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# Solana Torrance Traffic Impact Study 

## February 28, 2019

## I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report documents a Traffic Impact Study (TIS), and subsequent revisions, completed for the proposed Solana Torrance multi-family residential project (hereinafter referred to as the Project), proposed on the southwest corner of Hawthorne Boulevard and Via Valmonte, in the City of Torrance, California. In 2016, the TIS originally documented anticipated traffic impacts with a previous plan for 300 units. The Project scope was then revised and the First Revision (April 2017) analyzed traffic impacts with 248 units. Per the City's request, the Second Revision was modified to respond to questions/comments from interested parties including a revised trip generation rate for the proposed Project. The Third Revision included an expanded study area of additional intersections beyond the original study scope per the City's request. The Fourth and Fifth Revisions included adjustments made to the queuing analyses, per City comments, and completion dates. The Sixth and Seventh Revisions incorporated revised trip generation rates based upon the latest edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation manual - $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition. Note that the $10^{\text {th }}$ edition of the ITE manual was released in October 2017, after the initial preparation of the TIS. This Eighth Revision includes additional development scenarios for levels of service analyses, and a queuing analysis at a second location within the Study area. The latest edits were made per the recommendations of the environmental consultant and City staff.

## Project Overview

The Project site is located on 24.68 acres of land on the southwest corner of Via Valmonte and Hawthorne Boulevard in the City of Torrance, California. Existing topography ranges from open space on a significant hillside to a disturbed area that contains a former diatomaceous soil surface mine. The disturbed surface mine area is planned to be reclaimed and redeveloped with 248 multifamily residential apartments and a 7,475-square foot leasing office/community clubhouse constructed over at-grade parking garages. The remaining 18.92 acres of the total site will be preserved as open space. Access to and from the Project site is proposed through one driveway on Hawthorne Boulevard (right-in/right-out only). One "exit-only" driveway with raised traffic barriers is proposed for Via Valmonte (right-out only).

## Traffic Impact Study Scope

The TIS was commissioned by the Solana Torrance proponent and developer, Reylenn Properties, LLC, Solana Beach, California, and performed by KHR

Associates, Newport Beach, California. The original scope of work for the study was provided by staff with the City of Torrance, Public Works and Community Development Departments. As part of the TIS, traffic counts were taken at eleven study intersections and two roadway segments in April 2016. An annual growth factor of one percent was added to estimate updated 2017 volumes. Additionally, the City of Torrance, as well as neighboring cities provided lists of projects for inclusion in the cumulative analysis portion of the TIS. In addition to the original eleven intersections studied, seven more intersections were later added in the Third Revision.

## Revisions to TIS

Reviews of the initial submittal of the TIS, on April 20, 2017, generated comments regarding some of the methodologies used in the study. Subsequently, as noted above, several revisions of the report included additional concerns and an expanded study scope involving changes to trip generation rates, levels of service, queuing analyses, and site circulation. The following summarizes these updates.

## Trip Generation Rates

Trip generation rates used to estimate the number of vehicle trips (in and out of the Project site) in the first version of the TIS were obtained from the most recent version (at that time) of the ITE Trip Generation manual, $9^{\text {th }}$ Edition. For peak hour estimates, "Land Use Code" 223 - "Mid-Rise Apartment" was used for the Project because it was more specific to developments with the same number of floors. Note that Land Use Code 223 did not have a daily rate and therefore the more general "Land Use Code 220 - Apartment" was used to estimate average daily traffic. A comment was made that the study should use the more general "Apartment" rate (220) for peak hour analyses since it is a more established rate with broader survey samples. The second revision to the TIS was updated with the Land Use Code 220 trip generation rates for peak hour analyses. As indicated above, this Sixth Revision incorporated revised trip generation rates based upon the latest edition of the ITE Trip Generation manual - $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition. The new land use code is 221 "Mid Rise Multifamily".

## Palos Verdes North/Hawthorne Boulevard Intersection

For the Second Revision, the City of Torrance asked that one additional intersection be reviewed for potential impacts that may result from the proposed Project. The intersection of Palos Verdes North and Hawthorne Boulevard (located south of the Project site) in the City of Rolling Hills Estates, was researched for current traffic volumes and LOS designations. Data from a recent traffic study prepared for the "Peninsula Pointe Assisted Living Project, March 2016, as provided by the City, revealed that in 2016, the intersection was operating at LOS D in the A.M. peak hour with a volume/capacity ratio of .828 and LOS B in the P.M. peak hour with a volume/capacity ratio of .682. Also, total volumes for each of the peak hours was provided as follows: during the A.M. peak hour (7:30 to 8:30 A.M.), 3,845 vehicles traveled through the intersection; and during the P.M. peak hour (4:45 to 5:45 P.M.), 3,364 vehicles were counted.

Using this existing data and adding the anticipated number of Project related vehicles (from this study's revised trip generation and distribution assumptions) results in the following: in the A.M. peak hour, a total of 12 Project vehicles are anticipated to travel through this intersection. In the P.M., 15 Project vehicles are anticipated. Comparing these totals with the overall intersection volumes above indicate that Project vehicles represent roughly a half percent of the totals. Also, since the intersection operates within acceptable LOS, the very incremental increase from Project vehicles should not make any measurable impact on the operation of that intersection. As a follow-up in the Third Revision of this report, seven additional intersections were counted and analyzed for traffic related impacts including this intersection. A summary of the revised LOS for all eighteen intersections is provided below.

## Updated Levels of Service Results

The TIS included several procedures and considerations to identify potential Levels of Service (LOS) impacts associated with development of the Project. Below is a list of the steps and updates used in the analyses.

1) Traffic volume counts were taken in mid-April 2016. An ambient growth factor of one percent was added to the 2016 volumes to estimate 2017 conditions and reflect baseline conditions at study roadway segments and intersections.
2) The Project is estimated to generate a total of 1,349 daily trip ends; and 89 A.M. and 105 P.M. peak hour trips ends, respectively.
3) Based on the current site plan for the Project, vehicular access to and from the site will be provided via one future driveway along Hawthorne Boulevard. One "exit-only" driveway with raised barriers is proposed on Via Valmonte. Both Project driveways will be restricted to right-turn-only movements for residents and visitors. Only emergency vehicles will be allowed to turn left onto the site at the Via Valmonte entrance over the traffic movement barriers.
4) City capital improvements are slated (planned for 2018) for the intersections of Hawthorne Boulevard/Pacific Coast Highway and Vista Montana/Pacific Coast Highway that will reduce traffic congestion for each location.
5) Each intersection was originally analyzed for "Levels of Service" (LOS) using four scenarios: baseline conditions - existing plus one year of ambient growth 2017 volumes, two years of ambient growth, plus Project volumes, and plus cumulative development volumes for both the A.M. and P.M. peak hours. For this Eighth Revision, two more scenarios were analyzed including existing (baseline) conditions plus Project volumes (without an ambient growth factor), and cumulative development conditions without Project volumes.
6) Each signalized intersection was analyzed using two methods - Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU), and Highway Capacity Manual (HCM). Calculation
sheets for each intersection/condition are within the Appendix section of this report. Stop controlled intersections were only analyzed with the HCM method.
7) Using the baseline - existing 2017 volumes, the ICU LOS at each of the study intersections, during both the A.M. and P.M. peak hours of weekday commute, fall within acceptable limits (i.e., "D" or better) with the exception of:
a. the Crenshaw Boulevard/Pacific Coast Highway intersection during the P.M. peak hour;
b. the Crenshaw Boulevard/Palos Verdes Drive North intersection during the A.M. peak hour;
c. the Rolling Hills Road/Palos Verdes Drive North intersection during the A.M and P.M. peak hours; and
d. Pacific Coast Highway/Calle Mayor intersection during the A.M. and P.M. peak hours.
8) Adding Project traffic to these baseline conditions resulted in no changes to the LOS designations from the 2017 baseline levels.
9) The further addition of ambient growth (i.e., one percent per year for two years) traffic to the 2017 volumes resulted in incremental increases in volumes for all intersections and a decrease in ICU intersection LOS for the Crenshaw Boulevard/Palos Verdes Drive North intersection during the P.M. peak hour. Note that two intersections: Hawthorne Boulevard/Pacific Coast Highway and Vista Montana/Pacific Coast Highway, improved in LOS due to the addition of planned capital improvements by the City of Torrance.
10) With the addition of Project traffic to the 2019 ambient conditions, no changes to the LOS designations occurred.
11) With the addition of cumulative development traffic to existing baseline and ambient growth (2019), the utilization of each intersection increased; however, the ICU LOS at each intersection is projected to stay within acceptable limits during both the A.M. and P.M. peak hours, again with the exception of the four intersections noted above.
12) With the addition of Project traffic to the 2019 cumulative conditions, no changes to the LOS designations occurred.
13) Using the HCM methodology to determine levels of service for the studied intersections revealed similar results in the existing baseline plus Project conditions (i.e., to that of the ICU calculations) with the exception of the Hawthorne Boulevard/Pacific Coast Highway intersection resulting in LOS "E" in the P.M. peak hour, the Crenshaw Boulevard/Rolling Hills Road intersection resulting in LOS " $E$ " in the A.M. peak hour, and the Hawthorne

Boulevard/Palos Verdes Drive North intersection resulting in LOS "E" in the A.M. peak hour.
14) Intersection delays increased with 2019 ambient growth conditions; however, the LOS designations did not change with the addition of Project traffic.
15) Under the cumulative development conditions, many of the studied intersections showed increases in delays and further deterioration in LOS during both peak hours of traffic.
16) The addition of Project traffic to cumulative conditions did not result in any decreased LOS.
17) The two roadway segments analyzed - Via Valmonte (LOS "A") and Hawthorne Boulevard (LOS "B"), adjacent to the Project site both currently operate at acceptable levels, and will continue to do so with the addition of ambient growth. The only anticipated change in LOS occurs on Via Valmonte, from LOS "A" to an acceptable LOS "B" with the addition of cumulative traffic.

