ ← 1 ٩ ┛ -+ \mathbf{i} EBL EBT EBR WBL WBT WBR NBT Movement NBL NBR SBI SBT SBR **≜**†₽ Lane Configurations _î⇒ 4 4 ٦. ۳ Sign Control Free Free Stop Stop Grade 0% 0% 0% 0% Volume (veh/h) 0 915 12 807 0 4 0 29 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) 0 995 13 877 0 4 0 32 0 1 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 877 996 1460 1898 995 1929 1899 439 vC1, stage 1 conf vol vC2, stage 2 conf vol vCu, unblocked vol 877 996 1460 1898 439 995 1929 1899 tC, single (s) 4.1 4.1 7.5 6.5 6.9 7.5 6.5 6.9 tC, 2 stage (s) 2.2 2.2 tF (s) 3.5 4.0 3.3 3.5 4.0 3.3 p0 queue free % 100 98 95 100 87 100 100 100 691 243 cM capacity (veh/h) 766 89 67 34 67 566 WB 2 WB 3 NB 1 Direction, Lane # EB1 EB2 WB1 SB 1 Volume Total 996 13 585 36 0 292 0 Volume Left 0 13 0 0 0 4 0 Volume Right 32 0 1 0 0 0 0 201 1700 cSH 1700 1700 691 1700 1700 Volume to Capacity 0.00 0.00 0.59 0.02 0.34 0.17 0.18 Queue Length 95th (ft) 0 0 0 0 16 0 1 0.0 10.3 Control Delay (s) 0.0 0.0 0.0 26.8 0.0 Lane LOS D В Α 0.0 Approach Delay (s) 0.2 26.8 0.0 Approach LOS D А Intersection Summary 0.6 Average Delay ICU Level of Service Intersection Capacity Utilization 58.2% B Analysis Period (min) 15

5:00 pm Baseline Omni-Means Synchro 6 Report Page 4

5:00 pm Baseline Omni-Means

Lake County							2030 Summer Conditions PM Peak
5: Country Club Dr & SR 20 PM Peak Hour							
		•	t	1	1	Ļ	
Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	
Lane Configurations	Y		4Î			ب ا	
Sign Control	Stop		Free			Free	
Grade	0%		0%			0%	
Volume (veh/h)	91	260	877	54	34	646	
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	
Hourly flow rate (vph)	99	283	953	59	37	702	
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	1759	983			1012		
vC1, stage 1 conf vol							
vC2, stage 2 conf vol							
vCu, unblocked vol	1759	983			1012		
tC, single (s)	6.4	6.2			4.1		
tC, 2 stage (s)	0.5	0.0			0.0		
t⊢ (s)	3.5	3.3			2.2		
pU queue free %	0	6			95		
civi capacity (ven/n)	88	302			685		
Direction, Lane #	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1				
Volume Total	382	1012	739				
Volume Left	99	0	37				
Volume Right	283	59	0				
cSH	185	1700	685				
Volume to Capacity	2.06	0.60	0.05				
Queue Length 95th (ft)	735	0	4				
Control Delay (s)	536.1	0.0	1.4				
Lane LOS	F	0.0	A				
Approach Delay (s)	536.1	0.0	1.4				
Approach LOS	F						
Intersection Summary							
Average Delay			96.4				
Intersection Capacity U	tilization		89.4%	10	CU Leve	el of Serv	ice E
Analysis Period (min)			15				

6: Foothill Dr. & SR 20 PM Peak Hour ٠ t 1 ŧ € 1 WBL WBR NBT NBR SBL SBT Movement Y Lane Configurations Þ ٦. - 1 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 vC1, stage 1 conf vol vC2, stage 2 conf vol vCu, unblocked vol 2258 834 842 tC, single (s) 6.4 6.2 4.1 tC, 2 stage (s) 3.5 3.3 2.2 tF (s) p0 queue free % 0 60 91 368 793 cM capacity (veh/h) 41 Direction, Lane # WB 1 NB1 SB1 SB2 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 0.09 3.36 0.50 0.75 Queue Length 95th (ft) Err 0 7 0 0.0 10.0 0.0 Control Delay (s) Err Lane LOS F А Approach Delay (s) 0.0 0.5 Err Approach LOS F Intersection Summary 1090.2 Average Delay Intersection Capacity Utilization 83.2% ICU Level of Service Е Analysis Period (min) 15

5:00 pm Baseline Omni-Means

Lake County

Synchro 6 Report Page 6

2030 Summer Conditions PM Peak

5:00 pm Baseline Omni-Means
Lake County 7: SR 20 & SR 53							2030 Summer Conditions PM Peak PM Peak Hour
	-	$\mathbf{\hat{z}}$	4	+	1	1	
Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR	
Lane Configurations	- ††	1	ሻ	↑	- Y		
Sign Control	Free			Free	Stop		
Grade	0%			0%	0%		
Volume (veh/h)	125	268	100	146	773	165	
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	
Hourly flow rate (vph)	136	291	109	159	840	179	
Pedestrians							
Lane Width (ft)							
Walking Speed (ft/s)							
Percent Blockage							
Right turn flare (veh)							
Median type				1	Raised		
Median storage veh)					1		
Upstream signal (ft)							
pX, platoon unblocked							
vC, conflicting volume			427		512	68	
vC1, stage 1 conf vol					136		
vC2, stage 2 conf vol					376		
vCu, unblocked vol			427		512	68	
tC, single (s)			4.1		6.8	6.9	
tC, 2 stage (s)					5.8		
tF (s)			2.2		3.5	3.3	
p0 queue free %			90		0	82	
cM capacity (veh/h)			1129		510	981	
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	EB 2	EB 3	WB 1	WB 2	NB 1	
Volume Total	68	68	291	109	159	1020	
Volume Left	0	0	0	109	0	840	
Volume Right	0	0	291	0	0	179	
cSH	1700	1700	1700	1129	1700	557	
Volume to Capacity	0.04	0.04	0.17	0.10	0.09	1.83	
Queue Length 95th (ft)	0	0	0	8	0	1595	
Control Delay (s)	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.5	0.0	398.8	
Lane LOS				А		F	
Approach Delay (s)	0.0			3.5		398.8	
Approach LOS						F	
Intersection Summarv							
Average Delay			237.8				
Intersection Capacity Ut	ilization		71.9%	10	CU Lev	el of Sen	vice C
Analysis Period (min)			15				
. ,			. 0				

Lake County 8: Olympic Drive & I	_akesh	ore D	r.				2030 Summer Conditions PM Peak PM Peak Hour						
	۶	-	\mathbf{r}	4	+	•	1	Ť	1	1	ţ	~	
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBF	
Lane Configurations		\$			\$			\$			\$		
Sign Control		Stop			Stop			Free			Free		
Grade		0%			0%			0%			0%		
Volume (veh/h)	1	0	2	106	0	224	1	320	153	204	378	:	
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	0	2	115	0	243	1	348	166	222	411		
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	1533	1372	412	1291	1291	431	414			514			
vC1, stage 1 conf vol													
vC2, stage 2 conf vol													
vCu, unblocked vol	1533	1372	412	1291	1291	431	414			514			
tC, single (s)	7.1	6.5	6.2	7.1	6.5	6.2	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 %	98	100	100	1	100	61	100			79			
cM capacity (veh/h)	49	115	640	117	129	624	1145			1051			
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1									
Volume Total	3	359	515	636									
Volume Left	1	115	1	222									
Volume Right	2	243	166	3									
cSH	127	261	1145	1051									
Volume to Capacity	0.03	1.38	0.00	0.21									
Queue Length 95th (ft)	2	481	0	20									
Control Delay (s)	34.2	228.7	0.0	5.0									
Lane LOS	D	F	А	А									
Approach Delay (s)	34.2	228.7	0.0	5.0									
Approach LOS	D	F											
Intersection Summary													
Average Delay			56.4										
Intersection Capacity Ut	tilization		93.1%	10	CU Leve	el of Sei	rvice		F				
Analysis Period (min)			15										

Synchro 6 Report Page 8

5:00 pm Baseline Omni-Means

	٠	\sim	•	+	T	1	
M	-		NDI	NDT		000	
	EBL	EBR	INBL	NB I	SBI	SBR	
Lane Configurations	<u> </u>	r	1	_ T	_ T	r	
	Stop			Free	Free		
	0%	054	407	0%	0%	105	
volume (ven/n)	150	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				
vC1, stage 1 conf vol							
vC2, stage 2 conf vol							
vCu, unblocked vol	2410	730	942				
tC, single (s)	6.4	6.2	4.1				
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		540	0	0	0	
Volume Right	0	276	0	0	0	212	
cSH	a	422	728	1700	1700	1700	
Volume to Canacity	18 17	0.65	0.74	0.35	0.43	0.12	
	Frr	114	168	0.55	0.43	0.12	
Control Delay (s)	Err	28.3	22.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	
ane LOS	F	20.3	22.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Approach Dolay (a)	3833 0	J	10.2		0.0		
Approach LOS	5522.0 F		10.0		0.0		
Intersection Cummerce	-	_	_	_	_		
Average Delay			679.0				
Average Delay	Itilization		01 50/	14			
intersection Capacity U	unzation		01.5%	10	JU Leve	er or Servi	D D

5:00 pm	Baseline
Omni-Me	ans

	≯	-	\mathbf{i}	•	+	•	1	1	1	1	Ŧ	-
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SB
Lane Configurations	ሻሻ	વૈ		ኘ	•	1	۲	ŧβ		ኘ	^	
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
Satd. Flow (prot)	3433	1660	0	1770	1863	1583	1770	3468	0	1770	3539	158
Flt Permitted	0.950			0.950			0.950			0.950		
Satd. Flow (perm)	3433	1660	0	1770	1863	1583	1770	3468	0	1770	3539	158
Satd. Flow (RTOR)		156				229		16				75
Volume (vph)	1099	100	270	79	107	239	172	684	106	223	836	86
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	0.9
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	94
Turn Type	Prot			Prot		Perm	Prot			Prot		Per
Protected Phases	7	4		3	8		5	2		1	6	
Permitted Phases						8						
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
Act Effct Green (s)	32.0	36.5		8.9	11.2	11.2	10.0	23.0		13.0	26.0	26
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.34	0.38		0.09	0.12	0.12	0.10	0.24		0.14	0.27	0.2
v/c Ratio	1.04	0.55		0.53	0.53	0.67	1.01	1.01		1.00	0.94	0.9
Control Delay	68.6	17.3		51.1	43.3	13.6	112.7	69.9		102.0	52.9	28
Queue Delay	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
LOS	E	В		D	D	В	F	E		F	D	
Approach Delay		55.6			28.1			77.6			47.5	
Approach LOS		E			С			E			D	
Intersection Summary												
Cycle Length: 100												
Actuated Cycle Length:	95.3											
Control Type: Actuated-	Uncoor	dinated										
Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.0	4											
Intersection Signal Dela	v: 54.3			li I	ntersect	ion LOS	S: D					
Intersection Capacity U	tilization	1 85.0%		10	CU Leve	el of Se	rvice E					
Analysis Period (min) 1	5											
,												
Splits and Phases: 10): SR 29	9 & SR 9	53									
≜	1			-								
02	17.	øl	T	ø3	42.	ø4						
2/ \$	17.5		14 3		42.8							
↑ ø5 🖡 ø6				- ø8		∽ ₀7						
14 s 30 s			20 s	;		36 s						
										0		D
5:00 pm Baseline										Syr	ichro 6	керс

Lake County	Conv	on Po	ad				2030 Summer Conditions PM Peak
TT. SR 29 & Selgier	Cariyo		au				T W T Cak Hour
	-	\mathbf{r}	1	+	1	1	
Movement	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	NBL	NBR	
Lane Configurations	el el		ľ	- † †	¥		
Sign Control	Free			Free	Stop		
Grade	0%			0%	0%		
Volume (veh/h)	1170	6	135	982	18	259	
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	
Hourly flow rate (vph)	1272	7	147	1067	20	282	
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			1278		2102	1275	
vC1, stage 1 conf vol							
vC2, stage 2 conf vol							
vCu, unblocked vol			1278		2102	1275	
tC, single (s)			4.1		6.8	6.9	
tC, 2 stage (s)							
tF (s)			2.2		3.5	3.3	
p0 queue free %			73		39	0	
cM capacity (veh/h)			539		32	158	
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	WB 2	WB 3	NB 1		
Volume Total	1278	147	534	534	301		
Volume Left	0	147	0	0	20		
Volume Right	7	0	0	0	282		
cSH	1700	539	1700	1700	126		
Volume to Capacity	0.75	0.27	0.31	0.31	2.39		
Queue Length 95th (ft)	0	27	0	0	655		
Control Delay (s)	0.0	14.2	0.0	0.0	704.2		
Lane LOS		В			F		
Approach Delay (s)	0.0	1.7			704.2		
Approach LOS					F		
Intersection Summary							
Average Delay			76.6				
Intersection Capacity Ut	tilization	. <u></u>	96.4%	1	CU Leve	el of Serv	rice F
Analysis Period (min)			15				

