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## Section 1 - Executive Summary

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the findings and conclusions of the local transportation analysis conducted by Kittelson \& Associates for the proposed Parcel Group 3 (PG 3) project (the Project) located in Hayward, California. This report documents the non-California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) local transportation analysis conducted for this project and complements the CEQA transportation impact analysis documented in the VMT Impact Assessment Memorandum.

PG 3 is located at the northeastern corner of Mission Boulevard and Tennyson Road in Hayward. The proposed project consists of 176 affordable rental apartments ( 38 studios, 47 one-bedroom, 44 twobedroom, 47 three-bedroom) and a charter school serving 384 elementary students. Primary access to the project site for the school portion will be provided via Tennyson Road, with secondary access for the residential portion via two driveways on $16^{\text {th }}$ Street.

## Summary of Findings and Recommendations

The VMT Impact Assessment Memorandum previously determined that the project can be screened out of a detailed vehicle miles traveled (VMT) analysis under the City's Senate Bill 743-consistent VMT criteria. Therefore, it was determined that the project would have a less-than-significant VMT impact under CEQA. No mitigation measures were identified.

Non-CEQA recommendations have been made in this report to address multimodal transportation conditions and to be incorporated as part of this project.

To address local bus transit accessibility, the property owner should:

- Coordinate with AC Transit to improve user amenities at the two AC Transit bus stops at the intersection of Mission Boulevard and Hancock Street.

To address pedestrian conditions and accessibility, potential pedestrian-oriented treatments that could be considered as part of design review and conditions of approval include:

- Ensure that the project driveways are designed for pedestrian visibility safety (sidewalks clearly delineated, improved visibility by minimizing bushes and large signs).
- Coordinate with the City of Hayward to install warning signage (such as caution signage for exiting vehicles) and continental crosswalks at Site Access/Tennyson Road intersection.
- Explore options to improve pedestrian accessibility west of the project site, including along $16^{\text {th }}$ Street and Hancock Street. Improvements can include marked crosswalks and bulbouts at the East $16^{\text {th }}$ Street/Hancock Street intersection.
- There is the opportunity to add yellow continental school crosswalks at the Tennyson Road/Mission Boulevard intersection.

To address bicycling conditions and accessibility, potential bicycle-oriented treatments that could be considered as part of design review and conditions of approval include:

- Coordinate with the City of Hayward to install signage (such as bikeway signage and caution signage) and green conflict zone markings through the Site Access Road/Tennyson Road intersection.
- Consider implementing facilities to accommodate bicyclists (and pedestrians) crossing Tennyson Road to access the project site (e.g., marked north/south crosswalk at the Site Access Road/Tennyson Road intersection or a midblock location).
- Consider a treatment to improve downhill westbound bicycling conditions approaching the Mission Boulevard/Tennyson Road intersection. Note, Solutions for this location are limited by multiple constraints:
- A pocket bike lane between the through and right turn lanes may not be feasible due to the curb-to-curb right-of-way or to avoid offsetting the westbound through lane. The length of the pocket bike lane (more than 300 feet) could result in a high-stress situation with vehicles traveling on both sides of bicyclists for an extended period of time.
- A shared bike/right turn lane may be high-stress for children and other users due to the length of the right-turn lane and downhill vehicle speeds.
- Solutions may require shortening the westbound right-turn lane at the Mission Boulevard \& Tennyson Road intersection to reduce bicyclist stress.
- Consider installing bike routes with sharrows along residential roads such as Hancock Street and $16^{\text {th }}$ Street to facilitate bike access to and from the project. This could be combined with traffic calming strategies due to increased vehicle volumes.

Recommendations to improve student pick-up/drop-off circulation consist of the following:

- Install school area signage and pavement markings according to MUTCD standards.
- Relocate the northern drop-off area away from the traffic circle.
- Short-term parking spaces should be identified past the student loading area and near the building entrance.
- Block access to the residential area of the parking lot during student drop-off/pick-up
- Assign staff parking to the areas west of the traffic circle, leaving the parking spaces within the loop drive open for parents during the drop-off and pick-up times.
- At the designated drop-off areas north and west of the elementary school building, paint the curb white and mark it as "passenger loading during student drop-off and pick-up times." "No Parking" signs should be installed indicating the times of the day when parking is not allowed.
- Traffic cones and other channelizing devices can be used to minimize pedestrian/vehicles conflicts.
- Student safety patrols and loading supervisors should be well trained and wear reflective safety vests.
- Install signage to indicate that parking is not allowed during drop-off/pick-up times and drivers must remain in the vehicles. Signage should also direct kindergarten/early childhood and lower grade drop-off/pick-up to the southern drop-off/pick-up zones, and upper grade drop-off/pick-up to the northern drop-off/pickup zone. Kindergarten/early childhood students should be walked to the school buildings by staff during drop-off times, as opposed to parents parking and walking their students.
- The applicant for the school should prepare a traffic and parking management plan. The plan would identify the parking areas for staff, visitors, parking restrictions, management of the student drop-off/pick-up, locations of crossing guards, staff and monitors assisting with student drop-off/pick-up, and an advanced student identification system so students can be matched to their parents. The plan should be prepared for the satisfaction of City of Hayward Public Works staff and submitted prior to building occupancy permits. The plan should include a process to reduce or eliminate the need for the parents to get out of the vehicle at drop-off locations to provide an efficient and safe drop-off and pick-up procedure. The plan should also include staggered dropoff schedules.
- The applicant should prepare a transportation demand management (TDM) plan to encourage carpooling, rideshare, and other modes and facilitate carpool matching for staff and students.

Given the anticipated increase in traffic volumes on local residential streets such as $16^{\text {th }}$ Street and Hancock Street, project applicant should work with the City of Hayward to explore options for implementing traffic calming techniques along those streets. These measures can also support improved bicycle and pedestrian conditions in the neighborhood and access to the project site. Potential traffic calming techniques that could be applied to these streets include:

- Narrowing lanes
- Adding curb extensions and bulbouts
- Horizontal deflection
- On-site restrictions should be put in place to prohibit access to/from the project's charter school component from the East $16^{\text {th }}$ Street driveways during peak periods of school pick-up and drop-off.

Recommendations to improve circulation and access are as follows:

- Along $16^{\text {th }}$ Street, ample trees and on-street parking could potentially obstruct driveway sight distance. Parking should be prohibited within close proximity of the driveways to improve visibility and sight distance.
- In order to improve visibility and safety at the school access point on Tennyson Road for eastbound and westbound vehicles, it is recommended that an inbound left turn lane be added along Tennyson Road at the Site Access Road. Tennyson Road is currently approximately 35 feet wide (with two vehicle lanes and two bike lanes) adjacent to the project. Adding an inbound turn lane and its taper would require widening Tennyson Road by approximately 11 feet.


## Section 2 - Methodologies and Existing Conditions

## METHODOLOGIES AND EXISTING CONDITIONS

PG 3 is located at the northeastern corner of Mission Boulevard and Tennyson Road in Hayward. The proposed project consists of 176 affordable rental apartments ( 38 studios, 47 one-bedroom, 44 twobedroom, 47 three-bedroom) and a charter school serving 384 elementary students. Primary access to the project site for the school portion will be provided via Tennyson Road, with secondary access for the residential portion via two driveways on $16^{\text {th }}$ Street. The study area and project site are shown in Figure 1.

This local transportation analysis is therefore subject to the regulations and standards in place in the City of Hayward. These standards are outlined in the Hayward 2040 General Plan - Mobility Element (2014) and the City of Hayward Interim Traffic Study Guidelines (March 2017). Note, the City of Hayward published its updated Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines in December 2020; however, this report refers to standards and methodologies that were in place at the time of scoping.

The analysis methodology used in this report was approved by City Transportation Staff prior to commencement of the study.

## Intersection Level of Service Standards

Under Senate Bill (SB) 743, a project's effect on automobile delay shall not constitute a significant environmental impact. Therefore, level of service (LOS) and other similar vehicle delay or capacity metrics may no longer serve as transportation impact metrics for California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) impact analyses. The Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) has updated the CEQA Guidelines and provided a final technical advisory in December 2018 which recommends vehicle miles traveled (VMT) as the most appropriate measure of transportation impacts under CEQA. For land use and transportation projects, SB 743-compliant CEQA analysis became mandatory on July 1, 2020.

The City of Hayward has adopted VMT thresholds of significance and screening criteria, which were used in the VMT Impact Assessment Memorandum for impact analysis purposes. This report documents LOS analysis (consistent with the City's 2017 interim guidelines and the City's 2040 General Plan polices) which was considered part of the non-CEQA analysis conducted to determine any negative project effects on local roadway operations.


Goal 4 Local Circulation-M-4.3 of the City of Hayward's 2040 General Plan requires intersections to maintain a peak-hour level of service (LOS) of $E$ or better for signalized intersections. M-4.3 describes this as follows: The City shall maintain a minimum Level of Service E at signalized intersections during the peak commute periods except when a LOS F may be acceptable due to costs of mitigation or when there would be other unacceptable impacts, such as right-of-way acquisition or degradation of the pedestrian environment due to increased crossing distances or unacceptable crossing delays.

Under SB 743, a project's effect on automobile delay shall not constitute a significant environmental impact. Therefore, LOS is included for non-CEQA purposes to determine if local intersections operate acceptably and if the project would result in any operational deficiencies on the local roadway network. This approach is consistent with the City's adopted thresholds of significance and screening criteria.

## Signalized Intersections

Signalized intersection improvements should be identified if the project would degrade the AM or PM peak hour conditions from an acceptable LOS E or better under the No Project scenario to an unacceptable LOS F under the Plus Project scenario. The exception to this criterion is when LOS F is determined by the City of Hayward as acceptable due to right-of-way constraints or when there would be unacceptable impacts to other modes of travel, such as bicycle, pedestrian, or transit.

In addition, improvements should be identified at an intersection already operating at LOS F under an Existing or No Project scenario if the addition of project traffic results in an increase of 5.0 seconds or more to the intersection's average control delay.

## Unsignalized Intersections

At unsignalized intersections, the need for improvements is based on LOS and delay, and whether any of the following are met:

- Traffic signal warrant,
- Pedestrian signal warrant, or
- All-way stop warrant

Note that solely triggering a warrant does not trigger the need for an intersection improvement, but the City will at its discretion require or not require a signal be installed, where warranted.

## Level of Service Definitions

In this report, LOS is based on the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) 6th edition definitions, included as Table 1 for ease of reference. The HCM methodology assigns a level of service (LOS) grade to an intersection based on the delay for vehicles at the intersection, ranging from LOS A to LOS F; LOS A signifies very slight delay with no approach phase fully utilized, while LOS F signifies very high delays and congestion, frequent cycle failures, and long queues. For signalized and all-way stop-controlled intersections, the average control delay for all vehicles is assessed; for two-way stop-controlled intersections, the intersection approach with the highest delay is utilized.

Table 1: Level of Service Standards

| Level of Service | Delay Per Vehicle (Seconds) <br>  <br> A |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Unsignalized Intersection |  |
| C | $<10.0$ | $<10.0$ |
| D | $>10.0$ to 20.0 | $>10.0$ to 15.0 |
| E | $>20.0$ to 35.0 | $>15.0$ to 25.0 |
| F | $>35.0$ to 55.0 | $>25.0$ to 35.0 |
|  | $>55.0$ to 80.0 | $>35.0$ to 50.0 |

Source: Highway Capacity Manual

## Study Intersections

A total of eight study intersections (listed in Table 2 and shown in Figure 2) were selected for the purposes of this analysis. All study intersections are under the City of Hayward's jurisdiction. These study intersections were selected based on discussions with City staff and the project's anticipated trip distribution patterns.

Table 2: Study Intersections

| Intersection | Trafific Control |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Mission Boulevard \& Calhoun Street | Signal |
| 2 | Mission Boulevard \& Hancock Street | Signal |
| 3 | East 16th Street \& Hancock Street | TWSC |
| 4 | Whitman Street/Beatron Way \& Tennyson Road | Signal |
| 5 | East 12th Street/Dixon Street \& Tennyson Road | Signal |
| 6 | Mission Boulevard \& Tennyson Road | Signal |
| 7 | Site Access Road \& Tennyson Road | TWSC |
| 8 | Mission Boulevard \& Valle Vista Avenue | Signal |
| Note: TWSC sIGNIFIES A TWO-WAY STOP-CONTROLLED INTERSECTION. AWSC SIGNIFIES AN ALL-WAY STOP-CONTROLLED INTERSECTION. |  |  |



## EXISTING NETWORK

Existing multimodal transportation facilities are discussed in this section.

## ROADWAY NETWORK

The roadway system in the study area consists of arterial, collector, and local roadways that serve local and regional traffic demand. The vehicular facilities in the study area are discussed below. Signalized intersections in the study area are shown in Figure 3.

## Arterials Roadways

Mission Boulevard is a north-south facility that is classified as a Principal Arterial and designated as a truck route by the City of Hayward. Mission boulevard runs from Interstate 680 in Fremont to the Interstate 580/Interstate 238 interchange in Castro Valley. Also known as State Route 238 (SR 238), the road splits into two one-way roads north through downtown Hayward: Foothill Boulevard heading northbound and Mission Boulevard heading southbound. Within the study area, Mission Boulevard is a six-lane facility with a center median south of Industrial Parkway. North of Industrial Parkway, Mission Boulevard is primarily a four-lane facility with a center median, but widens to a six-lane facility at the intersection approaches and departures at Harder Road, Tennyson Road, and Industrial Parkway. Travel lanes are typically 11 feet wide, and on-street parking is available when the facility is four lanes wide. The curb-to-curb right-of-way is approximately 80 feet and widens up to 106 feet at its widest around intersections. The posted speed limit is 35 miles per hour (mph) north of Tennyson Road and 40 mph south of Tennyson Road.

Tennyson Road is an east-west Principal Arterial and truck route (west of Mission Boulevard) that runs from Mission Boulevard west to the South Hayward Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) station, Interstate 880, and Industrial Boulevard. East of Mission Boulevard, Tennyson Road is classified as a local road and connects to one of the proposed project access points. The road is a four-lane facility with a center median within the study area. Travel lanes are typically 12 feet wide, and there is on-street parking available on both sides of the roadway. The curb-to-curb right-of-way is approximately 90 feet wide. The posted speed limit varies between 25 and 35 mph .

Industrial Parkway is an east-west Minor Arterial and truck route (west of Mission Boulevard) that runs from Mission Boulevard west to Interstate I-880 (I-880) and Hesperian Boulevard before turning northward as Industrial Boulevard and connecting to State Route (SR) 92. At the Ruus Road intersection, Industrial Parkway becomes two separate roads: Industrial Parkway SW and Industrial Parkway W. Industrial Parkway SW allows northbound traffic from I-880 to exit at Whipple Road to access Industrial Parkway SW; there is no such northbound exit when I-880 and Industrial Parkway W intersect. The road is a four-lane facility with a center median within the study area. Travel lanes are typically 11 feet wide, and there is on-street parking available on both sides of the roadway. The curb-to-curb right-of-way is approximately 90 feet wide, widening to 102 feet wide on the eastbound approach with the Mission Boulevard intersection. The posted speed limit is 45 mph . East of Mission boulevard, this facility is Alquire Parkway.

Harder Road is an east-west Minor Arterial and truck route from Mission Boulevard west that connects with SR 92 and Jackson Road. Harder Road to the east of Mission Boulevard is a Collector Road that provides access to California State University, East Bay. The road is a four-lane facility with a center median within the study area. The inner travel lanes on Harder Road are 12 feet wide, and the outer travel lanes are 15 feet wide. The curb-to-curb right-of-way is approximately 88 feet wide. The posted speed limit is 35 mph .

Huntwood Avenue is a north-south Minor Arterial that connects to Industrial Parkway W and the city's industrial area to the south, as well as toward Harder Road heading north. The road is a truck route north of Tennyson Road. The road is a four-lane undivided roadway south of Tennyson Road and a two-lane road north of Tennyson Road. Along the four-lane portion, lanes are 11 feet wide, and there is on-street parking on both sides of the street where there is no center left-turn lane. The curb-to-curb right-of-way on the fourlane section of the road is approximately 72 feet. Along the two-lane portion, lanes are 11 feet wide, and
there is on-street parking on both sides of the street. The curb-to-curb right-of-way is approximately 48 feet. The posted speed limit is 30 mph .

## Collector Roadways

Dixon Street is a north-south Collector that runs from Industrial Parkway and the Mission Hills of Hayward Golf Course to the South Hayward BART station at Tennyson Road. North of Tennyson Road, the road becomes East $12^{\text {th }}$ Street and continues to head north. The road is a two-lane undivided facility with 12 -foot travel lanes and on-street parking on both sides of the road. There is no on-street parking when a left-turn lane is present. The curb-to-curb right-of-way is approximately 48 feet. The posted speed limit is 25 mph .

Valle Vista Avenue is an east-west Collector that runs from Mission Boulevard to the BART railroad tracks, where it ends in a cul-de-sac. The road is a two-lane undivided facility and with a double yellow centerline at intersection approaches. Travel lanes are approximately 13 to 14 feet wide, and there is on-street parking along the road. The curb-to-curb right-of-way varies between 30 feet near Mission Boulevard to 40 feet at the western end of the road. Valle Vista Avenue does not have a posted speed limit.

Alquire Parkway is an east-west Collector that connects the Mission Boulevard/Industrial Parkway intersection with neighborhoods to the east. The road is classified as a Collector between Mission Boulevard and Vanderbilt Street; heading east, the road becomes a Local roadway. The road is a divided facility on the approach to Mission Boulevard; otherwise, it is a two-lane undivided roadway with on-street parking east of Vanderbilt Street. Travel lanes vary between 10 and 14 feet depending on the section of roadway. The curb-to-curb right-of-way varies between 42 feet on the two-lane section and 80 feet on the approach to Mission Boulevard. The posted speed limit is 25 mph . West of Mission boulevard, this facility is Industrial Parkway.

Whitman Street is a north-south Collector that runs from Tennyson Road north toward Jackson Street, running parallel to the BART railroad tracks. The road connects to several schools, including Cesar Chavez Middle School, Tennyson High School, and Harder Elementary School. The road is a two-lane undivided facility with 11 -foot travel lanes and on-street parking on both sides of the road. The curb-to-curb right-ofway is approximately 44 feet. The posted speed limit is 25 mph .

## Local Roadways

Hancock Street is an east-west Local roadway that runs from the general site area in the east to the BART railroad tracks. The road is a two-lane undivided facility and with a double yellow centerline at the approaches to Mission Boulevard. The curb-to-curb right-of-way varies between 30 feet west of Mission Boulevard and 48 feet east of Mission Boulevard. There is on-street parking on both sides of the road along its entire length. The posted speed limit is 25 mph .

East $1^{\text {th }}$ Street is a north-south Local roadway that runs from a cul-de-sac near the proposed project site to Calhoun Street and Moreau Catholic High School. The road is a two-lane undivided facility with no centerline. The curb-to-curb right-of-way is approximately 36 feet within the study area with on-street parking on both sides of the road. This road does not have a posted speed limit.

Calhoun Street is an east-west Local roadway that runs from Mission Boulevard and Moreau Catholic High School east into residential areas. The road is a winding two-lane undivided facility and with a double yellow centerline when approaching Mission Boulevard. The curb-to-curb right-of-way is approximately 30 feet, with a narrowing and varying right-of-way as the roadways ascends heading east. The posted speed limit is 25 mph .

East 12 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street is a north-south Local roadway that connects to Dixon Street, Tennyson Road, and the South Hayward BART station to the south and Jefferson Street to the north. The road is a two-lane undivided facility and with a double yellow centerline when approaching the Tennyson Road intersection. The curb-to-curb right-of-way is approximately 32 feet, and there is on-street parking on both sides of the roadway.

The only signage with speed information is the "Speed Humps Ahead - 15 MPH " accompanying speed humps.

Beatron Way is a north-south Local roadway that connects to Whitman Street, Tennyson Road, and Cesar Chavez Middle School to the north into the neighborhood immediately to the south. The road is a two-lane undivided facility with a double yellow centerline at intersections and around curves. The curb-to-curb right-of-way is approximately 34 feet, and there is on-street parking on both sides of the roadway. The posted speed limit is 25 mph .


## TRANSIT SERVICE

The transit system in the study area consists of local bus and regional rail service. The transit facilities in the study area are discussed below and shown in Figure 4.

## Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District

Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District (AC Transit) provides bus service in the study area. AC Transit bus routes and local bus stops are shown in Figure 4. In addition, weekday bus service in the study area is documented in Table 3.

Table 3: Existing AC Transit Weekday Service

| Route | Beginning and End Points | Peak / Off-Peak Frequency (in |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | North/West |  | Minutes) |
| 41 |  |  | $60 / 60$ |
| 86 | Hayward BART | Union Landing Transit Center | $35 / 35$ |
| 99 | Hayward BART | South Hayward BART | $25 / 25$ |
| 801 | San Leandro BART | Fremont BART | N/A / 60 |

Source: AC Transit Service Changes Effective Sunday, March 29, 2020.
Two of the four bus lines run along Mission Boulevard, and all four routes make stops at the South Hayward BART station. Line 801 is an overnight bus that complements Line 99 to provide 24 -hour service on Mission Boulevard. Line 41 runs north-south with service along Huntwood Avenue near the site, and Line 86 is a local route in Hayward that connects downtown Hayward, Winton Avenue, Cabot Boulevard, Industrial Boulevard, and Tennyson Road to the South Hayward BART.

Generally, curbside transit stops along Mission Boulevard and Tennyson Road in the study area are identified with posted signs and lighting and do not include passenger amenities such as a shelter, seating, landscaping, or bicycle parking. The northbound and southbound bus stops at Mission Boulevard and Tennyson Road each provide a shelter, bench, and trash can. The South Hayward BART station has bus boarding islands, bike lockers, shelters, benches, trash cans, signage, and lighting.

## Bay Area Rapid Transit

The South Hayward Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) station is a major transit hub and a key transfer point for BART-to-bus and bus-to-bus connections. There are nine bus bays serving four AC Transit routes at the South Hayward BART station. BART operates regional heavy rail service connecting San Francisco, San Mateo, Alameda and Contra Costa Counties. The South Hayward BART station is located to the west of the study area and is part of the Berryessa/North San Jose-Richmond and Berryessa/North San Jose-Daly City lines. Each line currently operates at 15-minute headways during peak periods, resulting in an average peak period frequency of 7.5 minutes at the station.

## Other Transit Services

The Hayward Greyhound bus station is located north of the study area at the Hayward BART station. In addition, the Hayward Amtrak Station is located approximately three miles northwest of the South Hayward BART station; the Hayward Amtrak station is part of the Capitol Corridor operating between San Jose and Sacramento.


## PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES

The study area offers several types of facilities and amenities that support walking. The availability and quality of pedestrian facilities can be analyzed using seven key factors as shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Pedestrian Facility Conditions

| Factor | Description | Assessment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sidewalk Availability | Sidewalk availability is core to supporting walkability and safety separating pedestrians from vehicles and other modes. In addition, it is important that sidewalks are present on both sides of the roadway and are available along the entire segment rather than end midblock. | All of the Arterial roadways within the study area have sidewalks on both sides of the roadway with no gaps. Most Collector roadways have complete sidewalk coverage, as well. The exceptions are Valle Vista Avenue (which has sidewalk gaps west of Mission Boulevard), Harder Road (where the sidewalks on both sides of the road drop east of Bryn Mawr Avenue), and Tennyson Road (on the south side east of Mission Boulevard). There are significant sidewalks gaps along Local roads in the study area, especially east of Mission Boulevard. While there are sidewalks along Hancock Street, East 12th Street, and Beatron Way, East $16^{\text {th }}$ Street has sidewalks on the west side of the street only (which contains gaps), and Calhoun Street generally does not provide sidewalks. |
| Sidewalk Conditions | Cracked, broken, or otherwise damaged sidewalks can pose a safety hazard and discourage walking. | Where sidewalks exist, they are generally in good condition free of cracks, breaks, or visible damage. At a few locations along Hancock Street and Beatron Way, grass and other plants have overtaken parts of the sidewalk, but the sidewalk is continuous through all of these areas. |
| Crosswalk Availability | Marked crosswalks can safely accommodate pedestrians that need to cross streets. A lack of marked crosswalks could hinder walkability since pedestrians need to travel greater distances to reach a safe marked crossing point. Drivers may also be less likely to yield to intersections at unmarked crossings. | All signalized intersections on Mission Boulevard within the study area have marked crosswalks, and all of these crosswalks have continental striping, except for the east and west crosswalks at Mission Boulevard/Industrial Parkway. Intersections on Tennyson Road have a mixture of continental and standard striping. These crosswalks are in good condition. There are no marked crosswalks at the East $16^{\text {th }}$ Street/Hancock Street and Site Access/Tennyson Road intersections. <br> As shown in Figure 5, arterial intersections in the study area tend to provide Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant curb ramps. Local streets to the west of Mission Boulevard tend to provide standard curb ramps, while Local streets to the east of Mission Boulevard (near the project site) generally lack curb ramps. |
|  | Shading, whether natural or artificial, can encourage walking in areas such as Southern California which are relatively warm with limited rainfall, especially in the summer. | Mission Boulevard, with its wide right-of-way, generally lacks shade for pedestrians, especially on the east side of the road. Other arterials, such as Tennyson Road and Industrial Parkway, have more intermittent shade from street trees. <br> Several Collector and Local roadways have ample shade for pedestrians from street trees or buildings. These |


| Factor | Description | Assessment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | include Dixon Street, Hancock Street, Beatron Way, Huntwood Avenue, and East $16^{\text {th }}$ Street. A couple of streets do not, including East $12^{\text {th }}$ Street and Whitman Street. |
| is <br> Flat <br> Grade | Steep hills and ravines can discourage walking, especially for pedestrians with limited mobility. | The land to the east of Mission Boulevard slopes upward at a fairly steep angle for pedestrians, which affects pedestrian accessibility from Mission Boulevard. The remaining study area is generally flat with mild inclines or declines for short stretches. |
|  | Buffers which provide separation between pedestrians and moving vehicles can help improve the walking experience, and can include landscaping, parked vehicles, and bulbouts, which serve to both reduce pedestrian crossing distances at intersections and as a traffic calming measure. | There are several roadway sections that have a landscaped or planted buffer between the sidewalk and the road. These include Tennyson Road east of Mission Boulevard, Hancock Street, Huntwood Avenue south of Tennyson Road, and Industrial Parkway (the south side of the road is a multi-use path). <br> There are also several roadway sections that have an intermittent buffer, such as street trees or planters. These include Mission Boulevard, Tennyson Road west of Mission Boulevard, and Huntwood Avenue north of Tennyson Road. All of these roads also have parked cars between the sidewalk and the motor vehicle lanes. <br> All other low-volume roads have intermittent buffers or no buffer space at all. |
| Amenities | In addition to physical facilities that accommodate walking, useful or interesting amenities along sidewalks create a more interesting walking environment and increase pedestrian comfort. Amenities can include sidewalk-adjacent retail and restaurants, landscaping, and street furniture. | Street furniture is generally lacking along the roadways in the study area, except at bus stops with benches and shelters. The arterial roadways in the study area generally have either landscaping features or sidewalk-adjacent businesses. Tennyson Road, Industrial Parkway, and Huntwood Avenue have landscaping present. Mission Boulevard has several street-facing businesses along the corridor, although these are often spaced long distances apart. Lower classification roads generally have some landscaping or no other pedestrian amenities. |

Source: Kittelson and Associates, Inc., 2021.


## BICYCLE FACILITIES

The study area contains a bicycle facilities network that consists primarily of dedicated street space for bicyclists. Figure 6 displays the existing designated bicycle facilities in the study area.

Bicycle facilities are categorized into four types, as described below:

- Class I Bikeway (Bike Path). Also known as a shared path or multi-use path, a bike path is a paved right-of-way for bicycle travel that is completely separate from any street or highway.
- Class II Bikeway (Bike Lane). A striped and stenciled lane for one-way bicycle travel on a street or highway. This facility could include a buffered space between the bike lane and vehicle lane and the bike lane could be adjacent to on-street parking.
- Class III Bikeway (Bike Route). A signed route along a street where the bicyclist shares the right-ofway with motor vehicles. This facility can also be designated using a shared-lane marking (sharrow).
- Class IV Bikeway (Separated Bike Lane). A bikeway for the exclusive use of bicycles including a separation required between the separated bikeway and the through vehicular traffic. The separation may include, but is not limited to, grade separation, flexible posts, inflexible physical barriers, or on-street parking.

As shown in Figure 6, the existing bicycle facilities near the project site include:

- Class Il bike lanes on Tennyson Road
- Class II bike lanes on Dixon Street
- Class II bike lanes on Whitman Street

Other on-street bicycle facilities in the study area include the following:

- Green conflict zone markings and pocket bike lanes along Tennyson Road west of Mission Boulevard

The City of Hayward Bicycle \& Pedestrian Master Plan (BPMP), includes the following bicycle improvements in the study area:

- Class IV separated bikeway on Mission Boulevard
- Class IV separated bikeway on Tennyson Road west of Mission Boulevard
- Class IV separated bikeway on Huntwood Avenue south of Tennyson Road
- Two Class I paths (parallel to Mission Boulevard and to the railroad tracks)
- Class Il buffered bicycles lane on Dixon Street
- Class III bicycle boulevard on East 12th Street



## EXISTING TRAFFIC VOLUMES

## Automobile Traffic Volumes

Vehicle turning movement data was collected in March 2020 during the weekday morning (7:00 AM to 9:00 AM) and evening (4:00 PM to 6:00 PM) peak periods. Because the traffic counts were collected shortly before the statewide COVID-19 shelter in place order, the counts were anticipated to be lower than normal. Therefore, the counts were compared to traffic counts collected during normal conditions in 2018 and 2019 at two of the study intersections (intersections \#6 and \#8) as well as two other adjacent intersections on Mission Boulevard. Generally, it was found that the AM peak hour counts were up to $15 \%$ lower during the pandemic and the PM peak hour counts were up to $5 \%$ lower. Therefore, it was concluded that:

- Historical counts would be used to analyze intersections \#6 and \#8.
- For the remaining intersections, the March 2020 counts would be used with growth applied uniformly ( $15 \%$ to the AM counts and $5 \%$ to the PM counts).
- The adjustment methodology was verified and approved by City Transportation staff

Figure 7 shows the existing automobile peak hour volumes at the study intersections, including the adjusted volumes where applicable. Intersection control (i.e., signalized or stop-controlled) and lane geometries are also shown. Field-collected count sheets and the COVID-19 adjustment calculations are provided in the appendix to this report.
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## Pedestrian and Bicycle Volumes

Pedestrian and bicycle volumes were collected at the study intersections as part of the data collection effort. Table 5 and Table 6 present the pedestrian and bicycle volume data for the weekday AM and weekday PM peak hours, respectively. Generally, most intersections experienced higher levels of bicycle and pedestrian activity during the PM peak hour. One exception is the intersection of Whitman Street/Beatron Way \& Tennyson Road, which experienced more than twice the pedestrian volumes during the AM peak hour compared to the PM peak hour.

Table 5: Pedestrian and Bicycle Volumes (Weekday AM Peak Hour)

|  | Intersection | Pedestrian Crossings (by intersection leg) |  |  |  | Northbound Bicycles |  |  | Southbound Bicycles |  |  | Eastbound Bicycles |  |  | Westbound Bicycles |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | N | S | E | W | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| 1 | Mission Boulevard \& Calhoun Street | 7 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 2 | Mission Boulevard \& Hancock Street | 2 | 4 | 35 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 3 | East 1 6th Street \& Hancock Street | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Whitman Street/Beatron Way <br> \& Tennyson Road | 19 | 57 | 34 | 94 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 2 |
| 5 | East 12th Street/Dixon Street <br> \& Tennyson Road | 6 | 8 | 6 | 25 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | Mission Boulevard \& Tennyson Road | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 7 | Site Access Road \& Tennyson Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | Mission Boulevard \& Valle Vista Avenue | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |

Source: Quality Counts manual turning movement counts (March 2020).
NOTE: AM PERIOD COUNTS WERE NOT COLLECTED AT INTERSECTION \#8 IN MARCH 2020.

Table 6: Pedestrian and Bicycle Volumes (Weekday PM Peak Hour)

|  | Intersection | Pedestrian Crossings (by intersection leg) |  |  |  | Northbound Bicycles |  |  | Southbound Bicycles |  |  | Eastbound Bicycles |  |  | Westbound Bicycles |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | N | S | E | W | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| 1 | Mission Boulevard \& Calhoun Street | 6 | 9 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Mission Boulevard \& Hancock Street | 7 | 4 | 28 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | East 16 th Street \& Hancock Street | 3 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Whitman Street/Beatron Way \& Tennyson Road | 5 | 57 | 8 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 |
| 5 | East 12th Street/Dixon Street \& Tennyson Road | 17 | 10 | 8 | 23 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | Mission Boulevard \& Tennyson Road | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | Site Access Road \& Tennyson Road | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | Mission Boulevard \& Valle Vista Avenue | 0 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Source: Quality Counts manual turning movement counts (March 2020).

## EXISTING TRAFFIC OPERATIONS AND PERFORMANCE

## Traffic Signal Warrants

Traffic signal warrants are standards that provide guidelines in the determination of the need for a traffic signal. A traffic signal should not be installed if no warrants are met, since the installation of traffic signals may increase delays for the majority of through traffic and may increase the potential for accidents.

As stated in the FHWA/Caltrans 2014 California Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CA-MUTCD), "An engineering study of traffic conditions, pedestrian characteristics, and physical characteristics of the location shall be performed to determine whether installation of a traffic control signal is justified at a particular location. The investigation of the need for a traffic control signal shall include an analysis of the applicable factors contained in the following traffic signal warrants and other factors related to existing operation and safety at the study location:

- Warrant 1, Eight-Hour Vehicular Volume.
- Warrant 2, Four-Hour Vehicular Volume.
- Warrant 3, Peak Hour.
- Warrant 4, Pedestrian Volume.
- Warrant 5, School Crossing.
- Warrant 6, Coordinated Signal System.
- Warrant 7, Crash Experience.
- Warrant 8, Roadway Network.

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

This local transportation assessment did not evaluate the full panoply of warrants for traffic signals, but instead focused on the peak hour warrant. The peak hour warrant is being used in this study as an "indicator" of the likelihood of an existing or future unsignalized intersection warranting a traffic signal.

Intersections that fail to exceed the peak hour warrant are considered (for the purposes of this impact analysis) to be unlikely to meet one or more of the other signal warrants (such as the 4-hour or 8-hour warrants). However, this does not mean that a signal is definitely unwarranted. A signal may be warranted by other criteria, some of which cannot be known until the intersection is constructed and operational. This peak hour analysis is not intended to replace a rigorous and complete traffic signal warrant analysis by the responsible jurisdiction.

As discussed earlier in this report, the need for improvements at unsignalized intersections is based on LOS and delay, and whether any of the following are met:

- Traffic signal warrant,
- Pedestrian signal warrant, or
- All-way stop warrant

Note that solely triggering a warrant does not trigger the need for an intersection improvement, but the City will at its discretion require or not require a signal be installed, where warranted.

Regardless of intersection control, per the City of Hayward Interim Traffic Study Guidelines (2017), improvements would be required at an intersection already operating at LOS F under an Existing or No Project scenario if the addition of project traffic results in an increase of 5.0 seconds or more in the intersection's average control delay. Unsignalized intersections were evaluated using the Peak Hour Volume Warrant (Warrant No. 3) in the CA-MUTCD. Even if the Peak Hour Volume Warrant is met, a more detailed signal warrant study is recommended before a signal is installed. The more detailed study should consider volumes during the daily peak hours of roadway traffic, pedestrian traffic, and collision histories.

Neither of the two unsignalized study intersections (\#3 East $16^{\text {th }}$ Street \& Hancock Street and \#7 Site Access Road \& Tennyson Road) meet peak hour traffic signal warrants under existing conditions for either the AM or PM peak hour. Existing traffic signal warrant worksheets are provided in the appendix to this report.

## Automobile Level of Service

LOS at the study intersections were evaluated based on the HCM $6^{\text {th }}$ Edition methodology, as implemented in the Synchro 10 software package. LOS analysis was performed for the weekday AM and PM peak hours using COVID-adjusted traffic counts collected in the field. Table 7 provides a summary of the existing automobile level of service. As shown in the table, all study intersections operate acceptably at LOS C or better. The Existing Conditions LOS worksheets for the study intersections are provided in the appendix to this report.

Table 7: Automobile Level of Service, Existing Conditions

|  | Intersection | Traffic | Week |  | Week |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Delay (sec) | LOS | Delay (sec) | LOS |
| 1 | Mission Boulevard \& Calhoun Street | Signal | 18.2 | B | 9.7 | A |
| 2 | Mission Boulevard \& Hancock Street | Signal | 11.0 | B | 8.2 | A |
| 3 | East 1 6th Street \& Hancock Street | TWSC | 11.3 | B | 8.9 | A |
| 4 | Whitman Street/Beatron Way \& Tennyson Road | Signal | 26.8 | C | 23.1 | C |
| 5 | East 12th Street/Dixon Street \& Tennyson Road | Signal | 30.2 | C | 26.1 | C |
| 6 | Mission Boulevard \& Tennyson Road | Signal | 21.2 | C | 24.5 | C |
| 7 | Site Access Road \& Tennyson Road | TWSC | 0.0 | A | 0.0 | A |
| 8 | Mission Boulevard \& Valle Vista Avenue | Signal | 23.0 | C | 13.0 | B |

SOURCE: KIttelson \& ASSOCIATES, INC. 2021

## Queve Storage

The $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queues at the study intersections were reviewed for informational purposes to identify locations where these may exceed the available storage. The $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queue lengths represent queues that have only a $5 \%$ probability of occurring within the analyzed peak hour. This measure is typically used in traffic engineering as a conservative measure of queuing. The average driver would experience shorter queue lengths than the reported $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queues.

For through movements and turning movements without a dedicated lane, the available storage is assumed to be the distance from the stop bar to the departure point of the nearest upstream stopcontrolled or signalized intersection. For turning movements with an exclusive turn lane, the length of the turn bay is assumed to be the available storage. Table 8 details the movements which were found to queue beyond their available storage capacity at the $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile demand level under Existing Conditions.

Table 8: Queue Lengths in Excess of Capacity, Existing Conditions

| \# | Intersection | Movement | Peak Hour | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Mission Boulevard \& Calhoun Street | NBT/R | AM \& PM | This movement spills back beyond the stop-controlled intersections with Kellogg Avenue and Broadway Street. |
|  |  | SBL | AM | This movement spills back beyond the stop-controlled intersection with Jefferson Street but does not exceed the length of its exclusive turn lane. |
|  |  | SBT/R | AM \& PM | This movement spills back beyond the stop-controlled Jefferson Street intersection and the signal-controlled entrance to Moreau Catholic High School. |
| 2 | Mission Boulevard \& Hancock Street | NBT/R | PM | This movement spills back beyond the intersection with Tennyson Road. |
| 4 | Whitman Street / Beatron Way \& Tennyson Road | NBL/T/R | AM | This movement spills back beyond the adjacent uncontrolled intersection with Rochelle Avenue. |
|  |  | SBL | AM | This movement spills back beyond the length of its exclusive turn lane and into the through lane. |
|  |  | SBR | AM \& PM | This movement spills back beyond the length of its exclusive turn lane, blocking access to the pocket bike lane. |
|  |  | EBL | AM \& PM | This movement spills back beyond the length of its exclusive turn lane and into the through lane. |
|  |  | WBT | AM | This movement spills back beyond stop-controlled intersections with Oharron Drive and Pacific Street. |
| 5 | East 12th Street / Dixon Street \& Tennyson Road | NBL | AM \& PM | This movement spills back beyond the length of its exclusive turn lane and into the through lane. |
|  |  | EBL | AM | This movement spills back beyond the length of its exclusive turn lane and into the through lane. |
|  |  | EBR | AM \& PM | This movement spills back beyond the length of its exclusive turn lane, blocking access to the pocket bike lane. |
|  |  | WBT/R | AM \& PM | This movement spills back beyond the stop-controlled intersection with 13th Street. |
| 6 | Mission Boulevard \& Tennyson Road | SBT | AM | This movement spills back beyond the stop-controlled intersection with Monticello Street. |
| 8 | Mission Boulevard \& Valle Vista Avenue | SBT/R | AM | This movement spills back beyond the stop-controlled intersection with Mariners Court. |

SOURCE: Kittelson \& Associates, Inc. 2021.

## Section 3 - Project Description

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

PG 3 is located at the northeastern corner of Mission Boulevard and Tennyson Road in Hayward, as shown in Figure 1. The proposed project consists of 176 affordable rental apartments ( 38 studios, 47 one-bedroom, 44 two-bedroom, 47 three-bedroom) and a charter school serving 384 elementary students. Primary access to the project site for the school portion will be provided via Tennyson Road, with secondary access for the residential portion via two driveways on $16^{\text {th }}$ Street. The proposed site plan is shown in Figure 8.

The charter school will consist of a new 35,360 square foot school and early education facility which will ultimately grow to serve 384 students from age 3 through $5^{\text {th }} / 6^{\text {th }}$ grade. The elementary school building will include 18 classrooms, an outdoor amphitheater, workrooms and administrative offices, an outdoor play area, and other spaces. The early childhood education center will include six classrooms, workrooms, administrative offices, a play area, and other spaces. Enrollment projections are provided in Table 9.

Table 9: Enrollment and Staffing Projections

| Year | \# Students |  | Grades | \# Classrooms |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2020-2021 Staff (est. FIE) |  |  |  |  |
| $2021-2022$ | 48 | PreK | 3 | 17 |
| $2022-2023$ | 96 | PreK | 6 | 28 |
| $2023-2024$ | 144 | PreK - Kinder | 8 | 36 |
| $2024-2025$ | 192 | PreK - 1st | 10 | 40 |
| $2025-2026$ | 240 | PreK - 2nd | 12 | 45 |
| $2026-2027$ | 288 | PreK - 3rd | 14 | 49 |
| $2027-2028$ | 384 | PreK - 4th | 16 | 52 |

Source: School Program Overview
A total of 219 parking spaces would be provided in the parking areas located along the proposed internal site roadway. 24 of these spaces would be dedicated for school parking and six of these spaces would be shared between the residential and school uses. A total of 233 parking spaces would be provided for the proposed project overall, including 24 electric vehicle spaces, 51 compact spaces, and 10 accessible spaces.

A total of 44 dedicated school parking spaces would be provided, including 17 spaces along the site access road, 24 spaces within the proposed parking area, five spaces along the frontage of the elementary school building, and 4 spaces at the entrance to the early childhood education center. In addition, six shared spaces would be provided to accommodate both school and residential parking needs, for a total of 50 parking spaces available for school use.

Figure 8: Project Site Plan


## Section 4 - Project Trip Generation/ <br> Distribution/Assignment

## PROJECT TRIP GENERATION/ DISTRIBUTION/ASSIGNMENT

This section provides the vehicle trip generation and distribution estimates for the proposed project.

## TRIP GENERATION

Project trip generation was estimated for the following three time periods, as shown in Table 10:

- Weekday daily
- Weekday AM peak hour
- Weekday PM peak hour

Trip generation for the project's affordable housing component was estimated using rates for the Multifamily Housing Mid-Rise land use (Code 221) in the ITE Trip Generation Manual, $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition. Trip generation for the project's charter school component was estimated using rates for the Charter Elementary School land use (Code 537). Given the charter school is in close proximity to residential units (including units adjacent to the project site), a $1 \%$ reduction was applied to the charter school trip generation to account for local non-motorized trips to the school. As shown in the table, the project is expected to generate 1,660 weekday daily vehicle trips, 485 weekday AM peak hour vehicle trips, and 131 weekday PM peak hour vehicle trips.

Table 10: Project Trip Generation Estimate

| Land Use |  | Irip G | tion |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Rate | Daily | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
|  |  |  | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |
| Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise) (221) | Units | 5.44 | 26\% | 74\% | 0.36 | 61\% | 39\% | 0.44 |
| Charter Elementary School (537) | Students | 1.85 | 53\% | 47\% | 1.11 | 35\% | 65\% | 0.14 |
| Trip Generation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Land Use | Size | Daily | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
|  |  |  | In | Out | Total | n | Out | Total |
| Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise) (221) | 176 Units | 957 | 16 | 47 | 63 | 47 | 30 | 77 |
| Charter Elementary School (537) | 384 Students | 710 | 226 | 200 | 426 | 19 | 35 | 54 |
| Local Non-Vehicle School Trips (1\%) |  | -7 | -2 | -2 | -4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL PROJECT TRIPS |  | 1,660 | 240 | 245 | 485 | 66 | 65 | 131 |

Source: : Kittelson and Associates, Inc., 2021 ; Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2017.

Generally, the PM peak hour of trip generation for K-12 schools takes place earlier in the day compared to the standard PM peak hour of the adjacent roadway network. For example, the PM peak hour of trip generation for a school could take place between 2:00 PM and 3:00 PM, while the evening PM peak hour of the roadway network could take place between 5:00 PM and 6:00 PM. Table 11 shows the estimated trip generation for the charter school portion of the project during the PM peak hour of the trip generator. Note, the trip generation and assignment for the school's PM peak hour of generator is provided for informational purposes; Existing Plus Project operations analysis has not been conducted for this peak hour as the ambient/background traffic (e.g. Existing volumes) are lower than during the PM peak hour of the adjacent roadway network. Additionally, PM trip generation of schools tends to be staggered throughout
the afternoon as students may leave school at different times due to after-school activities, as opposed to AM trip generation where the majority of students generally arrive during the same time period.

Table 11: Charter Elementary School Trip Generation Estimate (PM Peak Hour of Generator)

| Trip Generation Rates |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use | Rate | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
|  |  | In | Out | Total |
| Charter Elementary School (537) | Students | 46\% | 54\% | 0.69 |
| Trip Generation |  |  |  |  |
| Land Use | Size | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
|  |  | In | Out | Total |
| Charter Elementary School (537) | 384 Students | 122 | 143 | 265 |
| Local Non-Vehicle School Trips (1\%) |  | -1 | -1 | -2 |
|  | TOTAL TRIPS | 121 | 142 | 263 |

SOURCE: : Kittelson and Associates, Inc., 2021; Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2017.

## TRIP DISTRIBUTION AND ASSIGNMENT

Project trip distribution was developed using the City of Hayward General Plan Update travel demand model. The project trip distribution is based on the model's distribution of trips in and out of the traffic analysis zone (TAZ) representing the project site, as well as adjustments to reflect local travel patterns and circulation conditions. The project trip distribution and intersection count locations are shown in Figure 9. In addition, as shown in the figure, the trip distribution includes an assumption that $1 \%$ of school trips will be local walking and bicycling trips rather than vehicle trips on the local roadway network.

Figure 10 presents the weekday AM and PM project-only turning movements that were derived from the trip generation and trip distribution discussed in this section. School trips were assigned to the access point off Tennyson Road, while residential trips were assigned to $16^{\text {th }}$ Street. These project-only volumes will be used in the Existing Plus Project operations analysis.