## Queuing Analysis - Via Valmonte/Hawthorne Boulevard

Queuing analyses were performed for two intersections within the Study area. The first location was the eastbound approach to the Via Valmonte/Hawthorne Boulevard intersection. For this movement, an initial queuing analysis performed between the hours of 7:00 A.M. and 8:00 A.M. revealed that the hour long average of vehicles waiting within the left-turn lane during the A.M. peak hour was 2.8 vehicles (with an observed maximum of five vehicles) and the average signal cycle length was 90 seconds. A second queuing survey for this movement was conducted on Thursday, September 27, 2018, this time for two hours between 7:00 A.M. and 9:00 A.M. with the results showing the average queue of 3.62 vehicles and a maximum of nine vehicles occurring one time during the survey. By adding estimated Project traffic into the eastbound, left turn approach to the Via Valmonte/Hawthorne Boulevard intersection, it was estimated that there could be an average of 5.4 vehicles waiting to turn left at any given time during the peak hour, and a potential maximum of 10 vehicles.

Off-site improvements, as part of the Project plan, include constructing a second optional left turn lane for the eastbound approach to the intersection. The anticipated vehicle capacity of both left turn options is 250 feet (125 feet for each lane), which should accommodate at least 10 vehicles (space at 25 foot intervals). It should be noted that the additional lane is designed to be 16 feet wide for its entire length allowing right turning vehicles enough space to pass-by and avoid waiting in the leftturn queue. With the development of the proposed intersection improvements, and assuming a traffic signal cycle length of 90 seconds, there should be adequate space within the left turn pockets to accommodate existing plus Project related vehicles.

The City of Torrance asked for another analysis of impacts on queuing resulting from the use of a 120 second cycle, or 30 cycles per hour, if the signal timing were to be
adjusted in the future. Following the same methodology above, the average queue for left turn movements would be 7.2 vehicles during the A.M. peak hour - and a potential maximum of 14 vehicles.

Under extreme "worst-case" conditions, when there may be a significant number of vehicles attempting to exit the Project site onto Via Valmonte at the same time, the Project plan includes more than 120 feet of "on-site" queuing space within the driveway throat that could accommodate another six to seven vehicles.

## Queuing Analysis - Hawthorne Boulevard/Via Valmonte

For the Eighth Revision of this report, a second queuing analysis was performed for the northbound left-turn movement at the Hawthorne Boulevard/Pacific Coast Highway intersection. The following summarizes the results as explained in the Site Access, Circulation and Parking section of this report.

1) Based upon traffic count data, during the A.M. peak hour, 278 A.M. peak hour vehicles will be traveling through the northbound left-turn movement during 25 cycles for an average of 11 vehicles per cycle. Using a worst-case design factor of 1.75 x the average, there may be a worst-case queuing demand of 19 vehicles. With a leftturn lane capacity of approximately 21 vehicles, there should be sufficient left-turn lane capacity to accommodate A.M. peak hour demands for this movement.
2) During the P.M. peak hour, 311 left-turning vehicles will travel through 25 cycles for an average of 12 vehicles per cycle. Using a worst-case design factor of 1.75 x the average, there may be a worst-case queuing demand of 21 vehicles - equaling the current capacity.
3) The City has indicated that proposed improvements for this northbound left-turn movement include constructing an asphalt berm at the $242^{\text {nd }}$ street crossing and eliminating the existing "keep clear" zone. The estimated additional queuing space is 60 feet which would accommodate space for at least another 2 vehicles.
4) Project related traffic traveling through this northbound left-turn movement is anticipated to be the heaviest during the A.M. peak hour with 10 additional vehicles. These vehicles added to the A.M. analysis above results in 288 vehicles traveling through 25 cycles for an average of 11 vehicles per cycle and a worst-case condition of 19 vehicles - still below the current capacity of 21 vehicles and the future capacity of 23 vehicles.

## Site Access, Circulation and Parking

Development of Solana Torrance will include street improvements on Via Valmonte include widening of the eastbound approach leg to Hawthorne Boulevard, adjacent to the Project site, to provide an additional travel lane for optional left turn, through movement, or right turns. This improvement will include a new roadway surface; new curb, gutter, sidewalk, and parkway on the south side of Via Valmonte; a new
crosswalk across Via Valmonte at Hawthorne Boulevard; and new accessible ramps on the northwest and southwest corners of the intersection.

On Hawthorne Boulevard, street improvements will include widening and traffic lane re-striping to add a right southbound turn lane between Via Valmonte and the proposed Project driveway; a new sidewalk contiguous to the street curb; a landscaped parkway between the sidewalk and the Project property line wall; and modifications to the traffic signal at the Via Valmonte/Hawthorne Boulevard intersection.

Two driveways into the Project are proposed - one ingress/egress driveway on Hawthorne Boulevard and one egress driveway on Via Valmonte. Within the property, internal drive aisles lead directly into multiple subterranean parking structures located under the residential buildings. Designated guest parking will also be provided. In total, the 248 multi-family dwelling units will be served with 484 parking spaces.

## Line of Sight Analysis

The City of Torrance requested that the TIS include an analysis of the "line of sight" from exiting vehicles on the proposed driveway on Hawthorne Boulevard looking north toward oncoming southbound traffic. The proposed driveway is designed for right-in/right-out movements only, with all exiting vehicles required to stop before entering the flow of traffic on Hawthorne Boulevard. With a vehicle stopped in the exit lane at the stop limit line, drivers will first look to see if there are any pedestrians crossing the driveway, and secondly, look north along Hawthorne Boulevard to see if any vehicles are approaching the driveway.

The line of sight distance from the Project exit lane stop limit line is 290 feet to the center of the lane closest to the sidewalk curb (or Number 3 Lane). All traffic formed by these two lines of sight is within the cone of visibility by a driver exiting the Project driveway. Once the proposed street improvements along Hawthorne Boulevard are constructed (i.e., relocation of power poles; widening the street to include a southbound right turn/deceleration lane onto the Project driveway; modifying the traffic signal at Hawthorne Boulevard and Via Valmonte; and moving the sidewalk to be contiguous to the curb in lieu of a landscaped parkway), there should be no visual impairments to drivers exiting the Project site onto Hawthorne Boulevard.

## Recommendations

Based on the study findings and conclusions, the proposed Project is not anticipated to result in any significant traffic impacts to any of the study street segments or intersections. Therefore, the following recommendations are made:

1) Construct Project driveways only allowing right-turn, "exit-only" movements to Via Valmonte, and right-turn, ingress/egress movements to Hawthorne Blvd.
2) Complete the off-site widening and improvements to Via Valmonte as shown on the Project plan.
3) Construct the intersection improvements, including an additional left/through lane to the eastbound approach leg of the Via Valmonte/Hawthorne Boulevard; a new crosswalk on Via Valmonte leg; accessible ramps on the corners; and traffic signal improvements (e.g., modification of signal mast arms) on Via Valmonte.
4) Widen and restripe the west side of Hawthorne Boulevard for a right turn deceleration lane, adjacent to the site for Project related traffic ingress.
5) Provide various traffic controls, including signage, striping, and pavement marking, to provide safe and efficient vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle movement through and within the Project site.

## II. INTRODUCTION

Reylenn Properties, LLC (Reylenn), Solana Beach, originally proposed a 300-unit multi-family residential development (known as Solana Torrance) on a vacant site located on the southwest corner of Hawthorne Boulevard and Via Valmonte, in the Hillside Residential Neighborhood District of the City of Torrance, California. Subsequently, the Project was redesigned and now includes 248 units. As part of its environmental review process, the City determined that a traffic impact study (TIS) was necessary, and that potential impacts associated with the proposed development must be analyzed, and mitigation measures must be identified.

Reylenn was given permission by the City to commission KHR Associates, Newport Beach, California, to work with City staff and undertake the TIS. The City specified the requirements of the TIS, and identified intersection and roadway segments of concern. The City also provided a list of other development projects within the general proximity of the proposed development that should be analyzed for potential cumulative traffic impacts. Moreover, future development lists were gathered from neighboring cities in order to fully estimate future traffic increases on study intersections leading up to Project buildout.

Information regarding the proposed Solana Torrance development was provided by Reylenn and the project architect, Withee Malcolm Architects, Torrance, California. The results of the TIS are presented herein, and the findings, conclusions, and recommendations are solely those of KHR Associates, and may not be reflect the opinions of Reylenn, the City of Torrance, or any other interested parties.

## Project Description

The Project site is an assemblage of terraced, existing parcels covering 24.68 acres on the southwest corner of Via Valmonte and Hawthorne Boulevard in the City of Torrance, CA. Topography ranges from natural open space on a significant hillside to a highly disturbed area that contains a former diatomaceous soil surface mine. The 5.76-acre portion of the site that encompasses the disturbed surface mine area will be reclaimed and redeveloped. The remaining 18.92 acres of the total site will be preserved as open space.

Proposed development on the 5.76-acre portion consists of 248 multifamily residential apartments and a 7,475-square foot leasing office/community clubhouse in three, four, and five-story residential structures constructed over at-grade parking garages. A free-standing, five level on-grade parking structure with a rooftop outdoor recreation area is also proposed at the rear of the planned community. The Project's residential unit mix will include 135 one-bedroom units and 113 two-bedroom units. A total of 484 parking spaces will be provided by a combination of surface parking and in the parking structures.

Access to and from the Project site is proposed through one driveway entrance on Hawthorne Boulevard (right-in/right-out only). One "exit-only" driveway is proposed for Via Valmonte (right-out only). Only emergency vehicles will be allowed to enter the driveway on Via Valmonte. Figure 1 depicts the most current conceptual site plan for the Project.