Lake County 12: SR 29 & Point L	akevie	w Roa	ad				2030 Summer Conditions PM Peak PM Peak Hour
	۶	-	-	×	1	4	
Movement	EBL	EBT	WBT	WBR	SBL	SBR	
Lane Configurations	۲	1	≜ 1}		Y		
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	
vC1_stage 1 conf vol					2000	000	
vC2 stage 2 conf vol							
vCu, unblocked vol	1198				2095	599	
tC single (s)	4 1				6.8	6.9	
tC 2 stage (s)					0.0	0.0	
tE (s)	22				3.5	33	
n0 queue free %	100				0.0	92	
cM capacity (yeh/h)	578				45	445	
						110	
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	В		_		F		
Approach Delay (s)	0.0		0.0		Err		
Approach LOS					F		
Intersection Summary							
Average Delay			835.6				
Intersection Capacity Ut	ilization		62.6%	10	CU Leve	el of Servi	ce B
Analysis Period (min)			15				

Synchro 6 Report Page 12

5:00 pm Baseline Omni-Means

					<u>ر</u>	1	
	-		T		>	÷	
Novement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	
Lane Configurations	٦	1	f,		٦.	↑	
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)	None						
Instream signal (ft)							
C conflicting volume	1005	1170			1200		
vC, connicting volume	1095	1172			1200		
vC1, stage 1 contivol							
VC2, stage 2 cont vol	4005	4470			4000		
VCu, unbiocked voi	1895	11/2			1200		
tC, single (s)	0.4	6.2			4.1		
tC, 2 stage (s)	0.5	0.0			0.0		
t⊢ (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		В			
Approach Delay (s)	131.2		0.0	0.5			
Approach LOS	F						
Intersection Summary							
Average Delay			10.8				
Intersection Capacity Ut	tilization		70.1%	10	CU Leve	l of Servi	ice C
Analysis Period (min)			15				

Lake County 2030 Summer Conditions PM Peak 14: SR 175 & SR 29 PM Peak Hour ٦ ₹ \mathbf{i} Lane Group EBL EBT EBR WBL WBT WBR NBL NBT NBR SRI SBT SBR Lane Configurations 4 4 4 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 Flt Permitted 0.752 0.729 0.789 0.989 Satd. Flow (perm) 0 1334 0 1354 0 1468 0 1783 0 0 0 0 Satd. Flow (RTOR) 33 38 Volume (vph) 222 37 142 66 62 3 177 803 4 6 410 127 Confl. Peds. (#/hr) Confl. Bikes (#/hr) Peak Hour Factor Growth Factor 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 1069 0 591 0 0 0 Perm Turn Type Perm Perm Perm **Protected Phases** 6 Permitted Phases 4 8 2 6 25.0 25.0 0.0 25.0 25.0 0.0 55.0 55.0 0.0 55.0 55.0 0.0 Total Split (s) Act Effct Green (s) 21.0 21.0 51.0 51.0 0.26 0.26 0.64 0.64 Actuated g/C Ratio 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 С F А 126.0 28.2 95.2 Approach Delay 9.2 Approach LOS F С F А Intersection Summary Cycle Length: 80 Actuated Cycle Length: 80 Control Type: Actuated-Uncoordinated Maximum v/c Ratio: 1.16 Intersection Signal Delay: 74.2 Intersection LOS: E Intersection Capacity Utilization 121.5% ICU Level of Service H Analysis Period (min) 15 Splits and Phases: 14: SR 175 & SR 29 <† **→** ₀4 ø2 **₽**⊳ ø6 øß

5:00 pm Baseline Omni-Means Synchro 6 Report Page 13

5:00 pm Baseline

Omni-Means

Lake County							2030 Summer Conditions PM Pook
15: Dry Creek Cuto	ff & SR	29					PM Peak Hour
	۶	\mathbf{i}	•	Ť	ţ	~	
Movement	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR	
Lane Configurations	Y			ب	4Î		
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				
vC1, stage 1 conf vol							
vC2, stage 2 conf vol							
vCu, unblocked vol	1325	514	534				
tC, single (s)	6.4	6.2	4.1				
tC, 2 stage (s)							
t⊢ (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) Approach LOS	57.1 F	0.6	0.0				
Intersection Summary							
Average Delay			5.5				
Intersection Capacity U	tilization		66.8%	10	CU Leve	el of Ser	vice C
Analysis Period (min)			15				

Lake County 2030 Summer Conditions PM Peak 16: SR 29 & SR 281 (Soda Bay Road) PM Peak Hour ٠ ٠ ← ٩. ┛ -+ \mathbf{r} 1 EBR WBL WBT WBR NBT SBR Movement EBL EBT NBL NBR SBI SBT Lane Configurations 4 ٦. ÷ ۳ • 7 र्न Sign Control Free Free Stop Stop Grade 0% 0% 0% 0% 284 Volume (veh/h) 392 508 29 7 477 303 58 58 189 62 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 vC1, stage 1 conf vol vC2, stage 2 conf vol 848 584 vCu, unblocked vol 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 tC, 2 stage (s) 2.2 2.2 tF (s) 3.5 4.0 3.3 3.5 4.0 3.3 p0 queue free % 46 99 0 0 88 0 0 45 991 cM capacity (veh/h) 790 18 522 29 557 0 0 WB2 WB3 NB1 Direction, Lane # EB 1 EB2 WB1 SB 1 SB 2 Volume Total 426 584 134 273 8 518 329 309 Volume Left 426 0 8 205 8 0 0 0 Volume Right 32 329 63 0 309 0 0 0 cSH 790 1700 991 1700 1700 0 557 0 0.54 0.55 Volume to Capacity 0.34 0.01 0.30 0.19 Err Err Queue Length 95th (ft) 82 0 0 0 Err Err 84 1 Control Delay (s) 14.8 0.0 8.7 0.0 0.0 Err Err 19.2 Lane LOS В F F С А Approach Delay (s) 6.2 0.1 Err Err Approach LOS F F Intersection Summary Average Delay Err ICU Level of Service Intersection Capacity Utilization 77.2% D Analysis Period (min) 15

5:00 pm Baseline Omni-Means Synchro 6 Report Page 15 5:00 pm Baseline Omni-Means

Lake County							2030 Summer Conditions PM Peak
17: Point Lakeview	Road &	<u>8 SR</u> 2	<u>281 (</u> So	da Ba	y Roa	d)	PM Peak Hour
	4	×.	1	1	*	ţ	
Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	
Lane Configurations	۰Y		4			र्भ	
Sign Control	Stop		Free			Free	
Grade	0%		0%			0%	
Volume (veh/h)	109	29	157	187	12	134	
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	
Hourly flow rate (vph)	118	32	171	203	13	146	
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	444	272			374		
vC1, stage 1 conf vol							
vC2, stage 2 conf vol							
vCu, unblocked vol	444	272			374		
tC, single (s)	6.4	6.2			4.1		
tC, 2 stage (s)							
tF (s)	3.5	3.3			2.2		
p0 queue free %	79	96			99		
cM capacity (veh/h)	565	766			1185		
Direction, Lane #	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1				
Volume Total	150	374	159				
Volume Left	118	0	13				
Volume Right	32	203	0				
cSH	598	1700	1185				
Volume to Capacity	0.25	0.22	0.01				
Queue Length 95th (ft)	25	0	1				
Control Delay (s)	13.0	0.0	0.8				
Lane LOS	В		A				
Approach Delay (s)	13.0	0.0	0.8				
Approach LOS	В						
Intersection Summary							
Average Delay			3.0				
Intersection Capacity U	tilization		34.2%	10	CU Leve	el of Serv	vice A
Analysis Period (min)			15				
,			-				

18: Main ST & SR 29 PM Peak Hour ۰. t 1 ŧ € ۴ WBL WBR NBT NBR SBL SBT Movement Y Lane Configurations . 🕈 7 ٦ 1 Sign Control Stop Free Free Grade 0% 0% 0% Volume (veh/h) 561 183 541 270 112 872 Peak Hour Factor 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 0.92 Hourly flow rate (vph) 610 199 588 293 122 948 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 1779 588 882 vC1, stage 1 conf vol vC2, stage 2 conf vol vCu, unblocked vol 1779 588 882 tC, single (s) 6.4 6.2 4.1 tC, 2 stage (s) 3.5 3.3 2.2 tF (s) p0 queue free % 0 61 84 767 cM capacity (veh/h) 76 509 WB 1 NB1 NB2 SB1 SB 2 Direction, Lane # Volume Total 809 588 293 122 948 Volume Left 610 0 0 122 0 Volume Right 199 0 293 0 0 767 1700 cSH 96 1700 1700 Volume to Capacity 8.41 0.35 0.56 0.17 0.16 Queue Length 95th (ft) Err 0 0 14 0 0.0 Control Delay (s) Err 0.0 0.0 10.6 Lane LOS F В Approach Delay (s) Err 0.0 1.2 Approach LOS F Intersection Summary 2930.5 Average Delay Intersection Capacity Utilization 94.8% ICU Level of Service Analysis Period (min) 15

5:00 pm Baseline Omni-Means Synchro 6 Report Page 17 5:00 pm Baseline Omni-Means

Lake County

Synchro 6 Report Page 18

2030 Summer Conditions PM Peak

	≯	-	\mathbf{F}	-	+	•	1	T.	1	1	Ŧ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		÷			र्भ	1	<u>۲</u>	- † 1>		ኘ	- † 1>	
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	6
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	7
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		
vC1, stage 1 conf vol												
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		
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	В	В			Α					
Approach Delay (s)	777.4	144.7		0.1			1.3					
Approach LOS	F	F										
Intersection Summary												
Average Delay			48.2									
Intersection Capacity U	tilization	1	53.3%	- I	CU Leve	el of Ser	vice		А			
Analysis Period (min)			15									

Lake County 20: Argonaut Road a	& SR 2	29					2030 Summer Conditions PM Peak PM Peak Hour						
	≯	-	\mathbf{r}	4	+	•	•	Ť	1	1	ţ	4	
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR	
Lane Configurations		\$			\$		۲	¢Î		۲	eî 🕺		
Sign Control		Stop			Stop			Free			Free		
Grade		0%			0%			0%			0%		
Volume (veh/h)	51	163	112	37	88	51	30	678	10	19	1089	6	
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)	55	177	122	40	96	55	33	737	11	21	1184	7	
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	2134	2041	1187	2243	2039	742	1190			748			
vC1, stage 1 conf vol													
vC2, stage 2 conf vol													
vCu, unblocked vol	2134	2041	1187	2243	2039	742	1190			748			
tC, single (s)	7.1	6.5	6.2	7.1	6.5	6.2	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 %	0	0	47	0	0	87	94			98			
cM capacity (veh/h)	0	52	230	0	52	415	587			861			
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1	NB 2	SB 1	SB 2							
Volume Total	354	191	33	748	21	1190							
Volume Left	55	40	33	0	21	0							
Volume Right	122	55	0	11	0	7							
cSH	0	0	587	1700	861	1700							
Volume to Capacity	Err	Err	0.06	0.44	0.02	0.70							
Queue Length 95th (ft)	Err	Err	4	0	2	0							
Control Delay (s)	Err	Err	11.5	0.0	9.3	0.0							
Lane LOS	F	F	В		A								
Approach Delay (s)	Err	Err	0.5		0.2								
Approach LOS	F	F											
Intersection Summary													
Average Delay			Err										
Intersection Capacity Ut	ilizatior	ı	86.8%	10	CU Leve	el of Ser	vice		E				
Analysis Period (min)			15										

Synchro 6 Report Page 19

5:00 pm Baseline Omni-Means

	۶	-	\mathbf{i}	4	+	•	1	1	۲	1	Ļ	-
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBF
Lane Configurations		ર્સ	1	۲	†	1	ኘ	•	1	۲	†	7
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
Flt 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	C
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			e
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	9.3	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	А	F	С	D	F	F	В	F	F	E
Approach Delay		39.0			1218.5			478.0			473.3	
Approach LOS		D			F			F			F	
Intersection Summary												
Cycle Length: 100												
Actuated Cycle Length:	100											
Control Type: Actuated-	Uncoor	dinated										
Maximum v/c Ratio: 5.5	3											
Intersection Signal Dela	y: 692.4	4		I	ntersec	tion LOS	S: F					
Intersection Capacity Ut	ilizatior	n 196.8%	6	1	CU Lev	el of Se	rvice H					
Analysis Period (min) 15	5											
, , ,												
Splits and Phases: 21	I: SR 17	75 & SR	29									
1 -2			1	a1 🚽	★ a4							
42 s			11 s	47	- 104 Is							
				-	<u>e</u>							
~ } ø5 🔰 ø6				1	ø8							
0.0 45.0				4	1.0							