Charter school project trips for the PM peak hour of generator are shown for informational purposes in Figure 11.
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## Section 5 - Existing Plus Project Traffic Conditions

## EXISTING PLUS PROJECT TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

This chapter discusses the results of the Existing Plus Project traffic operations analysis, which was conducted for non-CEQA local transportation analysis purposes.

## EXISTING PLUS PROJECT AUTOMOBILE LEVEL OF SERVICE

The automobile turning movement counts for the Existing Plus Project scenario were developed from the sum of the Existing Conditions turning movement counts (Figure 7) and the Project Only turning movements (Figure 10). Figure 12 presents the Existing Plus Project turning movements.

Table 12 presents the Existing Conditions and Existing Plus Project delays and LOS for the study intersections. The table also compares the change in delay between the two scenarios. The Existing Plus Project LOS worksheets are provided in the appendix to this report.

As shown in the table, all study intersections continue to operate acceptably with the addition of project trips. Therefore, no operation improvements have been recommended.

Table 12: Automobile Level of Service, Existing Plus Project Conditions

|  | Intersection | Traffic | Peak | Wee | AM | Wee | PM | Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Delay (sec) | LOS | Delay (sec) | LOS |  |
| 1 | Mission Boulevard \& | Signal | AM | 18.2 | B | 20.5 | C | 2.3 |
|  | Calhoun Street |  | PM | 9.7 | A | 10.1 | B | 0.4 |
| 2 | Mission Boulevard \& | Signal | AM | 11.0 | B | 17.2 | B | 6.2 |
|  | Hancock Street |  | PM | 8.2 | A | 10.0 | A | 1.8 |
| 3 | East 16th Street \& | TWSC | AM | 11.3 | B | 14.2 | B | 2.9 |
|  | Hancock Street |  | PM | 8.9 | A | 9.9 | A | 1.0 |
| 4 | Whitman Street/Beatron | Signal | AM | 26.8 | C | 27.5 | C | 0.7 |
|  | Way \& Tennyson Road |  | PM | 23.1 | C | 23.3 | C | 0.2 |
| 5 | East 12th Street/Dixon | Signal | AM | 30.2 | C | 30.8 | C | 0.6 |
|  | Street \& Tennyson Road |  | PM | 26.1 | C | 26.3 | C | 0.2 |
| 6 | Mission Boulevard \& | Signal | AM | 21.2 | C | 34.3 | C | 13.1 |
|  | Tennyson Road |  | PM | 24.5 | C | 25.6 | C | 1.1 |
| 7 | Site Access Road \& | TWSC | AM | 0.0 | A | 10.3 | B | 10.3 |
|  | Tennyson Road |  | PM | 0.0 | A | 8.7 | A | 8.7 |
| 8 | Mission Boulevard \& Valle | Signal | AM | 23.0 | C | 23.4 | C | 0.4 |
|  | Vista Avenue |  | PM | 13.0 | B | 16.1 | B | 3.1 |

Source: Kittelson \& Associates, Inc. 2021

## EXISTING PLUS PROJECT QUEUE STORAGE

The $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile queues at the study intersections were reviewed to identify locations where these may exceed the available storage. Table 13 details the movements which were found to queue beyond their available storage capacity at the $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile demand level under Existing Plus Project conditions. The project is not anticipated to increase the queve lengths by more than eight (8) car lengths at any of the movements that exceed storage capacity. Generally, the Project increases queue lengths between one and three cars at most study intersections.

Table 13: Queue Lengths in Excess of Capacity, Existing Plus Project Conditions

| \# | Intersection | Movement | Peak <br> Hour | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Mission Boulevard \& Calhoun Street | NBT/R | AM \& PM | This movement continues to spill back beyond the stopcontrolled intersections with Kellogg Avenue and Broadway Street. The addition of project trips in the AM peak hour is anticipated to increase the queve length by approximately eight car lengths. In the PM peak hour, the addition of project trips is expected to increase the queve by less than one car length. |
|  |  | SBL | AM | This movement continues to spill back beyond the length of its exclusive turn lane and into the through lane. The addition of project trips is not anticipated to increase the queue length. |
|  |  | SBT/R | AM \& PM | This movement continues to spill back beyond the stopcontrolled Jefferson Street intersection and the signalcontrolled entrance to Moreau Catholic High School. The addition of project trips is anticipated to increase the queve by approximately five car lengths in the AM peak hour and one car length in the PM peak hour. |
| 2 | Mission Boulevard \& Hancock Street | NBT/R | PM | This movement continues to spill back beyond the intersection with Tennyson Road. The addition of project trips is anticipated to increase the queue length by approximately one car length. |
| 4 | Whitman Street /Beatron Way \& Tennyson Road | NBL/T/R | AM | This movement continues to spill back beyond the adjacent uncontrolled intersection with Rochelle Avenue. The addition of project trips is anticipated to increase the queve by less than one car length. |
|  |  | SBL | AM | This movement continues to spill back beyond the length of its exclusive turn lane and into the through lane. The addition of project trips is anticipated to increase the queve length by approximately one car length. |
|  |  | SBR | AM \& PM | This movement spills back beyond the length of its exclusive turn lane, blocking access to the pocket bike lane. The addition of project trips is anticipated to increase the queue length by approximately one car length in the AM peak hour and less than one car length in the PM peak hour. |
|  |  | EBL | AM \& PM | This movement continues to spill back beyond the length of its exclusive turn lane and into the through lane. The addition of project trips is anticipated to increase the queve by approximately one car length in the AM and PM peak hours. |
|  |  | WBT | AM | This movement continues to spill back beyond stopcontrolled intersections with Oharron Drive and Pacific Street. The addition of project trips is anticipated to increase the queve length by approximately one car length. |
|  |  | WBR | AM | With the addition of project trips, this movement spills back beyond the length of its exclusive turn lane, blocking access to the pocket bike lane. |


| \# | Intersection | Movement | Peak Hour | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | East 12th Street / Dixon Street \& Tennyson Road | NBL | AM \& PM | This movement continues to spill back beyond the length of its exclusive turn lane and into the through lane. The addition of project trips is anticipated to increase the queve length by approximately one car length in the AM peak hour and less than one car length in the PM peak hour. |
|  |  | EBL | AM | This movement continues to spill back beyond the length of its exclusive turn lane and into the through lane. The addition of project trips is anticipated to increase the queue by less than one car length. |
|  |  | EBR | AM \& PM | This movement continues to spill back beyond the length of its exclusive turn lane, blocking access to the pocket bike lane. The addition of project trips is anticipated to increase the queue length by approximately one car length in the AM peak hour and less than one car length in the PM peak hour. |
|  |  | WBT/R | AM \& PM | This movement continues to spill back beyond the stopcontrolled intersection with 13th Street. The addition of project trips is anticipated to increase the queve length by approximately one car length in the AM peak hour and less than one car length in the PM peak hour. |
| 6 | Mission Boulevard \& Tennyson Road | SBT | AM | This movement continues to spill back beyond the stopcontrolled intersection with Monticello Street. The addition of project trips is not anticipated to increase the queve length. |
| 8 | Mission Boulevard \& Valle Vista Avenue | SBT/R | AM | This movement continues to spill back beyond the stopcontrolled intersection with Mariners Court. The addition of project trips is anticipated to increase the queve length by approximately three car lengths. |
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Section 6 - Public Transit, Pedestrian, and Bicycle Assessment

# PUBLIC TRANSIT, PEDESTRIAN, AND BICYCLE ASSESSMENT 

This section discussed potential project effects on public transit, pedestrians, and bicyclists.

## PUBLIC TRANSIT ASSESSMENT

The Project is not expected to increase traffic levels at intersections serving local AC Transit buses to levels that would require improvements under the Existing Plus Project scenario. In addition, the project is not expected to degrade local access to bus stops along Mission Boulevard (such as the stops at the intersections with Tennyson Road and Hancock Street) which can be accessed via the local sidewalk network and existing facilities such as ADA curb ramps and crosswalks. There are no bus stops near the project or abutting the project driveways.

The project may increase the use of the nearby AC Transit bus stops along Mission Boulevard. While the bus stops at the intersection of Mission Boulevard \& Tennyson Road include amenities such as a bench and shelter, the bus stops at the intersection of Mission Boulevard and Hancock Street do not. Therefore, the property owner should coordinate with AC Transit to improve user amenities at the two AC Transit bus stops at the intersection of Mission Boulevard and Hancock Street.

## PEDESTRIAN ASSESSMENT

As discussed in the Existing Network section, arterial and collector roadways in the study area have mostly complete sidewalk coverage, but there are many gaps along local residential roads, including those near the $16^{\text {th }}$ Street access points. Tennyson Road and Hancock Street provide access to the project site from Mission Boulevard and include sidewalks on both sides of the street. Marked, high-visibility continental crosswalks are provided at the signalized intersections of these two streets with Mission Boulevard. Within the residential neighborhood to the west of the project site and east of Mission Boulevard, curb ramps and marked crosswalks are not consistently present at stop-controlled intersections. In addition, there is no sidewalk on the eastern side of $16^{\text {th }}$ Street. At the project's primary vehicular access points (the East $16^{\text {th }}$ Street/Hancock Street and Site Access/Tennyson Road intersections) there are no marked crosswalks.

Students walking to the proposed school (on the southern portion of the project site) or residents accessing the affordable housing component from the south would generally access the site by walking east along Tennyson Road from Mission Boulevard. Vehicular access for pick-up and drop-off is provided on the eastern side of the school building from the site access road, but the project includes trail access between Tennyson Road and the school west of the access road for people walking, as shown in Figure 13. The trail connects to a sidewalk that allows for internal site access without the need to use the vehicular access driveway off Tennyson Road.

Residents or students accessing the project site from the northwest via $16^{\text {th }}$ Street would benefit from a proposed sidewalk on the east side of $16^{\text {th }}$ Street. However, other pedestrian amenities such as marked crosswalks are not present to facilitate pedestrian access to the project. In addition, given that residential vehicle trips would access the project via the $16^{\text {th }}$ Street driveways, the project is expected add vehicle trips on streets such as $16^{\text {th }}$ Street and Hancock Street, affecting local pedestrian conditions.

Pedestrian treatments should be considered at the project access points and within the study area to facilitate pedestrian access to the project site and generally improve pedestrian safety in the study area. Potential pedestrian-oriented treatments that could be considered as part of design review and conditions of approval could include:

- Ensure that the project driveways are designed for pedestrian visibility safety (sidewalks clearly delineated, improved visibility by minimizing bushes and large signs).
- Coordinate with the City of Hayward to install warning signage (such as caution signage for exiting vehicles) and continental crosswalks at Site Access/Tennyson Road intersection.
- Explore options to improve pedestrian accessibility west of the project site, including along $16^{\text {th }}$ Street and Hancock Street. Improvements can include marked crosswalks and bulbouts at the East $16^{\text {th }}$ Street/Hancock Street intersection.
- There is the opportunity to add yellow continental school crosswalks at the Tennyson Road/Mission Boulevard intersection.


## BICYCLE ASSESSMENT

As discussed in the Existing Network section of this report, existing bikeways in the study area include Class II bike lanes in both directions along Tennyson Road. The Hayward BPMP includes planed Class IV separated bike lanes along Mission Boulevard and along Tennyson Road west of Mission Boulevard.

Bicyclists accessing the southern portion of the project site (primarily students accessing the school) can utilize the trail access off of Tennyson Road to avoid utilizing the project driveway off Tennyson Road. However, inbound bicyclists approaching from Mission Boulevard using the eastbound bike lanes may have difficulty turning into the project, especially due to the grade and lack of a turn pocket or other marked facility for crossing into the school. In addition, a substantial number of turning vehicles are being added to the Site Access/Tennyson Road intersection during peak hours. For bikes leaving westbound along Tennyson Road using the bike lane, downhill vehicle speeds combined with increased peak hour vehicle volumes and the bike lane being dropped for the 315 -foot right turn lane could result in an uncomfortable bicycling environment for students and other bicyclists.

Bicyclists accessing the northern portion of the project must utilize the project's $16^{\text {th }}$ Street driveways or dismount and use the sidewalks to access the project site. In addition, there are no designated bikeways on local residential streets such as $16^{\text {th }}$ Street and Hancock Street. The project will also add vehicular traffic to these roads, especially during peak hours.

Bicycle treatments should be considered at the project access points and within the study area to facilitate bicyclist access to the project site and generally improve bicyclist safety in the study area. Potential bicycle-oriented treatments that could be considered as part of design review and conditions of approval could include:

- Coordinate with the City of Hayward to install signage (such as bikeway signage and caution signage) and green conflict zone markings through the Site Access Road/Tennyson Road intersection.
- Consider implementing facilities to accommodate bicyclists (and pedestrians) crossing Tennyson Road to access the project site (e.g., marked north/south crosswalk at the Site Access Road/Tennyson Road intersection or a midblock location).
- Consider a treatment to improve downhill westbound bicycling conditions approaching the Mission Boulevard/Tennyson Road intersection. Note, Solutions for this location are limited by multiple constraints:
- A pocket bike lane between the through and right turn lanes may not be feasible due to the curb-to-curb right-of-way or to avoid offsetting the westbound through lane. The length of the pocket bike lane (more than 300 feet) could result in a high-stress situation with vehicles traveling on both sides of bicyclists for an extended period of time.
- A shared bike/right turn lane may be high-stress for children and other users due to the length of the right-turn lane and downhill vehicle speeds.
- Solutions may require shortening the westbound right-turn lane at the Mission Boulevard \& Tennyson Road intersection to reduce bicyclist stress.
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- Consider installing bike routes with sharrows along residential roads such as Hancock Street and $16^{\text {th }}$ Street to facilitate bike access to and from the project. This could be combined with traffic calming strategies due to increased vehicle volumes (which will be discussed in a later chapter).

Figure 13: On-Site Pedestrian Facilities


Section 7 - Pick-Up and Drop-Off Analysis

## STUDENT PICK-UP AND DROP-OFF ANALYSIS

This section provides an assessment of the proposed student pick-up and drop-off zone, including a determination if sufficient queuing area is provided for site access planning purposes.

The project site includes an internal circulation system to provide access for vehicles and pedestrians to the school and residential portions of the project, as well as pedestrian connectivity to Tennyson Road and $16^{\text {th }}$ Street. The student pick-up and drop-off plan is presented in

Figure 14. Please note, the narrative and analysis provided below references north/south/east/west directionality relative to this figure, which is rotated 90 degrees so that Tennyson Road is running north/south.

## VEHICULAR ACCESS

The school would be primarily accessed from Tennyson Road via the eastern project driveway. The school may also technically be accessed from $16^{\text {th }}$ Street via a secondary access driveway and internal driveways that are primarily to provide access to the residential portion of the project, although that is not intended. The eastern driveway that will connect the school to Tennyson Road will have one 13 -foot wide travel lane in each direction and parallel curbside parking. The northern/westbound lane side of the road will provide 17 parallel parking spaces. The access driveway south of the traffic circle will have one lane in each direction with 5 parallel parking spaces on the east/northbound lane side of the road, and 4 perpendicular parking spaces at the end of the cul-de-sac.

## PEDESTRIAN ACCESS

The school would have multiple entrances. The primary school entrance for the elementary school building will be located on the northwestern portion of the building by the eastern end of the proposed crosswalk south of the traffic circle. An additional entry will be located to the south near the cul-de-sac.

The early childhood center building would be accessed by the cul-de-sac area at the terminus of the access driveway.

Sidewalks will be constructed along both sides of the roads in the vicinity of the school. Sidewalks along north side of access road providing access from 17 parking spaces, connecting to/from the school via two crosswalks. Crosswalks would be provided on the west and south legs of the traffic circle. A trail from north of the school building would provide direct pedestrian access from the school area to Tennyson Road.

## PARKING

The vicinity of the school will include 9 parking spaces that would be provided on the south driveway, 17 parking spaces on the northern driveway east of the traffic circle, and 18 dedicated parking spaces. A total of 44 dedicated parking spaces plus 6 shared parking spaces west of the traffic circle would be available for school parking. The parking spaces located along the north side of the internal road would be accessible via crosswalks.

## DROP-OFF/PICK-UP AREAS

The plan includes drop-off and pick-up areas that would facilitate students to exit or enter vehicles on the passenger side to prevent students from crossing between vehicles in the drop-off/pick-up queue. Drop-off areas will be located west and north of the elementary school building. The west area would have a length of over 100 feet, which would be able to accommodate 5 vehicles, and the north area would have a length of 78 feet, which would accommodate 3 vehicles. Both drop-off areas would provide easy access to the school buildings. The kindergarten building does not have a pick-up and drop-off area, as parents normally park and walk their young children in kindergarten/early childhood grades to school.

## VEHICULAR LOOP DRIVE STACKING

The school is anticipated to accommodate almost 400 students, 96 of which are in the early childhood programs. The school will generate up to 422 trips ( $224 \mathrm{in} / 198$ out) in the AM peak hour during the student drop-off and 263 trips ( $121 \mathrm{in} / 142$ out) in the mid-afternoon hour during the student pick-up.

The circulation would consist of two drop-off/pick-up paths to provide a single-lane drive stacking loop as follows:

- Early Childhood Student Drop-off/Pick-up: The vehicular path would consist of utilizing the south drive aisle to access the early childhood building and turn around at the cul-de-sac with a loop drive stacking length of 790 feet. The site plan envisions this path to use the 9 parking spaces for student drop-off/pick-up, so parents can park and walk their children to the early childhood building. Parents may also park at other parking spaces dedicated for the school.
- Elementary School Drop-off: The vehicular path would consist of utilizing the east-west main access driveway to access the northern entrance of the elementary school building, utilizing the traffic circle to turn around. This queue would have a loop drive stacking length of 365 feet. The site plan envisions this path to primarily use the pick-up/drop-off area north of the elementary school building, where students would load directly from the vehicles to the curb/sidewalk.


## POTENTIAL ISSUES

Potential pick-up and drop-off issues have been identified as follows:

- Potential vehicular/pedestrian conflicts: The main school entrances are located in the northwest corner of the elementary school building, and the entrance on the eastern portion of the kindergarten building. Potential conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians may occur when pedestrians cross the internal access driveways. The primary locations where conflicts may occur are at the driveway north of the elementary school and the driveway south of the traffic circle. These driveways will also be the path for vehicles accessing the school drop-off and parking areas. To reduce conflicts and improve circulation for pedestrians and vehicles, pedestrians should be directed to only cross the streets at designated pedestrian facilities. Pedestrians should not cross driveways outside designated facilities.
- Parking and Maneuvering: The loop drive is single queve and does not provide a passing lane. Therefore, vehicles maneuvering in and out of the parking spaces located along the driveway loops will conflict with vehicles traveling in the queue. This may create friction especially during the student drop-off and pick-up periods.
- The drop-off area for the elementary school can only accommodate 3 vehicles. As the configuration is a single queve, parents that cannot stop at the drop-off area would either: (1) stop and block the single queve line and the traffic circle in close proximity, (2) drop-off at a nondesignated location, or (3) exit the internal driveway to make a U-turn to reenter the queue.
- The drop-off queue is in close proximity of the traffic circle and will likely block traffic in all directions.
- During student pick-up, it would be difficult to move the single queue as parents in the queue need to locate their children.
- The southernmost spaces at the end of the cul-de-sac on both sides would require substantial vehicle maneuvering. During student drop-off and pick-up times, it would be difficult to find gaps in the queue, essentially trapping these vehicles.
- It is not clear where the school buses and vans for special education students would be located and if it is feasible to separate vehicles from school buses.
- According to published research, elementary schools with a student population of less than 500 students usually have a loop drive stacking length ranging from 400 to 750 feet. Given the site's characteristics with a short drop-off area and the single queue it is anticipated the queue would be in the upper range, possibly reaching the Site Access Road leading to Tennyson Road.


## RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommended improvements to pick-up/drop-off circulation are provided below.

- Install school area signage and pavement markings according to MUTCD standards.
- Relocate the northern drop-off area away from the traffic circle.
- Short-term parking spaces should be identified past the student loading area and near the building entrance.
- Block access to the residential area of the parking lot during student drop-off/pick-up
- Assign staff parking to the areas west of the traffic circle, leaving the parking spaces within the loop drive open for parents during the drop-off and pick-up times.
- At the designated drop-off areas north and west of the elementary school building, paint the curb white and mark it as "passenger loading during student drop-off and pick-up times." "No Parking" signs should be installed indicating the times of the day when parking is not allowed.
- Traffic cones and other channelizing devices can be used to minimize pedestrian/vehicles conflicts.
- Student safety patrols and loading supervisors should be well trained and wear reflective safety vests.
- Install signage to indicate that parking is not allowed during drop-off/pick-up times and drivers must remain in the vehicles. Signage should also direct kindergarten/early childhood and lower grade drop-off/pick-up to the southern drop-off/pick-up zones, and upper grade drop-off/pick-up to the northern drop-off/pickup zone. Kindergarten/early childhood students should be walked to the school buildings by staff during drop-off times, as opposed to parents parking and walking their students.
- The applicant for the school should prepare a traffic and parking management plan. The plan would identify the parking areas for staff, visitors, parking restrictions, management of the student drop-off/pick-up, locations of crossing guards, staff and monitors assisting with student drop-off/pick-up, and an advanced student identification system so students can be matched to their parents. The plan should be prepared for the satisfaction of City of Hayward Public Works staff and submitted prior to building occupancy permits. The plan should include process to reduce or eliminate the need for the parents to get out of the vehicle at drop-off locations to provide an efficient and safe drop-off and pick-up procedure. The plan should also include staggered dropoff schedules.
- The applicant should prepare a transportation demand management (TDM) plan to encourage carpooling, rideshare, and other modes and facilitate carpool matching for staff and students.

Figure 14: Student Pick-Up and Drop-Off Plan


## Section 8 - Traffic Calming

## TRAFFIC CALMING

The City of Hayward has expressed concerns regarding the potential for vehicles to divert to or pass through residential streets to local arterial and regional roads in the study area. Generally, pass-through vehicle concerns can be addressed with traffic calming measures to slow vehicles down to safer speeds.

- Examples of traffic calming measures can include:
- Narrowing roadways
- Adding on-street parking
- Installing a bike lane
- Adding curb extensions and bulbouts
- Adding bollards and planters
- Removing lanes
- Vertical deflection such as speed bumps, humps, or tables
- Horizontal deflection
- Lateral shift with a median island and curb extensions
- Lateral shift with a chicane and curb extensions
- Enforcement and education
- Speed cameras
- Vehicle activated speed signs
- Lowering speed limits

The driveways for the project's residential component are located on East $16^{\text {th }}$ Street. This could result in increased traffic on neighborhood streets in the area. Existing volumes and the anticipated project contribution are shown in Table 14.

Table 14: Anticipated Project Trip Contribution (Hancock Street and E. 16th Street)

| Street | Peak Hour | Existing Volume | Project-Only Trips |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| East l6th Street (south of Hancock | AM | 57 | 31 |
| Street) | PM | 79 | 38 |
| Hancock Street (between Mission | AM | $235-334$ | 63 |
| Boulevard and E. 16th Street) | PM | $137-241$ | 77 |

As shown in the table, it is anticipated that the project will increase traffic along East $16^{\text {th }}$ Street south of Hancock Street by approximately $50 \%$ during both peak hours. Vehicle trips will also be added to Hancock Street east of Mission Boulevard. Therefore, the project applicant should work with the City of Hayward to explore options for implementing traffic calming techniques along these streets. These measures can also support improved bicycle and pedestrian conditions in the neighborhood and access to the project site. Potential traffic calming techniques that could be applied to these streets include:

- Narrowing lanes
- Adding curb extensions and bulbouts
- Horizontal deflection

In addition, on-site restrictions should be put in place to prohibit access to/from the project's charter school component from the East $16^{\text {th }}$ Street driveways during peak periods of school pick-up and drop-off.