Figure 1 - Solana Torrance Site Plan

## Site Location and Existing Uses

The Project site is located on the southwesterly corner of Hawthorne Boulevard and Via Valmonte, within the City of Torrance, California. The Project is within the Hillside Overlay Zone, with General Plan Land Use Designations of Low Density Residential (R-LO), and a Zoning designation of A1 - Light Agricultural. Adjacent land uses include residential uses to the north and west, residential and light commercial/office to the east and vacant/hillside land to the south. Hawthorne Boulevard, running along the east side of the Project site, is within the Hawthorne Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan. Figure 2 illustrates the location of the Project site within the City of Torrance along with the City's Residential Neighborhood Districts.

Current existing major land uses in close proximity to the Project site include the Torrance Municipal Airport (also known as Zamperini Field), a general aviation airport owned and operated by the City of Torrance, providing regional aviation access to recreational pilots, businesses, and emergency services flights; and Del Amo Fashion Center, a superregional shopping center with approximately three million square feet of retail space. The Project site is currently undeveloped land, vacant and unutilized. Figure 3 provides a recent aerial perspective of the configuration and limits of the Project site.


Figure 2 - Project Site Location within the City of Torrance ${ }^{A}$
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Figure 3 - Aerial Perspective of Project Site

## Traffic Impact Study Area

The TIS area generally consists of the development site and surrounding residential communities and commercial properties. Three major transportation corridors exist within close proximity - Hawthorne Boulevard, Crenshaw Boulevard, and Pacific Coast Highway, which all provide regional access opportunities to either the San Diego Freeway (l-405) or the Harbor Freeway (l-110). Study intersections and arterial roadway segments were identified by the Public Works Department, and are listed in Table I. Figure 4 provides an aerial view of the study roadway segments and intersections within the general study area.

## Description of Roadway Segments

The existing regional network of streets and highways servicing the development site include Via Valmonte, Hawthorne Boulevard, Pacific Coast Highway, and Crenshaw Boulevard. Freeways in the Project vicinity include the San Diego (l-405) Freeway and the Harbor (I-110) freeway.

The following briefly describes each of these existing roadways, as described within the City's General Plan - Circulation and Infrastructure Element.

| TABLE I - STUDY AREA ROADWAYS \& INTERSECTIONS |  |
| :---: | :--- |
| ID | Roadway Segments |
| A | Hawthorne Boulevard south of Via Valmonte |
| B | Via Valmonte west of Hawthorne Boulevard |
| No. | Intersection |
| 1 | Hawthorne Boulevard \& Pacific Coast Highway |
| 2 | Hawthorne Boulevard \& 244 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street |
| 3 | Hawthorne Boulevard \& Newton Street |
| 4 | Hawthorne Boulevard \& Via Valmonte |
| 5 | Hawthorne Boulevard \& Rolling Hills Road |
| 6 | Rolling Hills Road \& Whiffle Tree Lane |
| 7 | Rolling Hills Road \& Fallenleaf Drive |
| 8 | Crenshaw Boulevard \& Rolling Hills Road |
| 9 | Crenshaw Boulevard \& Pacific Coast Highway |
| 10 | Anza Avenue/Vista Montana \& Pacific Coast Highway |
| 11 | Via Valmonte \& Palos Verdes Drive North |
| 12 | Hawthorne Boulevard \& Palos Verdes Drive North |
| 13 | Crenshaw Boulevard \& Palos Verdes Drive North |
| 14 | Rolling Hills Road \& Palos Verdes Drive North |
| 15 | Newton Street \& Calle Mayor |
| 16 | Vista Montana \& Newton Street |
| 17 | Madison Street \& Newton Street |
| 18 | Pacific Coast Highway \& Calle Mayor |



Figure 4 - Location of Study Roadway Segments \& Intersections

Hawthorne Boulevard - Hawthorne Boulevard (SR-107) runs in a primarily north to south direction from Century Boulevard to Palos Verdes Drive, respectively. Hawthorne Boulevard is classified as a Principal Arterial, and is generally an eightlane divided roadway with a raised median. Adjacent the project site, Hawthorne Boulevard is six lanes, divided, with an existing half right of way from the centerline to the westerly right of way line of 50 feet along the entire property frontage, and a centerline to westerly face-of-curb dimension of 40 feet. From Interstate 405, Hawthorne Boulevard provides access to the Del Amo Fashion Center as well as residential areas.

Via Valmonte - Via Valmonte is a Collector street providing access to the residential neighborhood adjacent to the development site. Trending in an east to west direction, terminating at Hawthorne Boulevard to the east and Paseo Del Campo to the west, Via Valmonte consists of two lanes, undivided.

Pacific Coast Highway - Pacific Coast Highway (SR-1) is a major state highway running along most of the Pacific coastline of California. Within the City of Torrance, Pacific Coast Highway is designated a Major Arterial, tending in an east-west direction with six lanes, divided.

San Diego (I-405) Freeway - The San Diego (l-405) freeway runs in a northwestsoutheast orientation through the City of Torrance. The l-405 freeway was constructed as a bypass of the Santa Ana freeway (l-5), and it continues to serve interstate and regional travel needs to major destinations within the western and southern parts of the greater Los Angeles area. The I-405 freeway features four to five mixed flow lanes and HOV lanes in each direction.

Harbor (I-110) Freeway - The Harbor (I-110) freeway runs in a north-south direction, connecting San Pedro and the Port of Los Angeles with Downtown Los Angeles and Pasadena. The I-110 freeway features at least four mixed flow lanes and HOV lanes in each direction.

## Description of Study Intersections

The eighteen study intersections are briefly described below, followed by aerial views of each study intersection (see Figures 5 through 22). The current lane configurations of the approach legs to the eighteen study intersection are depicted in Figure 23.

1) Hawthorne Boulevard \& Pacific Coast Highway - This intersection is signalized for eight phases of traffic movement. The northbound approach leg features three through lanes and dual left turn lanes. The southbound approach leg has three through lanes, a separate right turn lane, and dual left turn lanes. The eastbound approach leg has three through lanes and a left turn pocket. The westbound approach leg has three through lanes and a left turn pocket. Highvisibility crosswalks are marked across all four legs of the intersection.

The City of Torrance has indicated that this intersection is slated for capital improvements in 2018 to include three through lanes and dual left turn lanes in all directions. The intersection will continue to operate with eight phases.
2) Hawthorne Boulevard \& $\mathbf{2 4 4}{ }^{\text {th }}$ Street - This intersection is signalized for two phases of traffic movement. The northbound and southbound approach legs each feature three through lanes and a left turn pocket. The eastbound and westbound approach legs each have one lane for left, through and right turns. Crosswalks are marked across all four legs of the intersection. There is a current time period restriction for no northbound right or left turns between 6 and 9 A.M., Monday through Friday at this intersection. Also, southbound U-turns are not permitted.
3) Hawthorne Boulevard \& Newton Street - The intersection of Hawthorne Boulevard and Newton Street is signalized for four phases of traffic movement. The northbound approach leg features three through lanes and a left turn pocket. The southbound approach leg has three through lanes and a left turn pocket. The eastbound approach leg has one through/right turn lane and a left turn pocket. The westbound approach leg has one through lane, a separate right turn lane, and a left turn pocket. Crosswalks are marked across all four legs of the intersection. Time period restrictions for this intersection include no northbound right turns between 6 and 9 A.M., Monday through Friday.
4) Hawthorne Boulevard \& Via Valmonte - The intersection of Hawthorne Boulevard and Via Valmonte is signalized for two phases of movement. The northbound approach leg features three through lanes, a right turn lane, a left turn pocket, and a raised median island. The southbound approach leg has three through lanes and a left turn pocket, and a raised median island. The eastbound leg has an optional through/right turn/left turn lane, along with enough shoulder for separate right turn movements. The westbound leg has optional through/left and through/right turn lanes. Crosswalks are marked across the southbound, eastbound and westbound legs. U-turns in the northbound and southbound directions are currently prohibited.
5) Hawthorne Boulevard \& Rolling Hills Road - The intersection of Hawthorn Boulevard and Rolling Hills Road is signalized for four phases of traffic movement. The northbound approach leg features two through lanes and a left turn pocket. The southbound approach leg has two through lanes and dual left turn lanes. The eastbound approach leg serves as the driveway for the Sunrise at Palos Verdes development. The westbound approach leg has an optional through/right turn lane, a separate right turn lane, and a separate left turn lane. Crosswalks are marked across the northbound, southbound and westbound approach legs. U-turns in the northbound direction are not permitted.
6) Rolling Hills Road \& Whiffletree Lane - The intersection of Rolling Hills Road and Whiffletree Lane is signalized for two phases of traffic movement. The northbound and southbound approach legs (Whiffletree Lane) each feature one lane serving all movements. The eastbound and westbound approach legs each
have two through lanes with left turn movements yielding to opposing traffic. Crosswalks are marked across all four legs.
7) Rolling Hills Road \& Fallenleaf Drive - The intersection of Rolling Hills Road and Fallenleaf Drive is signalized for two phases of traffic movement. The eastbound and westbound approach legs (Rolling Hills Road) each feature two through lanes and a left turn pocket. The northbound and southbound legs each have a single through lane serving all movements. Crosswalks are marked across all four legs of the intersection.
8) Crenshaw Boulevard \& Rolling Hills Road - The intersection of Crenshaw Boulevard and Rolling Hills Road is signalized for eight phases of traffic movement. The eastbound and westbound approach legs (Rolling Hills Road) each feature one through lane, a separate right turn lane, and a left turn pocket. The northbound and southbound approach legs have three through lanes and a left turn pocket. Crosswalks are marked across all four legs of the intersection.
9) Crenshaw Boulevard \& Pacific Coast Highway - The intersection of Crenshaw Boulevard and Pacific Coast Highway is signalized for eight phases of traffic movement. The northbound approach leg (Crenshaw Boulevard) has three through lanes, a separate right turn lane, and a left turn pocket. The southbound approach leg has three through lanes and a left turn pocket. The eastbound approach leg (Pacific Coast Highway) has two through lanes and dual left turn lanes. The westbound approach leg features three through lanes and dual left turn lanes. High-visibility crosswalks are marked across all four legs.
10) Anza Avenue/Vista Montana \& Pacific Coast Highway - The intersection of Anza Avenue/Vista Montana and Pacific Coast Highway is signalized for six phases of traffic movement. The northbound approach leg features one left turn lane, one left/through lane, and one through/right turn lane. The southbound approach leg has one left turn lane, one left/through lane, one through lane and a separate right turn lane. The eastbound and westbound approach legs each have two through lanes and a left turn pocket. The intersection currently operates with a split phase in the north and south directions. Crosswalks are marked across the northbound, southbound, and eastbound legs of the intersection. Traffic signage indicates that southbound left turns between 4 and 7 P.M., Monday through Friday, are prohibited at the Vista Montana/Newton Street intersection.