5:00 pm	Baseline
Omni-Me	ans

Synchro 6 Report Page 21

22: Lakeport Blvd &	Lakep	ort Blv	d/SR 2	29 NB	Entry	Ramp				F	PM Peal	k Hour
	۶	-	$\mathbf{\hat{z}}$	4	+	•	1	Ť	۲	1	ţ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	۲	•			ĥ			¢.				
Sign Control		Free			Free			Stop			Stop	
Grade		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Volume (veh/h)	296	679	0	0	627	256	67	2	349	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)	322	738	0	0	682	278	73	2	379	0	0	0
Pedestrians												
Lane Width (ft)												
Walking Speed (ft/s)												
Percent Blockage												
Right turn flare (veh)												
Median type								None			None	
Median storage veh)												
Unstream signal (ft)												
oX platoon unblocked												
vC conflicting volume	960			738			2202	2341	738	2583	2202	821
vC1, stage 1 conf vol												
vC2_stage 2 conf vol												
vCu unblocked vol	960			738			2202	2341	738	2583	2202	821
C single (s)	4 1			4 1			7 1	6.5	62	7 1	6.5	6.2
tC 2 stage (s)								0.0	0.2		0.0	0.2
F(s)	22			22			3.5	40	3.3	3.5	4 0	3.3
n0 queue free %	55			100			0	89	9	100	100	100
cM capacity (veh/h)	717			868			21	20	418	1	25	375
								20			20	0.0
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	EB 2	WB 1	NB 1								
Volume I otal	322	738	960	454								
Volume Left	322	0	0	73								
Volume Right	0	0	278	379								
CSH	717	1700	1700	100								
Volume to Capacity	0.45	0.43	0.56	4.53								
Queue Length 95th (ft)	58	0	0	Err								
Control Delay (s)	14.0	0.0	0.0	Err								
Lane LOS	В			F								
Approach Delay (s)	4.3		0.0 9	9999.0								
Approach LOS				F								
Intersection Summary												
Average Delay			1838.2									
Intersection Canacity Liti	lization	1	00.3%	10	CU Leve	el of Ser	vice		G			
increased on oapacity of												