## Section 9 - Circulation and Access

## CIRCULATION AND ACCESS

This section provides an overview of site access and on-site circulation.

## FIRE TRUCK AND WASTE MANAGEMENT TRUCK ACCESS

An analysis of the project driveways and internal site was prepared by the project team using AutoCAD to assess circulation and site access for fire trucks. The fire truck turning template is shown in Figure 15. As shown in the figure, a tandem axle ladder fire truck is able to navigate the project driveways and drive aisles.

The waste management access plan is shown in Figure 16. As shown in the figure, waste management trucks would utilize a one-way path of travel, entering from Tennyson Road and exiting through East $16^{\text {th }}$ Street. An AutoTurn template was not prepared for waste management vehicles. However, given that the fire truck templates represent the largest vehicle expected to enter and exit the site, it is expected that the site is navigable for waste management trucks.

## PASSENGER VEHICLES

AutoTurn templates were not prepared for passenger vehicles, since the fire truck template represents the largest vehicle expected to enter and exit the site. Given the results of the truck turning template, it is expected that the driveway and drive aisles are sufficient to accommodate passenger vehicles. In addition, the exiting vehicle queves at the project driveways and at the Site Access Road/Tennyson Road intersections are not expected to exceed 25 feet; therefore, no conflict is expected between exiting queuing vehicles, parking spaces, and internal drive aisle intersections. In addition, a single outbound lane at each driveway and at the Site Access Road/Tennyson Road intersection is sufficient, especially since exiting vehicles are expected to primarily turn right to exit.

Due to the hilly terrain and uncontrolled intersections east of Mission Boulevard in the vicinity of the project site, sight distance was assessed at uncontrolled intersections and project driveways:

- The school driveway near Tennyson Road - for eastbound vehicles leaving the site
- The residential driveways on $16^{\text {th }}$ Street - for westbound vehicles leaving the site
- The intersection of East $16^{\text {th }}$ Street $\&$ Hancock Street - for vehicles at the eastbound stop-controlled approach
- The intersection of Site Access Road \& Tennyson Road - for southbound vehicles entering Tennyson Road

The line of sight for stop-controlled movements at these locations were analyzed to ensure that adequate sight distances are provided for vehicles to see both pedestrians in sidewalk areas and vehicles approaching the driveways. Line of sight was analyzed using standards and methodologies described in the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Geometric Design of Highways and Streets. AASHTO standards were used to develop departure sight triangles at each location that should be unobstructed for vehicles to provide sufficient view of approaching vehicles and pedestrians.

AASHTO recommends that the driver decision point of the sight triangle (the short side) should be 14.5 feet from the major road traveled way. However, where practical, AASHTO recommends increasing the distance to 18 feet. Given the presence of bike lanes and sidewalks along Tennyson Road, a decision point of 18 feet was assumed for the Site Access Road \& Tennyson Road intersection.

The following formula was used to calculate the necessary intersection sight distance:

$$
\text { ISD }=1.47 * V_{\text {major }} * \dagger_{\mathrm{g}}
$$

where:
ISD = intersection sight distance (length of the leg of sight distance triangle along major road) (ft)
$\mathrm{V}_{\text {major }}=$ design speed of major road (mph)
$t_{g}=$ time gap for minor road vehicle to enter the major road (s)
Assuming a passenger car time gap of 6.5 seconds (based on AASHTO) and speed limits of 15 mph on alleys and 25 mph on other roads, the intersection sight distances were calculated and recommended departure sight triangles are provided below.

- At the school driveway, 239 feet of sight distance is needed. No obstructions are present.
- For vehicles existing the residential driveways, 239 feet of sight distance is needed to the north of the driveway and 143 feet to the south. Obstructions consist of trees and parked cars (no buildings).
- At the East $16^{\text {th }}$ Street \& Hancock intersection, eastbound vehicles require 239 feet of sight distance in each direction. Obstructions consist of trees and parked cars (no buildings).
- At the Site Access Road \& Tennyson Road intersection, 239 feet of sight distance are needed in each direction. No obstructions are present.

Therefore, access points and intersections around the project site generally have acceptable sight distance, unobstructed by buildings. However, along $16^{\text {th }}$ Street, ample trees and on-street parking could potentially obstruct sight distance. Parking should be prohibited within close proximity of the driveways to improve visibility and sight distance.

There is an incline along Tennyson Road as well as limited visibility due to the roadway's curve and the hilly terrain to the east of the Site Access Road. Currently, the intersection provides full inbound and outbound access and is stop-controlled on the southbound approach. Vehicles traveling along Tennyson Road are not controlled; this includes westbound vehicles traveling downhill. There is the potential for sight issues and conflicts between vehicles taking a left into the project and vehicles traveling westbound downhill along Tennyson due to the grade crest. Furthermore, inbound vehicles may queue back along Tennyson Road's shared left/through lane until a gap form in downhill vehicles; vehicles continuing eastbound along Tennyson Road would have to navigate around these waiting vehicles. In order to improve visibility and safety at the school access point on Tennyson Road for eastbound and westbound vehicles, it is recommended that an inbound left turn lane be added along Tennyson Road at the Site Access Road. Tennyson Road is currently approximately 35 feet wide (with two vehicle lanes and two bike lanes) adjacent to the project. Adding an inbound turn lane and its taper would require widening Tennyson Road by approximately 11 feet.

## PEDESTRIANS AND BICYCLISTS

Pedestrians can access the project site using sidewalks at the project driveways or a trail access from Tennyson Road. Pedestrians will be able to use a network of on-site walkways and crosswalks through the project site. In addition, recommended pedestrian-oriented improvements are detailed in preceding chapters of this report.

Bicyclists accessing the site must either use the $16^{\text {th }}$ Street driveways and sidewalks or the trail access from Tennyson Road. Once on site, bicyclists would need to dismount and use the internal pedestrian network. Recommended bicyclist-oriented improvements are detailed in preceding chapters of this report.

Figure 15: Fire Truck Access Plan


Figure 16: Waste Management Access Plan


## Section 10 - Summary of Findings

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The VMT Impact Assessment Memorandum previously determined that the project can be screened out of a detailed vehicle miles traveled (VMT) analysis under the City's Senate Bill 743-consistent VMT criteria.
Therefore, it was determined that the project would have a less-than-significant VMT impact under CEQA. No mitigation measures were identified.

Non-CEQA recommendations have been made in this report to address multimodal transportation conditions and to be incorporated as part of this project.

To address local bus transit accessibility, the property owner should:

- Coordinate with AC Transit to improve user amenities at the two AC Transit bus stops at the intersection of Mission Boulevard and Hancock Street.

To address pedestrian conditions and accessibility, potential pedestrian-oriented treatments that could be considered as part of design review and conditions of approval include:

- Ensure that the project driveways are designed for pedestrian visibility safety (sidewalks clearly delineated, improved visibility by minimizing bushes and large signs).
- Coordinate with the City of Hayward to install warning signage (such as caution signage for exiting vehicles) and continental crosswalks at Site Access/Tennyson Road intersection.
- Explore options to improve pedestrian accessibility west of the project site, including along $16^{\text {th }}$ Street and Hancock Street. Improvements can include marked crosswalks and bulbouts at the East $16^{\text {th }}$ Street/Hancock Street intersection.
- There is the opportunity to add yellow continental school crosswalks at the Tennyson Road/Mission Boulevard intersection

To address bicycling conditions and accessibility, potential bicycle-oriented treatments that could be considered as part of design review and conditions of approval include:

- Coordinate with the City of Hayward to install signage (such as bikeway signage and caution signage) and green conflict zone markings through the Site Access Road/Tennyson Road intersection.
- Consider implementing facilities to accommodate bicyclists (and pedestrians) crossing Tennyson Road to access the project site (e.g., marked north/south crosswalk at the Site Access Road/Tennyson Road intersection or a midblock location).
- Consider a treatment to improve downhill westbound bicycling conditions approaching the Mission Boulevard/Tennyson Road intersection. Note, Solutions for this location are limited by multiple constraints:
- A pocket bike lane between the through and right turn lanes may not be feasible due to the curb-to-curb right-of-way or to avoid offsetting the westbound through lane. The length of the pocket bike lane (more than 300 feet) could result in a high-stress situation with vehicles traveling on both sides of bicyclists for an extended period of time.
- A shared bike/right turn lane may be high-stress for children and other users due to the length of the right-turn lane and downhill vehicle speeds.
- Solutions may require shortening the westbound right-turn lane at the Mission Boulevard \& Tennyson Road intersection to reduce bicyclist stress.
- Consider installing bike routes with sharrows along residential roads such as Hancock Street and $16^{\text {th }}$ Street to facilitate bike access to and from the project. This could be combined with traffic calming strategies due to increased vehicle volumes.

Recommendations to improve student pick-up/drop-off circulation consist of the following:

- Install school area signage and pavement markings according to MUTCD standards.
- Relocate the northern drop-off area away from the traffic circle.
- Short-term parking spaces should be identified past the student loading area and near the building entrance.
- Block access to the residential area of the parking lot during student drop-off/pick-up
- Assign staff parking to the areas west of the traffic circle, leaving the parking spaces within the loop drive open for parents during the drop-off and pick-up times.
- At the designated drop-off areas north and west of the elementary school building, paint the curb white and mark it as "passenger loading during student drop-off and pick-up times." "No Parking" signs should be installed indicating the times of the day when parking is not allowed.
- Traffic cones and other channelizing devices can be used to minimize pedestrian/vehicles conflicts.
- Student safety patrols and loading supervisors should be well trained and wear reflective safety vests.
- Install signage to indicate that parking is not allowed during drop-off/pick-up times and drivers must remain in the vehicles. Signage should also direct kindergarten/early childhood and lower grade drop-off/pick-up to the southern drop-off/pick-up zones, and upper grade drop-off/pick-up to the northern drop-off/pickup zone. Kindergarten/early childhood students should be walked to the school buildings by staff during drop-off times, as opposed to parents parking and walking their students.
- The applicant for the school should prepare a traffic and parking management plan. The plan would identify the parking areas for staff, visitors, parking restrictions, management of the student drop-off/pick-up, locations of crossing guards, staff and monitors assisting with student drop-off/pick-up, and an advanced student identification system so students can be matched to their parents. The plan should be prepared for the satisfaction of City of Hayward Public Works staff and submitted prior to building occupancy permits. The plan should include process to reduce or eliminate the need for the parents to get out of the vehicle at drop-off locations to provide an efficient and safe drop-off and pick-up procedure. The plan should also include staggered dropoff schedules.
- The applicant should prepare a transportation demand management (TDM) plan to encourage carpooling, rideshare, and other modes and facilitate carpool matching for staff and students.

Given the anticipated increase in traffic volumes on local residential streets such as $16^{\text {th }}$ Street and Hancock Street, the project applicant should work with the City of Hayward to explore options for implementing traffic calming techniques along those streets. These measures can also support improved bicycle and pedestrian conditions in the neighborhood and access to the project site. Potential traffic calming techniques that could be applied to these streets include:

- Narrowing lanes
- Adding curb extensions and bulbouts
- Horizontal deflection
- On-site restrictions should be put in place to prohibit access to/from the project's charter school component from the East $16^{\text {th }}$ Street driveways during peak periods of school pick-up and drop-off.

Recommendations to improve circulation and access are as follows:

- Along $16^{\text {th }}$ Street, ample trees and on-street parking could potentially obstruct driveway sight distance. Parking should be prohibited within close proximity of the driveways to improve visibility and sight distance.
- In order to improve visibility and safety at the school access point on Tennyson Road for eastbound and westbound vehicles, it is recommended that an inbound left turn lane be added along Tennyson Road at the Site Access Road. Tennyson Road is currently approximately 35 feet wide (with two vehicle lanes and two bike lanes) adjacent to the project. Adding an inbound turn lane and its taper would require widening Tennyson Road by approximately 11 feet.


## Appendix 1 - Traffic Counts and COVID-19 Adjustments




Peak-Hour: 7:15 AM -- 8:15 AM
Peak 15-Min: 7:45 AM -- 8:00 AM


| 15-Min Count Period Beginning At | 2. Mission Blvd (Northbound) |  |  |  | 2. Mission Blvd (Southbound) |  |  |  | Calhoun St (Eastbound) |  |  |  | Calhoun St (Westbound) |  |  |  | Total | Hourly Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 220 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 384 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 632 |  |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 242 | 11 | 2 | 6 | 439 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 732 |  |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 314 | 24 | 0 | 8 | 401 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 790 |  |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 374 | 24 | 2 | 21 | 387 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 878 | 3032 |
| 8:00 AM | 1 | 263 | 31 | 4 | 32 | 363 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 781 | 3181 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 285 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 345 | 0 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 684 | 3133 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 266 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 309 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 595 | 2938 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 250 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 284 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 552 | 2612 |
| Peak 15-Min Flowrates | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Total |  |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U |  |  |  |
| All Vehicles | 0 | 1496 | 96 | 8 | 84 | 1548 | 0 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 180 | 0 | 52 | 0 |  | 12 |
| Heavy Trucks Buses | 0 | 52 | 0 |  | 0 | 32 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 4 |
| Pedestrians |  | 4 |  |  |  | 16 |  |  |  | 16 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 6 |
| Bicycles Scooters | 0 | 4 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 4 |

Comments:















Peak-Hour: 7:15 AM -- 8:15 AM
Peak 15-Min: 8:00 AM -- 8:15 AM


| 15-Min Count Period Beginning At | 9. Main Entry Access Rd (Northbound) |  |  |  | 9. Main Entry Access Rd (Southbound) |  |  |  | Tennyson Rd (Eastbound) |  |  |  | Tennyson Rd (Westbound) |  |  |  | Total | Hourly Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U |  |  |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 7 |  |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 13 |  |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 15 |  |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 51 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 73 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 73 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 66 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 62 |
| Peak 15-Min Flowrates | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Total |  |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U |  |  |  |
| All Vehicles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 64 | 0 | 0 |  | 6 |
| Heavy Trucks Buses | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 8 | 0 |  |  | 8 |
| Pedestrians |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |
| Bicycles Scooters | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |

Comments:


Peak-Hour: 4:15 PM -- 5:15 PM
Peak 15-Min: 5:00 PM -- 5:15 PM


| 15-Min Count Period Beginning At | 9. Main Entry Access Rd (Northbound) |  |  |  | 9. Main Entry Access Rd (Southbound) |  |  |  | Tennyson Rd (Eastbound) |  |  |  | Tennyson Rd (Westbound) |  |  |  | Total | Hourly Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U |  |  |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 18 |  |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 13 |  |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 17 |  |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 65 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 68 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 64 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 59 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 57 |
| Peak 15-Min Flowrates | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Total |  |
|  | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U | Left | Thru | Right | U |  |  |  |
| All Vehicles | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 0 |  | 4 |
| Heavy Trucks Buses | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 4 | 0 |  |  | 4 |
| Pedestrians |  | 0 |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 4 |
| Bicycles Scooters | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |

Comments:




| Adjusted AM | AM Turning Mo | ent Counts - Ve | Volumes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intersection | ns \#6 and \#8 fron | previous projec | ith data from | m 2018 and | 2019- | other int | sections us | d March | 20 coun | with 15\% | crease in | olumes |  |  |
| ID | N -S STREET | E-W STREET | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR |
| 1 | Mission Blvd | Calhoun St | 10 | 1372 | 104 | 160 | 1829 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 159 | 0 | 25 |
| 2 | Mission Blvd | Hancock St | 15 | 1446 | 85 | 28 | 1902 | 24 | 85 | 22 | 6 | 125 | 39 | 35 |
| 3 | E 16th St | Hancock St | 36 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 100 | 91 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Whitman St | Tennyson Rd | 77 | 32 | 24 | 216 | 6 | 485 | 323 | 854 | 59 | 8 | 652 | 208 |
| 5 | E 12th St | Tennyson Rd | 214 | 32 | 112 | 10 | 58 | 139 | 138 | 593 | 335 | 94 | 451 | 5 |
| 6 | Mission Blvd | Tennyson Rd | 196 | 1287 | 0 | 8 | 1657 | 239 | 329 | 3 | 248 | 7 | 5 | 1 |
| 7 | Site Access | Tennyson Rd | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 0 |
|  | Mission Blvd | Valle Vista Ave | 71 | 1374 | 0 | 0 | 1912 | 39 | 16 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Adjusted PM Turning Movement Counts - Vehicle Volumes
Intersections \#6 and \#8 from previous projects with data from 2018 and 2019 - all other intersections used March 2020 counts with 5\% increase in volumes

| ID | N-S STREET | E-W STREET | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Mission Blvd | Calhoun St | 14 | 2043 | 12 | 74 | 1567 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 56 | 0 | 32 |
| 2 | Mission Blvd | Hancock St | 27 | 2006 | 36 | 69 | 1576 | 23 | 64 | 24 | 19 | 72 | 13 | 27 |
| 3 | E 16th St | Hancock St | 23 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 40 | 25 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 4 | Whitman St | Tennyson Rd | 29 | 8 | 7 | 93 | 8 | 265 | 455 | 834 | 42 | 14 | 753 | 155 |
| 5 | E 12th St | Tennyson Rd | 265 | 62 | 86 | 4 | 16 | 71 | 104 | 563 | 227 | 78 | 594 |  |
| 6 | Mission Blvd | Tennyson Rd | 380 | 1695 | 1 | 32 | 1198 | 328 | 352 | 4 | 248 | 9 | 17 |  |
| 7 | Site Access | Tennyson Rd | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 36 |  |
| 8 | Mission Blvd | Valle Vista Ave | 41 | 2035 | 0 | 0 | 1417 | 40 | 22 | 0 | 35 | 0 | 0 |  |

# Appendix 2 - 

## Existing Level of Service, Queuing, and Peak Hour Traffic Signal Warrants Worksheets

1: Mission Boulevard \& Driveway/Calhoun Street

|  |  | 4 |  |  | $\frac{1}{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 202 | 11 | 1622 | 176 | 2010 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.77 | 0.13 | 0.71 | 0.73 | 0.72 |
| Control Delay | 56.6 | 52.4 | 17.5 | 77.2 | 11.2 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 56.6 | 52.4 | 17.5 | 77.2 | 11.2 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 117 | 10 | 423 | 161 | 331 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 196 | m14 | 374 | 234 | 778 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) | 729 |  | 1333 |  | 1909 |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  | 90 |  | 275 |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 413 | 83 | 2277 | 275 | 2781 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.49 | 0.13 | 0.71 | 0.64 | 0.72 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |
| m Volume for 95th perc | ueue | metered | y upst | m sig |  |



2: Mission Boulevard \& Hancock Street

|  | $\rightarrow$ |  | 4 | $\dagger$ |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBT | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 133 | 234 | 18 | 1801 | 33 | 2266 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.55 | 0.86 | 0.25 | 0.74 | 0.39 | 0.90 |
| Control Delay | 59.8 | 82.1 | 73.6 | 21.9 | 84.4 | 19.8 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 59.8 | 82.1 | 73.6 | 22.2 | 84.4 | 19.8 |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) | 110 | 205 | 15 | 541 | 29 | 868 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 167 | 282 | m39 | 195 | m47 | \#488 |
| Internal Link Dist (tt) | 518 | 789 |  | 1040 |  | 1333 |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  | 240 |  | 200 |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 280 | 314 | 71 | 2422 | 87 | 2506 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 133 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.47 | 0.75 | 0.25 | 0.79 | 0.38 | 0.90 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.m Volume for 95 th percentile queue is metered by upstream signal. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | 4 | 7 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | 4 |  |  | ¢ |  | ${ }^{4}$ | 性 |  | \% | 性 |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 85 | 22 | 6 | 125 | 39 | 35 | 15 | 1446 | 85 | 28 | 1902 | 24 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 85 | 22 | 0 | 125 | 39 | 35 | 15 | 1446 | 85 | 28 | 1902 | 24 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 0.99 | 0.99 |  | 0.98 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1870 | 1900 | 1856 | 1781 | 1856 | 1841 | 1841 | 1856 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 100 | 26 | 7 | 147 | 46 | 41 | 18 | 1701 | 100 | 33 | 2238 | 28 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 0 |
| Cap, veh/h | 217 | 53 | 13 | 212 | 54 | 48 | 36 | 2373 | 138 | 54 | 2535 | 32 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.04 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.04 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 976 | 300 | 71 | 966 | 302 | 269 | 1697 | 3379 | 197 | 1753 | 3563 | 44 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 133 | 0 | 0 | 234 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 880 | 921 | 33 | 1104 | 1162 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 1347 | 0 | 0 | 1538 | 0 | 0 | 1697 | 1763 | 1813 | 1753 | 1763 | 1845 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 29.1 | 30.2 |
| Cycle Q Clear (g_c), s | 13.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 21.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 29.1 | 30.2 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.75 |  | 0.05 | 0.63 |  | 0.18 | 1.00 |  | 0.11 | 1.00 |  | 0.02 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 282 | 0 | 0 | 313 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 1238 | 1273 | 54 | 1254 | 1312 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.47 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.75 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.50 | 0.71 | 0.72 | 0.62 | 0.88 | 0.89 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 347 | 0 | 0 | 381 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 1238 | 1273 | 85 | 1254 | 1312 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 1.33 | 1.33 | 1.33 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.62 | 0.62 | 0.62 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 54.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 57.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 68.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 68.2 | 1.9 | 1.9 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.8 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 7.0 | 5.9 | 5.9 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 4.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 4.0 | 4.2 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 55.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 63.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 77.0 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 75.2 | 7.8 | 7.8 |
| LnGrp LOS | E | A | A | E | A | A | E | A | A | E | A | A |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 133 |  |  | 234 |  |  | 1819 |  |  | 2299 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 55.2 |  |  | 63.7 |  |  | 3.8 |  |  | 8.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | E |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s | 8.4 | 106.1 |  | 29.5 | 7.1 | 107.4 |  | 29.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc} \mathrm{c}$, s | 4.0 | 5.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 7.0 | 92.0 |  | 32.0 | 6.0 | 93.0 |  | 32.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s | 4.7 | 2.0 |  | 15.0 | 3.5 | 32.2 |  | 23.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.0 | 26.7 |  | 0.6 | 0.0 | 39.7 |  | 0.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl DelayHCM 6th LOS |  |  | 11.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 5.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | M |  |  | $\uparrow$ | a |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 91 | 8 | 36 | 8 | 5 | 100 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 91 | 8 | 36 | 8 | 5 | 100 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Mvmt Flow | 154 | 14 | 61 | 14 | 8 | 169 |