The City of Torrance has indicated that this intersection is slated for capital improvements in 2018 to include: dual left turn lanes, one through lane and one through/right turn lane in the northbound direction; and dual left turn lanes, two through lanes and a separate right turn lane in the southbound direction. The intersection will operate with eight phases of movement.
11) Via Valmonte \& Palos Verdes Drive North - The intersection of Via Valmonte and Palos Verdes Drive North is controlled in each direction by stop signs. The northbound approach leg features a through lane and a left turn pocket. The
southbound approach leg has one lane serving all movements. The eastbound and westbound approach legs each have one lane serving all movements. The north leg of the intersection is separated by wide parkway that includes a pedestrian path that continues northwest to Via Alameda. Crosswalks are marked across the southbound, eastbound and westbound legs of the intersection.
12) Hawthorne Boulevard \& Palos Verdes Drive North - This intersection is signalized for eight phases of traffic movement. The northbound approach leg (Hawthorne Boulevard) features two through lanes, a separate right turn lane, and a left turn pocket. The southbound approach leg (Hawthorne Boulevard) has two through lanes, a separate right turn lane, and a left turn pocket. The eastbound approach leg (Palos Verdes Drive North) has two through lanes, a separate right turn lane, and a left turn pocket. The westbound approach leg (Palos Verdes Drive North) has two through lanes, a separate right turn lane, and dual left turn lanes. Crosswalks are marked across all four legs of the intersection. Also, eastbound and westbound U-turns are not permitted.
13) Crenshaw Boulevard \& Palos Verdes Drive North - This intersection is signalized for eight phases of traffic movement. The northbound and southbound approach legs (Crenshaw Boulevard) each feature two through lanes, a separate right turn lane, and a left turn pocket. The eastbound and westbound approach legs (Palos Verdes Drive North) each have two through lanes and dual left turn lanes. Crosswalks are marked across all four legs of the intersection. Traffic signage indicates that northbound right turns on red are prohibited between 7 A.M. to 6 P.M., Monday through Friday at this intersection.
14) Rolling Hills Road/Portuguese Bend Road \& Palos Verdes North - This intersection is signalized for four phases of traffic movement. The northbound approach leg (Rolling Hills Road/Portuguese Bend Road) features a through lane, a separate right turn lane, and a left turn pocket. The southbound approach leg (Rolling Hills Road/Portuguese Bend Road) has an optional through/right turn/left turn lane and a left turn pocket. The eastbound approach leg (Palos Verdes Drive North) has one through lane, a separate right turn lane, and a left turn pocket. The westbound approach leg (Palos Verdes Drive North) has one through lane, a separate right turn lane, and a left turn pocket. Crosswalks are marked across all four legs of the intersection. Northbound U-turns are not permitted.
15) Newton Street \& Calle Mayor - This "T" intersection is controlled by a stop sign in the westbound direction only (Newton Street). The northbound approach leg has one lane serving all movements, while the southbound approach leg has a through lane and a left turn pocket. The westbound approach leg features one lane serving all movements. A yellow (school) crosswalk is marked across the northbound leg only.
16) Vista Montana \& Newton Street - This intersection is controlled in each direction by stop signs. The northbound approach leg (Vista Montana) features one lane serving all movements. The southbound approach leg has a through
lane, a separate right turn lane, and a left turn pocket. The eastbound and westbound approach legs (Newton Street) each have one lane serving all movements. Crosswalks are marked on the northbound, southbound, and eastbound legs.
17) Madison Street \& Newton Street - This intersection is controlled in all directions by stop signs. The northbound, southbound, eastbound, and westbound approach legs each feature one lane serving all movements. There is adequate street width on all approach legs for allow two vehicles to stop side by side (i.e., one going through and one turning right). Yellow (school) crosswalks are marked on all legs of the intersection.
18) Pacific Coast Highway \& Calle Mayor - This intersection is signalized for eight phases of traffic movement. The northbound and southbound approach legs (Calle Mayor) each have a through lane, a separate right turn lane, and a left turn pocket. The westbound approach leg (Pacific Coast Highway) features two through lanes and a left turn pocket. The eastbound approach leg (Pacific Coast Highway) has two through lanes and a left turn pocket. Crosswalks are marked across all four legs of the intersection. Northbound, southbound, eastbound and westbound U-turns are not permitted. Yellow (school) crosswalks are marked on all legs of the intersection.


Figure 5 - Hawthorne Boulevard \& Pacific Coast Highway


Figure 6 - Hawthorne Boulevard \& 244 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street


Figure 7 - Hawthorne Boulevard \& Newton Street


Figure 8 - Hawthorne Boulevard \& Via Valmonte


Figure 9 - Hawthorne Boulevard \& Rolling Hills Road


Figure 10 - Rolling Hills Road \& Whiffletree Lane


Figure 11 - Rolling Hills Road \& Fallenleaf Drive


Figure 12 - Crenshaw Boulevard \& Rolling Hills Road


Figure 13 - Crenshaw Boulevard \& Pacific Coast Highway


Figure 14 - Anza Avenue/Vista Montana \& Pacific Coast Highway


Figure 15 - Via Valmonte \& Palos Verde Drive North


Figure 16 - Hawthorne Boulevard \& Palos Verdes Drive North


Figure 17 - Crenshaw Boulevard \& Palos Verdes Drive North


Figure 18 - Rolling Hills Road/Portuguese Bend \& Palos Verdes Drive North


Figure 19 - Newton Street \& Calle Mayor


Figure 20 - Vista Montana \& Newton Street


Figure 21 - Madison Street \& Newton Street


Figure 22 - Pacific Coast Highway \& Calle Mayor

## III. STUDY TERMINOLOGY

The following are definitions of some of the more frequent terminology used throughout this report.

## A.M. and P.M. Peak Hours

The A.M and P.M. peak hours refer to the morning and late afternoon times of the day during which the greatest number of motor vehicles are carried on a given roadway segment or intersection. Typically, the significant peak hours of traffic on an average weekday occur during the morning commute, between 7:00 and 9:00 A.M., and during the afternoon, between 4:00 and 6:00 P.M. These hours do not necessarily correspond to the peak trip generation, which, for commercial uses, can occur mid-day and on weekends. For the subject study, A.M. and P.M. peak hour turn movement traffic counts were collected in the month of April 2016 for each study intersection on a Wednesday. An annual growth factor of one percent was then added to the 2016 counts to estimate 2017 volumes. These intersection turn movement counts were independently collected for KHR Associates by National Data \& Surveying Services (NDS), Santa Ana, California. The summary intersection traffic count results can be found in the Appendix section of this report.


Figure 23 - Intersection Lane Configurations

## Average Daily Traffic

The average daily traffic (ADT) volume is an estimate of the number of motor vehicles carried on a given roadway segment over a 24 -hour period of time. The estimate of ADT is often based on one or more days of actual traffic counts taken by a mechanical device designed specifically for counting traffic on streets. ADT volumes are typically expressed as the total number of vehicles for both directions of travel, but may be separated by direction when such information is useful, as was done for this traffic analysis. ADT volumes do not typically change in dramatic fashion from month to month or year to year, unless the area in question is undergoing rapid growth and development or seasonal variations are significant. For the subject study, directional roadway segment traffic counts were continuously collected in the month of April 2016 over 24 consecutive hours - on a Wednesday. These daily traffic counts were also independently collected for KHR Associates by NDS. The summary ADT count results can be found in the Appendix section of this report.

## Capacity

The capacity of a roadway segment or intersection is the maximum rate of vehicular traffic flow under prevailing traffic, physical design, and operational conditions. Factors affecting capacity include the type and frequency of traffic controls; the operational characteristics of traffic signals (if present); lane widths; horizontal and vertical grades; horizontal and vertical clearances from obstructions; the amount of truck and/or bus traffic; the availability of on-street parking and the rate of parking turnover; restrictions on mid-property access; and the volume of turn movements at adjacent intersections and driveways. Capacity is most commonly defined for hourly periods of time, and most analyses rely on peak 15 -minute count increments to establish capacity values. It is useful to define capacity as the maximum volume of traffic that an intersection may be expected to carry, under the least desirable conditions (e.g., with heavy congestion during the peak hours).

For planning purposes, roadway segments are also assigned "capacities" based on the number of travel lanes; width of the roadway; access restrictions; medians; parkway and intersection design; and land uses. 24-hour segment capacities are not indicative of the maximum number of vehicles that can be physically carried - rather, such capacities suggest the maximum number of vehicles that should be allowed under ideal conditions given the characteristics of the roadway and community preferences. These capacity values vary somewhat between jurisdictions. The City of Torrance uses a per lane capacity of 1,600 vehicles.

Hourly capacities for roadways are typically stated in vehicles per hour per lane (VPHPL). On multi-lane arterials and freeways, unimpeded capacity is $2,000 \mathrm{VPHPL}$. On two-lane roadways, with directional traffic split $50 \% / 50 \%$, the total capacity for both directions combined is 2,800 vehicles per hour (VPH). Lane capacities on surface streets vary from $1,500 \mathrm{VPH}$ to $1,900 \mathrm{VPH}$, depending on ambient and
operational conditions, including the types of adjacent land uses, number and location of driveways, intersection signal operations, and other factors.