5:00 pm Baseline Omni-Means

23: Lakeport Blvd & SR 29 SB Ramp PM Peak Hour Image: Configurations	Lake County							2030) Sumr	ner Co	onditio	ns PM	Peak
Movement EBL EBT EBR WBL WBT WBR NBL NBT NBR SBL SBT SBR Lane Configurations 1 1 1 4 4 Sign Control Free Free Stop Stop Stop Grade 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% Volume (veh/h) 0 705 185 250 420 0 0 0 0 20.92 0.92 <td>23: Lakeport Blvd &</td> <td>SR 29</td> <td>) SB R</td> <td>amp</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>F</td> <td>PM Peal</td> <td>(Hour</td>	23: Lakeport Blvd &	SR 29) SB R	amp							F	PM Peal	(Hour
Movement EBL EBT EBR WBL WBT WBT NBT NBT NBR SBL SBF SBR Lane Configurations F Free Free Stop Stop Stop Stop Stop Stop Stop O% 0%		۶	+	¥	4	ł	×.	<	1	1	*	ţ	~
Lane Configurations ↑ ↑ ↑ ↑ ↓	Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Sign Control Free Stop Stop Grade 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% Volume (veh/h) 0 705 185 250 420 0 0 0 277 2 194 Peak Hour Factor 0.92	Lane Configurations		4		<u>۲</u>	↑						4	
Grade 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% Volume (veh/h) 0 705 185 250 420 0 0 0 0.277 2 194 Peak Hour Factor 0.92 0.9	Sign Control		Free			Free			Stop			Stop	
Volume (veh/h) 0 705 185 250 420 0 0 0 0 277 2 194 Peak Hour Factor 0.92 <t< td=""><td>Grade</td><td></td><td>0%</td><td></td><td></td><td>0%</td><td></td><td></td><td>0%</td><td></td><td></td><td>0%</td><td></td></t<>	Grade		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Peak Hour Factor 0.92 0.9	Volume (veh/h)	0	705	185	250	420	0	0	0	0	277	2	194
Hourly flow rate (vph) 0 766 201 272 457 0 0 0 0 301 2 211 Pedestrians Lane Width (ft) Walking Speed (ft's) Percent Blockage Right turn flare (veh) Median type None None Median type 0 7 967 2079 1867 867 1867 1967 457 VC1, stage 1 conf vol VC2, stage 2 conf vol VC2, stage 3 conf vol VC1, stage (s) UF (s) 2.2 2.2 2.2 2.2 3.5 4.0 3.3 5 4.0 3.3 5 4.0 3.3 5 4.0 3.3 0 0 queue free % 100 62 100 100 100 0 94 65 C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	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
Pedestrians Lane Width (ft) Walking Speed (ft/s) Percent Blockage Right turn flare (veh) Median type None Median type None Vector 1000000000000000000000000000000000000	Hourly flow rate (vph)	0	766	201	272	457	0	0	0	0	301	2	211
Lane Width (ft) Walking Speed (ft/s) Percent Blockage Right turn flare (veh) Median type None None None Median type VC, conflicting volume 457 967 2079 1867 867 1867 1867 1967 457 VC, conflicting volume 457 967 2079 1867 867 1867 1967 457 VC, conflicting volume 457 967 2079 1867 867 1867 1967 457 VC, stage 1 conf vol VC, stage 2 conf vol VO, s	Pedestrians												
Walking Speed (Ir/s) None None Percent Blockage None None Median type None None Median storage veh) Upstream signal (ft) px, platoon unblocked vC. conflicting volume 457 967 2079 1867 867 1867 1967 457 vC2, stage 1 conf vol vC2, stage 2 conf vol vC1, 1 6.5 6.2 7.1 6.5 6.2 7.1 6.5 6.2 7.1 6.5 6.2 7.1 6.5 6.2 7.1 6.5 6.2 7.1 6.5 6.2 7.1 6.5 6.2 7.1 6.5 6.2 7.1 6.5 6.2 7.1 6.5 6.2 7.1 6.5 6.2 7.1 6.5 6.2 7.1 6.5 6.2 7.1 6.5 6.2 7.1 6.5 6.2 7.1 6.5 6.2 7.1 1.0 3.3 3.5 4.0 3.3 3.5 4.0 3.3 3.5 4.0 3.3 3.5	Lane Width (ft)												
Percent Blockage Right turn flare (veh) Median type None None Median storage veh) Upstream signal (ft) pX, platoon unblocked vC, conflicting volume 457 967 2079 1867 867 1867 1967 457 vC1, stage 1 conf vol vC2, stage 2 conf vol vC2, stage 2 conf vol vC2, single (s) 4.1 4.1 7.1 6.5 6.2 7.1 6.5 6.2 tC, single (s) 4.1 4.1 7.1 6.5 6.2 7.1 6.5 6.2 tC, single (s) 4.1 4.1 7.1 6.5 6.2 7.1 6.5 6.2 tC, single (s) 4.1 4.1 7.1 6.5 6.2 7.1 6.5 6.2 tC, single (s) 4.1 4.1 7.1 6.5 6.2 7.1 6.5 6.2 tC, single (s) 4.1 4.1 7.1 6.5 6.2 7.1 6.5 6.2 tC, single (s) 4.1 4.1 7.1 6.5 6.2 7.1 6.5 6.2 tC, single (s) 4.1 4.1 7.1 6.5 6.2 7.1 6.5 6.2 tC, single (s) 4.1 4.1 7.1 6.5 6.2 7.1 6.5 6.2 tC, single (s) 4.1 4.1 7.1 6.5 6.2 7.1 6.5 6.2 tC, single (s) 4.1 4.1 7.1 6.5 6.2 7.1 6.5 6.2 tC, single (s) 4.1 4.1 7.1 6.5 6.2 7.1 6.5 6.2 tC, single (s) 4.1 4.1 7.1 6.5 6.2 7.1 6.5 6.2 tC, single (s) 4.1 4.1 7.1 6.5 6.2 7.1 6.5 6.2 tC, single (s) 4.1 4.1 7.1 6.5 6.2 7.1 6.5 6.2 tC, single (s) 4.1 4.1 7.1 6.5 6.2 7.1 6.5 6.2 tC, single (s) 4.1 4.1 7.1 6.5 6.2 7.1 6.5 6.2 tC, single (s) 4.1 4.1 7.1 6.5 6.2 7.1 6.5 6.2 tC, single (s) 4.1 4.1 7.1 6.5 6.2 7.1 6.5 6.2 tC, single (s) 4.0 3.3 3.5 4.0 3.3 p0 queue free % 100 62 100 100 100 100 0 94 65 cM capacity (veh/h) 1104 712 170 6.2 Volume Total 967 272 4.57 514 Volume Left 0 272 0 301 Volume Right 201 0 0 211 cSH 1700 712 1700 6.3 Volume Right 201 0 0 211 cSH 1700 712 1700 6.3 Volume Right 201 0 0 5. terr Control Delay (s) 0.0 13.1 0.0 Err Lane LOS B F Approach LOS F Intersection Summary Average Delay ICU Level of Service G Intersection Capacity Utilization 100.3% ICU Level of Service G	Walking Speed (ft/s)												
Right turn flare (veh) None None Median type None None Median storage veh) Upstream signal (ft) None None Upstream signal (ft) pX, platoon unblocked VC, conflicting volume 457 967 2079 1867 867 1867 1967 457 VC1, stage 1 conf vol VC2, stage 2 conf vol VC1, stage (s) 1667 867 1867 1967 457 VC2, stage (s) T 4.1 7.1 6.5 6.2 7.1 6.5 6.2 tf (s) 2.2 2.2 3.5 4.0 3.3 3.5 4.0 3.3 pd queue free % 100 62 100 100 0 94 65 cM capacity (veh/h) 1104 712 17 45 352 39 39 604 Direction, Lane # EB 1 WB 1 WB 2 SB 1 Volume Total 967 272 0 301 Volume Total 967 272 0	Percent Blockage												
Median type None None None Median storage veh) Upstream signal (It) pX, platoon unblocked 457 967 2079 1867 867 1867 1967 457 vC1, stage 1 conf vol vC2, stage 2 conf vol 457 967 2079 1867 867 1867 1967 457 vC2, stage 2 conf vol 4.1 7.1 6.5 6.2 7.1 6.5	Right turn flare (veh)												
Median storage veh) Upstream signal (ft) yX, platoon unblocked vC, conflicting volume 457 967 2079 1867 867 1867 1967 457 vC1, stage 1 conf vol vC2, stage 2 conf vol vC2, stage 2 conf vol vC2, unblocked vol 457 967 2079 1867 867 1867 1967 457 vC1, single (s) 4.1 4.1 7.1 6.5 6.2 7.1 6.5	Median type								None			None	
Upstream signal (It) pX, platoon unblocked vC, conflicting volume 457 967 2079 1867 867 1867 1967 457 vC1, stage 1 conf vol vC2, stage 2 conf vol vC2, unblocked vol 457 967 2079 1867 867 1867 1967 457 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 62 100 100 100 0 94 65 cM capacity (veh/h) 1104 712 17 45 352 39 39 604 Direction, Lane # EB 1 WB 1 WB 2 SB 1 Volume Total 967 272 457 514 Volume Left 0 272 0 301 Volume Left 0 0 271 63 Volume Left 0 0 271 63 Volume Left 0 0 272 0 301 Volume Left 0 0 272 8.13 Queue Length 95th (ft) 0 45 0 Err Control Delay (s) 0.0 13.1 0.0 Err Lane LOS B F Approach Delay (s) 0.0 4.9 Err Approach Delay (s) 0.0 4.9 Err Approach LOS F Intersection Summary Average Delay 2328.0 Intersection Capacity Utilization 100.3% ICU Level of Service G	Median storage veh)												_
pX, platoon unblocked vC, conflicting volume 457 967 2079 1867 867 1867 1967 457 vC1, stage 1 conf vol vC2, stage 2 conf vol vC2, stage 2 conf vol vC2, stage 2 conf vol vC2, unblocked vol 457 967 2079 1867 867 1867 1967 457 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 62 100 100 100 0 94 65 cM capacity (veh/h) 1104 712 17 45 352 39 39 604 Direction, Lane # EB 1 WB 1 WB 2 SB 1 Volume Total 967 272 457 514 Volume Total 967 272 457 514 Volume Right 201 0 0 211 cSH 1700 63 Volume to Capacity 0.57 0.38 0.27 8.13 Queue Length 95th (ft) 0 45 0 Err Control Delay (s) 0.0 13.1 0.0 Err Lane LOS B F Approach LOS F Approach LOS F Intersection Summary Average Delay 2328.0 Intersection Capacity Utilization 10.3% ICU Level of Service G	Upstream signal (ft)												
VC, contricting volume 457 967 2079 1867 867 1867 1967 457 VC1, stage 1 conf vol VC2, stage 2 conf vol VOLUME Compacity (veh/h) 1104 712 170 Conf total 967 272 457 514 Volume Cospacity 0.57 0.38 0.27 8.13 Queue Length 95th (ft) 0 45 0 Err Control Delay (s) 0.0 13.1 0.0 Err Lane LOS B F Approach LOS F Intersection Summary Average Delay 2232.0 Intersection Capacity Utilization 100.3% ICU Level of Service G	pX, platoon unblocked							0.070	1007		1007	1007	
VC1, stage 1 cont vol VC2, stage 2 conf vol VC2, stage 2 conf vol VC1, unblocked vol 457 967 2079 1867 867 1867 1967 457 tC, single (s) 4.1 4.1 7.1 6.5 6.2 7.1 6.5 6.2 tC, 2 stage (s) F (s) 2.2 2.2 3.5 4.0 3.3 3.5 4.0 3.3 PO queue free % 100 62 100 100 100 0 94 65 cM capacity (veh/h) 1104 712 17 45 352 39 39 604 Direction, Lane # EB 1 WB 1 WB 2 SB 1 Volume Total 967 272 457 514 Volume Left 0 272 0 301 Volume Left 0 272 0 301 Volume Left 0 0 271 cos CSH 1700 712 1700 63 Volume to Capacity 0.57 0.38 0.27 8.13 Queue Length 95th (ft) 0 45 0 Err Control Delay (s) 0.0 13.1 0.0 Err Lane LOS B F Approach Delay (s) 0.0 4.9 Err Approach LOS F Average Delay 57 0.38 0.27 8.13 Average Delay 2328.0 Intersection Summary Average Delay 2328.0 Intersection Capacity Utilization 100.3% ICU Level of Service G	vC, conflicting volume	457			967			2079	1867	867	1867	1967	457
vC2, stage 2 cont vol 967 2079 1867 867 1967 457 vCu, unblocked vol 457 967 2079 1867 867 1967 457 tC, single (s) 4.1 4.1 7.1 6.5 6.2 7.1 6.5 6.2 tF (s) 2.2 2.2 3.5 4.0 3.3 3.5 4.0 3.3 p0 queue free % 100 62 100 100 0 94 65 cM capacity (veh/h) 1104 712 17 45 352 39 39 604 Direction, Lane # EB 1 WB 1 WB 2 SB 1 Volume Left 0 272 457 514 Volume Left 0 271 0 301 Volume Left 0 221 53 4.0 3.3 3.5 4.0 3.5 4.0 3.5 4.0 3.5 4.0 3.5 4.0 3.5 4.0 3.5 4.0 3.5 4.0 3.5 4.0 3.5 4.0 3.5 4.0 3.5 4.0	vC1, stage 1 conf vol												_
VCU, unblocked vol 457 967 2079 1867 186	vC2, stage 2 cont vol	457			0.07			0070	4007	0.07	4007	4007	457
tc, single (s) 4.1 4.1 7.1 6.5 6.2 7.1 6.5 6.2 tC, 2 stage (s) tr (s) 2.2 2.2 3.5 4.0 3.3 3.5 4.0 3.3 p0 queue free % 100 62 100 100 0 94 65 cM capacity (veh/h) 1104 712 17 45 352 39 39 604 Direction, Lane # EB 1 WB 1 WB 2 SB 1 Volume Total 967 272 457 514 Volume Total 0 271 0 301 Volume total 967 272 8.13 Exercise to task Exercise	vCu, unblocked vol	457			967			2079	1867	867	1867	1967	457
It, 2 Stage (s) 2.2 2.2 3.5 4.0 3.3 3.5 4.0 3.3 p0 queue free % 100 62 100 100 0 94 65 cM capacity (veh/h) 1104 712 17 45 352 39 39 604 Direction, Lane # EB 1 WB 1 WB 2 SB 1 Volume Total 967 272 457 514 Volume Left 0 272 0 301 Volume Left 0 272 0 301 Volume Left 0 271 csH Volume Left 0 272 0 301 Volume Left 0 271 csH 1700 63 Volume to Capacity 0.57 0.38 0.27 8.13 Ueue Length 95th (ft) 0 45 0 Err Err Lane LOS B F	tC, single (s)	4.1			4.1			7.1	6.5	6.2	7.1	6.5	6.2
tr (s) 2.2 2.2 3.3 4.0 3.3 3.3 3.5 4.0 3.3 3.5 4.0 3.3 3.5 4.0 3.3 3.5 6.0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 65 0 0 0 100 100 0 94 65 0 0 17 45 352 39 39 604 Direction, Lane # EB 1 WB 1 WB 2 SB 1 Volume 1 0 0 211 0 0 211 0 0 211 0 0 211 0 0 211 0 0 211 0 0 211 0 0 211 0 0 211 0 0 10	tC, 2 stage (s)	~ ~ ~			0.0			25	4.0	2.2	2 5	4.0	2.2
bit debe inter % 100 62 100 100 100 0 94 63 cM capacity (veh/h) 1104 712 17 45 352 39 39 604 Direction, Lane # EB 1 WB 1 WB 2 SB 1 Volume Total 967 272 457 514 </td <td></td> <td>2.2</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>2.2</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>3.5</td> <td>4.0</td> <td>3.3</td> <td>3.5</td> <td>4.0</td> <td>3.3</td>		2.2			2.2			3.5	4.0	3.3	3.5	4.0	3.3
Direction, Lane # EB 1 WB 1 WB 2 SB 1 Volume Total 967 272 457 514 Volume Total 967 272 457 514 Volume Eff 0 272 0 301 Volume Right 201 0 211 cSH 1700 712 1700 63 Volume to Capacity 0.57 0.38 0.27 8.13 Queue Length 95th (ft) 0 45 0 Err Control Delay (s) 0.0 13.1 0.0 Err Control Delay (s) 0.0 4.9 Err Approach Delay (s) 0.0 4.9 Err Approach LOS F Intersection Summary Average Delay 2328.0 Intersection Capacity Utilization Intersection Capacity Utilization 100.3% ICU Level of Service G Analysis Period (min) 15 15 100	p0 queue free %	1100			712			100	100	252	20	94	604
Direction, Lane # EB 1 WB 1 WB 2 SB 1 Volume Total 967 272 457 514 Volume Left 0 272 0 301 Volume Right 201 0 0 211 cSH 1700 712 1700 63 Volume to Capacity 0.57 0.38 0.27 8.13 Queue Length 95th (ft) 0 45 0 Err Lane LOS B F F Approach Delay (s) 0.0 4.9 Err Approach LOS F F Intersection Summary F Average Delay 2328.0 Intersection Capacity Utilization Intersection Capacity Utilization 100.3% ICU Level of Service G Analysis Period (min) 15 15 ICU Level of Service		1104			112			17	40	302	39	39	004
Volume Total 967 272 457 514 Volume Left 0 272 0 301 Volume Right 201 0 0 211 cSH 1700 712 1700 63 Volume to Capacity 0.57 0.38 0.27 8.13 Queue Length 95th (ft) 0 45 0 Err Control Delay (s) 0.0 13.1 0.0 Err Lane LOS B F Approach Delay (s) 0.0 4.9 Err Approach LOS F F Intersection Summary	Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	WB 2	SB 1								
Volume Left 0 272 0 301 Volume Right 201 0 0 211 CSH 1700 712 1700 63 Volume to Capacity 0.57 0.38 0.27 8.13 Queue Length 95th (ft) 0 45 0 Err Control Delay (s) 0.0 13.1 0.0 Err Lane LOS B F Approach Delay (s) 0.0 4.9 Approach LOS F F F Intersection Summary F Intersection Capacity Utilization 100.3% ICU Level of Service G Analysis Period (min) 15 5 5	Volume Total	967	272	457	514								
Volume Right 201 0 0 211 cSH 1700 712 1700 63 Volume to Capacity 0.57 0.38 0.27 8.13 Queue Length 95th (ft) 0 45 0 Err Control Delay (s) 0.0 13.1 0.0 Err Approach Delay (s) 0.0 4.9 Err Approach LOS F F Intersection Summary F Average Delay 2328.0 Intersection Capacity Utilization 100.3% ICU Level of Service G Analysis Period (min) 15 G	Volume Left	0	272	0	301								
CSH 1700 712 1700 63 Volume to Capacity 0.57 0.38 0.27 8.13 Queue Length 95th (ft) 0 45 0 Err Control Delay (s) 0.0 13.1 0.0 Err Lane LOS B F Approach Delay (s) 0.0 4.9 Err Approach LOS F F Intersection Summary F Average Delay 2328.0 Intersection Capacity Utilization Intersection Capacity Utilization 100.3% ICU Level of Service G Analysis Period (min) 15 15 G	Volume Right	201	0	0	211								
Volume to Capacity 0.57 0.38 0.27 8.13 Queue Length 95th (ft) 0 45 0 Err Control Delay (s) 0.0 13.1 0.0 Err Lane LOS B F Approach Delay (s) 0.0 4.9 Err Approach LOS F F Intersection Summary 2328.0 Intersection Capacity Utilization Intersection Capacity Utilization 100.3% ICU Level of Service G Analysis Period (min) 15 15 Intersection Summary	cSH	1700	712	1700	63								
Queue Length 95th (ft) 0 45 0 Err Control Delay (s) 0.0 13.1 0.0 Err Lane LOS B F Approach Delay (s) 0.0 4.9 Err Approach LOS F F Intersection Summary 7 F Intersection Capacity Utilization 100.3% ICU Level of Service G Analysis Period (min) 15 15 1000000000000000000000000000000000000	Volume to Capacity	0.57	0.38	0.27	8.13								
Control Delay (s) 0.0 13.1 0.0 Err Lane LOS B F Approach Delay (s) 0.0 4.9 Err Approach LOS F F Intersection Summary 2328.0 Intersection Capacity Utilization Intersection Capacity Utilization 100.3% ICU Level of Service G Analysis Period (min) 15 15 Intersection Summary	Queue Length 95th (ft)	0	45	0	Err								
Lane LOS B F Approach Delay (s) 0.0 4.9 Err Approach LOS F F Intersection Summary Intersection Capacity Utilization 100.3% ICU Level of Service G Analysis Period (min) 15 15 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 10000 1000 1000 100000 100000 1000	Control Delay (s)	0.0	13.1	0.0	Err								
Approach Delay (s) 0.0 4.9 Err Approach LOS F Intersection Summary 2328.0 Intersection Capacity Utilization 100.3% ICU Level of Service G Analysis Period (min) 15	Lane LOS		В		F								
Approach LOS F Intersection Summary 2328.0 Intersection Capacity Utilization 100.3% ICU Level of Service G Analysis Period (min) 15	Approach Delay (s)	0.0	4.9		Err								
Intersection Summary Average Delay 2328.0 Intersection Capacity Utilization 100.3% ICU Level of Service G Analysis Period (min) 15 15	Approach LOS				F								
Average Delay 2328.0 Intersection Capacity Utilization 100.3% ICU Level of Service G Analysis Period (min) 15	Intersection Summary												
Intersection Capacity Utilization 100.3% ICU Level of Service G Analysis Period (min) 15 15 16	Average Delay			2328.0									
Analysis Period (min) 15	Intersection Capacity Ut	ilization	1	00.3%	10	CU Leve	el of Sei	vice		G			
	Analysis Period (min)			15									

Lake County							2030) Sumr	ner Co	onditio	ns PM	Peak
24: 11th ST & SR 29	9 NB ra	amps									PM Peal	k Hour
	٦	-	\mathbf{r}	1	+	•	1	1	1	1	ŧ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		ę			4Î			\$				
Sign Control		Free			Free			Stop			Stop	
Grade		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Volume (veh/h)	23	448	0	0	485	447	129	4	525	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)	25	487	0	0	527	486	140	4	571	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	1013			487			1307	1550	487	1880	1307	770
vC1, stage 1 conf vol												
vC2, stage 2 conf vol												
vCu, unblocked vol	1013			487			1307	1550	487	1880	1307	770
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 %	96			100			0	96	2	100	100	100
cM capacity (veh/h)	684			1076			133	110	581	1	154	401
Direction Lone #	ED 1		ND 1									
Direction, Lane #	ED 1	4042										
	512	1013	/15									
Volume Len	25	496	571									
	694	480	5/1									
	004	1700	344									
Volume to Capacity	0.04	0.60	2.08									
Queue Length 95th (π)	3	0	1290									
Control Delay (s)	1.0	0.0	520.1									
Lane LUS	A	0.0	F 20 4									
Approach LOS	1.0	0.0	520.1 F									
Intersection Summary												
Average Delay			166.3									
Intersection Canacity Lit	ilization		99.3%	10		el of Ser	vice		F			
Analysis Period (min)	mzauon		15				100					
			15									