4: Beaton Way/Whitman Street \& Tennyson Road

|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | 7 | $\checkmark$ | 4 | $\dagger$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBT | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 363 | 960 | 66 | 9 | 733 | 234 | 150 | 243 | 7 | 545 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.81 | 0.46 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.65 | 0.42 | 0.39 | 0.82 | 0.01 | 0.66 |
| Control Delay | 49.9 | 11.5 | 4.0 | 48.5 | 29.7 | 11.2 | 31.1 | 55.5 | 27.8 | 17.2 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 49.9 | 11.5 | 4.0 | 48.5 | 29.7 | 11.2 | 31.1 | 55.5 | 27.8 | 17.2 |
| Queue Length 50th (t) | 205 | 145 | 3 | 5 | 201 | 32 | 69 | 136 | 3 | 171 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | \#410 | 264 | 24 | 23 | 271 | 94 | 139 | \#280 | 15 | 331 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 470 |  |  | 1481 |  | 548 |  | 469 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( t ) | 175 |  | 100 | 90 |  | 100 |  | 100 |  | 110 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 508 | 2149 | 937 | 514 | 1745 | 771 | 496 | 390 | 649 | 882 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.71 | 0.45 | 0.07 | 0.02 | 0.42 | 0.30 | 0.30 | 0.62 | 0.01 | 0.62 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | \% | 7 |  | 4 | 4 | 4 | 7 | - | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 个4 | " | \% | 个4 | \% |  | \$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 323 | 854 | 59 | - | 652 | 208 | 77 | 32 | 24 | 216 | 6 | 485 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 323 | 854 | 59 | 8 | 652 | 208 | 77 | 32 | 24 | 216 | 6 | 485 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 0.92 | 1.00 |  | 0.88 | 0.95 |  | 0.88 | 0.92 |  | 0.89 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1885 | 1826 | 1870 | 1900 | 1811 | 1885 | 1856 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1900 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 363 | 960 | 66 | 9 | 733 | 234 | 87 | 36 | 27 | 243 | 7 | 545 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | , | 5 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Cap, veh/h | 395 | 1911 | 802 | 24 | 1185 | 483 | 230 | 93 | 58 | 428 | 570 | 772 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.22 | 0.55 | 0.55 | 0.01 | 0.34 | 0.34 | 0.30 | 0.30 | 0.30 | 0.30 | 0.30 | 0.30 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1795 | 3469 | 1456 | 1810 | 3441 | 1402 | 578 | 310 | 195 | 1239 | 1900 | 1414 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 363 | 960 | 66 | 9 | 733 | 234 | 150 | 0 | 0 | 243 | 7 | 545 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 1795 | 1735 | 1456 | 1810 | 1721 | 1402 | 1083 | 0 | 0 | 1239 | 1900 | 1414 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 19.8 | 17.2 | 2.1 | 0.5 | 17.8 | 13.1 | 9.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.1 | 0.3 | 30.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear (g_c), s | 19.8 | 17.2 | 2.1 | 0.5 | 17.8 | 13.1 | 10.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 18.6 | 0.3 | 30.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.58 |  | 0.18 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 395 | 1911 | 802 | 24 | 1185 | 483 | 382 | 0 | 0 | 428 | 570 | 772 |
| VIC Ratio(X) | 0.92 | 0.50 | 0.08 | 0.37 | 0.62 | 0.48 | 0.39 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.57 | 0.01 | 0.71 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 449 | 1911 | 802 | 452 | 1548 | 631 | 382 | 0 | 0 | 428 | 570 | 772 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 38.2 | 14.0 | 10.6 | 48.9 | 27.3 | 25.8 | 27.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 31.3 | 24.6 | 18.8 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 21.3 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 3.6 | 1.9 | 2.7 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 2.5 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 10.8 | 6.4 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 7.6 | 4.7 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.3 | 0.1 | 10.0 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 59.5 | 14.7 | 10.7 | 52.5 | 29.2 | 28.5 | 28.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 32.4 | 24.6 | 21.3 |
| LnGrp LOS | E | B | B | D | C | C | C | A | A | C | C | C |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 1389 |  |  | 976 |  |  | 150 |  |  | 795 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 26.2 |  |  | 29.3 |  |  | 28.1 |  |  | 24.7 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s | 5.3 | 60.1 |  | 34.6 | 26.0 | 39.4 |  | 34.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $Y+R \mathrm{c}$ ), s | 4.0 | 5.0 |  | 4.6 | 4.0 | 5.0 |  | 4.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 25.0 | 45.0 |  | 30.0 | 25.0 | 45.0 |  | 30.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+1), s | 2.5 | 19.2 |  | 32.0 | 21.8 | 19.8 |  | 12.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.0 | 16.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.2 | 14.7 |  | 0.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrr Delay |  |  | 26.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes

User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.

5: Dixon Street/E 12th Street \& Tennyson Road

|  | $\rangle$ | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | $\dagger$ | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $\frac{1}{7}$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 160 | 690 | 390 | 109 | 530 | 249 | 167 | 78 | 162 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.54 | 0.63 | 0.62 | 0.46 | 0.52 | 0.86 | 0.47 | 0.69 | 0.27 |
| Control Delay | 42.6 | 29.1 | 15.5 | 43.8 | 28.8 | 68.0 | 17.3 | 70.7 | 3.9 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 42.6 | 29.1 | 15.5 | 43.8 | 28.8 | 68.0 | 17.3 | 70.7 | 3.9 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 84 | 173 | 74 | 57 | 130 | 139 | 22 | 42 | 3 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 151 | 234 | 160 | 114 | 187 | \#314 | 83 | \#130 | 28 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 1481 |  |  | 525 |  | 495 | 553 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (tt) | 125 |  | 80 | 130 |  | 100 |  |  | 100 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 494 | 1729 | 863 | 462 | 1726 | 288 | 359 | 113 | 765 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.32 | 0.40 | 0.45 | 0.24 | 0.31 | 0.86 | 0.47 | 0.69 | 0.21 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


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

Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.

6: Mission Boulevard \& Tennyson Road

|  | $\rangle$ | $\rightarrow$ |  |  | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 370 | 3 | 279 | 14 | 1 | 220 | 1446 | 9 | 1862 | 269 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.67 | 0.01 | 0.58 | 0.09 | 0.00 | 0.61 | 0.43 | 0.12 | 0.67 | 0.30 |
| Control Delay | 62.3 | 46.0 | 10.2 | 56.6 | 0.0 | 68.7 | 15.8 | 60.6 | 30.9 | 17.1 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 62.3 | 46.0 | 10.2 | 56.6 | 0.0 | 68.7 | 15.8 | 60.6 | 30.9 | 17.1 |
| Queue Length 50th ( t ) | 171 | 2 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 102 | 193 | 8 | 382 | 77 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 205 | 11 | 72 | 30 | 0 | \#201 | 485 | m10 | \#757 | m128 |
| Internal Link Dist (t) |  | 525 |  | 1121 |  |  | 1386 |  | 1040 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 335 |  | 225 |  | 315 | 520 |  | 230 |  | 210 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 771 | 435 | 564 | 423 | 426 | 358 | 3383 | 73 | 2793 | 907 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.48 | 0.01 | 0.49 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.61 | 0.43 | 0.12 | 0.67 | 0.30 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| m Volume for 95 th percentile queue is metered by upstream signal. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  | 4 | 4 | $p$ |  | $\frac{1}{7}$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7} 1$ | 4 | 「 |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 | ${ }^{4} 1$ | 恌 |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 444 | 「 |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 329 | 3 | 248 | 7 | 5 | 1 | 196 | 1287 | 0 | 8 | 1657 | 239 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 329 | 3 | 248 | 7 | 5 | 1 | 196 | 1287 | 0 | 8 | 1657 | 239 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 0.99 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1841 | 1900 | 1841 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1811 | 1856 | 1900 | 1811 | 1870 | 1856 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 370 | 3 | 279 | 8 | 6 | 1 | 220 | 1446 | 0 | 9 | 1862 | 269 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 3 |
| Cap，veh／h | 688 | 384 | 313 | 45 | 34 | 66 | 209 | 3126 | 0 | 22 | 2896 | 876 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.06 | 0.62 | 0.00 | 0.03 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 3401 | 1900 | 1546 | 1056 | 792 | 1543 | 3346 | 5233 | 0 | 1725 | 5106 | 1545 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 370 | 3 | 279 | 14 | 0 | 1 | 220 | 1446 | 0 | 9 | 1862 | 269 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1700 | 1900 | 1546 | 1847 | 0 | 1543 | 1673 | 1689 | 0 | 1725 | 1702 | 1545 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 14.0 | 0.2 | 25.3 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 9.0 | 22.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 14.0 | 0.2 | 25.3 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 9.0 | 22.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.57 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 688 | 384 | 313 | 79 | 0 | 66 | 209 | 3126 | 0 | 22 | 2896 | 876 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.54 | 0.01 | 0.89 | 0.18 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 1.05 | 0.46 | 0.00 | 0.41 | 0.64 | 0.31 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 779 | 435 | 354 | 423 | 0 | 354 | 209 | 3126 | 0 | 72 | 2896 | 876 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Upstream Filter（I） | 0.74 | 0.74 | 0.74 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.00 | 0.31 | 0.31 | 0.31 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 51.4 | 45.9 | 55.9 | 66.4 | 0.0 | 66.0 | 67.5 | 14.8 | 0.0 | 69.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 0.5 | 0.0 | 17.3 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 72.4 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 6.1 | 0.1 | 11.4 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.9 | 8.2 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 51.9 | 45.9 | 73.2 | 67.5 | 0.0 | 66.1 | 139.9 | 15.2 | 0.0 | 73.5 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| LnGrp LOS | D | D | E | E | A | E | F | B | A | E | A | A |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 652 |  |  | 15 |  |  | 1666 |  |  | 2140 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 61.0 |  |  | 67.4 |  |  | 31.7 |  |  | 0.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | E |  |  | C |  |  | A |  |
| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration（G＋Y＋Rc），s | 13.0 | 86.7 |  | 10.2 | 5.8 | 93.8 |  | 34.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period（ $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ），s | 4.0 | 5.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 9.0 | 51.0 |  | 33.0 | 6.0 | 54.0 |  | 33.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 11.0 | 2.0 |  | 3.1 | 2.7 | 24.0 |  | 27.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.0 | 25.1 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 12.3 |  | 1.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay |  |  | 21.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

7: Tennyson Road \& Main Entry Access Road

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement EBL | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations |  | ${ }_{*} 1$ | $\dagger$ |  | * |  |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 39 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 39 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Sign Control F | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |  |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |  |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |  |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 6 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 62 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |



8: Mission Boulevard \& Valle Vista

|  | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | NBL | NBT | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 52 | 80 | 1544 | 2192 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.47 | 0.67 | 0.49 | 0.78 |
| Control Delay | 43.1 | 91.0 | 2.3 | 10.7 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 43.1 | 91.0 | 2.3 | 10.7 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 17 | 73 | 103 | 580 |
| Queue Length 95th (tt) | 60 | \#170 | 171 | 641 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) | 364 |  | 816 | 1386 |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  | 225 |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 323 | 120 | 3168 | 2828 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.16 | 0.67 | 0.49 | 0.78 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longerQueue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |



## Notes

User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.

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


KITTELSON \& ASSOCIATES, INC.
610 SW Alder, Suite 700
Portland, Oregon 97205
(503) 228-5230

| Project \#: | 24641 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: | Hayward Parcel 3 Entitlements |  |  |
| Analyst: | MZS |  |  |
| Date: | 1/19/2021 |  |  |
| e: | H:\<4\<4641- Hayward Parcel 3 |  |  |
|  | Entitlements\analysis\LTA\Signal |  |  |
| Intersection: Scenario: | Warrants\「Existine intersection 3 AM.xlsmlWar \#3 - <br> 3. East 16th Street \& Hancock Street |  |  |
|  | Existing AM |  |  |
| Warrant Summary |  |  |  |
| Warrant | Name | Analyzed? | Met? |
| \#1 | Eight-Hour Vehicular Volume | Yes | No |
| \#2 | Four-Hour Vehicular volume | Yes | No |
| \#3 | Peak Hour | Yes | No |
| \#4 | Pedestrian Volume | No | - |
| \#5 | School Crossing | No | - |
| \#6 | Coordinated Signal System | No | - |
| \#7 | Crash Experience | No | - |
| \#8 | Roadway Network | No | - |
| \#9 | Intersection Near a Grade Crossing | No | - |

Analysis Traffic Volumes

| Major Street |  | Minor Street |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NB | SB | EB | WB |
| 44 | 106 | 99 | 0 |
| 42 | 100 | 94 | 0 |
| 41 | 99 | 92 | 0 |
| 39 | 95 | 88 | 0 |
| 39 | 93 | 87 | 0 |
| 39 | 93 | 87 | 0 |
| 37 | 89 | 83 | 0 |
| 36 | 88 | 82 | 0 |
| 35 | 85 | 79 | 0 |
| 33 | 79 | 74 | 0 |
| 32 | 76 | 71 | 0 |
| 31 | 75 | 70 | 0 |
| 30 | 72 | 67 | 0 |
| 26 | 62 | 58 | 0 |
| 21 | 49 | 46 | 0 |
| 19 | 47 | 44 | 0 |
| 13 | 33 | 30 | 0 |
| 11 | 27 | 25 | 0 |
| 6 | 14 | 13 | 0 |
| 4 | 10 | 9 | 0 |
| 4 | 8 | 8 | 0 |
| 2 | 6 | 5 | 0 |
| 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |

## Input Parameters

| Volume Adjustment Factor = | 1.0 |
| :--- | :---: |
| North-South Approach = | Major |
| East-West Approach = | Minor |
| Major Street Thru Lanes = | 1 |
| Minor Street Thru Lanes = | 1 |
| Speed > 40 mph? | No |
| Population < 10,000? | No |
| Warrant Factor | $100 \%$ |
| Peak Hour or Daily Count? | Peak Hour |
|  |  |
| Major Street: 4 4th-Highest Hour / Peak Hour | $89 \%$ |
| Major Street: 8 th-Highest Hour / Peak Hour | $83 \%$ |
| Minor Street: 4 4th-Highest Hour / Peak Hour | $89 \%$ |
| Minor Street: 8 8th-Highest Hour / Peak Hour | $83 \%$ |




KITTELSON \& ASSOCIATES, INC.
610 SW Alder, Suite 700
Portland, Oregon 97205
(503) 228-5230

| Project \#: | 24641 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: | Hayward Parcel 3 Entitlements |  |  |
| Analyst: | MZS |  |  |
| Date: | 1/19/2021 |  |  |
| e: | H: \<4\<4641- Hayward Parcel 3 |  |  |
|  | Entitlements\analysis\LTA\Signal |  |  |
| Intersection: Scenario: | Warrants\IExisting intersection 3 AM.xlsmlWar \#3 7. Site Access Road \& Tennyson Road |  |  |
|  | Existing AM |  |  |
| Warrant Summary |  |  |  |
| Warrant | Name | Analyzed? | Met? |
| \#1 | Eight-Hour Vehicular Volume | Yes | No |
| \#2 | Four-Hour Vehicular volume | Yes | No |
| \#3 | Peak Hour | Yes | No |
| \#4 | Pedestrian Volume | No | - |
| \#5 | School Crossing | No | - |
| \#6 | Coordinated Signal System | No | - |
| \#7 | Crash Experience | No | - |
| \#8 | Roadway Network | No | - |
| \#9 | Intersection Near a Grade Crossing | No | - |

Analysis Traffic Volumes
Major Street Minor Street

| Begin | End | EB | WB | NB |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7:15 AM $8: 15$ AM | 39 | 45 | 0 | SB |
| 2nd Highest Hour | 37 | 43 | 0 | 0 |
| 3rd Highest Hour | 36 | 42 | 0 | 0 |
| 4th Highest Hour | 35 | 40 | 0 | 0 |
| 5th Highest Hour | 34 | 40 | 0 | 0 |
| 6th Highest Hour | 34 | 40 | 0 | 0 |
| 7th Highest Hour | 33 | 38 | 0 | 0 |
| 8th Highest Hour | 32 | 37 | 0 | 0 |
| 9th Highest Hour | 31 | 36 | 0 | 0 |
| 10th Highest Hour | 29 | 34 | 0 | 0 |
| 11th Highest Hour | 28 | 32 | 0 | 0 |
| 12th Highest Hour | 28 | 32 | 0 | 0 |
| 13th Highest Hour | 27 | 31 | 0 | 0 |
| 14th Highest Hour | 23 | 26 | 0 | 0 |
| 15th Highest Hour | 18 | 21 | 0 | 0 |
| 16th Highest Hour | 17 | 20 | 0 | 0 |
| 17th Highest Hour | 12 | 14 | 0 | 0 |
| 18th Highest Hour | 10 | 11 | 0 | 0 |
| 19th Highest Hour | 5 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| 20th Highest Hour | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 21st Highest Hour | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 22nd Highest Hour | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 23rd Highest Hour | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 24th Highest Hour | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

## Input Parameters

| Volume Adjustment Factor = | 1.0 |
| :--- | :---: |
| North-South Approach = | Minor |
| East-West Approach = | Major |
| Major Street Thru Lanes = | 1 |
| Minor Street Thru Lanes = | 1 |
| Speed > 40 mph? | No |
| Population < 10,000? | No |
| Warrant Factor | $100 \%$ |
| Peak Hour or Daily Count? | Peak Hour |
|  |  |
| Major Street: 4 4th-Highest Hour / Peak Hour | $89 \%$ |
| Major Street: 8 8th-Highest Hour / Peak Hour | $83 \%$ |
| Minor Street: 4 4th-Highest Hour / Peak Hour | $89 \%$ |
| Minor Street: 8 8th-Highest Hour / Peak Hour | $83 \%$ |



1: Mission Boulevard \& Driveway/Calhoun Street

|  | $\cdots$ |  | 4 |  | ( | $\frac{1}{\dagger}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBR | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 2 | 94 | 15 | 2210 | 80 | 1685 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.01 | 0.61 | 0.18 | 0.81 | 0.55 | 0.56 |
| Control Delay | 0.0 | 54.6 | 61.3 | 8.8 | 80.9 | 5.5 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 0.0 | 54.6 | 61.3 | 8.8 | 80.9 | 5.5 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 0 | 50 | 15 | 251 | 78 | 153 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 0 | 109 | m19 | 380 | 133 | 421 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 729 |  | 1334 |  | 1909 |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  | 90 |  | 275 |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 385 | 354 | 82 | 2732 | 150 | 3007 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.01 | 0.27 | 0.18 | 0.81 | 0.53 | 0.56 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| m Volume for 95th percentile queue is metered by upstream signal. |  |  |  |  |  |  |



|  | $\rightarrow$ |  | 4 | $\dagger$ |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBT | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 111 | 115 | 28 | 2105 | 71 | 1649 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.69 | 0.74 | 0.30 | 0.81 | 0.52 | 0.60 |
| Control Delay | 82.0 | 85.8 | 90.5 | 21.7 | 84.1 | 6.5 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 82.0 | 85.8 | 90.5 | 23.3 | 84.1 | 6.5 |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) | 102 | 103 | 25 | 886 | 72 | 210 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 164 | 168 | m57 | 1242 | 129 | 213 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) | 518 | 789 |  | 1040 |  | 1334 |
| Turn Bay Length ( ft ) |  |  | 240 |  | 200 |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 290 | 278 | 94 | 2586 | 141 | 2764 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 295 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.38 | 0.41 | 0.30 | 0.92 | 0.50 | 0.60 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | $\cdots$ | 7 |  | 4 | 4 | 4 | $p$ |  | $\dagger$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\leqslant$ |  |  | \& |  | \% | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | \% | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 64 | 24 | 19 | 72 | 13 | 27 | 27 | 2006 | 36 | 69 | 1576 | 23 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 64 | 24 | 19 | 72 | 13 | 27 | 27 | 2006 | 36 | 69 | 1576 | 23 |
| Initial Q (Qb), veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 0.99 |  | 0.97 | 0.99 |  | 0.98 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1870 | 1841 | 1900 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1900 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 66 | 25 | 20 | 74 | 13 | 28 | 28 | 2068 | 37 | 71 | 1625 | 24 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 2 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Cap, veh/h | 135 | 50 | 32 | 145 | 29 | 43 | 49 | 2672 | 48 | 89 | 2761 | 41 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.05 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.10 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 793 | 405 | 263 | 864 | 232 | 353 | 1810 | 3597 | 64 | 1810 | 3611 | 53 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 111 | 0 | 0 | 115 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 1026 | 1079 | 71 | 805 | 844 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s), veh/h/ln | 1461 | 0 | 0 | 1449 | 0 | 0 | 1810 | 1791 | 1870 | 1810 | 1791 | 1873 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 11.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.59 |  | 0.18 | 0.64 |  | 0.24 | 1.00 |  | 0.03 | 1.00 |  | 0.03 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 217 | 0 | 0 | 217 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 1330 | 1389 | 89 | 1369 | 1432 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.51 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.53 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.57 | 0.77 | 0.78 | 0.80 | 0.59 | 0.59 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 342 | 0 | 0 | 343 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 1330 | 1389 | 106 | 1369 | 1432 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Upstream Filter(I) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.82 | 0.82 | 0.82 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 63.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 63.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 71.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 68.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.1 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 24.7 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 4.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 3.2 | 0.6 | 0.6 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 65.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 65.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 79.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 92.9 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| LnGrp LOS | E | A | A | E | A | A | E | A | A | F | A | A |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 111 |  |  | 115 |  |  | 2133 |  |  | 1720 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 65.3 |  |  | 65.8 |  |  | 4.6 |  |  | 5.3 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | E |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s | 11.5 | 118.7 |  | 22.8 | 8.2 | 122.0 |  | 22.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ) , $s$ | 4.0 | 5.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 9.0 | 99.0 |  | 32.0 | 6.0 | 102.0 |  | 32.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s | 7.9 | 2.0 |  | 13.0 | 4.3 | 2.0 |  | 13.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.0 | 41.7 |  | 0.5 | 0.0 | 21.2 |  | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay |  |  | 8.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 5.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBR | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | Mr |  |  | $\uparrow$ | S |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 25 | 49 | 23 | 4 | 3 | 40 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 25 | 49 | 23 | 4 | 3 | 40 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 | 98 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 2 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 26 | 50 | 23 | 4 | 3 | 41 |



4: Beaton Way/Whitman Street \& Tennyson Road

|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | 7 | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBT | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 474 | 869 | 44 | 15 | 784 | 161 | 45 | 97 | 8 | 276 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.74 | 0.32 | 0.04 | 0.11 | 0.63 | 0.29 | 0.19 | 0.46 | 0.03 | 0.35 |
| Control Delay | 33.8 | 5.3 | 1.7 | 38.2 | 22.7 | 9.1 | 29.1 | 39.3 | 30.5 | 10.5 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 33.8 | 5.3 | 1.7 | 38.2 | 22.7 | 9.1 | 29.1 | 39.3 | 30.5 | 10.5 |
| Queue Length 50th (t) | 196 | 57 | 0 | 7 | 156 | 18 | 16 | 43 | 3 | 53 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | \#451 | 166 | 10 | 28 | 234 | 62 | 49 | 98 | 16 | 124 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 459 |  |  | 1481 |  | 548 |  | 469 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( t ) | 175 |  | 100 | 90 |  | 100 |  | 100 |  | 110 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 637 | 2685 | 1131 | 554 | 2251 | 921 | 611 | 571 | 719 | 787 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.74 | 0.32 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.35 | 0.17 | 0.07 | 0.17 | 0.01 | 0.35 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | \% | 7 | $\leftarrow$ | 4 | 4 | 4 | 7 |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \% | 个4 | " | \% | 个4 | " |  | $\dagger$ |  | \% | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 455 | 834 | 42 | 14 | 753 | 155 | 29 | 8 | 7 | 93 | 8 | 265 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 455 | 834 | 42 | 14 | 753 | 155 | 29 | 8 | 7 | 93 | 8 | 265 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 0.93 | 1.00 |  | 0.90 | 0.98 |  | 0.97 | 0.97 |  | 0.97 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1900 | 1870 | 1826 | 1678 | 1870 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1693 | 1885 | 1722 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 474 | 869 | 44 | 15 | 784 | 161 | 30 | 8 | 7 | 97 | 8 | 276 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 2 | 5 | 15 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 1 | 12 | 1 |
| Cap, veh/h | 506 | 2258 | 912 | 33 | 1339 | 545 | 215 | 57 | 37 | 349 | 323 | 737 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.28 | 0.64 | 0.64 | 0.02 | 0.38 | 0.38 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.19 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1810 | 3554 | 1435 | 1598 | 3554 | 1447 | 778 | 302 | 199 | 1370 | 1722 | 1549 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 474 | 869 | 44 | 15 | 784 | 161 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 97 | 8 | 276 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 1810 | 1777 | 1435 | 1598 | 1777 | 1447 | 1279 | 0 | 0 | 1370 | 1722 | 1549 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 22.3 | 10.3 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 15.4 | 6.8 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.6 | 0.3 | 10.1 |
| Cycle Q Clear (g_c), s | 22.3 | 10.3 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 15.4 | 6.8 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.8 | 0.3 | 10.1 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.67 |  | 0.16 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 506 | 2258 | 912 | 33 | 1339 | 545 | 309 | 0 | 0 | 349 | 323 | 737 |
| VIC Ratio(X) | 0.94 | 0.38 | 0.05 | 0.45 | 0.59 | 0.30 | 0.15 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.28 | 0.02 | 0.37 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 519 | 2258 | 912 | 458 | 1835 | 747 | 503 | 0 | 0 | 564 | 593 | 980 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 30.6 | 7.7 | 6.0 | 42.2 | 21.7 | 19.0 | 29.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 30.6 | 28.9 | 15.1 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 24.0 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 3.4 | 1.5 | 1.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 12.6 | 3.4 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 6.5 | 2.4 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 0.1 | 3.5 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 54.7 | 8.1 | 6.1 | 45.6 | 23.2 | 20.1 | 29.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 30.7 | 28.9 | 15.2 |
| LnGrp LOS | D | A | A | D | C | C | C | A | A | C | C | B |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 1387 |  |  | 960 |  |  | 45 |  |  | 381 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 23.9 |  |  | 23.0 |  |  | 29.6 |  |  | 19.4 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | B |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s | 5.8 | 60.4 |  | 20.9 | 28.4 | 37.8 |  | 20.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $Y+R \mathrm{c}$ ), s | 4.0 | 5.0 |  | 4.6 | 4.0 | 5.0 |  | 4.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 25.0 | 45.0 |  | 30.0 | 25.0 | 45.0 |  | 30.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+1), s | 2.8 | 12.3 |  | 12.1 | 24.3 | 17.4 |  | 4.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.0 | 16.5 |  | 0.7 | 0.1 | 15.5 |  | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrr Delay |  |  | 23.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes

User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.