## Level of Service

The level of service (LOS) of a roadway segment or an intersection is a qualitatively defined measure of prevailing traffic, design, and operational conditions. The LOS, denoted alphabetically from "A" to "F," best to worst, is an evaluation of the degree of congestion, roadway design constraints, delay, accident potential, and driver discomfort experienced during a given period of time - typically during the peak hour or on a daily basis. LOS "D" or better is considered to be a target for intersection operations within the City of Torrance to maintain stable traffic flow, realizing that peak hour congestion may occur at locations with unusual traffic characteristics due to regional traffic flow. ${ }^{\text {B }}$

The LOS may be quantitatively calculated by a number of methods that generally compare traffic volumes with the physical and operational capacity of a roadway section or intersection to carry traffic demands placed upon it. For roadway segments and intersections, the volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio is indicative of LOS. Traffic volumes are measured by conducting actual counts over prescribed periods of time. Capacity figures are established by the governing jurisdiction, and often based on localized conditions. Intersection LOS can also be determined using computer software to account for various influencing factors such as lane configurations, traffic signal timing (for signalized intersections), and vehicle delays.

Table II lists the typical service volumes corresponding to the number of lanes and median type. It should be noted that the LOS for roadway segments are generally used for planning purposes only, and do not indicate true operational LOS.

| TABLE II - LEVELS OF SERVICE FOR ROADWAY CLASSIFICATIONS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Traffic Lane | Levels of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Configuration | A | B | C | D | E | F |  |
| 8 (divided) | 45,000 | 52,500 | 60,000 | 67,500 | 75,000 | $>75,000$ |  |
| 6 (divided) | 33,900 | 39,400 | 45,000 | 50,600 | 56,300 | $>56,300$ |  |
| 4 (divided) | 22,500 | 26,300 | 30,000 | 33,800 | 37,500 | $>37,500$ |  |
| 4 (undivided) | 15,000 | 17,500 | 20,000 | 22,500 | 25,000 | $>25,000$ |  |
| 2 (undivided) | 7,500 | 8,800 | 10,000 | 11,300 | 12,500 | $>12,500$ |  |

Various methods of computing intersection LOS are used, including the Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) and HCS+ software, based on the 2010 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM). ${ }^{\text {C }}$ Table III provides City of Torrance LOS definitions for signalized intersections at corresponding volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratios. Table IV provides

[^1]criteria for signalized and unsignalized intersections, based on HCM methodologies for determining LOS. These LOS are used to approximate true operating conditions, and are calculated for intersections during morning and late afternoon peak hours. It should be noted that four of the eighteen studied intersections are located along Pacific Coast Highway - State Route 1 and are therefore under the jurisdiction of the Caltrans which evaluates intersection impacts using the HCM method - included within this study.

## TABLE III - SIGNALIZED INTERSECTION LOS \& VIC RATIOS

\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{ccl}\frac{\text { LOS }}{\text { A }} & \underline{\text { VIC Ratio }} & \leq 0.60\end{array}
$$ \begin{array}{l}Definitions <br>
B <br>
Cxcellent operation. All approaches to the intersection appear quite open, <br>
turning movements are easily made, and nearly all drivers find freedom of <br>

operation.\end{array}\right]=0.60 \leq 0.70\)| Very good operation. Many drivers begin to feel somewhat restricted within |
| :--- |
| platoons of vehicles. This represents stable flow. An approach to an |
| intersection may occasionally be fully utilized and traffic queues start to form. |

TABLE IV - UNSIGNALIZED \& SIGNALIZED INTERSECTION LOS CRITERIA

|  |  | $\frac{\text { Intersection Delay (in Seconds) }}{}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Level of Service |  | Unsignalized Intersection | $\leq 10.0$ |
| A |  | Signalized Intersection |  |
| B | $>10.0$ and $\leq 15.0$ | $\leq 10.0$ |  |
| C | $>15.0$ and $\leq 25.0$ | $>10.0$ and $\leq 20.0$ |  |
| D | $>25.0$ and $\leq 35.0$ | $>20.0$ and $\leq 35.0$ |  |
| E | $>35.0$ and $\leq 50.0$ | $>35.0$ and $\leq 55.0$ |  |
| F | $>50.0$ | $>55.0$ and $\leq 80.0$ |  |
|  |  | $>80.0$ |  |

Source: Highway Capacity Manual, HCM 2010 \& Caltrans Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies, 2002.

## Significant Transportation Impact

Although the methodologies for calculating LOS are well-established and fairly consistent, determining whether or not a "significant transportation impact" or intersection traffic impact occurs is not as easy to quantify. Local jurisdictions have varying interpretations of what constitutes a significant impact. Some agencies base
significant impacts on the number of seconds added to average intersection delay per vehicle or the number of additional vehicles added to a critical intersection turn movement. The City of Torrance defines a significant impact as when project traffic increases volume/capacity by .02 or more and the resulting LOS is E or worse. The neighboring City of Rolling Hills Estates considers a significant impact as a change in LOS from C to $D$, or $D$ to $E$, or a change in volume/capacity by .02 or more within LOS C or D, or a change of . 01 within LOS E or F. The City of Palos Verdes Estates considers added delay, in seconds, (e.g., 3 seconds or more within LOS D).

## Trip Ends

Traffic generated by different types of development and land use is typically expressed in terms of trip ends. A trip end (or trip) is the directional movement of a single motor vehicle either to or from a development site. When a vehicle enters a development site, one trip end is generated. When a vehicle exits a development site, one trip end is generated. Therefore, each vehicle entering and exiting a development site generates two trip ends. For analysis purposes, the number of trip ends generated over a given time period is the total of all vehicles entering plus all vehicles exiting the site during that time period. Trip ends generated to a development site are designated inbound trips and trip ends generated from a development site are designated outbound trips.

## Trip Generation

Trip generation refers to the number of trip ends generated by a given development or land use over a specified period of time - usually per day and during morning and late afternoon peak hours of traffic demand. Attempts to quantify the trip making propensities of given land uses and types of development have led to the formulation of trip generation rates. In simplified travel demand forecasting, trip ends are often estimated by applying these empirically-determined trip generation rates. Rates for a variety of land uses, including residential developments, may be found in technical reference documents such as the Institute of Transportation Engineers' (ITE) Trip Generation manual. ${ }^{\text {D }}$ The data found in these documents typically include average weekday and peak hour rates that correspond with the peak periods of commuter traffic. A wide assortment of land uses, including multi-family residential, commercial office, and lodging are covered. For multi-family residential development, the independent variable is typically the number of dwelling units, and trip generation is stated in terms of trip ends per dwelling unit.

## Trip Reduction

The convenient and price-sensitive availability of transit service to and from a given project site can also reduce private vehicle trips. The City provides a municipally operated transit system called the "Torrance Transit" serving the South Bay region of

[^2]Los Angeles County. In addition, the proliferation of private taxi services such as Uber and Lyft are having an impact on how small groups of people routinely travel to certain destinations and venues. Due to the uncertain benefit of these services, trip reduction estimates were not used to estimate future traffic related impacts.

## Trip Distribution/Trip Assignment

In addition to trip generation, travel demand forecasting also includes trip distribution and trip assignment. Trip distribution signifies by general direction (i.e., east, west, north, and south) the percentage of all traffic generated to and from a given project site. Trip assignment identifies the particular routes used by traffic generated to and from a given project site. These steps are often combined for small projects and/or areas of analysis. Trip distribution/trip assignment is used to predict the patterns of traffic generated by a given project site, taking into consideration several factors, including: observations of existing traffic patterns; existing land use and proposed land use; surrounding land uses; volumes of traffic on streets and highways; the carrying capacity of these streets and highways; and access restrictions.

## Ambient Growth

In order to effectively estimate future traffic conditions at the Project completion, an ambient growth factor was included in the evaluations per the recommendation of the City of Torrance. Volumes recorded in 2016 for study roadways and intersections were multiplied by one percent to estimate current 2017 conditions and another one percent per year for the next two years - the estimated date of occupancy.

## IV. TRIP GENERATION

Trip generation for the proposed Project can be estimated by applying known trip generation rates for the various proposed uses. For urban settings, trip generation is calculated for an average weekday (24-hour period, and for the morning and afternoon peak hours of weekday commute (typically 7:00 to 9:00 A.M. and 4:00 to 6:00 P.M.) on streets serving a given project). For the proposed Project residential use, the ITE Trip Generation manual provides the following definitions, as updated with the $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition of the ITE Trip Generation manual:

## Land Use Code 221 - Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise)

Per ITE Land Use Code 221, Multifamily Housing (Mid-Rise) buildings are defined as buildings containing three to ten floors, located in a General Urban/Suburban setting. This general land use includes a variety of multifamily housing types with varying sizes, locations, and price ranges. Additionally, with respect to analyzing potential traffic impacts associated with residential housing, "the peak hour of the generator typically coincides with the peak hour of the adjacent street traffic." ${ }^{E}$