Synchro 6 Report Page 23 5:00 pm Baseline Omni-Means

												-
	٠	-	\mathbf{F}	4	-	•	1	†	1	1	Ŧ	-
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		4			ન ી						4	
Sign Control		Free			Free			Stop			Stop	
Grade		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Volume (veh/h)	0	144	114	479	91	0	0	0	0	321	2	22
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Hourly flow rate (vph)	0	157	124	521	99	0	0	0	0	349	2	24
Pedestrians												
Lane Width (ft)												
Valking Speed (II/S)												
Percent blockage												
Modion type								Nono			None	
Median storage yeb)								NUTE			NUTIE	
I Instream signal (ff)												
nX platoon unblocked												
vC conflicting volume	99			280			1384	1359	218	1359	1421	99
vC1, stage 1 conf vol				200					2.0			
vC2, stage 2 conf vol												
vCu, unblocked vol	99			280			1384	1359	218	1359	1421	99
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			59			100	100	100	0	97	98
cM capacity (veh/h)	1494			1282			79	88	821	86	81	957
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	SB 1									
Volume Total	280	620	375									
Volume Left	0	521	349									
Volume Right	124	0	24									
cSH	1700	1282	91									
Volume to Capacity	0.16	0.41	4.11									
Queue Length 95th (ft)	0	50	Err									
Control Delay (s)	0.0	8.8	Err									
Lane LOS		A	F									
Approach Delay (s)	0.0	8.8	Err									
Approach LOS			F									
Intersection Summary												
Average Delay		2	2945.2									
Intersection Capacity Ut	ilization		75.1%	10	CU Leve	el of Ser	vice		D			
Analysis Pariod (min)			15									

Lake County 26: Lyons Rd./Nice	Lucerr	ne Cuto	off & N	ice Lu	cerne/	SR 29	2030 NB Er) Sumr htry Ra	mer Co Imp	onditioi F	ns PM PM Pea	Peak k Hour
	۶	-	\mathbf{F}	4	+	•	1	1	~	1	ţ	4
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBF
Lane Configurations		ا			¢Î			\$				
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	(
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	(
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				100					100			0.74
vC, conflicting volume	390			192			570	587	192	1048	570	373
VC1, stage 1 cont vol												
vC2, stage 2 cont vol	000			100			570	507	400	40.40	570	07(
VCu, unblocked vol	390			192			570	587	192	1048	570	3/3
tC, single (s)	4.1			4.1			7.1	0.5	6.2	7.1	0.5	0.4
tC, Z stage (s)	2.2			2.2			2.5	4.0	2.2	25	4.0	2 2
n guouo froo %	100			100			00	4.0	3.3	100	4.0	100
oM conceity (yoh/h)	1160			1201			422	421	040	100	421	671
	1100			1501			452	421	043	03	431	070
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1									
Volume Total	195	390	485									
Volume Left	2	0	2									
Volume Right	0	35	4/5									
CSH	1168	1700	832									
Volume to Capacity	0.00	0.23	0.58									
Queue Length 95th (II)	0 1	0	90									
Control Delay (s)	0.1	0.0	15.2									
Lane LUS	A	0.0	15.0									
Approach LOS	0.1	0.0	15.2 C									
Intersection Summary												
Average Delay			6.9									
Intersection Capacity Ut	tilization	1	53.3%	10	CU Leve	el of Ser	vice		А			
Analysis Period (min)			15		2011							

Synchro 6 Report Page 25 5:00 pm Baseline Omni-Means

27: Lyons Rd./Nice	Lucerr	ne Cuto	off & S	R 29 S	B ram	р				F	PM Pea	k Hour
	۶	-	\mathbf{r}	4	+	•	1	1	1	1	ŧ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		4			4						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	4	0	0	0	0	124	1	1
Pedestrians												
Lane Width (ft)												
Walking Speed (ft/s)												
Percent Blockage												
Right turn flare (veh)												
Median type								None			None	
Median storage ven)												
Upstream signal (ft)												
pX, platoon unblocked	4			4			700	707	2	707	700	4
vC, conflicting volume	4			4			798	191	3	191	798	4
vC1, stage 1 cont vol												
vCz, stage z com vol	4			4			709	707	2	707	709	4
tC single (s)	4			4			7 1	65	62	7 1	65	62
$tC_2 \text{ stane}(s)$	4.1			4.1			7.1	0.5	0.2	7.1	0.5	0.2
tE (s)	22			22			3.5	40	33	35	40	33
n0 queue free %	100			76			100	100	100	50	100	100
cM capacity (veh/h)	1617			1617			246	242	1081	247	241	1079
Discotion Long #			00.4									
Direction, Lane #	EBI	VVB 1	SBT									
Volume Loft	4	399	120									
Volume Lett	0	395	124									
	1700	1617	240									
Volume to Conseitu	0.00	0.24	249									
Queue Length 95th (#)	0.00	0.24	0.51									
Control Dolay (s)	0.0	7.0	33 /									
	0.0	1.9	00.4 D									
Approach Delay (s)	0.0	79	33.4									
Approach LOS	0.0	1.5	D									
Intersection Summary		_	_					_				_
			13.0									
Intersection Canacity Lit	ilization		40.1%	10	<u></u>	al of Sor	vice		۵			
Analysis Period (min)	mzauon		15		JO Leve	51 01 0 61	VICE		A			
			13									

28: Nice Lucerne Cu	utoff &	West	Lake F	Road						F	PM Pea	k Hour
	۶	-	\mathbf{r}	4	+	×	1	Ť	1	1	Ŧ	-
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	٦	•	7	٦	f,			4	7		4	
Sign Control		Free			Free			Stop			Stop	
Grade		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Volume (veh/h)	3	485	58	30	336	7	31	10	263	18	3	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)	3	527	63	33	365	8	34	11	286	20	3	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	373			590			966	972	527	1259	1031	369
vC1, stage 1 conf vol												
vC2, stage 2 conf vol												
vCu unblocked vol	373			590			966	972	527	1259	1031	369
tC single (s)	4 1			4 1			71	6.5	6.2	7 1	6.5	6.2
tC 2 stage (s)								0.0	0.2		0.0	0.2
tF (s)	2.2			2.2			3.5	4.0	3.3	3.5	4.0	3.3
p0 queue free %	100			97			85	96	48	71	99	100
cM capacity (veh/h)	1186			985			225	244	551	67	225	677
Direction Lane #	FB 1	FB 2	FB 3	WB 1	WB 2	NB 1	NB 2	SB 1				
Volume Total	3	527	63	33	373	45	286	23				
Volume Left	3	0	0	33	0	34	0	20				
Volume Right	0	0	63	0	8	0	286	0				
cSH	1186	1700	1700	985	1700	229	551	74				
Volume to Canacity	0.00	0.31	0.04	0.03	0.22	0.19	0.52	0.31				
Queue Length 95th (ft)	0.00	0.01	0.04	0.00	0.22	18	74	28				
Control Dolay (s)	8.0	0.0	0.0	8.8	0.0	24.4	18/	73.0				
Lane LOS	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	24.4	10.4	73.5 E				
Approach Delay (c)	0.0			0.7		10.2	U	73.0				
Approach LOS	0.0			0.7		13.2 C		75.5 F				
Intersection Summary						-						
Average Delay			6.0									
Average Delay	lization		0.2		CLLLaw	al of Car	n dia a		P			
Analysis Daried (n-in)	inzation		33.1%		CU Leve	el 01 261	vice		В			
Analysis Period (min)			15									

Synchro 6 Report Page 27 5:00 pm Baseline Omni-Means

	۶	-	\mathbf{r}	4	-	•	1	1	1	- \	Ŧ	4
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	0
Satd. Flow (RTOR)												
Volume (vph)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Confl. Peds. (#/hr)												
Confl. Bikes (#/hr)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
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 venicles (%)	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%
Bus blockages (#/III)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mid-Block Traffic (%)		0%			0%			0%			0%	
ane Group Flow (vph)	0	0 /8	0	0	0 /0	0	0	0 /8	0	0	0 /0	0
Turn Type	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
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%), Referen	ced to p	hase 2:	and 6:,	Start of	Green							
Control Type: Pretimed												
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.0	0											
Intersection Signal Dela	y: 0.0			l	ntersect	ion LOS	S: A					
Intersection Capacity U	tilization	0.0%			CU Lev	el of Sei	rvice A					

Synchro 6 Report Page 29 Lake County 2030 Summer Conditions PM Peak 61: SR 29 SB ramps & SR 29 PM Peak Hour ≯ ۰ \mathbf{i} Lane Group EBL EBT EBR WBL WBT WBR NBL NBT NBR 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 Growth Factor 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 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 Total Split (s) 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

5:00 pm Baseline Omni-Means

	≯	-	\rightarrow	1	+	•	1	Ť	1	- \	Ļ	-
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBF
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	0.9
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												
Annroach Delay												
Approach LOS												
Intersection Summary												
Cycle Length: 80												
Actuated Cycle Length:	80											
Offset: 0 (0%), Reference	ced to p	hase 2:	and 6:,	Start of	Green							
Control Type: Pretimed												
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.0	0											
Intersection Signal Dela	y: 0.0				ntersec	ion LOS	5: A					
Intersection Capacity UI	ilizatior	n 0.0%		1	CU Lev	el of Se	rvice A					
Analysis Period (min) 15	5											

Synchro 6 Report Page 31 Lake County 2030 Summer Conditions PM Peak 67: SR 29 & SR 29 SB ramp PM Peak Hour ≯ ٠ \mathbf{i} ٩ Lane Group EBL EBT EBR WBL WBT WBR NBL NBT NBR SBT SBR SBI 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 Growth Factor 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 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 Total Split (s) 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: 67: SR 29 & SR 29 SB ramp

5:00 pm Baseline Omni-Means

	۶	-	\mathbf{r}	1	-	•	1	†	1	1	Ŧ	-
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	C
Flt Permitted												
Satd. Flow (perm)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	C
Satd. Flow (RTOR)												
Volume (vph)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	C
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	C
Parking (#/hr)												
Mid-Block Traffic (%)		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Lane Group Flow (vph)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	C
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												
Internetion Summon												
Actuated Quals Langth	00											
Offect: 0 (0%) Reference	ou and to n	haaa 2.	and 6:	Start of	Croon							
Control Type: Protimed	leu io p	nase z.	anu o.,	Start U	Green							
Maximum v/a Patia: 0.00	0											
Intersection Signal Dela	v. 0 0				ntoreact	ion I OS	2· A					
Intersection Signal Dela	y. 0.0 ilization	0.0%			CLLLow							
Analysis Period (min) 15	inzatioi	10.0 %			CO Lev		NCE A					
	,											
Splits and Phases: 68	3: SR 2	9 SB rar	nps & S	R 29								

Synchro 6 Report Page 33

Lake County 71: SR 29 SB ramps	s & SF	R 29					2030) Sum	mer Co	onditio	ns PM PM Pea	Peak Ik Hour
	۶	-	\mathbf{r}	4	+	•	•	1	1	1	ţ	4
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	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 Effet Green (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
Actuated g/C Ratio												
v/c Ratio												
Control Delay												
Queue Delay												
Total Delay												
Approach Delay												
Approach LOS												
Intersection Summary												
Cycle Length: 80												
Actuated Cycle Length:	80											
Offset: 0 (0%), Referend	ced to p	hase 2:	and 6:,	Start of	f Green							
Control Type: Pretimed												
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.0	0											
Intersection Signal Dela	y: 0.0			1	ntersect	tion LOS	S: A					
Intersection Capacity Ut	tilizatior	n 0.0%		1	CU Lev	el of Se	rvice A					
Analysis Period (min) 15	5											
Splits and Phases: 71	1: SR 2	9 SB rai	mps & S	R 29								

5:00 pm Baseline Omni-Means

	≯		\mathbf{r}	4	-	•	1	Ť	1	×	Ļ	4
Lane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBF
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	C
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%), Reference	ed to p	hase 2:	and 6:,	Start of	Green							
Control Type: Pretimed												
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.0	0											
Intersection Signal Dela	y: 0.0			h	ntersect	ion LOS	S: A					
Intersection Capacity Ut	ilization	0.0%		10	CU Leve	el of Sei	vice A					