5: Dixon Street/E 12th Street \& Tennyson Road

|  | $\rangle$ | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | 7 | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $\frac{1}{7}$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 109 | 593 | 239 | 82 | 631 | 279 | 156 | 21 | 75 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.35 | 0.49 | 0.40 | 0.29 | 0.54 | 0.64 | 0.35 | 0.09 | 0.18 |
| Control Delay | 31.5 | 20.3 | 9.9 | 32.0 | 21.8 | 36.9 | 22.7 | 32.6 | 4.1 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 31.5 | 20.3 | 9.9 | 32.0 | 21.8 | 36.9 | 22.7 | 32.6 | 4.1 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 34 | 84 | 19 | 25 | 93 | 87 | 30 | 6 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 104 | 186 | 89 | 84 | 206 | \#316 | 117 | 33 | 18 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 1481 |  |  | 525 |  | 495 | 553 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (tt) | 125 |  | 80 | 130 |  | 100 |  |  | 100 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 717 | 2597 | 1099 | 710 | 2593 | 438 | 441 | 366 | 771 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.15 | 0.23 | 0.22 | 0.12 | 0.24 | 0.64 | 0.35 | 0.06 | 0.10 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


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

Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.

6: Mission Boulevard \& Tennyson Road

|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | * | 4 | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 359 | 4 | 253 | 26 | 2 | 388 | 1731 | 33 | 1222 | 335 |
| $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio | 0.68 | 0.01 | 0.56 | 0.18 | 0.01 | 0.80 | 0.53 | 0.39 | 0.45 | 0.35 |
| Control Delay | 67.3 | 50.5 | 10.7 | 63.5 | 0.0 | 81.9 | 17.6 | 76.1 | 29.0 | 13.5 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 67.3 | 50.5 | 10.7 | 63.5 | 0.0 | 81.9 | 17.7 | 76.1 | 29.0 | 13.5 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 177 | 3 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 211 | 236 | 33 | 226 | 37 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 215 | 14 | 77 | 49 | 0 | 258 | 567 | m59 | 424 | 173 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 525 |  | 1123 |  |  | 1386 |  | 1040 |  |
| Turn Bay Length ( t ) | 335 |  | 225 |  | 315 | 520 |  | 230 |  | 210 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 747 | 409 | 534 | 387 | 424 | 541 | 3291 | 85 | 2714 | 946 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 193 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.48 | 0.01 | 0.47 | 0.07 | 0.00 | 0.72 | 0.56 | 0.39 | 0.45 | 0.35 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


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

7: Tennyson Road \& Main Entry Access Road

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | -1 | T |  | Mr |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 36 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 36 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 81 | 81 | 81 | 81 | 81 | 81 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 44 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 |



8: Mission Boulevard \& Valle Vista

|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | NBL | NBT | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 59 | 43 | 2120 | 1518 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.48 | 0.43 | 0.65 | 0.51 |
| Control Delay | 45.7 | 82.3 | 3.4 | 7.0 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 45.7 | 82.3 | 3.4 | 7.0 |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) | 23 | 42 | 202 | 141 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 71 | 85 | 328 | 248 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) | 364 |  | 816 | 1386 |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  | 225 |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 347 | 112 | 3243 | 2983 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.17 | 0.38 | 0.65 | 0.51 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |



## Notes

User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.

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


KITTELSON \& ASSOCIATES, INC.
610 SW Alder, Suite 700
Portland, Oregon 97205
(503) 228-5230

| Project \#: | 24641 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: | Hayward Parcel 3 Entitlements |  |  |
| Analyst: | MZS |  |  |
| Date: | 1/19/2021 |  |  |
| File: | H: \<4\<24641- Hayward Parcel 3 |  |  |
|  | Entitlements\analysis\LTA\Signal |  |  |
| Intersection: | Warrants\IExisting intersection 3 AM.xlsmlWar \#3 - <br> 3. East 16th Street \& Hancock Street |  |  |
| Scenario: | Existing PM |  |  |
| Warrant Summary |  |  |  |
| Warrant | Name | Analyzed? | Met? |
| \#1 | Eight-Hour Vehicular Volume | Yes | No |
| \#2 | Four-Hour Vehicular volume | Yes | No |
| \#3 | Peak Hour | Yes | No |
| \#4 | Pedestrian Volume | No | - |
| \#5 | School Crossing | No | - |
| \#6 | Coordinated Signal System | No | - |
| \#7 | Crash Experience | No | - |
| \#8 | Roadway Network | No | - |
| \#9 | Intersection Near a Grade Crossing | No | - |

Analysis Traffic Volumes
Major Street Minor Street

| Hour |  | Major Street |  | Minor Street |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Begin | End | NB | SB | EB |  |

## Input Parameters

| Volume Adjustment Factor = | 1.0 |
| :--- | :---: |
| North-South Approach = | Major |
| East-West Approach = | Minor |
| Major Street Thru Lanes = | 1 |
| Minor Street Thru Lanes = | 1 |
| Speed > 40 mph? | No |
| Population < 10,000? | No |
| Warrant Factor | $100 \%$ |
| Peak Hour or Daily Count? | Peak Hour |
|  |  |
| Major Street: 4 4th-Highest Hour / Peak Hour | $89 \%$ |
| Major Street: 8 th-Highest Hour / Peak Hour | $83 \%$ |
| Minor Street: 4 4th-Highest Hour / Peak Hour | $89 \%$ |
| Minor Street: 8 8th-Highest Hour / Peak Hour | $83 \%$ |




KITTELSON \& ASSOCIATES, INC.
610 SW Alder, Suite 700
Portland, Oregon 97205
(503) 228-5230

| Project \#: | 24641 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: | Hayward Parcel 3 Entitlements |  |  |
| Analyst: | MZS |  |  |
| Date: | 1/19/2021 |  |  |
| e: | H: \<4\<4641- Hayward Parcel 3 |  |  |
|  | Entitlements\analysis\LTA\Signal |  |  |
| Intersection: Scenario: | Warrants\IExisting intersection 3 AM.xlsmlWar \#3 7. Site Access Road \& Tennyson Road |  |  |
|  | Existing PM |  |  |
| Warrant Summary |  |  |  |
| Warrant | Name | Analyzed? | Met? |
| \#1 | Eight-Hour Vehicular Volume | Yes | No |
| \#2 | Four-Hour Vehicular volume | Yes | No |
| \#3 | Peak Hour | Yes | No |
| \#4 | Pedestrian Volume | No | - |
| \#5 | School Crossing | No | - |
| \#6 | Coordinated Signal System | No | - |
| \#7 | Crash Experience | No | - |
| \#8 | Roadway Network | No | - |
| \#9 | Intersection Near a Grade Crossing | No | - |

Analysis Traffic Volumes
Major Street Minor Street

| Begin | End | EB | WB | NB |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 4:15 PM $5: 15$ PM | 36 | 36 | 0 | 0 |
| 2nd Highest Hour | 34 | 34 | 0 | 0 |
| 3rd Highest Hour | 34 | 34 | 0 | 0 |
| 4th Highest Hour | 32 | 32 | 0 | 0 |
| 5th Highest Hour | 32 | 32 | 0 | 0 |
| 6th Highest Hour | 32 | 32 | 0 | 0 |
| 7th Highest Hour | 30 | 30 | 0 | 0 |
| 8th Highest Hour | 30 | 30 | 0 | 0 |
| 9th Highest Hour | 29 | 29 | 0 | 0 |
| 10th Highest Hour | 27 | 27 | 0 | 0 |
| 11th Highest Hour | 26 | 26 | 0 | 0 |
| 12th Highest Hour | 25 | 25 | 0 | 0 |
| 13th Highest Hour | 24 | 24 | 0 | 0 |
| 14th Highest Hour | 21 | 21 | 0 | 0 |
| 15th Highest Hour | 17 | 17 | 0 | 0 |
| 16th Highest Hour | 16 | 16 | 0 | 0 |
| 17th Highest Hour | 11 | 11 | 0 | 0 |
| 18th Highest Hour | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 |
| 19th Highest Hour | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| 20th Highest Hour | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 21st Highest Hour | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 22nd Highest Hour | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 23rd Highest Hour | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 24th Highest Hour | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

## Input Parameters

| Volume Adjustment Factor = | 1.0 |
| :--- | :---: |
| North-South Approach = | Minor |
| East-West Approach = | Major |
| Major Street Thru Lanes = | 1 |
| Minor Street Thru Lanes = | 1 |
| Speed > 40 mph? | No |
| Population < 10,000? | No |
| Warrant Factor | $100 \%$ |
| Peak Hour or Daily Count? | Peak Hour |
|  |  |
| Major Street: 4 4th-Highest Hour / Peak Hour | $89 \%$ |
| Major Street: 8 8th-Highest Hour / Peak Hour | $83 \%$ |
| Minor Street: 4 4th-Highest Hour / Peak Hour | $89 \%$ |
| Minor Street: 8 8th-Highest Hour / Peak Hour | $83 \%$ |



## Appendix 3 - Intersection <br> Queuing Analysis <br> Spreadsheet

| \# | Intersection | Control | Movement |  | Storage | Existing |  |  |  | Existing Plus Project |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { AM Queue } \\ \text { (ft.) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Exceed } \\ \text { Storage? } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { PM Queue } \\ (\mathrm{ft.} \text { ) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Exceed } \\ \text { Storage? } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { AM Queue } \\ \text { (ft.) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Exceed } \\ & \text { Storase? } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PM Queue } \\ \text { (ft.) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Exceed } \\ & \text { Storage? } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1 | Mission Boulevard \& Calhoun Street | Signal | NB | Left |  | 95 | <25[b] |  | <25 [b] |  | <25[b] |  | <25 [b] |  |
|  |  |  |  | Thru/Right | 145 | 374 | Yes | 380 | Yes | 571 | Yes | 391 | Yes |
|  |  |  | SB | Left | 175 | 234 | Yes | 133 |  | 234 | Yes | 133 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Thru/Right | 175 | 778 | Yes | 421 | Yes | 894 | Yes | 437 | Yes |
|  |  |  | EB | R1ght | 155 | <25 |  | <25 |  | <25 |  | <25 |  |
|  |  |  | wB | Left/Thru/Right | 510 | 196 |  | 109 |  | 196 |  | 109 |  |
| 2 | Mission Boulevard \& Hancock Street | Signal | nв | Left | 240 | 39 [b] |  | 57 [b] |  | 26 [b] |  | 54 [b] |  |
|  |  |  |  | Thru/Right | 1,055 | 195 |  | 1,242 | Yes | 215 |  | 1,265 | Yes |
|  |  |  | SB | Left | 195 | 47 [b] |  | 129 |  | 57 [b] |  | 178 [c] |  |
|  |  |  |  | Thru/Right | 1,315 | 488 [c] |  | 213 |  | 1257 [c] |  | 214 |  |
|  |  |  | ев | Left/Thru/Right | 185 | 167 |  | 164 |  | 168 |  | 159 |  |
|  |  |  | wB | Left/Thru/Right | 780 | 282 |  | 168 |  | 402 [c] |  | 201 |  |
| 3 | East 16th Street \& Hancock Street [a] | TwSC | NB | Left/Thru/Right | 460 | <25 |  | <25 |  | <25 |  | <25 |  |
|  |  |  | SB | Left/Thru/Right | 345 | N/A |  | N/A |  | <25 |  | $<25$ |  |
|  |  |  | EB | Left/Thru/Right | 780 | <25 |  | <25 |  | 38 |  | <25 |  |
|  |  |  | wB | Left/Thru/Right | 75 | N/A |  | N/A |  | <25 |  | <25 |  |
| 4 | Whitman Street/Beatron Way \& Tennyson Road | Signal | Nв | Left/Thru/Right | 110 | 139 | Yes | 49 |  | 145 | Yes | 50 |  |
|  |  |  | SB | Left | 100 | 280 [c] | Yes | 98 |  | 295 [c] | Yes | 100 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Thru | 275 | $<25$ |  | <25 |  | <25 |  | $<25$ |  |
|  |  |  |  | Right | 100 | 331 | Yes | 124 | Yes | 365 | Yes | 129 | Yes |
|  |  |  | Eв | Left | 175 | 410 [c] | Yes | 451 [c] | Yes | 432 [c] | Yes | 464 [c] | Yes |
|  |  |  |  | Thru | 425 | 264 |  | 166 |  | 287 |  | 171 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Right | 105 | <25 |  | <25 |  | <25 |  | <25 |  |
|  |  |  | wB | Left | 90 | <25 |  | 28 |  | <25 |  | 28 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Thru | 265 | 271 | Yes | 234 |  | 298 | Yes | 240 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Right | 95 | 94 |  | 62 |  | 101 | Yes | 62 |  |
| 5 | East 12th Street/Dixon Street \& Tennyson Road | Signal | NB | Left | 100 | 314 [c] | Yes | 316 [c] | Yes | 334 [c] | Yes | 320 [c] | Yes |
|  |  |  |  | Thru/Right | 170 | 83 |  | 117 |  | 89 |  | 118 |  |
|  |  |  | sb | Left/Thru | 275 | 130 [c] |  | 33 |  | 139 [c] |  | 33 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Right | 95 | 28 |  | <25 |  | 40 |  | $<25$ |  |
|  |  |  | Eb | Left | 120 | 151 | Yes | 104 |  | 158 | Yes | 105 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Thru | 1,020 | 234 |  | 186 |  | 264 |  | 192 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Right | 80 | 160 | Yes | 89 | Yes | 175 | Yes | 92 | Yes |
|  |  |  | wB | Left | 125 | 114 |  | 84 |  | 124 |  | 86 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Thru/Right | 160 | 187 | Yes | 206 | Yes | 213 | Yes | 212 | Yes |
| 6 | Mission Boulevard \& Tennyson Road | Signal | NB | Left | 515 | 201 [c] |  | 258 |  | 201 [c] |  | 259 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Thru/Right | 1,320 | 485 |  | 567 |  | 521 |  | 575 |  |
|  |  |  | SB | Left | 235 | <25[b] |  | 59 [b] |  | 167 [b] [c] |  | 72 [b] |  |
|  |  |  |  | Thru | 490 | 757 [c] | Yes | 424 |  | 690 [b] [c] | Yes | 417 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Right | 210 | 128 [b] |  | 173 |  | $113[\mathrm{b]}$ |  | 181 |  |
|  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {eb }}$ | Left | 465 | 205 |  | 215 |  | 207 |  | 223 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Thru | 465 | $<25$ |  | <25 |  | 95 |  | $<25$ |  |
|  |  |  |  | Right | 215 | 72 |  | 77 |  | 72 |  | 77 |  |
|  |  |  | wB | Left/Thru | 1,115 | 30 |  | 49 |  | 173 |  | 75 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Right | 315 | <25 |  | <25 |  | 46 |  | <25 |  |
| 7 | Site Access Road \& Tennyson Road | TwSC | SB | Left/R/ight | 115 | <25 |  | <25 |  | 35 |  | <25 |  |
|  |  |  | ев | Left/Thru | 1,115 | <25 |  | $<25$ |  | $<25$ |  | <25 |  |
| 8 | Mission Boulevard \& Valle Vista Avenue | Signal | nв | Left | 225 | 170 [c] |  | 85 |  | 170 [c] |  | 85 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Thru | 1,075 | 171 |  | 328 |  | 187 |  | 337 |  |
|  |  |  | SB | Thru/Right | 390 | 641 | Yes | 248 |  | 710 | Yes | 254 |  |
|  |  |  | EB | Left/R/ight | 80 | 60 |  | 71 |  | 60 |  | 71 |  |


| Project Contribution |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AM Queue | AM Cars | PM Queue | PM Cars |
| -2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 197 | 8 | 11 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 116 | 5 | 16 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| -13 | -1 | -3 | 0 |
| 20 | 1 | 23 | 1 |
| 10 | 0 | 49 | 2 |
| 769 | 31 | 1 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | -5 | 0 |
| 120 | 5 | 33 | 1 |
| 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 15 | 1 | 8 | 0 |
| 8 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 15 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 34 | 1 | 5 | 0 |
| 22 | 1 | 13 | 1 |
| 23 | 1 | 5 | 0 |
| -1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 27 | 1 | 6 | 0 |
| 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 20 | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 30 | 1 | 6 | 0 |
| 15 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| 10 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 26 | 1 | 6 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 36 | 1 | 8 | 0 |
| 157 | 6 | 13 | 1 |
| -67 | -3 | -7 | 0 |
| -15 | -1 | 8 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| 84 | 3 | 9 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 143 | 6 | 26 | 1 |
| 46 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 35 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| 23 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16 | 1 | 9 | 0 |
| 69 | 3 | 6 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

[^0]Appendix 4 -
Existing Plus Project Level of Service, Queuing, and Peak Hour Traffic Signal Warrants Worksheets

1: Mission Boulevard \& Driveway/Calhoun Street

|  |  | 4 |  |  | $\dagger$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 202 | 11 | 1739 | 176 | 2125 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.77 | 0.13 | 0.76 | 0.73 | 0.76 |
| Control Delay | 56.6 | 51.4 | 23.2 | 77.2 | 12.5 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 56.6 | 51.4 | 23.2 | 77.2 | 12.5 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 117 | 10 | 438 | 161 | 380 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 196 | m12 | 571 | 234 | 894 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) | 729 |  | 1333 |  | 1909 |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  | 90 |  | 275 |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 413 | 83 | 2279 | 275 | 2781 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.49 | 0.13 | 0.76 | 0.64 | 0.76 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |
| m Volume for 95th percentile queue is metered by upstream signal. |  |  |  |  |  |



2: Mission Boulevard \& Hancock Street

|  | $\rightarrow$ | $\downarrow$ | 4 | 4 |  | $\frac{1}{7}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBT | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 133 | 290 | 18 | 1913 | 41 | 2381 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.50 | 0.95 | 0.26 | 0.84 | 0.50 | 1.00 |
| Control Delay | 55.9 | 94.4 | 88.8 | 20.8 | 89.1 | 37.2 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 55.9 | 94.4 | 88.8 | 21.5 | 89.1 | 37.2 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 108 | 262 | 18 | 997 | 36 | ~1287 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 168 | \#402 | m26 | 215 | m57 | \#1257 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) | 518 | 789 |  | 1040 |  | 1333 |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  | 240 |  | 200 |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 273 | 312 | 69 | 2287 | 84 | 2372 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 118 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.49 | 0.93 | 0.26 | 0.88 | 0.49 | 1.00 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\sim$ Volume exceeds capacity, queue is theoretically infinite. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $m$ Volume for 95 th percentile queue is metered by upstream signal. |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | $\stackrel{*}{ }$ |  | \% | 7 |  | 4 | 4 | 4 | $p$ |  | $\dagger$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | 4 |  |  | * |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | ${ }^{1}$ | 中 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 85 | 22 | 6 | 151 | 39 | 56 | 15 | 1532 | 94 | 35 | 2000 | 24 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 85 | 22 | 6 | 151 | 39 | 56 | 15 | 1532 | 94 | 35 | 2000 | 24 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 0.99 | 0.99 |  | 0.98 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1781 | 1856 | 1856 | 1841 | 1856 | 1856 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 100 | 26 | 7 | 178 | 46 | 66 | 18 | 1802 | 111 | 41 | 2353 | 28 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| Cap, veh/h | 241 | 59 | 14 | 234 | 50 | 72 | 36 | 2257 | 137 | 59 | 2433 | 29 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.04 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.04 | 0.91 | 0.91 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 955 | 288 | 69 | 940 | 243 | 349 | 1697 | 3369 | 205 | 1753 | 3566 | 42 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 133 | 0 | 0 | 290 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 933 | 980 | 41 | 1160 | 1221 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 1312 | 0 | 0 | 1532 | 0 | 0 | 1697 | 1763 | 1811 | 1753 | 1763 | 1845 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 13.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.3 | 70.3 | 73.6 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 12.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 26.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.3 | 70.3 | 73.6 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.75 |  | 0.05 | 0.61 |  | 0.23 | 1.00 |  | 0.11 | 1.00 |  | 0.02 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 314 | 0 | 0 | 356 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 1181 | 1214 | 59 | 1203 | 1259 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.42 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.81 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.50 | 0.79 | 0.81 | 0.70 | 0.96 | 0.97 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 337 | 0 | 0 | 380 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 1181 | 1214 | 85 | 1203 | 1259 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 1.33 | 1.33 | 1.33 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.68 | 0.68 | 0.68 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.56 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 50.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 55.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 68.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 68.1 | 5.4 | 5.5 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 12.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.0 | 3.7 | 4.0 | 8.0 | 12.7 | 13.1 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 4.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 1.2 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 8.3 | 8.8 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 51.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 67.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 75.1 | 3.7 | 4.0 | 76.1 | 18.1 | 18.6 |
| LnGrp LOS | D | A | A | E | A | A | E | A | A | E | B | B |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 133 |  |  | 290 |  |  | 1931 |  |  | 2422 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 51.3 |  |  | 67.9 |  |  | 4.6 |  |  | 19.3 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | D |  |  | E |  |  | A |  |  | B |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s | 8.8 | 101.5 |  | 33.7 | 7.1 | 103.2 |  | 33.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s | 4.0 | 5.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 7.0 | 92.0 |  | 32.0 | 6.0 | 93.0 |  | 32.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s | 5.3 | 2.0 |  | 14.8 | 3.5 | 75.6 |  | 28.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.0 | 31.5 |  | 0.6 | 0.0 | 15.5 |  | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay |  |  | 17.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS |  |  | B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 7.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $\ddagger$ |  |  | * |  |  | * |  |  | \$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 91 | 8 | 16 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 59 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 100 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 91 | 8 | 16 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 59 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 100 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 7 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 | 59 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Mvmt Flow | 154 | 14 | 27 | 0 | 41 | 0 | 100 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 169 |