[^3]| TABLE V - SUMMARY OF SOLANA TORRANCE TRIP GENERATION AVERAGE DAILY TRIPS ON A WEEKDAY |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use Category (Code) ${ }^{1}$ | Size ${ }^{2}$ | Trip Rate ${ }^{3}$ | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Inbound/ } \\ \text { Outbound }\end{array}$ | Inbound <br> Trip Ends ${ }^{4}$ | Outbound <br> Trip Ends ${ }^{4}$ | Total Trip Ends ${ }^{4}$ |
| Multi-Family Residential (221) | 248 DU | 5.44/DU | 50\%/50\% | 674 | 675 | 1,349 |
| WEEKDAY A.M. PEAK HOUR OF ADJACENT STREET TRAFFIC |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Land Use Category (Code) ${ }^{1}$ | Size ${ }^{2}$ | Trip Rate ${ }^{3}$ | Inbound/ Outbound ${ }^{3}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Inbound } \\ & \text { Trip Ends }{ }^{4} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Outbound Trip Ends ${ }^{4}$ | Total Trip Ends |
| Multi-Family Residential (221) | 248 DU | 0.36/DU | 26\%/74\% | 23 | 66 | 89 |
| WEEKDAY P.M. PEAK HOUR OF ADJACENT STREET TRAFFIC |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Land Use Category (Code) ${ }^{1}$ | Size $^{2}$ | Trip Rate ${ }^{3}$ | Inbound/ Outbound ${ }^{3}$ | Inbound Trip Ends ${ }^{4}$ | Outbound Trip Ends ${ }^{4}$ | Total Trip Ends |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Multi-Family } \\ & \text { Residential (221) } \end{aligned}$ | 248 DU | 0.44/DU | 61\%/39\% | 66 | 43 | 109 |
| Notes: <br> 1 - Land Use Code Per Trip Generation Manual, $10^{\text {th }}$ Ed., Institute of Transportation Engineers. <br> 2 - DU = Dwelling Units <br> 3 - Trip Generation Rate \& Percentage of Inbound/Outbound Trips Per Trip Generation Manual, $10^{\text {th }}$ Ed., Institute of Transportation Engineers <br> 4 - All Trip Ends Rounded to Nearest Whole Unit |  |  |  |  |  |  |

As indicated in Table V, the proposed Project is estimated to generate a total of 1,349 daily trip ends, as well as 89 A.M. peak hour trip ends ( 23 inbound and 66 outbound) and 109 P.M. peak hour trip ends ( 66 inbound and 43 outbound).

## V. TRIP DISTRIBUTION/TRIP ASSIGNMENTS

Trip distribution and trip assignments for the proposed Project were formulated with input from the City of Torrance Traffic and Transportation Division.

## Trip Distribution

Based on known trip making propensities and travel routes taken by those residing, working, and traveling within the regional proximity of the proposed Project, trip distribution assumptions were formulated. The distribution of inbound and outbound trips generated by the proposed Project are depicted in Figure 24. As noted, the majority of trips ( 80 percent) are oriented toward the north, where most employment centers, commercial businesses, and schools are located. The remaining 20 percent were oriented to the south along Hawthorne Boulevard where access exists to Crenshaw Boulevard, Palos Verdes Drive, and Western Avenue.


Figure 24 - Trip Distribution Assumptions

## Trip Assignments

Based on the trip distribution assumptions illustrated in Figure 24, trip assignments were made. These trip assignments were based on physical and operational constraints affecting roadways and intersections; direction (i.e., inbound or outbound) and time of day (i.e., A.M. or P.M. peak hour) of travel; and traffic control devices that regulate the flow of traffic on the streets and highways network servicing the Project site. It should be noted that, at the northbound approach to the Via Valmonte/ Hawthorne Boulevard intersection, U-turns leading to southbound Hawthorne are not permitted. Therefore, Project vehicles coming from the south were sent through this intersection to ultimately make U-turns at the Hawthorne/Newton Street intersection.

Inbound and outbound trips generated by the proposed Project during the daily, and A.M. and P.M. peak hours of weekday commute were assigned to various roadway segments and study intersections based on trip distribution percentages in each direction from the Project site. These inbound and outbound trip assignments during daily, and A.M. and P.M. peak hours are depicted in Figure 25.

## Existing Traffic - Year 2017 Conditions

Existing traffic (2016 Volumes plus 1\% Annual Growth) at roadways and intersections were documented by 24 -hour (i.e., ADT) and peak hour (i.e., A.M. and P.M. peak hours) turn movement counts. The results are illustrated in Figure 26.

## Existing + Ambient Growth Conditions

Adding ambient growth traffic (i.e., 1\% per year for two years) to existing (2017) traffic at study roadway segments and intersections during the A.M. and P.M peak hours of weekday commute are illustrated in Figure 27.

## Ambient+Project Traffic Conditions

Adding Project traffic to the Ambient Growth condition at study roadway segments and intersections during the A.M. and P.M peak hours of weekday commute are illustrated in Figure 28.

## Committed and Proposed Developments

There are a number of development projects within the regional area of the Project site that are either in the design or advanced planning stages, or under construction that will generate varying amounts of traffic on the regional streets and highways network. Traffic generated by these development projects need to be taken into account when evaluating the proposed Project's fair share responsibilities for traffic improvements. Although the timing of completion of each development will vary, for this study, a worst-case scenario was used by assuming build-out and occupancy of each development in two years.


Figure 25 - ADT \& Peak Hour "Project-Only" Trip Assignments


Figure 26-2017 Existing ADT \& Peak Hour Intersection Traffic Volumes


Figure 27 - Ex.+Ambient Growth ADT \& Peak Hour Intersection Traffic Volumes


Figure 28 - Ambient + Project ADT \& Peak Hour Intersection Traffic Volumes

Table VI contains a list of committed and proposed projects within the area of the Project site, as provided by the Cities of Torrance, Rancho Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills Estates, Redondo Beach and Lomita. Note that Palos Verdes Estates did not have any new developments on the horizon. Also listed are their respective amounts of traffic estimated to be generated upon completion. The location of each of these projects is identified in Figure 29. Additionally, since the previous version of this report, another project located directly across Via Valmonte is proposed for a mixeduse development that is anticipated to create a minor addition of traffic to the intersection of Via Valmonte and Hawthorne Boulevard. These anticipated trips have been added to Table VI and included in the analysis.


Figure 29 - Location of Committed and Proposed Development Projects

## Cumulative Traffic Conditions

Adding cumulative development traffic to the existing traffic, ambient growth, and project development traffic at study roadway segments and intersections during the A.M. and P.M peak hours of weekday commute are illustrated in Figure 30.


## Notes:

DU: Dwelling Unit; SF: Square Feet; RM: Room
${ }^{1}$ Trip Gen. Rate \& Percent of In/Out Trips Per Trip Generation Manual, $9^{\text {th }}$ Ed., Institute of Transportation Engineers.
${ }^{2}$ All Trip Ends Rounded to Nearest Whole Unit.
${ }^{3}$ Data from Available Traffic Studies.


Figure 30 - Cumulative ADT \& Peak Hour Intersection Traffic Volumes

## VI. EXISTING \& FUTURE LEVELS OF SERVICE

Future traffic conditions resulting from additional development may be predicted by performing a travel demand forecast. Such forecasts vary in magnitude and complexity, but at minimum include defining the streets and highways network of interest; estimating the amount of traffic generated by a given development or geographic area; determining the area-wide distribution of this traffic; and assigning it to specific portions of the streets and highways network. In order to determine the magnitude and impact of additional traffic generated onto streets surrounding the project site, a travel demand forecast of future traffic conditions was undertaken for the proposed Project. Using the 2017 traffic volumes and employing trip generation, distribution and assignment of future traffic, as described in Section V , existing and future roadway and intersection levels of service can be determined.

Both the ICU and the HCM methodologies were employed to determine intersection levels of service for signalized intersections. For stop-controlled intersections, only the HCM method was used due to several factors that contribute to LOS for these types of movements. For Project and Cumulative estimates, Capital Improvements, as described in Section II, slated for the Pacific Coast Highway/Hawthorne Boulevard and Pacific Coast Highway/Vista Montana intersections were included in the analyses. Also, the Hawthorne Boulevard/Via Valmonte intersection analysis includes additional capacity provided by the additional left turn lane proposed as part of the Project. Roadway segments were evaluated based on typical level of service volumes for each roadway designation.

## Existing, Ambient Growth, Project, and Cumulative Roadway LOS

Based on a comparison between the ADT count in Appendix A of this report (plus the one percent annual growth) and the City's Circulation Element designations for roadway classifications, the LOS for study roadways for the 2017 conditions, and existing plus ambient growth (i.e., one percent per year for two years) volumes were determined. Then, the Project traffic and the cumulative development related traffic were added to estimate future LOS conditions.

Cumulative impacts refer to the combined effects of traffic generated by individual projects within a defined area of concern. The City's list of committed and proposed projects along with neighboring City projects will generate varying amounts of additional traffic (see Table VII). While the traffic impacts associated with each project may not be individually significant, cumulatively, the traffic impacts can be significant, or have the potential of compounding or increasing the effects of traffic impacts of the proposed Project. As noted in Table VII, all roadway segments currently operate at acceptable levels of service, and should continue to operate at acceptable levels of service. The only change in roadway segment LOS occurs on Via Valmonte adjacent to the Project site - from "A" to "B" with the addition of cumulative traffic.


## Existing (2017) \& Existing + Project Intersection LOS - ICU Method

Existing intersection LOS, as calculated using the ICU method, are summarized in Table VIII for the signalized intersections studied. Turn movement counts for existing traffic were taken in April 2016 (plus the one percent annual growth), and in November 2017 for the added intersections establishing the 2017 baseline conditions. Anticipated Project traffic (as well as the proposed intersection improvements at Via Valmonte/Hawthorne Boulevard) was then added to the intersections to determine Project related impacts on baseline conditions. As shown, with the addition of Project traffic, no changes in LOS occurred between the two scenarios. The ICU calculation forms may be found in the Appendix section of this report. Table VIII shows that most of intersections operate within acceptable levels of LOS "D" or better under both scenarios with the exception of the following:

- Crenshaw Blvd/Pacific Coast Hwy intersection - LOS "E" P.M.
- Crenshaw Blvd/Palos Verdes Dr. N. intersection - LOS "E" A.M \& P.M.
- Rolling Hills Rd/Palos Verdes Dr. N. intersection - LOS "F" A.M \& P.M.
- Calle Mayor/Pacific Coast Hwy intersection - LOS "E" A.M. / LOS "F" P.M.