Synchro 6 Report Page 35 Lake County 2030 Summer Conditions PM Peak 75: Park Way/SR 29 NB Exit Ramp & Park Way/SR 29 NB Entry Ramp PM Peak Hour ≯ ₹ -+ Lane Group EBL EBT EBR WBL WBT WBR NBL NBT NBR SBT SBR SBI 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 Growth Factor 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 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 Total Split (s) 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: 75: Park Way/SR 29 NB Exit Ramp & Park Way/SR 29 NB Entry Ramp

5:00 pm Baseline Omni-Means

	≯	-+	\mathbf{r}	1	-	•	•	Ť	1	- \	Ļ	4
ane Group	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBF
ane Configurations												
Fotal 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)												
/olume (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	C
Parking (#/hr)												
Vid-Block Traffic (%)		0%			0%			0%			0%	
ane Group Flow (vph)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	C
Furn 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												
//c Ratio												
Control Delay												
Queue Delay												
Fotal Delay												
LOS												
Approach Delay												
Approach LOS												
ntersection Summary												
Cycle Length: 80												
Actuated Cycle Length:	80											
Offset: 0 (0%), Reference	ed to p	hase 2:	and 6:,	Start of	Green							
Control Type: Pretimed												
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.00	2											
ntersection Signal Dela	y: 0.0			- li	ntersect	tion LOS	S: A					
ntersection Capacity Ut	ilization	0.0%		1	CU Lev	el of Se	rvice A					

Synchro 6 Report Page 37 Lake County 2030 Summer Conditions PM Peak 77: Park Way & Park Way/SR 29 SB Exit Ramp PM Peak Hour ۰ ٦ Lane Group EBL EBT EBR WBL WBT WBR NBL NBT NBR 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 Growth Factor 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 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 Total Split (s) 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: 77: Park Way & Park Way/SR 29 SB Exit Ramp

5:00 pm Baseline Omni-Means

																			New Bri	idge/Culvert St	ucture				Traffic Sign	als and Restr	iping			FINAL		E	
					Existing Conditions			Re	adway Construc	tion/Reconstru	uction			Developed	R/W Acquis	sition		\$1.	,000,000			\$250	,000 \$10,	000 \$50,00	0 \$100,00	0 \$10,00	\$50,00	\$25	\$100,000	COSTS	i ji	grai	
Improvement #	Facility Name	Roadway Segments	Length of Roadway Segment (Feet) Intersection Number	Intersections & Interchanges	NS Travel Lanes NS Left-turn Lanes ENV Travel Lanes ENV Left-turn Lanes Intersection Control	Improvement	Cost ² (\$1,000)	Length of Roadway Section (Linear Feet)	Average Construction Area Width (Ft.) Total Roadway Construction Area (Sq. Ft.)	Planning Level Roadway Construction Unit Cost (per sq.ft.)	Roadway Construction Cost Sub-Total	Length of New Developed Right-of- Way Section (Linear Feet)	Average Ex ROW Width Proposed ROW Width	Average Developed Right-of- Way Area Width (Ft.)	Total Developed Right-of- Way Area (Sq. Ft.)	Planning Level Developed Right-of- Way Unit Cost (sq.ft.)	Roadway Developed Right-of-Way Aquisition Cost Sub-Total	Length of Section (Linear Feet)	Structure Average Construction	Area Width (Ft.) Total Structure Construction Area (Sq. Ft.)	Planning Level Stucture Construction Unit Cost (sq.ft.) Structure Construction Cost	ाक bo L- प्र Sig	Coord I New Exist ffic Traf nal Sigr	Minor inate Modificat ing to Existi ic Traffic al Signal	Major ion Modificati ng to Existin : Traffic I Signal	on g Minor Restripir Project	Major Ig Restripir Project	Interconne g Cable (Linear Fee	ect Coordinated Signal et) System	Estimated Total Construction Cost	Is Improvement Feas	is cost incl. in Fee Proj	FEE PROG. COSTS
	Park Way																																
		SR 29 SB ramps to SR 29 NB ramps SR 29 NB ramps to Oak Park	676		2 -	Improve to a 2 lane collector acc. to County Standards	\$603	676	27 18,252	\$23	419,796	676	31 58	27	18,252	\$10	\$182,520													\$602,316	Yes	Yes	\$602,316
I P #1		Way.	1,407		2 -	to County Standards	\$1,301	1,407	28 39,396	\$23	906,108	1,407	30 58	28	39,396	\$10	\$393,960													\$1,300,068	Yes	Yes	\$1,300,068
LI #1		Oak Park Way to Keeling Ave	. 1,449		2 -	to County Standards	\$1,292	1,449	27 39,123	\$23	899,829	1,449	31 58	27	39,123	\$10	\$391,230													\$1,291,059	Yes	Yes	\$1,291,059
		Keeling Ave. to Lakeview Rd.	1,258		2 -	Improve to a 2 lane collector acc. to County Standards	\$1,163	1,258	28 35,224	\$23	810,152	1,258	30 58	28	35,224	\$10	\$352,240													\$1,162,392	Yes	Yes	\$1,162,392
		Eakview Rd. to Lakeshore Blvd.	985		2 -	to County Standards	\$911	985	28 27,580	\$23	634,340	985	30 58	28	27,580	\$10	\$275,800													\$910,140	Yes	Yes	\$910,140
LP #2	Main St.	Lakeport Blvd. to SR 175	3,340		11	Widen to 4 lane Undivided arterial acc. to County Standards	\$5,511	3,340	50 167,000	\$23	3,841,000	3,340	32 82	50	167,000	\$10	\$1,670,000													\$5,511,000	Yes	Yes	\$5,511,000
	11th Street	_																															
LP #3		SR 29 SB ramps to Main St.	4,880		2 -	Improve to a 2 lane Divided Arterial acc. to County Standards	\$6,603	4,880	41 200,080	\$23	4,601,840	4,880	31 72	41	200,080	\$10	\$2,000,800													\$6,602,640	Yes	Yes	\$6,602,640
				Mellor Dr.	2 - 2 1 TWSC	Install Traffic Signal	\$250																							\$250,000	Yes	Yes	\$250,000
				High St.	2 - 2 1 TWSC	Install Traffic Signal	\$250																1							\$250,000	Yes	Yes	\$250,000
	High Street	16th St. to 20t St.	1,121																														
LP #4				16th St. 20th St	2 1 2 - TWSC	Install Traffic Signal	\$260																			1	1			\$260,000	Yes	Yes	\$260,000
LP #5	Lakeshore Blvd.	Lakeport City limit to Nice Lucerne Cut-off	22,000	200100.	2	Improve to a 2 lane collector acc. to County Standards	\$20,328	22,000	28 616,000	\$23	14,168,000	22,000	30 58	28	616,000	\$10	\$6,160,000													\$20,328,000	Yes	Yes	\$20,328,000
				Hill Rd. East	2 - 2 - TWSC	Install Traffic Signal	\$260																l .			1				\$260,000	Yes	Yes	\$260,000
	Lakeport Blvd.	SR 29 SB ramps to Larrecou Ln.	1,450		2 -	Improve to 4 lane divided arterial acc. to City stds.	\$4,037	1,450	53 76,850	\$23	1,767,550	1,450	43 96	53	76,850	\$10	\$768,500	500	- 2	24 12,000	125 1,500	000								\$4,036,050	Yes	Yes	\$4,036,050
LP #6				Bevins Rd.	2 - 2 1 TWSC	Install Traffic Signal coord with SR 29NB ramps	\$250 \$10																1							\$250,000 \$10,000	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	\$250,000 \$10,000
		Larrecou Ln. to Main St.	1,340		2 -	Improve to 2 lane divided arterial acc. to City stds.	\$1,681	1,340	38 50,920	\$23	\$1,171,160	1,340	34 72	38	50,920	\$10	\$509,200													\$1,680,360	Yes	Yes	\$1,680,360
		Crustal Laka Way to Park		Main St.	3 - 2 1 TWSC	Install Traffic Signal	\$260																1			1				\$260,000	Yes	Yes	\$260,000
LP #7	Keeling Ave.	Way. Crystal Lake Way to south of	3,950		2 -	\$455	3,950	5 19,750	\$23	\$454,250	3,950	0 0	0	0	\$10	\$0													\$454,250	Yes	No	\$0	
LP #8	Howard Ave.	Rainbow Rd. Howard Ave. to Lakeshore	2,670		2 -	Safety & Operational Impv's	\$308	2,670	5 13,350	\$23	\$307,050	2,670	0 0	0	0	\$10	\$0													\$307,050	Yes	No	\$0
LP #9	Kainbow Kd.	Blvd.	1,290		2 -	Sarety & Operational Impv's	\$149	1,290	5 6,450	\$23	\$148,350	1,290	0 0	0	0	\$10	20													\$148,350	Yes	No	\$0
LP #10	Soda Bay Rd.	Planning Area boundary	6,911		2-	acc. to Caltrans Stds.	\$10,035	6,911	44 304,084	\$23	6,993,932	6,911	28 72	44	304,084	\$10	\$3,040,840													10,034,772	Yes	Yes	\$10,034,772
	Scotts Valley Rd		S	S.Main St./SR 175/Soda F	Rd. 2 1 2 - TWSC	Install Traffic Signal	\$250																1							\$250,000	Yes	Yes	\$250,000
LP #11		Hill Rd./Halber Rd. to Riggs Rd.	4,000		2 -	Widen to 2 lane Undivided collector, according to County	\$3,960	4,000	30 120,000	\$23	2,760,000	4,000	28 58	30	120,000	\$10	\$1,200,000													\$3,960,000	Yes	Yes	\$3,960,000
		Riggs Rd. to SR 29 SB ramps	2,367		2 -	widen to 2 lane Undivided collector according to County	\$2,344	2,367	30 71,010	\$23	1,633,230	2,367	28 58	30	71,010	\$10	\$710,100													\$2,343,330	Yes	Yes	\$2,343,330
		TOTAL COST \$63,01 \$61,000 \$61,000 \$61,000 \$61,000 \$61,000 \$63,000													\$63,011,777			\$62,102,127															
B) Constructi C) Safety and C) Note that	on and R/W costs ar operational Costs a he improvements re	e approximate only. Information show re assumed to involve widening by a commended in the subsequent section	vn is for cost estima otal of 5ft. are adequate for pl	ating purposes only and not a lanning purposes only. The	accurate for determining const constructability of these impro	ruction units or R/W acquisitions. wements would need to determined, whic	h could only be e.	stablished based o	on additional engine	ering analysis.																							