4: Beaton Way/Whitman Street \& Tennyson Road

|  | $\rangle$ | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | 7 | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBT | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 363 | 1026 | 66 | 9 | 799 | 234 | 150 | 243 | 7 | 545 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.83 | 0.48 | 0.07 | 0.08 | 0.67 | 0.41 | 0.40 | 0.84 | 0.01 | 0.68 |
| Control Delay | 54.3 | 11.6 | 3.8 | 50.5 | 29.7 | 11.9 | 32.9 | 60.1 | 29.5 | 19.9 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 54.3 | 11.6 | 3.8 | 50.5 | 29.7 | 11.9 | 32.9 | 60.1 | 29.5 | 19.9 |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) | 218 | 164 | 3 | 6 | 227 | 39 | 73 | 143 | 3 | 194 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | \#432 | 287 | 23 | 24 | 298 | 101 | 145 | \#295 | 15 | 365 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 470 |  |  | 1481 |  | 548 |  | 469 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 175 |  | 100 | 90 |  | 100 |  | 100 |  | 110 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 487 | 2157 | 941 | 492 | 1673 | 738 | 476 | 372 | 622 | 849 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.75 | 0.48 | 0.07 | 0.02 | 0.48 | 0.32 | 0.32 | 0.65 | 0.01 | 0.64 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | 4 | 4 | P |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{4}$ | 个4 | 「 | \％ | 个4 | 「 |  | ¢ |  | \％ | $\uparrow$ | 「 |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 323 | 913 | 59 | 8 | 711 | 208 | 77 | 32 | 24 | 216 | 6 | 485 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 323 | 913 | 59 | 8 | 711 | 208 | 77 | 32 | 24 | 216 | 6 | 485 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 0.92 | 1.00 |  | 0.88 | 0.95 |  | 0.88 | 0.92 |  | 0.89 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1885 | 1826 | 1870 | 1900 | 1811 | 1885 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1900 | 1870 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 363 | 1026 | 66 | 9 | 799 | 234 | 87 | 36 | 27 | 243 | 7 | 545 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 1 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Cap，veh／h | 393 | 1952 | 820 | 24 | 1228 | 502 | 224 | 90 | 57 | 414 | 555 | 759 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.22 | 0.56 | 0.56 | 0.01 | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.29 | 0.29 | 0.29 | 0.29 | 0.29 | 0.29 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1795 | 3469 | 1458 | 1810 | 3441 | 1407 | 577 | 310 | 195 | 1238 | 1900 | 1409 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 363 | 1026 | 66 | 9 | 799 | 234 | 150 | 0 | 0 | 243 | 7 | 545 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／n | 1795 | 1735 | 1458 | 1810 | 1721 | 1407 | 1081 | 0 | 0 | 1238 | 1900 | 1409 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 20.3 | 18.9 | 2.1 | 0.5 | 20.0 | 13.2 | 9.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.5 | 0.3 | 30.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 20.3 | 18.9 | 2.1 | 0.5 | 20.0 | 13.2 | 11.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 19.5 | 0.3 | 30.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.58 |  | 0.18 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp $\operatorname{Cap}$（c），veh／h | 393 | 1952 | 820 | 24 | 1228 | 502 | 371 | 0 | 0 | 414 | 555 | 759 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.92 | 0.53 | 0.08 | 0.38 | 0.65 | 0.47 | 0.40 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.59 | 0.01 | 0.72 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 437 | 1952 | 820 | 440 | 1506 | 616 | 371 | 0 | 0 | 414 | 555 | 759 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 39.3 | 14.0 | 10.3 | 50.3 | 27.7 | 25.5 | 29.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 33.0 | 25.9 | 20.0 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 22.8 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 3.6 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 2.9 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 11.2 | 7.0 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 8.5 | 4.7 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.6 | 0.1 | 10.6 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 62.1 | 14.8 | 10.4 | 53.9 | 29.9 | 27.9 | 29.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 34.5 | 25.9 | 22.9 |
| LnGrp LOS | E | B | B | D | C | C | C | A | A | C | C | C |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 1455 |  |  | 1042 |  |  | 150 |  |  | 795 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 26.4 |  |  | 29.6 |  |  | 29.6 |  |  | 26.5 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |
| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration（ $G+Y+R \mathrm{c}$ ），$s$ | 5.4 | 62.8 |  | 34.6 | 26.5 | 41.7 |  | 34.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period（ $Y+R \mathrm{R}$ ），s | 4.0 | 5.0 |  | 4.6 | 4.0 | 5.0 |  | 4.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 25.0 | 45.0 |  | 30.0 | 25.0 | 45.0 |  | 30.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋1），s | 2.5 | 20.9 |  | 32.0 | 22.3 | 22.0 |  | 13.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.0 | 16.1 |  | 0.0 | 0.2 | 14.7 |  | 0.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrr DelayHCM 6th LOS |  |  | 27.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green．

5: Dixon Street/E 12th Street \& Tennyson Road

|  | $\stackrel{*}{ }$ | $\rightarrow$ | \% | $\dagger$ | 4 | 4 | 4 | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 160 | 758 | 390 | 115 | 599 | 249 | 172 | 79 | 162 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.55 | 0.66 | 0.61 | 0.49 | 0.55 | 0.90 | 0.49 | 0.73 | 0.28 |
| Control Delay | 44.6 | 29.4 | 16.4 | 45.9 | 28.8 | 75.2 | 18.2 | 79.6 | 5.7 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 44.6 | 29.4 | 16.4 | 45.9 | 28.8 | 75.2 | 18.2 | 79.6 | 5.7 |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) | 88 | 197 | 87 | 64 | 152 | 146 | 23 | 45 | 10 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 158 | 264 | 175 | 124 | 213 | \#334 | 89 | \#139 | 40 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 1481 |  |  | 525 |  | 495 | 553 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 125 |  | 80 | 130 |  | 100 |  |  | 100 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 477 | 1669 | 830 | 446 | 1666 | 278 | 353 | 108 | 728 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.34 | 0.45 | 0.47 | 0.26 | 0.36 | 0.90 | 0.49 | 0.73 | 0.22 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | $\rangle$ | $\rightarrow$ | \% | $\checkmark$ | - | 4 | 4 | 4 | $p$ | $\checkmark$ | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{7}$ | 个4 | 「 | ${ }^{7}$ | $\uparrow$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | $\hat{\beta}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 138 | 652 | 335 | 99 | 510 | 5 | 214 | 32 | 116 | 10 | 58 | 139 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 138 | 652 | 335 | 99 | 510 | 5 | 214 | 32 | 116 | 10 | 58 | 139 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 1.00 |  | 0.99 | 1.00 |  | 0.99 | 1.00 |  | 0.91 | 1.00 |  | 0.92 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1870 | 1826 | 1841 | 1767 | 1826 | 1826 | 1826 | 1900 | 1900 | 1870 | 1870 | 1811 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 160 | 758 | 390 | 115 | 593 | 6 | 249 | 37 | 135 | 12 | 67 | 162 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 2 | 5 | 4 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 |
| Cap, veh/h | 205 | 1411 | 627 | 150 | 1339 | 14 | 286 | 55 | 199 | 39 | 215 | 371 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.12 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.09 | 0.38 | 0.38 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.14 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 1781 | 3469 | 1543 | 1682 | 3518 | 36 | 1739 | 332 | 1212 | 282 | 1574 | 1418 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 160 | 758 | 390 | 115 | 292 | 307 | 249 | 0 | 172 | 79 | 0 | 162 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/n | 1781 | 1735 | 1543 | 1682 | 1735 | 1819 | 1739 | 0 | 1544 | 1856 | 0 | 1418 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 7.8 | 14.9 | 18.0 | 6.0 | 11.2 | 11.3 | 12.5 | 0.0 | 9.4 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 8.6 |
| Cycle Q Clear (g_c), s | 7.8 | 14.9 | 18.0 | 6.0 | 11.2 | 11.3 | 12.5 | 0.0 | 9.4 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 8.6 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.02 | 1.00 |  | 0.78 | 0.15 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap (c), veh/h | 205 | 1411 | 627 | 150 | 660 | 692 | 286 | 0 | 254 | 253 | 0 | 371 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.78 | 0.54 | 0.62 | 0.77 | 0.44 | 0.44 | 0.87 | 0.00 | 0.68 | 0.31 | 0.00 | 0.44 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 497 | 1742 | 775 | 469 | 871 | 913 | 291 | 0 | 258 | 311 | 0 | 414 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 38.5 | 20.2 | 21.1 | 39.9 | 20.7 | 20.7 | 36.5 | 0.0 | 35.2 | 34.9 | 0.0 | 28.3 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 10.4 | 1.2 | 3.6 | 13.0 | 1.7 | 1.6 | 23.4 | 0.0 | 6.8 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.8 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 4.0 | 6.1 | 6.9 | 3.0 | 4.8 | 5.0 | 7.1 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 3.0 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 48.9 | 21.3 | 24.8 | 52.8 | 22.4 | 22.3 | 59.9 | 0.0 | 42.0 | 35.6 | 0.0 | 29.1 |
| LnGrp LOS | D | C | C | D | C | C | E | A | D | D | A | C |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 1308 |  |  | 714 |  |  | 421 |  |  | 241 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 25.7 |  |  | 27.2 |  |  | 52.6 |  |  | 31.2 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration ( $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s | 12.0 | 41.4 |  | 16.8 | 14.3 | 39.1 |  | 19.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period ( $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ), s | 4.0 | 5.0 |  | 4.6 | 4.0 | 5.0 |  | 4.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 25.0 | 45.0 |  | 15.0 | 25.0 | 45.0 |  | 15.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s | 8.0 | 20.0 |  | 10.6 | 9.8 | 13.3 |  | 14.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.5 | 16.4 |  | 0.4 | 0.7 | 10.3 |  | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay |  |  | 30.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes

User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.

6: Mission Boulevard \& Tennyson Road

|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ |  |  | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $\checkmark$ | $\frac{1}{7}$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 375 | 69 | 279 | 139 | 98 | 220 | 1527 | 119 | 1878 | 282 |
| $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio | 0.66 | 0.21 | 0.57 | 0.59 | 0.34 | 0.61 | 0.70 | 0.49 | 0.79 | 0.35 |
| Control Delay | 61.0 | 51.2 | 9.9 | 67.8 | 11.9 | 68.7 | 35.7 | 54.8 | 40.4 | 21.2 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 61.0 | 51.2 | 9.9 | 67.8 | 12.0 | 68.7 | 35.7 | 54.8 | 40.4 | 21.2 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 172 | 57 | 0 | 127 | 0 | 102 | 406 | 110 | 480 | 112 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 207 | 95 | 72 | 173 | 46 | \#201 | 521 | m\#167 | m\#690 | m113 |
| Internal Link Dist (t) |  | 525 |  | 1121 |  |  | 1386 |  | 1040 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (tt) | 335 |  | 225 |  | 315 | 520 |  | 230 |  | 210 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 771 | 435 | 564 | 424 | 438 | 358 | 2185 | 241 | 2387 | 798 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.49 | 0.16 | 0.49 | 0.33 | 0.24 | 0.61 | 0.72 | 0.49 | 0.79 | 0.35 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.m Volume for 95th percentile queue is metered by upstream signal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  | 4 | 4 | 4 | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{*}{ }^{1 / 1}$ | $\uparrow$ | ${ }^{*}$ |  | 4 | 「 | \％${ }^{1 / 1}$ | 惺 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | ${ }^{*}$ | ヶ个ヶ | F |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 334 | 61 | 248 | 67 | 57 | 87 | 196 | 1291 | 68 | 106 | 1671 | 251 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 334 | 61 | 248 | 67 | 57 | 87 | 196 | 1291 | 68 | 106 | 1671 | 251 |
| Initial Q（Qb），veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 0.99 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1841 | 1900 | 1841 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1811 | 1856 | 1856 | 1811 | 1870 | 1856 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 375 | 69 | 279 | 75 | 64 | 98 | 220 | 1451 | 76 | 119 | 1878 | 282 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 3 |
| Cap，veh／h | 692 | 387 | 315 | 109 | 93 | 173 | 209 | 2561 | 134 | 72 | 2552 | 772 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.06 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.08 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 3401 | 1900 | 1546 | 998 | 852 | 1584 | 3346 | 4920 | 258 | 1725 | 5106 | 1544 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 375 | 69 | 279 | 139 | 0 | 98 | 220 | 996 | 531 | 119 | 1878 | 282 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／ln | 1700 | 1900 | 1546 | 1850 | 0 | 1584 | 1673 | 1689 | 1800 | 1725 | 1702 | 1544 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 14.2 | 4.3 | 25.3 | 10.4 | 0.0 | 8.5 | 9.0 | 28.9 | 28.9 | 6.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 14.2 | 4.3 | 25.3 | 10.4 | 0.0 | 8.5 | 9.0 | 28.9 | 28.9 | 6.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.54 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.14 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 692 | 387 | 315 | 202 | 0 | 173 | 209 | 1758 | 937 | 72 | 2552 | 772 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.54 | 0.18 | 0.89 | 0.69 | 0.00 | 0.57 | 1.05 | 0.57 | 0.57 | 1.66 | 0.74 | 0.37 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 779 | 435 | 354 | 424 | 0 | 363 | 209 | 1758 | 937 | 72 | 2552 | 772 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.09 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 51.3 | 47.4 | 55.7 | 61.8 | 0.0 | 60.9 | 67.5 | 23.5 | 23.5 | 66.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 0.5 | 0.2 | 16.1 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 71.7 | 1.1 | 2.1 | 300.7 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 6.2 | 2.1 | 11.3 | 5.2 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 5.9 | 11.5 | 12.5 | 8.5 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 51.8 | 47.6 | 71.8 | 65.9 | 0.0 | 63.8 | 139.2 | 24.6 | 25.6 | 366.7 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| LnGrp LOS | D | D | E | E | A | E | F | C | C | F | A | A |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 723 |  |  | 237 |  |  | 1747 |  |  | 2279 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 59.1 |  |  | 65.0 |  |  | 39.3 |  |  | 19.3 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | E |  |  | D |  |  | B |  |
| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration（ $\mathrm{G}+\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ），$s$ | 13.0 | 77.0 |  | 19.7 | 10.0 | 80.0 |  | 34.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period（ $\mathrm{Y}+\mathrm{Rc}$ ），s | 4.0 | 5.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 9.0 | 51.0 |  | 33.0 | 6.0 | 54.0 |  | 33.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋1），s | 11.0 | 2.1 |  | 12.4 | 8.0 | 30.9 |  | 27.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.0 | 25.5 |  | 1.1 | 0.0 | 11.1 |  | 1.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrr DelayHCM 6th LOS |  |  | 34.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

7: Tennyson Road \& Main Entry Access Road

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 7.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | ${ }_{1} 1$ | $\uparrow$ |  | * |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 224 | 39 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 198 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 224 | 39 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 198 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 6 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 356 | 62 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 314 |



8: Mission Boulevard \& Valle Vista

|  | $\rangle$ | 4 |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | NBL | NBT | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 52 | 80 | 1625 | 2275 |
| $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio | 0.47 | 0.75 | 0.51 | 0.80 |
| Control Delay | 43.1 | 103.5 | 2.4 | 11.0 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 43.1 | 103.5 | 2.4 | 11.0 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 17 | 76 | 113 | 520 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 60 | \#170 | 187 | 710 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) | 364 |  | 816 | 1386 |
| Turn Bay Length (t) |  | 225 |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 323 | 107 | 3168 | 2854 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.16 | 0.75 | 0.51 | 0.80 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer.Queue shown is maximum after two cycles. |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |



## Notes

User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.

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


KITTELSON \& ASSOCIATES, INC.
610 SW Alder, Suite 700
Portland, Oregon 97205
(503) 228-5230

| Project \#: | 24641 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Project Name: | Hayward Parcel 3 Entitlements |
| Analyst: | MZS |
| Date: | $5 / 19 / 2021$ |
| File: | H:\<24\<4641-Haywara Parcel 3 |
|  | Entitlements\analysis\LTA\Signal Warrants\Existing |
| Intersection: | PP\VExistingPP intersection 3 AM..xlsmlWar \#3 - Peak |
| Scenario: | 3. East 16th Street \& Hancock Street |
|  | Existing Plus Project AM |


| Warrant Summary |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Warrant | Name | Analyzed? | Met? |
| \#1 | Eight-Hour Vehicular Volume | Yes | No |
| \#2 | Four-Hour Vehicular volume | Yes | No |
| \#3 | Peak Hour | Yes | No |
| $\# 4$ | Pedestrian Volume | No | - |
| $\# 5$ | School Crossing | No | - |
| $\# 6$ | Coordinated Signal System | No | - |
| $\# 7$ | Crash Experience | No | - |
| $\# 8$ | Roadway Network | No | - |
| $\# 9$ | Intersection Near a Grade Crossing | No | - |

Analysis Traffic Volumes

| Major Street |  | Minor Street |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NB | SB | EB | WB |
| 67 | 198 | 263 | 45 |
| 63 | 187 | 249 | 43 |
| 63 | 185 | 245 | 42 |
| 60 | 177 | 235 | 40 |
| 59 | 174 | 231 | 40 |
| 59 | 174 | 231 | 40 |
| 56 | 166 | 221 | 38 |
| 55 | 164 | 217 | 37 |
| 54 | 158 | 210 | 36 |
| 50 | 148 | 196 | 34 |
| 48 | 143 | 189 | 32 |
| 47 | 140 | 186 | 32 |
| 46 | 135 | 179 | 31 |
| 39 | 116 | 154 | 26 |
| 31 | 92 | 123 | 21 |
| 29 | 87 | 116 | 20 |
| 21 | 61 | 81 | 14 |
| 17 | 50 | 67 | 11 |
| 9 | 26 | 35 | 6 |
| 6 | 18 | 25 | 4 |
| 5 | 16 | 21 | 4 |
| 4 | 11 | 14 | 2 |
| 2 | 5 | 7 | 1 |
| 2 | 5 | 7 | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |

## Input Parameters

| Volume Adjustment Factor = | 1.0 |
| :--- | :---: |
| North-South Approach = | Major |
| East-West Approach = | Minor |
| Major Street Thru Lanes = | 1 |
| Minor Street Thru Lanes = | 1 |
| Speed > 40 mph? | No |
| Population < 10,000? | No |
| Warrant Factor | $100 \%$ |
| Peak Hour or Daily Count? | Peak Hour |
|  |  |
| Major Street: 4 4th-Highest Hour / Peak Hour | $89 \%$ |
| Major Street: 8 8th-Highest Hour / Peak Hour | $83 \%$ |
| Minor Street: 4 4th-Highest Hour / Peak Hour | $89 \%$ |
| Minor Street: 8 th-Highest Hour / Peak Hour | $83 \%$ |

Warrant \#1 - Eight Hour

| Warrant <br> Factor | Condition | Major Street <br> Requirement | Minor Street <br> Requirement | Hours That <br> Condition Is <br> Met | Condition for <br> Warrant Factor <br> Met? | Signal Warrant <br> Met? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $100 \%$ | A | 500 | 150 | 0 | No | No |
|  | B | 750 | 75 | 0 | No |  |
| $80 \%$ | A | 400 | 120 | 0 | No | No |
|  | B | 600 | 60 | 0 | No |  |
| $70 \%$ | A | 350 | 105 | 0 | No | No |
|  | B | 525 | 53 | 0 | No |  |
| $56 \%$ | A | 280 | 84 | 0 | No | No |
|  | B | 420 | 42 | 0 | No |  |





KITTELSON \& ASSOCIATES, INC.
610 SW Alder, Suite 700
Portland, Oregon 97205
(503) 228-5230

| Project \#: | 24641 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: | Hayward Parcel 3 Entitlements |  |  |
| Analyst: | MZS |  |  |
| Date: | 5/19/2021 |  |  |
| File: | H:\<4\<4641- Hayward Parcel 3 |  |  |
|  | Entitlements\analysis\LTA\Signal Warrants\Existing |  |  |
| Intersection: Scenario: | PP\IExistingPP intersection 3 AM.xlsmlWar \#3 - Peak <br> 7. Site Access Road \& Tennyson Road |  |  |
|  | Existing Plus Project AM |  |  |
| Warrant Summary |  |  |  |
| Warrant | Name | Analyzed? | Met? |
| \#1 | Eight-Hour Vehicular Volume | Yes | No |
| \#2 | Four-Hour Vehicular volume | Yes | No |
| \#3 | Peak Hour | Yes | No |
| \#4 | Pedestrian Volume | No | - |
| \#5 | School Crossing | No | - |
| \#6 | Coordinated Signal System | No | - |
| \#7 | Crash Experience | No | - |
| \#8 | Roadway Network | No | - |
| \#9 | Intersection Near a Grade Crossing | No | - |

Analysis Traffic Volumes
Major Street Minor Street

| Hour |  | Major Street |  | Minor Street |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Begin | End | WB | NB | SB |  |
| 7:15 AM | 263 | 45 | 0 | 198 |  |
| 2nd Highest Hour | 249 | 43 | 0 | 187 |  |
| 3rd Highest Hour | 245 | 42 | 0 | 185 |  |
| 4th Highest Hour | 235 | 40 | 0 | 177 |  |
| 5th Highest Hour | 231 | 40 | 0 | 174 |  |
| 6th Highest Hour | 231 | 40 | 0 | 174 |  |
| 7th Highest Hour | 221 | 38 | 0 | 166 |  |
| 8th Highest Hour | 217 | 37 | 0 | 164 |  |
| 9th Highest Hour | 210 | 36 | 0 | 158 |  |
| 10th Highest Hour | 196 | 34 | 0 | 148 |  |
| 11th Highest Hour | 189 | 32 | 0 | 143 |  |
| 12th Highest Hour | 186 | 32 | 0 | 140 |  |
| 13th Highest Hour | 179 | 31 | 0 | 135 |  |
| 14th Highest Hour | 154 | 26 | 0 | 116 |  |
| 15th Highest Hour | 123 | 21 | 0 | 92 |  |
| 16th Highest Hour | 116 | 20 | 0 | 87 |  |
| 17th Highest Hour | 81 | 14 | 0 | 61 |  |
| 18th Highest Hour | 67 | 11 | 0 | 50 |  |
| 19th Highest Hour | 35 | 6 | 0 | 26 |  |
| 20th Highest Hour | 25 | 4 | 0 | 18 |  |
| 21st Highest Hour | 21 | 4 | 0 | 16 |  |
| 22nd Highest Hour | 14 | 2 | 0 | 11 |  |
| 23rd Highest Hour | 7 | 1 | 0 | 5 |  |
| 24th Highest Hour | 7 |  | 0 | 5 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Input Parameters

| Volume Adjustment Factor = | 1.0 |
| :--- | :---: |
| North-South Approach = | Minor |
| East-West Approach = | Major |
| Major Street Thru Lanes = | 1 |
| Minor Street Thru Lanes = | 1 |
| Speed > 40 mph? | No |
| Population < 10,000? | No |
| Warrant Factor | $100 \%$ |
| Peak Hour or Daily Count? | Peak Hour |
|  |  |
| Major Street: 4 4th-Highest Hour / Peak Hour | $89 \%$ |
| Major Street: 8 th-Highest Hour / Peak Hour | $83 \%$ |
| Minor Street: 4 4th-Highest Hour / Peak Hour | $89 \%$ |
| Minor Street: 8 8th-Highest Hour / Peak Hour | $83 \%$ |