## Existing + Ambient \& Existing + Ambient + Project Intersection LOS - ICU Method

Future "Existing + Ambient (2019)" conditions as calculated using the ICU method, are summarized in Table IX for the signalized intersections studied. This time period includes two more years of ambient growth. Also, these estimates included the capital improvements slated for the Pacific Coast Highway/ Hawthorne Boulevard and Pacific Coast Highway/Vista Montana intersections. Project traffic was then added and the listed values for the Hawthorne Boulevard/Via Valmonte intersection under the + Project scenario include additional capacity provided by the additional left turn lane proposed as part of the Project. As shown in Table IX, the LOS designations remain the same between the two scenarios.

| Intersection | $\begin{aligned} & \text { III - EXI } \\ & \text { IZED IN } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ISTING } \\ & \text { ITERS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { (2017) } \\ & \text { ECTION } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \& \text { EXI } \\ & \text { S - IC } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JG+PR } \\ & \text { ETHOL } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { JECT } \\ & \text { LOS } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2017 EXISTING $^{1}$ |  |  |  | EXISTING + PROJECT ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |
|  | A.M. Peak Hour |  | P.M. Peak Hour |  | A.M. Peak Hour |  | P.M. Peak Hour |  |
|  | ICU | LOS | ICU | LOS | ICU | Los | ICU | LOS |
| Hawthorne Blvd/Pacific Coast Hwy | 0.878 | D | 0.870 | D | 0.886 | D | 0.878 | D |
| Hawthorne Blvd/244 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street | 0.504 | A | 0.521 | A | 0.514 | A | 0.528 | A |
| Hawthorne Blvd/Newton Street | 0.627 | B | 0.773 | C | 0.640 | B | 0.794 | C |
| Hawthorne Blvd/Via Valmonte | 0.576 | A | 0.633 | B | $0.521^{3}$ | A | $0.609^{3}$ | B |
| Hawthorne Blvd/Rolling Hills Road | 0.658 | B | 0.606 | B | 0.660 | B | 0.609 | B |
| Whiffletree Lane/Rolling Hills Road | 0.393 | A | 0.399 | A | 0.394 | A | 0.402 | A |
| Fallenleaf Drive/Rolling Hills Road | 0.318 | A | 0.288 | A | 0.318 | A | 0.290 | A |
| Crenshaw Blvd/Rolling Hills Road | 0.780 | C | 0.840 | D | 0.782 | C | 0.846 | D |
| Crenshaw Blvd/Pacific Coast Hwy. | 0.882 | D | 0.980 | E | 0.897 | D | 0.986 | E |
| Vista Montana/Pacific Coast Hwy. | 0.779 | C | 0.843 | D | 0.783 | C | 0.847 | D |
| Hawthorne Blvd/Palos Verdes Dr. N | 0.764 | c | 0.709 | C | 0.766 | c | 0.712 | C |
| Crenshaw Blvd/Palos Verdes Dr. N | 0.939 | E | 0.884 | D | 0.940 | E | 0.885 | D |
| Rolling Hills Rd/Palos Verdes Dr. N | 1.398 | F | 1.401 | F | 1.399 | F | 1.402 | F |
| Pacific Coast Hwy/Calle Mayor | 0.974 | E | 1.028 | F | 0.976 | E | 1.030 | F |
| ${ }^{1}$ Intersection Counts Taken by NDS, April 2016 (Plus 1\% Annual Growth), and November 2017 for Added Locations <br> ${ }_{3}^{2}$ Project Related Trips Per Trip Distribution and Turn Movement Restrictions and Opportunities <br> ${ }^{3}$ Includes Project Related Improvements |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## TABLE IX - EXISTING + AMBIENT (2019) \& EX. + AMBIENT + PROJECT SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS - ICU METHOD LOS

| Intersection | EXISTING+AMBIENT (2019) ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  | EX.+AMBIENT+PROJECT ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A.M. Peak Hour |  | P.M. Peak Hour |  | A.M. Peak Hour |  | P.M. Peak Hour |  |
|  | ICU | LOS | ICU | LOS | ICU | LOS | ICU | LOS |
| Hawthorne Blvd/Pacific Coast Hwy ${ }^{3}$ | 0.809 | C | 0.700 | C | 0.817 | D | 0.761 | C |
| Hawthorne Blvd/244 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street | 0.512 | A | 0.529 | A | 0.522 | A | 0.536 | A |
| Hawthorne Blvd/Newton Street | 0.638 | B | 0.786 | C | 0.652 | B | 0.807 | D |
| Hawthorne Blvd/Via Valmonte | 0.586 | A | 0.643 | B | $0.529^{4}$ | A | $0.619^{4}$ | B |
| Hawthorne Blvd/Rolling Hills Road | 0.670 | B | 0.617 | B | 0.672 | B | 0.620 | B |
| Whiffletree Lane/Rolling Hills Road | 0.397 | A | 0.404 | A | 0.399 | A | 0.407 | A |
| Fallenleaf Drive/Rolling Hills Road | 0.323 | A | 0.292 | A | 0.324 | A | 0.294 | A |
| Crenshaw Blvd/Rolling Hills Road | 0.795 | C | 0.854 | D | 0.796 | C | 0.854 | D |
| Crenshaw Blvd/Pacific Coast Hwy. | 0.897 | D | 0.998 | E | 0.899 | D | 0.998 | E |
| Vista Montana/Pacific Coast Hwy ${ }^{3}$ | 0.794 | C | 0.858 | C | 0.798 | C | 0.862 | C |
| Hawthorne Blvd/Palos Verdes Dr. N | 0.778 | C | 0.721 | C | 0.779 | C | 0.724 | C |
| Crenshaw Blvd/Palos Verdes Dr. N | 0.956 | E | 0.900 | E | 0.957 | E | 0.900 | E |
| Rolling Hills Rd/Palos Verdes Dr. N | 1.424 | F | 1.429 | F | 1.427 | F | 1.429 | F |
| Pacific Coast Hwy/Calle Mayor | 0.992 | E | 1.047 | F | 0.994 | E | 1.048 | F |

[^4]
## Existing + Ambient + Cumulative \& Existing + Ambient + Cumulative + Project Intersection LOS - ICU Method

Future "Existing+Ambient+Cumulative" and "Existing+Ambient+Cumulative+Project" LOS, as calculated using the ICU method, are summarized in Table $X$ for the signalized intersections studied. These estimates also included the capital improvements slated for the Pacific Coast Highway/Hawthorne Boulevard and Pacific Coast Highway/Vista Montana intersections. Under the + Project scenario, the values for the Hawthorne Boulevard/Via Valmonte intersection include additional capacity provided by the additional left turn lane proposed as part of the Project.

As shown in Table $X$, the addition of Cumulative development results in decreased volume/capacity ratios, and in some locations and time periods, the LOS designations decrease with the added traffic from surrounding development. With the addition of Project traffic, the LOS designations do not change worsen any further.

| Intersection | $\begin{array}{r} X-E X \\ \text { NG + A } \\ \text { IZED IN } \\ \text { EX. } \end{array}$ | STIN MBIE TERS AMB. + | $\begin{aligned} & \text { + AMB } \\ & \text { T + CUN } \\ & \text { ECTION } \\ & \text { UMULAT } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ENT + } \\ & \text { NULAT } \\ & \text { S - ICU } \\ & \text { VVE }^{1} \end{aligned}$ | MULA + PRO <br> ETHOD <br> EX.+A | IVE <br> JECT <br> LOS <br> MB+CU | U.+PROJ | CT ${ }^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A.M. Peak Hour |  | P.M. Peak Hour |  | A.M. Peak Hour |  | P.M. Peak Hour |  |
|  | ICU | LOS | ICU | LOS | ICU | LOS | ICU | LOS |
| Hawthorne Blvd/Pacific Coast Hwy ${ }^{3}$ | 0.772 | C | 0.769 | C | 0.779 | C | 0.776 | C |
| Hawthorne Blvd/244 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street | 0.530 | A | 0.549 | A | 0.540 | A | 0.556 | A |
| Hawthorne Blvd/Newton Street | 0.647 | B | 0.809 | D | 0.660 | B | 0.830 | D |
| Hawthorne Blvd/Via Valmonte | 0.522 | A | 0.609 | B | $0.540^{4}$ | A | $0.633{ }^{4}$ | B |
| Hawthorne Blvd/Rolling Hills Road | 0.684 | B | 0.628 | B | 0.686 | B | 0.631 | B |
| Whiffletree Lane/Rolling Hills Road | 0.399 | A | 0.407 | A | 0.401 | A | 0.410 | A |
| Fallenleaf Drive/Rolling Hills Road | 0.326 | A | 0.294 | A | 0.327 | A | 0.296 | A |
| Crenshaw Blvd/Rolling Hills Road | 0.811 | D | 0.867 | D | 0.813 | D | 0.868 | D |
| Crenshaw Blvd/Pacific Coast Hwy. | 0.913 | E | 1.032 | F | 0.919 | E | 1.033 | F |
| Vista Montana/Pacific Coast Hwy ${ }^{3}$ | 0.772 | C | 0.727 | C | 0.776 | C | 0.780 | C |
| Hawthorne Blvd/Palos Verdes Dr. N | 0.792 | C | 0.736 | C | 0.793 | C | 0.739 | C |
| Crenshaw Blvd/Palos Verdes Dr. N | 0.961 | E | 0.913 | E | 0.962 | E | 0.914 | E |
| Rolling Hills Rd/Palos Verdes Dr. N | 1.429 | F | 1.451 | F | 1.431 | F | 1.451 | F |
| Pacific Coast Hwy/Calle Mayor | . 998 | F | 1.059 | F | 1.000 | F | 1.061 | F |
| ${ }^{1}$ Project Related Trips Per Trip Distribution and Turn Movement Restrictions and Opportunities <br> ${ }^{2}$ Cumulative Developments - Volumes Based Upon Various Trip Distribution Percentages for Each Region <br> ${ }^{3}$ Includes Planned Capital Improvements <br> ${ }^{4}$ Includes Project Related Improvements |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Intersection LOS - HCM Method

"Existing" and "Existing+Project" Growth LOS, as calculated using the HCM method, are summarized in Table XI for all eighteen intersections studied. The
"Existing+Ambient" and and "Existing+Ambient+Project" scenarios are shown in Table XII. The "Cumulative" condition without the Project, and with the Project are shown in Table XIII. The HCM calculation forms may be found in the Appendix section of this report.