																							Traffic Sign	als and Rest	riping			1	FINAL	0	в	
					Existing Conditions	_		<u> </u>	Roadway	Construction	n/Reconstruct	tion			Dev	veloped R/V	W Acquisition	n		\$250,000	\$10,000	\$50,00	\$100,00	\$10,0	00 \$5	0,000	\$25 \$1	100,000	COSTS	ldis	ogra	
at #			way ()		nes nes anes						Dianaina		Length of				Tatal	Planning	Deedusu											t Fe	e Pr	
emei			oady Feet		Lan Lan Lan Lan Lan Lan		2	Length of Roadway	Average	Total Roadway	Level	Roadway	New Developed	Average	Proposed	Average Developed	Developed	Level	Developed		Coordina	Minor	Major	Mino	r N	Maior In	arconnect Cor	ordinated	Estimated	men	n Fe	FEE PROG. COSTS
rove	Facility Name	e Roadway Segments	of R ent (Intersections & Interchanges	avel -tur avel t-tur t-tur t-tur	Improvement	Cost ² (\$1,000)	Section	Construction Area Width	Construction	Roadway Construction	Construction Cost	Right-of- Wav	Ex ROW	ROW	Right-of- Wav	Right-of- Wav	Right-of-	Right-of-Way Aquisition	Install New Traffic Signal	Existing	Modificat to Existi	on Modificati	n Restrip	ing Res	striping	Cable	Signal	Total Construction	OVE	Icl. i	
li li			egm reed	et interenanges	C Lef		(\$1,000)	(Linear Feet)	(Ft.)	Area (Sq. Ft.)	Unit Cost (per	Sub-Total	Section	Width	Width	Area Width	Area	Way Unit Cost	Cost Sub-Total	J	Traffic Sig	nal Traffic Si	nal Traffic Sig	nal Projec	t Pi	roject (Lii	near Feet) S	lystem	Cost	īduj	ost ir	
			Ler S		N/S E/V E/W						34.11.)		Feet)			(1.1)	(04.11.)	(sq.ft.)	oub-rotai											Is]	is co	
	Lakeshore Dr	r																														
		SR 53/W 40th Ave. to Old Hwy 53	2,400 .		2	Improve to 4 lane arterial acc. to City of Clearlake Standards	\$1,656	2,400	30	72,000	\$23	1,656,000	2,400	60	60	0	0	\$10	\$0										\$1,656,000	Yes	Yes	\$1,656,000
		Old Hwy 53 to Olympic Dr.	7,460			Improve to 2 lane arterial acc. to City of Clearlake Standards	\$4,290	7,460	25	186,500	\$23	4,289,500	7,460	50	50	0	0	\$10	\$0										\$4,289,500	Yes	Yes	\$4,289,500
						add 1 exclusive NBR	\$190	100	12	1,200	\$23	27,600	100	0	12	12	1,200	\$10	\$12,000										\$189,600	Yes	Yes	\$189,600
CL #1				Lakeshore Dr./Old Hwy. 53	3 2 - 2 1 Signal	add 1 exclusive SBL add I exclusive SBR	\$40 \$40	100 100	12 12	1,200 1,200	\$23 \$23	27,600 27,600	100 100	0	12 12	12 12	1,200 1,200	\$10 \$10	\$12,000 \$12,000				1			1			\$39,600 \$39,600	Yes Yes	Yes Yes	\$39,600 \$39,600
						add I exclusive EBR	\$60	150	12	1,800	\$23	41,400	150	0	12	12	1,800	\$10	\$18,000	1	_								\$59,400	Yes	Yes	\$59,400
			8	3 Lakeshore Dr./Olympic Dr	. 2 - 2 1 TWSC	add 1 exclusive NBR	\$40	100	12	1,200	\$23	27,600	100	0	12	12	1,200	\$10	\$12,000	1						1			\$39,600	Yes	Yes	\$39,600
						add 1 exclusive SBL Improve to 2 lane arterial acc. to	\$60	150	12	1,800	\$23	41,400	150	0	12	12	1,800	\$10	\$18,000										\$59,400	Yes	Yes	\$59,400
		Olympic Drive to Park Stree	et 3,340 -		2	City of Clearlake Standards	\$1,921	3,340	25	83,500	\$23	1,920,500	3,340	50	50	0	0	\$10	\$0										\$1,920,500	Yes	Yes	\$1,920,500
	Old Hwy 53	ig Lot				200 stalls at \$2500/stall	\$500																						\$500,000	Yes	Yes	\$500,000
CT #2		Olympic Dr. to Austin Ave.	1,368		2	Improve to 2 lane collector acc. to	\$787	1,368	25	34,200	\$23	786,600	1,368	50	50	0	0	\$10	\$0										\$786,600	Yes	Yes	\$786,600
CL #2		Austin Ave. to Lakeshore D	r. 3.166 ·		2	Improve to 2 lane collector acc. to	\$1.821	3,166	25	79.150	\$23	1.820.450	3166	50	50	0	0	\$10	\$0										\$1,820.450	Yes	Yes	\$1,820,450
					2	City of Clearlake Standards Install Traffic Signal	\$300	5,100		77,150	425	1,020,150	5100	50	50	0	0	010	00	1						1			\$300,000	Yes	Yes	\$300,000
				Old Huny 52/Austin Ave	2 TWSC	add 1 exclusive NBL	\$40 \$40	100	12	1,200	\$23 \$22	27,600	100	0	12	12	1,200	\$10 \$10	\$12,000										\$39,600	Yes	Yes	\$39,600
				Old Hwy. 55/Ausuli Ave.	2 1₩3€	add I exclusive SBL	\$40 \$40	100	12	1,200	\$23	27,600	100	0	12	12	1,200	\$10	\$12,000										\$39,600	Yes	Yes	\$39,600
						add I exclusive EBR Improve to 2 lane collector acc. to	\$60	150	12	1,800	\$23	41,400	150	0	12	12	1,800	\$10	\$18,000										\$59,400	Yes	Yes	\$59,400
		Lakeshore Dr. to SR 53	9,351		3	City of Clearlake Standards	\$5,377	9,351	25	233,775	\$23	5,376,825	9351	50	50	0	0	\$10	\$0										\$5,376,825	Yes	Yes	\$5,376,825
	Olympic Dr.	Lakeshore Dr. to Uhl Ave	810	-																												l
						Widen to 2 lane Undivided arterial								-0					**													
		Uni Ave. to Cottage Ave.	1,395	-	2 -	acc. to City of Clearlake Stds.	\$803	1,395	25	34,875	\$23	802,125	1395	60	60	0	0	\$10	\$0										\$802,125	Yes	Yes	\$802,125
		Cottage Ave. to Old Hwy. 53/Burns Valley	3,084		2 1																											1
		Old Hwy. 53/Burns Valley	961		2 -	Widen to 2 lane divided arterial	\$553	961	25	24.025	\$23	552,575	961	60	60	0	0	\$10	\$0										\$552,575	Yes	Yes	\$552.575
CL #3		Rd. to Jackson St.				acc. to City of Clearlake Stds Install Traffic Signal	\$300		-							-	-			1									\$300,000	Yes	Yes	\$300,000
				Olympic Dr./Old Hwy 53/	1 1 TWSC	add 1 exclusive NBL	\$125	150	15	2250	\$23 \$22	51,750	150	0	15	15	2250	\$10 \$10	22500										\$124,250	Yes	Yes	\$124,250
				Burns Valley Rd.	1 - 1 - 1wsc	add 1 exclusive NBR	\$75	150	15	2250	\$23	51,750	150	0	15	15	2250	\$10	22500							1			\$74,250	Yes	Yes	\$74,250
						add 1 exclusive WBL	\$75	150	15	2250	\$23	51,750	150	0	15	15	2250	\$10	22500										\$74,250	Yes	Yes	\$74,250
		Jackson St. to SR 53	3,795		2 -	Widen to 2 lane Undivided arterial acc. to City of Clearlake Stds	\$2,183	3,795	25	94,875	\$23	2,182,125	3795	50	50	0	0	\$10	\$0										\$2,182,125	Yes	Yes	\$2,182,125
						Widen to 2 loss Wederland enterint																										
CL #4	40 th Ave.	SR 53 to Phillips Ave.	2,260		2 -	acc. to City of Clearlake Stds.	\$1,300	2,260	25	56,500	\$23	1,299,500	2,260	50	50	0	0	\$10	\$0										\$1,299,500	Yes	Yes	\$1,299,500
		D 1 4 . (D 72	2.450		0	Widen to 2 lane Undivided arterial	¢1.004	2.450	25	05.050	622	1 002 750	2.450	50	50	0	0	610	¢0										61.002.550	X/	N/	¢1.002.750
CL #5	18 th Ave.	Boyles Ave. to SR 55	3,450		2 -	acc. to City of Clearlake Stds.	\$1,984	3,450	25	80,250	\$23	1,985,750	3,450	50	50	0	0	\$10	\$0										\$1,983,750	res	res	\$1,985,750
		SR 53 to Old Hwy. 53	910		2 -	Improve to 2 lane undivided collector type facility	\$524	910	25	22,750	\$23	523,250	910	50	50	0	0	\$10	\$0										\$523,250	Yes	Yes	\$523,250
				Old Hwy. 53/18th Ave. extr	1	add 1 exclusive SBL	\$75 \$75	150	15	2250	\$23 \$23	51,750	150	0	15	15	2250	\$10	22500										\$74,250	Yes	Yes	\$74,250
	Dam Rd.					add I exclusive wBL	\$15	150	15	2230	\$23	51,750	150	0	15	15	2230	\$10	22300										374,230	105	Tes	\$74,230
		section just west of Lake St	1.000		2	Widen to 2 lane Undivided arterial	\$575	1.000	25	25,000	\$23	575.000	1000	50	50	0	0	\$10	\$0										\$575.000	Yes	Yes	\$575.000
			. 1,000		-	acc. to City of Clearlake Stds.	4575	1,000		20,000	<i>Q20</i>	575,000	1000	50	50	, v	Ŭ	<i></i>	\$ 0										\$375,000	105	105	\$575,000
CL #6		Dam Rd. Extn to SR 53	350		2 1	Install Traffic Signal	\$360													1	1		1						\$360,000	Yes	Yes	\$360.000
						extend existing EBL by 150 ft	\$110	150	12	1,800	\$23	41,400	150	0	12	12	1,800	\$10	\$18,000										\$109,400	Yes	Yes	\$109,400
				Dam Kd./Dam Kd. Extn.	1 1 2 1 Iwsc	add 2nd EBL extend existing WBL by 115 f	\$92 \$46	230 115	12	2,760	\$23 \$23	63,480 31,740	230 115	0	12	12	2,760	\$10	\$27,600 \$13,800							1			\$91,080 \$45,540	Yes	Yes	\$45,540
						add 2nd WBL	\$92	230	12	2,760	\$23	63,480	230	0	12	12	2,760	\$10	\$27,600										\$91,080	Yes	Yes	\$91,080
CL #7	Boyles Ave.	18th Ave. to 33rd Ave.	3,560		2	City of Clearlake Standards	\$2,047	3,560	25	89,000	\$23	2,047,000	3,560	50	50	0	0	\$10	\$0										\$2,047,000	Yes	Yes	\$2,047,000
CL #8	Burns Valley Rd.	Old Hwy 53 to Arrowhead Rd.	6,470		2	Improve to 2 lane collector acc. to City of Clearlake Standards	\$3,721	6,470	25	161,750	\$23	3,720,250	6,470	50	50	0	0	\$10	\$0										\$3,720,250	Yes	Yes	\$3,720,250
CL #9	Arrowhead Rd	Burns Valley Rd. to Acacia St	1,440		2	Improve to 2 lane collector acc. to City of Clearlake Standards	\$828	1,440	25	36,000	\$23	828,000	1,440	50	50	0	0	\$10	\$0										\$828,000	Yes	Yes	\$828,000
CL #10	Pomo Rd	Arrowhead Rd. to Lakeshor	e 1.335		2	Improve to 2 lane collector acc. to	\$768	1.335	25	33,375	\$23	767 625	1,335	50	50	0	0	\$10	\$0										\$767.625	Yes	Yes	\$767 625
		Dr.	-,	TOTAL COST		City of Clearlake Standards	\$34.348	-,		,070		\$31,959.075	-,000	20	20	v	0		\$360.400										\$34,329.075	- 55	- 00	\$34,329.075
Notes:							77 JO 10																									
A) $Cost(s) de$	o not include pote	ential slope and utility easements	that may be req	uired on one or both sides of R/W.																												

ng purposes only and not accurate for determining construction units or R/W acquisitions. sts are approximate only. In

C) Safety and operational Costs are assumed to involve widening by a total of 5ft.
 C) Safety and operational Costs are assumed to involve widening by a total of 5ft.
 D) Note that the improvements recommended in the subsequent section are adequate for planning purposes only. The constructability of these improvements would need to determined, which could only be established based on additional engineering analysis.