1: Mission Boulevard \& Driveway/Calhoun Street

|  | $\cdots$ |  | 4 |  | ( | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBR | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 2 | 94 | 15 | 2241 | 80 | 1717 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.01 | 0.61 | 0.18 | 0.82 | 0.55 | 0.57 |
| Control Delay | 0.0 | 54.6 | 58.6 | 9.7 | 80.9 | 5.7 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 0.0 | 54.6 | 58.6 | 9.7 | 80.9 | 5.7 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 0 | 50 | 14 | 265 | 78 | 158 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 0 | 109 | m19 | 391 | 133 | 437 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 729 |  | 1334 |  | 1909 |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  | 90 |  | 275 |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 382 | 354 | 82 | 2732 | 150 | 3007 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.01 | 0.27 | 0.18 | 0.82 | 0.53 | 0.57 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| m Volume for 95th perce | ueue | metere | by upstread | m sign |  |  |



2: Mission Boulevard \& Hancock Street

|  | $\rightarrow$ |  | 4 | $\dagger$ |  | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBT | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 111 | 146 | 28 | 2149 | 93 | 1658 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.59 | 0.78 | 0.31 | 0.87 | 0.60 | 0.62 |
| Control Delay | 69.7 | 83.9 | 93.3 | 27.7 | 90.8 | 7.4 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 69.7 | 83.9 | 93.3 | 29.2 | 90.8 | 7.4 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 99 | 132 | 24 | 994 | 97 | 421 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 159 | 201 | m54 | 1265 | \#178 | 214 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) | 518 | 789 |  | 1040 |  | 1334 |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  |  | 240 |  | 200 |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 284 | 282 | 89 | 2466 | 155 | 2692 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 164 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.39 | 0.52 | 0.31 | 0.93 | 0.60 | 0.62 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Queue shown is maximum after two cycles.m Volume for 95th percentile queue is metered by upstream signal |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | $\stackrel{*}{ }$ |  | \% | 7 |  | 4 | 4 | 4 | \% |  | $\dagger$ | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \$ |  |  | \& |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 㻢 |  | ${ }^{1 /}$ | 㻢 |  |
| Traffic Volume (veh/h) | 64 | 24 | 19 | 89 | 13 | 40 | 27 | 2022 | 62 | 90 | 1585 | 23 |
| Future Volume (veh/h) | 64 | 24 | 19 | 89 | 13 | 40 | 27 | 2022 | 62 | 90 | 1585 | 23 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$, veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT) | 0.99 |  | 0.97 | 0.99 |  | 0.98 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 |
| Parking Bus, Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln | 1841 | 1841 | 1841 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1885 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate, veh/h | 66 | 25 | 20 | 92 | 13 | 41 | 28 | 2085 | 64 | 93 | 1634 | 24 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| Percent Heavy Veh, \% | 4 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Cap, veh/h | 146 | 54 | 36 | 159 | 24 | 57 | 49 | 2539 | 77 | 106 | 2702 | 40 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.05 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.12 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Sat Flow, veh/h | 779 | 388 | 256 | 866 | 172 | 405 | 1810 | 3543 | 108 | 1810 | 3611 | 53 |
| Grp Volume(v), veh/h | 111 | 0 | 0 | 146 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 1047 | 1102 | 93 | 809 | 849 |
| Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln | 1423 | 0 | 0 | 1443 | 0 | 0 | 1810 | 1791 | 1860 | 1810 | 1791 | 1873 |
| Q Serve(g_s), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s | 11.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 14.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 0.59 |  | 0.18 | 0.63 |  | 0.28 | 1.00 |  | 0.06 | 1.00 |  | 0.03 |
| Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h | 236 | 0 | 0 | 240 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 1283 | 1333 | 106 | 1340 | 1401 |
| V/C Ratio(X) | 0.47 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.61 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.57 | 0.82 | 0.83 | 0.87 | 0.60 | 0.61 |
| Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h | 337 | 0 | 0 | 341 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 1283 | 1333 | 106 | 1340 | 1401 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Upstream Filter(l) | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.79 | 0.79 | 0.79 | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.80 |
| Uniform Delay (d), s/veh | 61.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 63.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 71.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 66.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay (d2), s/veh | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.8 | 4.6 | 4.8 | 42.8 | 1.6 | 1.6 |
| Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \%ile BackOfQ(50\%),veh/ln | 4.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 4.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 |
| Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh | 62.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 65.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 79.3 | 4.6 | 4.8 | 109.8 | 1.6 | 1.6 |
| LnGrp LOS | E | A | A | E | A | A | E | A | A | F | A | A |
| Approach Vol, veh/h |  | 111 |  |  | 146 |  |  | 2177 |  |  | 1751 |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh |  | 62.7 |  |  | 65.5 |  |  | 5.7 |  |  | 7.3 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | E |  |  | A |  |  | A |  |
| Timer - Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s | 13.0 | 114.6 |  | 25.4 | 8.2 | 119.5 |  | 25.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period (Y+Rc), s | 4.0 | 5.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 |  | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting (Gmax), s | 9.0 | 99.0 |  | 32.0 | 6.0 | 102.0 |  | 32.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time (g_c+11), s | 9.7 | 2.0 |  | 13.1 | 4.3 | 2.0 |  | 16.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time (p_c), s | 0.0 | 44.4 |  | 0.5 | 0.0 | 21.5 |  | 0.7 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay |  |  | 10.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |




4: Beaton Way/Whitman Street \& Tennyson Road

|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | 7 | 4 | 4 | $\dagger$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBT | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 474 | 884 | 44 | 15 | 800 | 161 | 45 | 97 | 8 | 276 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.75 | 0.33 | 0.04 | 0.11 | 0.63 | 0.29 | 0.19 | 0.46 | 0.03 | 0.35 |
| Control Delay | 34.5 | 5.3 | 1.6 | 38.8 | 22.6 | 9.2 | 29.5 | 39.8 | 30.9 | 11.0 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 34.5 | 5.3 | 1.6 | 38.8 | 22.6 | 9.2 | 29.5 | 39.8 | 30.9 | 11.0 |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) | 197 | 58 | 0 | 7 | 161 | 19 | 16 | 43 | 3 | 55 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | \#464 | 171 | 10 | 28 | 240 | 62 | 50 | 100 | 16 | 129 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) |  | 459 |  |  | 1481 |  | 548 |  | 469 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 175 |  | 100 | 90 |  | 100 |  | 100 |  | 110 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 633 | 2691 | 1133 | 550 | 2234 | 915 | 607 | 567 | 713 | 781 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.75 | 0.33 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.36 | 0.18 | 0.07 | 0.17 | 0.01 | 0.35 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



Notes
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.

5: Dixon Street/E 12th Street \& Tennyson Road

|  | $\rangle$ | $\rightarrow$ | 7 | 7 | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 109 | 608 | 239 | 83 | 647 | 279 | 157 | 21 | 75 |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio | 0.35 | 0.49 | 0.40 | 0.30 | 0.55 | 0.64 | 0.36 | 0.09 | 0.18 |
| Control Delay | 32.0 | 20.3 | 10.1 | 32.4 | 21.8 | 37.6 | 23.1 | 33.1 | 4.2 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 32.0 | 20.3 | 10.1 | 32.4 | 21.8 | 37.6 | 23.1 | 33.1 | 4.2 |
| Queue Length 50th (tt) | 34 | 87 | 20 | 26 | 96 | 87 | 30 | 6 | 0 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 105 | 192 | 92 | 86 | 212 | \#320 | 118 | 33 | 18 |
| Internal Link Dist (tt) |  | 1481 |  |  | 525 |  | 495 | 553 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 125 |  | 80 | 130 |  | 100 |  |  | 100 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 711 | 2580 | 1091 | 704 | 2577 | 434 | 438 | 352 | 766 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.15 | 0.24 | 0.22 | 0.12 | 0.25 | 0.64 | 0.36 | 0.06 | 0.10 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \# 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity, queue may be longer. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | 4 | 4 | P |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | ${ }^{*}$ | 个个 | 「 | ${ }^{*}$ | 中t |  | ${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | F |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 104 | 578 | 227 | 79 | 609 | 6 | 265 | 62 | 87 | 4 | 16 | 71 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 104 | 578 | 227 | 79 | 609 | 6 | 265 | 62 | 87 | 4 | 16 | 71 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 0.95 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.92 | 1.00 |  | 0.95 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1811 | 1885 | 1841 | 1796 | 1885 | 1885 | 1841 | 1870 | 1870 | 1900 | 1900 | 1841 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 109 | 608 | 239 | 83 | 641 | 6 | 279 | 65 | 92 | 4 | 17 | 75 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 6 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Cap，veh／h | 147 | 1285 | 533 | 114 | 1238 | 12 | 333 | 126 | 178 | 49 | 208 | 334 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.09 | 0.36 | 0.36 | 0.07 | 0.34 | 0.34 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.14 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 1725 | 3582 | 1486 | 1711 | 3635 | 34 | 1753 | 663 | 938 | 358 | 1524 | 1478 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 109 | 608 | 239 | 83 | 316 | 331 | 279 | 0 | 157 | 21 | 0 | 75 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／n | 1725 | 1791 | 1486 | 1711 | 1791 | 1878 | 1753 | 0 | 1600 | 1882 | 0 | 1478 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 4.5 | 9.6 | 9.0 | 3.5 | 10.4 | 10.4 | 11.2 | 0.0 | 6.5 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 3.1 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 4.5 | 9.6 | 9.0 | 3.5 | 10.4 | 10.4 | 11.2 | 0.0 | 6.5 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 3.1 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.02 | 1.00 |  | 0.59 | 0.19 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp $\operatorname{Cap}$（c），veh／h | 147 | 1285 | 533 | 114 | 610 | 639 | 333 | 0 | 304 | 257 | 0 | 334 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.74 | 0.47 | 0.45 | 0.73 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.84 | 0.00 | 0.52 | 0.08 | 0.00 | 0.22 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 588 | 2198 | 912 | 583 | 1099 | 1153 | 359 | 0 | 327 | 385 | 0 | 435 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 32.8 | 18.2 | 18.0 | 33.6 | 19.4 | 19.4 | 28.6 | 0.0 | 26.7 | 27.7 | 0.0 | 23.4 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 11.9 | 1.0 | 2.1 | 14.0 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 15.1 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 2.3 | 4.0 | 3.3 | 1.9 | 4.5 | 4.8 | 6.0 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 1.1 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 44.6 | 19.1 | 20.1 | 47.5 | 21.8 | 21.7 | 43.8 | 0.0 | 28.0 | 27.8 | 0.0 | 23.7 |
| LnGrp LOS | D | B | C | D | C | C | D | A | C | C | A | C |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 956 |  |  | 730 |  |  | 436 |  |  | 96 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 22.3 |  |  | 24.7 |  |  | 38.1 |  |  | 24.6 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | C |  |  | C |  |  | D |  |  | C |  |
| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration（ $G+Y+R \mathrm{c}$ ），$s$ | 8.9 | 31.3 |  | 14.6 | 10.2 | 30.0 |  | 18.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period（ $Y+R \mathrm{R}$ ），s | 4.0 | 5.0 |  | 4.6 | 4.0 | 5.0 |  | 4.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 25.0 | 45.0 |  | 15.0 | 25.0 | 45.0 |  | 15.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋1），s | 5.5 | 11.6 |  | 5.1 | 6.5 | 12.4 |  | 13.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.3 | 14.7 |  | 0.2 | 0.5 | 11.4 |  | 0.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrr DelayHCM 6th LOS |  |  | 26.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Notes

User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green．

6: Mission Boulevard \& Tennyson Road

|  | 4 | $\rightarrow$ | \% | 4 | 4 | 4 | $\uparrow$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 371 | 8 | 253 | 46 | 18 | 388 | 1751 | 42 | 1233 | 342 |
| V/c Ratio | 0.68 | 0.03 | 0.55 | 0.29 | 0.08 | 0.80 | 0.56 | 0.45 | 0.48 | 0.37 |
| Control Delay | 67.1 | 50.8 | 10.5 | 66.3 | 0.6 | 84.3 | 19.6 | 76.7 | 31.9 | 15.0 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 67.1 | 50.8 | 10.5 | 66.3 | 0.6 | 84.3 | 19.7 | 76.7 | 31.9 | 15.0 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 184 | 7 | 0 | 45 | 0 | 211 | 289 | 41 | 261 | 58 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 223 | 23 | 77 | 75 | 0 | 259 | 575 | m72 | 417 | 181 |
| Internal Link Dist (tt) |  | 525 |  | 1123 |  |  | 1386 |  | 1040 |  |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) | 335 |  | 225 |  | 315 | 520 |  | 230 |  | 210 |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 747 | 409 | 534 | 388 | 424 | 541 | 3144 | 93 | 2593 | 916 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 200 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.50 | 0.02 | 0.47 | 0.12 | 0.04 | 0.72 | 0.59 | 0.45 | 0.48 | 0.37 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ | $\rightarrow$ |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  | 4 | $\dagger$ | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \％${ }^{*}$ | $\uparrow$ | F |  | $\uparrow$ | 「 | \％${ }^{*}$ | 个中b |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 个种 | F |
| Traffic Volume（veh／h） | 364 | 8 | 248 | 19 | 26 | 18 | 380 | 1709 | 7 | 41 | 1208 | 335 |
| Future Volume（veh／h） | 364 | 8 | 248 | 19 | 26 | 18 | 380 | 1709 | 7 | 41 | 1208 | 335 |
| Initial $Q(Q b)$ ，veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped－Bike Adj（A＿pbT） | 1.00 |  | 0.99 | 1.00 |  | 0.96 | 1.00 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 |  | 0.98 |
| Parking Bus，Adj | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Work Zone On Approach |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |  | No |  |
| Adj Sat Flow，veh／h／ln | 1885 | 1900 | 1870 | 1811 | 1811 | 1900 | 1870 | 1885 | 1885 | 1900 | 1870 | 1885 |
| Adj Flow Rate，veh／h | 371 | 8 | 253 | 19 | 27 | 18 | 388 | 1744 | 7 | 42 | 1233 | 342 |
| Peak Hour Factor | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| Percent Heavy Veh，\％ | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| Cap，veh／h | 646 | 353 | 290 | 48 | 68 | 102 | 441 | 3168 | 13 | 59 | 2572 | 791 |
| Arrive On Green | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.19 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.13 | 0.60 | 0.60 | 0.07 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Sat Flow，veh／h | 3483 | 1900 | 1565 | 733 | 1042 | 1551 | 3456 | 5290 | 21 | 1810 | 5106 | 1571 |
| Grp Volume（v），veh／h | 371 | 8 | 253 | 46 | 0 | 18 | 388 | 1131 | 620 | 42 | 1233 | 342 |
| Grp Sat Flow（s），veh／h／n | 1742 | 1900 | 1565 | 1774 | 0 | 1551 | 1728 | 1716 | 1881 | 1810 | 1702 | 1571 |
| Q Serve（g＿s），s | 14.9 | 0.5 | 24.0 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 16.9 | 30.2 | 30.2 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cycle Q Clear（g＿c），s | 14.9 | 0.5 | 24.0 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 16.9 | 30.2 | 30.2 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop In Lane | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.41 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 0.01 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Lane Grp Cap（c），veh／h | 646 | 353 | 290 | 116 | 0 | 102 | 441 | 2054 | 1126 | 59 | 2572 | 791 |
| V／C Ratio（X） | 0.57 | 0.02 | 0.87 | 0.40 | 0.00 | 0.18 | 0.88 | 0.55 | 0.55 | 0.71 | 0.48 | 0.43 |
| Avail Cap（c＿a），veh／h | 751 | 410 | 337 | 383 | 0 | 335 | 542 | 2054 | 1126 | 71 | 2572 | 791 |
| HCM Platoon Ratio | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| Upstream Filter（l） | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.75 | 0.75 | 0.75 |
| Uniform Delay（d），s／veh | 56.8 | 51.0 | 60.5 | 68.6 | 0.0 | 67.6 | 65.6 | 18.4 | 18.4 | 70.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Incr Delay（d2），s／veh | 0.7 | 0.0 | 17.0 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 9.9 | 0.8 | 1.4 | 17.8 | 0.5 | 1.3 |
| Initial Q Delay（d3），s／veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| \％ile BackOfQ（50\％），veh／ln | 6.7 | 0.3 | 11.0 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 8.0 | 11.8 | 13.1 | 1.9 | 0.1 | 0.3 |
| Unsig．Movement Delay，s／veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LnGrp Delay（d），s／veh | 57.5 | 51.0 | 77.5 | 70.8 | 0.0 | 68.4 | 75.5 | 19.1 | 19.8 | 88.6 | 0.5 | 1.3 |
| LnGrp LOS | E | D | E | E | A | E | E | B | B | F | A | A |
| Approach Vol，veh／h |  | 632 |  |  | 64 |  |  | 2139 |  |  | 1617 |  |
| Approach Delay，s／veh |  | 65.4 |  |  | 70.1 |  |  | 29.5 |  |  | 2.9 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | E |  |  | C |  |  | A |  |
| Timer－Assigned Phs | 1 | 2 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Phs Duration（ $G+Y+R \mathrm{c}$ ），$s$ | 23.5 | 82.1 |  | 14.0 | 9.0 | 96.6 |  | 33.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Change Period（ $Y+\mathrm{Rc}$ ），s | 4.0 | 5.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 |  | 5.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Green Setting（Gmax），s | 24.0 | 45.0 |  | 33.0 | 6.0 | 63.0 |  | 33.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Max Q Clear Time（g＿c＋11），s | 18.9 | 2.0 |  | 5.8 | 5.5 | 32.2 |  | 26.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Green Ext Time（p＿c），s | 0.7 | 13.8 |  | 0.3 | 0.0 | 15.1 |  | 1.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th Ctrl Delay |  |  | 25.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HCM 6th LOS |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

7: Tennyson Road \& Main Entry Access Road

| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | WBT | WBR | SBL | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | $-\uparrow$ | $\mathbf{T}$ |  | Mr |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 19 | 36 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 19 | 36 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop |
| RT Channelized | - | None | - | None | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | 0 | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, $\#$ | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 81 | 81 | 81 | 81 | 81 | 81 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 0 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mvmt Flow | 23 | 44 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 43 |



8: Mission Boulevard \& Valle Vista

|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | NBL | NBT | SBT |
| Lane Group Flow (vph) | 59 | 43 | 2141 | 1539 |
| v/c Ratio | 0.48 | 0.43 | 0.66 | 0.52 |
| Control Delay | 45.7 | 82.2 | 3.5 | 7.4 |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total Delay | 45.7 | 82.2 | 3.5 | 7.4 |
| Queue Length 50th (ft) | 23 | 42 | 208 | 163 |
| Queue Length 95th (ft) | 71 | 85 | 337 | 254 |
| Internal Link Dist (ft) | 364 |  | 816 | 1386 |
| Turn Bay Length (ft) |  | 225 |  |  |
| Base Capacity (vph) | 347 | 113 | 3243 | 2983 |
| Starvation Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Spillback Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Storage Cap Reductn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Reduced v/c Ratio | 0.17 | 0.38 | 0.66 | 0.52 |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |



## Notes

User approved volume balancing among the lanes for turning movement.

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


KITTELSON \& ASSOCIATES, INC.
610 SW Alder, Suite 700
Portland, Oregon 97205
(503) 228-5230

| Project \#: | 24641 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: | Hayward Parcel 3 Entitlements |  |  |
| Analyst: | MZS |  |  |
| Date: | 5/19/2021 |  |  |
| e: | H:\<4\<4641- Hayward Parcel 3 |  |  |
|  | Entitlements\analysis\LTA\Signal Warrants\Existing |  |  |
| Intersection: | PP\「ExistingPP intersection 3 AM.xlsmlWar \#3-Peak 3. East 16th Street \& Hancock Street |  |  |
| Scenario: | Existing Plus Project PM |  |  |
|  | Warrant Summary |  |  |
| Warrant | Name | Analyzed? | Met? |
| \#1 | Eight-Hour Vehicular Volume | Yes | No |
| \#2 | Four-Hour Vehicular volume | Yes | No |
| \#3 | Peak Hour | Yes | No |
| \#4 | Pedestrian Volume | No | - |
| \#5 | School Crossing | No | - |
| \#6 | Coordinated Signal System | No | - |
| \#7 | Crash Experience | No | - |
| \#8 | Roadway Network | No | - |
| \#9 | Intersection Near a Grade Crossing | No | - |

Analysis Traffic Volumes
Major Street Minor Street

| Hour |  | Major Street |  | Minor Street |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Begin | End | NB | SB | EB |  |

## Input Parameters

| Volume Adjustment Factor = | 1.0 |
| :--- | :---: |
| North-South Approach = | Major |
| East-West Approach = | Minor |
| Major Street Thru Lanes = | 1 |
| Minor Street Thru Lanes = | 1 |
| Speed > 40 mph? | No |
| Population < 10,000? | No |
| Warrant Factor | $100 \%$ |
| Peak Hour or Daily Count? | Peak Hour |
|  |  |
| Major Street: 4 4th-Highest Hour / Peak Hour | $89 \%$ |
| Major Street: 8 th-Highest Hour / Peak Hour | $83 \%$ |
| Minor Street: 4 4th-Highest Hour / Peak Hour | $89 \%$ |
| Minor Street: 8 8th-Highest Hour / Peak Hour | $83 \%$ |




KITTELSON \& ASSOCIATES, INC.
610 SW Alder, Suite 700
Portland, Oregon 97205
(503) 228-5230

| Project \#: | 24641 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: | Hayward Parcel 3 Entitlements |  |  |
| Analyst: | MZS |  |  |
| Date: | 5/19/2021 |  |  |
| File: | H:\<4\<4641- Hayward Parcel 3 |  |  |
|  | Entitlements\analysis\LTA\Signal Warrants\Existing |  |  |
| Intersection: Scenario: | PP\IExistingPP intersection 3 AM.xlsmlWar \#3 - Peak <br> 7. Site Access Road \& Tennyson Road |  |  |
|  | Existing Plus Project PM |  |  |
| Warrant Summary |  |  |  |
| Warrant | Name | Analyzed? | Met? |
| \#1 | Eight-Hour Vehicular Volume | Yes | No |
| \#2 | Four-Hour Vehicular volume | Yes | No |
| \#3 | Peak Hour | Yes | No |
| \#4 | Pedestrian Volume | No | - |
| \#5 | School Crossing | No | - |
| \#6 | Coordinated Signal System | No | - |
| \#7 | Crash Experience | No | - |
| \#8 | Roadway Network | No | - |
| \#9 | Intersection Near a Grade Crossing | No | - |

Analysis Traffic Volumes
Major Street Minor Street

| Hour |  | Major Street |  | Minor Street |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Begin | End | EB | WB | NB |  |

## Input Parameters

| Volume Adjustment Factor = | 1.0 |
| :--- | :---: |
| North-South Approach = | Minor |
| East-West Approach = | Major |
| Major Street Thru Lanes = | 1 |
| Minor Street Thru Lanes = | 1 |
| Speed > 40 mph? | No |
| Population < 10,000? | No |
| Warrant Factor | $100 \%$ |
| Peak Hour or Daily Count? | Peak Hour |
|  |  |
| Major Street: 4 4th-Highest Hour / Peak Hour | $89 \%$ |
| Major Street: 8 8th-Highest Hour / Peak Hour | $83 \%$ |
| Minor Street: 4 4th-Highest Hour / Peak Hour | $89 \%$ |
| Minor Street: 8 8th-Highest Hour / Peak Hour | $83 \%$ |




[^0]:    a) One of the project's residential driveways forms this intersection's eastern leg under Plus Project conditions.
    b) At this movement, the volume for the 95 th percentile queue is metered by an upstream signal.
    c) At this movement, the 95th percentile volume exceeds capacity and the queue may be longer.