																			T	raffic Signals	and Restriping	ng			FINAL		Ξ				
					Existing Conditi	ins			Roadw	ay Construct	ion/Reconstruc	ction			Dev	veloped R/V	V Acquisitio	m		\$250,00	\$10,000	\$50,000	\$100,000	\$10,000	\$50,000	\$25	\$100,000	COSTS	sible	gra.	S
# 10 ano 5 facility Name	Roadway Segments	Length of Roadway Segment (Feet)	Intersection Number	ections rchanges	N/S Travel Lanes N/S Left-turn Lanes E/W Travel Lanes E/W Left-turn Lanes	Improvement	Cost ² (\$1,000)	Length of Roadway Section (Linear Feet)	Average Constructio Area Width (Ft.)	Total Roadway Constructior Area (Sq. Ft.)	Planning Level Roadway Construction Unit Cost (per sq.ft.)	Roadway Construction Cost Sub-Total	Length of New Developed Right-of- Way Section (Linear Feet)	Average Ex ROW Width	Proposed ROW Width	Average Developed Right-of- Way Area Width (Ft.)	Total Developeo Right-of- Way Area (Sq. Ft.)	Planning Level Developed Right-of- Way Unit Cost (sq.ft.)	Roadway Developed Right-of-Way Aquisition Cost Sub-Total	Install Ne Traffic Sig	w Coordinate Existing Traffic Sign	Minor Modificatior to Existing Traffic Signa	Major Modification to Existing Il Traffic Signal	Minor Restriping Project	Major Restriping Project	Interconnec Cable (Linear Feet	ct Coordinated Signal rt) System	Estimated Total Construction Cost	Is Improvement Fea	is cost incl. in Fee Pro	FEE PROG. COSI
MID#1 Spruce Crove P/	east of SR 29 (both location	ns) 2,000			2 .	Safety & Operational Impy's	\$230	2 000	5	10.000	\$23	230.000	2 000	0	0	0	0	\$10	\$0									\$230,000	Ves	NO	\$0
MID#1 Sprace Grove Ku	SP 20 to Stinson Panch Pd	1 11 676			2	Safety & Operational Impy's	\$1.242	11.676		58 380	\$23	1 342 740	11.676			0	0	\$10	\$0									\$1 342 740	Vac	Vas	\$1 342 740
MID#2 Hartmann Ku.	SR 29 to Stinson Kanen Ku	1. 11,070			2 -	Safety & Operational Impv s	\$1,545	11,070	5	38,360	\$25	1,342,740	11,070	0	0	U	0	\$10	φu									\$1,342,740	Tes	Tes	\$1,342,740
MID#3 Stewart St.	SR 175 (Middletown) to Callayomi St.	875			2	Safety & Operational Impv's	\$101	875	5	4,375	\$23	100,625	875	0	0	0	0	\$10	\$0									\$100,625	Yes	NO	\$0
MID#4 Santa Clara Rd.	Central Park Rd. to SR 175	5 2,830			2	Safety & Operational Impv's	\$326	2,830	5	14,150	\$23	325,450	2,830	0	0	0	0	\$10	\$0									\$325,450	Yes	NO	\$0
MID#5 Barnes St.	SR 175 to Wardlaw St./Big Canyon Rd.	g 880			2	Safety & Operational Impv's	\$102	880	5	4,400	\$23	101,200	880	0	0	0	0	\$10	\$0									\$101,200	Yes	NO	\$0
MID#6 Wardlaw St.	Barnes St./Big Canyon Rd. St. Helena Creek Rd.	. to 1,780			2 -	Safety & Operational Impv's	\$205	1,780	5	8,900	\$23	204,700	1,780	0	0	0	0	\$10	\$0									\$204,700	Yes	NO	\$0
MID#7 Butts Canyon Rd	. SR 29 to Loconomi St.	9,210			2 -	Widen to 2 lane undivided arterial according to County Stds.	\$9,118	9,210	30	276,300	\$23	6,354,900	9,210	28	58	30	276,300	\$10	\$2,763,000									\$9,117,900	Yes	Yes	\$9,117,900
			TOTAL COS	т		·	\$11,425	1				\$8,659,615	+						\$2,763,000									\$11,422,615			\$10,460,640
Notes: A) Cost(s) do not include pote B) Construction and R/W coss C) Safety and operational Co	ntial slope and utility easements ti s are approximate only. Informati sts are assumed to involve widenin	hat may be requir ion shown is for co 1g by a total of 5fi	red on one or both sides o ost estimating purposes o h	of R/W. only and not accu	urate for determining	construction units or R/W acquisitions.																									

D) Note that the improvements recommended in the subsequent section are adequate for planning purposes only. The constructability of these improvements would need to determined, which could only be established based on additional engineering analysis.

COUNTYWIDE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE STUDY

T990e09_Lake County CIP Worksheet_09.xlsCIP_Middletown

			_									<u> </u>					_	_	-		_	_	Traffic Sign	nals and Re	striping				FINAL		E	
					Existing Conditions Roadway Construction/Reconstruction Developed R generating and the second secon													n		\$250,000	\$10,000	\$50,0	00 \$100,0	900 \$10),000 \$ 5	50,000	\$25	\$100,000	COSTS	sible	graı	S
Inprovement #	'acility Name	Roadway Segments	Length of Roadway Segment (Feet) Intersection Number	Intersections & Interchanges	N/S Travel Lanes N/S Left-turn Lanes E/W Left-turn Lanes E/W Left-turn Lanes Intersection Control	Improvement	Cost ² (\$1,000)	Length of Roadway Section (Linear Feet)	Average Construction Area Width (Ft.)	Total Roadway Construction Area (Sq. Ft.)	Planning Level Roadway Construction Unit Cost (per sq.ft.)	Roadway Construction Cost Sub-Total	Length of New Developed Right-of- Way Section (Linear Feet)	Average Ex ROW Width	Proposed ROW Width	Average Developed Right-of- Way Area Width (Ft.)	Total Developed Right-of- Way Area (Sq. Ft.)	Planning Level Developed Right-of- Way Unit Cost (sq.ft.)	Roadway Developed Right-of-Way Aquisition Cost Sub-Total	Install Nev Traffic Sign	, Coordinat Existing al Traffic Sigr	e Mino Modific to Exis Traffic S	r Major ation Modifica ting to Exist ignal Traffic Si	r Mi ation Rest ting Pro	inor N triping Re oject P	Major In Istriping Project (L	iterconnect (Cable ∟inear Feet)	Coordinated Signal System	Estimated Total Construction Cost	Is Improvement Feas	is cost incl. in Fee Pro	FEE PROG. COST
VDC#1		CD 201 +- CD 20	26.205			Sefeter & Ownerford Terroris	\$4.164	26 205		191.025		4 1 6 2 5 7 5	26.205				0	£10	03										\$4.162.575	X		60
KKC#1	t. Lake view Kd.	SR 281 to SK 29 Highland Springs Rd. to	36,205		2 -	Safety & Operational Impv s	\$4,104	30,205		181,025	\$25	4,105,575	30,203				0	\$10	20										\$4,103,373	res	NO	30
KRC#2	ig Valley Rd.	Merritt Rd/Gaddy Ln.	12,505		2 -	Safety & Operational Impv's	\$1,439	12,505	5	62,525	\$23	1,438,075	12,505	0	0	0	0	\$10	\$0										\$1,438,075	Yes	NO	50
KRC#3	iell Hill Rd.	Highland Springs Kd. to SK 29	20,056		2 -	Safety & Operational Impv's	\$2,307	20,056	5	100,280	\$23	2,306,440	20,056	0	0	0	0	\$10	\$0										\$2,306,440	Yes	NO	\$0
	addy Ln.					Widen to 2 lane undivided art.																										
KRC#4		Lossa Rd. to State St.	3,083		2 -	according to County Stds.	\$3,053	3,083	30	92,490	\$23	2,127,270	3,083	28	58	30	92,490	\$10	\$924,900										\$3,052,170	Yes	Yes	\$3,052,170
		State St. to Soda Bay Rd.	11,095		2 -	Widen to 2 lane collector according to County Stds.	\$3,330	11,095	30	58	\$23	1,334	11,095	28	58	30	332,850	\$10	\$3,328,500										\$3,329,834	Yes	Yes	\$3,329,834
	farrington Flat Rd.	Bottle Rock Rd. to Sulphur						1																								
KRC#5		Creek Rd.	22,234		2	Safety & Operational Impv's	\$2,557	22,234	5	111,170	\$23	2,556,910	22,234	0	0	0	0	\$10	\$0										\$2,556,910	Yes	NO	\$0
		Sulphur Creek Rd. to SR 175	5 5,790		2	Safety & Operational Impv's	\$666	5,790	5	28,950	\$23	665,850	5,790	0	0	0	0	\$10	\$0										\$665,850	Yes	NO	\$0
KRC#6	ulphur Creek Rd.	Flat Rd.	on 6,236		2	Safety & Operational Impv's	\$718	6,236	5	31,180	\$23	717,140	6,236	0	0	0	0	\$10	\$0										\$717,140	Yes	NO	\$0
KRC#7	och Lomonu Ku.	Big Canyon Rd. to Siegler Springs N. Rd	4,041		2 -	Safety & Operational Impv's	\$465	4,041	5	20,205	\$23	464,715	4,041	0	0	0	0	\$10	\$0										\$464,715	Yes	NO	\$0
		Siegler Springs N. Rd. to SR 175	17,113		2 -	Safety & Operational Impv's	\$1,968	17,113	5	85,565	\$23	1,967,995	17,113	0	0	0	0	\$10	\$0										\$1,967,995	Yes	NO	\$0
KRC#8	iegler Canyon Rd.	Big Canyon Rd. to SR 29	21,461		2 -	Safety & Operational Impv's	\$2,469	21,461	5	107,305	\$23	2,468,015	21,461	0	0	0	0	\$10	\$0										\$2,468,015	Yes	NO	\$0
KRC#9	ig Canyon Rd.	Siegler Canyon Rd./Loch Lomond Rd. to Middletown/Lowerlake bdy.	33,509		2	Safety & Operational Impv's	\$3,854	33,509	5	167,545	\$23	3,853,535	33,509	0	0	0	0	\$10	\$0										\$3,853,535	Yes	NO	\$0
KRC#10	Aeritt Rd.	SR 29 to Lossa Rd.	3,150		2 -	Widen to 2 lane Undivided art. according to County Standard:	\$3,119	3,150	30	94,500	\$23	2,173,500	3,150	28	58	30	94,500	\$10	\$945,000										\$3,118,500	Yes	Yes	\$3,118,500
KRC#11	lighland Springs Rd.	SR 29 to Bell Hill Rd.	16,071		2	Safety & Operational Impv's	\$2,652	16,071	5	80,355	\$23	1,848,165	16,071	0	5	5	80,355	\$10	\$803,550										\$2,651,715	Yes	Yes	\$2,651,715
KRC#12	Aain St.	Bell Hill Rd. to State St.	2,706		2 -	Widen to 2 lane Undivided art.	\$2,679	2,706	30	81,180	\$23	1,867,140	2,706	28	58	30	81,180	\$10	\$811,800										\$2,678,940	Yes	Yes	\$2,678,940
			TO	TAL COST	-	according to County Standard:	\$35,440					\$28,619,659							\$6,813,750										\$35,433,409			\$14,831,159
<u>Notes:</u> A) Cost(s) de	not include potential slope an	nd utility easements that may be req	uired on one or both sid	les of R/W.																												

struction and R/W costs are approximate only. Information shown is for cost estimating purposes only and not accurate for determining construction units or R/W acquisitions.

C) Solery and operational Costs are assumed to involve widening by a total of 5ft.
D) Note that the improvements recommended in the subsequent section are adequate for planning purposes only. The constructability of these improvements would need to determined, which could only be established based on additional engineering analysis.

COUNTYWIDE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE STUDY

																					Т	raffic Signals	and Restrip	ing			FINAL	0	в	
				Existing Condition	ons			Roadwa	ay Construct	ion/Reconstru	iction			D	eveloped R/	W Acquisitio	on		\$250,000	\$10,000	\$50,000	\$100,000	\$10,000	\$50,000	\$25	\$100,000	COSTS	ible	grai	s
# uuuu Sacility Name	Roadway Segments	Length of Roadway Segment (Feet)	Intersections & Interchanges	N/S Travel Lanes N/S Left-turn Lanes E/W Travel Lanes E/W Left-turn Lanes	Improvement	Cost ² (\$1,000)	Length of Roadway Section (Linear Feet)	Average Constructior Area Width (Ft.)	Total Roadway Construction Area (Sq. Ft.)	Planning Level Roadway Construction Unit Cost (per sq.ft.)	Roadway Construction Cost Sub-Total	Length o New Develope Right-of- Way Section (Linear Feet)	f Average Ex ROW Width	Proposed ROW Wid	Average Develope d Right-of- th Way Area Widt (Ft.)	Total Developed Right-of- Way Area (Sq. Ft.)	Planning Level Developed Right-of- Way Unit Cost (sq.ft.)	Roadway Developed Right-of-Way Aquisition Cost Sub-Total	Install New Traffic Signa	Coordinate Existing Traffic Sign	Minor Modificatio to Existing Traffic Sign	Major n Modificatior to Existing al Traffic Signa	Minor Restriping Project	Major Restripin Project	Interconne g Cable (Linear Fe	ct Coordinated Signal st) System	Estimated Total Construction Cost	Is Improvement Feas	is cost incl. in Fee Prog	FEE PROG. COST
ULS #1 SR 20	Nice Lucerne Cut-off to Sulphur Banks Drive	91,385		2 -	Safety & Operational Impv's	\$19,648	91,385	5	456,925	\$23	10,509,275	91,385	0	10	10	913,850	\$10	\$9,138,500									\$19,647,775	Yes	Yes	\$19,647,775
			TOTAL COST			\$19,648					\$10,509,275							\$13,812,545,20	0								\$19,647,775			\$19,647,775
Notes: A) Cost(s) do not include pou B) Construction and R/W cos C) Safety and operational Co D) Note that the improvement	otential slope and utility easements that m osts are approximate only. Information sh Costs are assumed to involve widening by onts recommended in the subsequent sectio	ay be required on own is for cost est a total of 5ft. on are adequate fo	one or both sides of R/W. timating purposes only and not acc or planning purposes only. The con	urate for determining cons nstructability of these impr	struction units or R/W acquisitions. ovements would need to determined, which o	could only be est	tablished base	ed on additiona	l engineering d	analysis.																				

COUNTYWIDE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE STUDY

T990e09_Lake County CIP Worksheet_09.xlsUpperlake_Shoreline Comm