## TABLE XI - 2017 EXISTING \& EXISTING+PROJECT TRAFFIC ALL INTERSECTIONS - HCM METHOD LOS

| Intersection | 2017 EXISTING ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  | EXISTING+PROJECT ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A.M. Peak Hour |  | P.M. Peak Hour |  | A.M. Peak Hour |  | P.M. Peak Hour |  |
|  | Delay ${ }^{3}$ | LOS | Delay ${ }^{3}$ | LOS | Delay ${ }^{3}$ | LOS | Delay ${ }^{3}$ | LOS |
| Hawthorne Blvd/Pacific Coast Hwy. | 50.3 | D | 67.2 | E | 52.5 | D | 70.5 | E |
| Hawthorne Blvd/244 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street | 21.8 | C | 21.9 | C | 26.3 | C | 24.8 | C |
| Hawthorne Blvd/Newton Street | 10.9 | B | 12.6 | B | 11.1 | B | 13.3 | B |
| Hawthorne Blvd/Via Valmonte | 11.6 | B | 15.0 | B | 14.3 | B | 18.7 | B |
| Hawthorne Blvd/Rolling Hills Road | 17.5 | B | 13.7 | B | 17.7 | B | 13.7 | B |
| Whiffletree Lane/Rolling Hills Road | 5.4 | A | 4.2 | A | 5.4 | A | 4.2 | A |
| Fallenleaf Drive/Rolling Hills Road | 6.3 | A | 4.9 | A | 6.3 | A | 4.9 | A |
| Crenshaw Blvd/Rolling Hills Road | 67.3 | E | 46.2 | D | 68.5 | E | 46.5 | D |
| Crenshaw Blvd/Pacific Coast Hwy. | 48.5 | D | 59.7 | E | 49.4 | D | 60.8 | E |
| Vista Montana/Pacific Coast Hwy. | 72.3 | E | 44.8 | D | 76.9 | E | 45.6 | D |
| Palos Verdes Drive/Via Valmonte | 29.7 | D | 26.7 | D | 29.8 | D | 26.8 | D |
| Hawthorne Blvd/Palos Verdes Dr. N. | 55.3 | E | 31.2 | C | 56.1 | E | 31.6 | C |
| Crenshaw Blvd/Palos Verdes Dr. N. | 103.5 | F | 104.1 | F | 104.3 | F | 104.7 | F |
| Rolling Hills Rd/Palos Verdes Dr. N. | 292.0 | F | 257.2 | F | 294.0 | F | 260.2 | F |
| Newton Street/Calle Mayor | 14.0 | B | 11.8 | B | 14.0 | B | 11.8 | B |
| Vista Montana/Newton Street | 15.0 | C | 11.1 | B | 15.1 | C | 11.1 | B |
| Madison Street/Newton Street | 8.7 | A | 9.2 | A | 8.7 | A | 9.2 | A |
| Pacific Coast Hwy/Calle Mayor | 112.1 | F | 179.9 | F | 113.4 | F | 181.5 | F |
| ${ }^{1}$ Intersection Counts Taken by NDS, April 2016 (Plus 1\% Annual Growth <br> ${ }^{2}$ Annual Growth Rate of 1 Percent per Year for 2 Years <br> ${ }^{3}$ Worst Case Direction Average Intersection Delay Per Vehicle (In Seconds) <br> ${ }^{4}$ Includes Planned Capital Improvements to that Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

As shown in the Table XI, many of the intersections operate within acceptable levels of LOS "D" or better under both scenarios with the exception of the following:

- Hawthorne Blvd/Pacific Coast Hwy - LOS "E" in the P.M. conditions
- Crenshaw Blvd/Rolling Hills Road. - LOS "E" in the A.M. conditions
- Crenshaw Blvd/Pacific Coast Hwy - LOS "E" in the P.M. conditions
- Vista Montana/Pacific Coast Hwy - LOS "E" in A.M. conditions
- Hawthorne Blvd/Palos Verdes Dr. N. - LOS "E" in the A.M. conditions
- Crenshaw Blvd/Palos Verdes Dr. N. - LOS "F" in all conditions
- Rolling Hills Rd/Palos Verdes Dr. N. - LOS "F" in all conditions
- Calle Mayor/Pacific Coast Hwy - LOS "F" in all conditions

Also, as shown, the intersection LOS do not decrease with Project traffic.

| TABLE XII | ISTING INTERS | AMB <br> ECTI | ENT \& EX ONS - H | $E X+A M$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PROJEC } \\ & \text { IOD LOS } \end{aligned}$ | T TRA |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EXISTING+AMBIENT ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  | EX+AMB+PROJECT ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |
|  | A.M. Peak Hour |  | P.M. Peak Hour |  | A.M. Peak Hour |  | P.M. Peak Hour |  |
|  | Delay ${ }^{3}$ | LOS | Delay ${ }^{3}$ | LOS | Delay ${ }^{3}$ | Los | Delay ${ }^{3}$ | Los |
| Hawthorne Blvd/Pacific Coast Hwy. ${ }^{4}$ | 47.5 | D | 64.4 | E | 49.8 | D | 71.4 | E |
| Hawthorne Blvd/244 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street | 24.1 | C | 24.1 | C | 29.8 | C | 27.4 | C |
| Hawthorne Blvd/Newton Street | 11.0 | B | 12.9 | B | 11.4 | B | 13.7 | B |
| Hawthorne Blva/Via Valmonte | 11.9 | B | 10.7 | B | 14.5 | B | 12.0 | B |
| Hawthorne Blvd/Rolling Hills Road | 18.5 | B | 13.6 | B | 18.7 | B | 13.6 | B |
| Whiffletree Lane/Rolling Hills Road | 5.5 | A | 4.2 | A | 5.4 | A | 4.3 | A |
| Fallenleaf Drive/Rolling Hills Road | 6.4 | A | 4.9 | A | 6.4 | A | 4.9 | A |
| Crenshaw Blvd/Rolling Hills Road | 72.4 | E | 47.4 | D | 73.7 | E | 47.8 | D |
| Crenshaw Blvd/Pacific Coast Hwy. | 50.9 | D | 63.9 | E | 52.1 | D | 65.1 | E |
| Vista Montana/Pacific Coast Hwy. ${ }^{4}$ | $49.1{ }^{4}$ | D | $37.1^{4}$ | D | $51.1{ }^{4}$ | D | $37.6^{4}$ | D |
| Palos Verdes DriveNia Valmonte | 34.4 | D | 29.7 | D | 34.4 | D | 30.2 | D |
| Hawthorne Blvd/Palos Verdes Dr. N. | 56.8 | E | 31.8 | C | 58.7 | E | 32.2 | C |
| Crenshaw Blvd/Palos Verdes Dr. N. | 107.1 | F | 107.7 | F | 108 | F | 108.3 | F |
| Rolling Hills Rd/Palos Verdes Dr. N. | 303.3 | F | 269.3 | F | 305.4 | F | 272.4 | F |
| Newton Street/Calle Mayor | 14.5 | B | 12.1 | B | 14.5 | B | 12.1 | B |
| Vista Montana/Newton Street | 15.6 | C | 11.3 | B | 15.8 | C | 11.3 | B |
| Madison Street/Newton Street | 8.7 | A | 9.3 | A | 8.7 | A | 9.4 | A |
| Pacific Coast Hwy/Calle Mayor | 119.6 | F | 190.1 | F | 120.9 | F | 191.7 | F |
| ${ }^{1}$ Intersection Counts Taken by NDS, April 2016 (Plus 1\% Annual Growth <br> ${ }^{2}$ Annual Growth Rate of 1 Percent per Year for 2 Years <br> ${ }^{3}$ Worst Case Direction Average Intersection Delay Per Vehicle (In Seconds) <br> ${ }^{4}$ Includes Planned Capital Improvements to that Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

As shown in the Table XII, with the addition of two years of ambient growth, many of the intersections experience increased delays, however, the LOS designations do not decrease from those shown in Table XI. In fact, two of the intersections that are planned for Capital Improvements improved in delay and/or LOS designations.

As shown in the Table XIII, there are further incremental increases in intersection delays with cumulative traffic. Also, many of the intersections show a decreased LOS. The addition of Project traffic to the cumulative conditions does not result in decreased LOS.


## VII. SITE ACCESS, CIRCULATION, \& PARKING

Proposed site access, internal circulation, and parking for the proposed Project were analyzed by reviewing the Project site plan, the proposed off-site improvements, and other constraints and opportunities for access to the site. It is important to note that turn movement restrictions placed upon the proposed Project restrict resident and visitor vehicle ingress and egress to right turns only on Hawthorne Boulevard, and "exit-only" right turns on Via Valmonte. With these restrictions, internal circulation and off-site improvements for site access were designed accordingly.

## Street and Traffic Improvements

Vehicular access to and from the Project site is proposed via one main driveway on Hawthorne Boulevard. A second exit-only driveway is proposed on Via Valmonte. The turn movements at these two locations will be restricted to right turns only, with the exception of emergency vehicle access at the Via Valmonte driveway. Raised traffic movement barriers at the Via Valmonte driveway will allow only emergency vehicles to access the property from this direction.

On Via Valmonte, street improvements include widening of the eastbound approach leg to Hawthorne Boulevard, adjacent to the Project site, to provide an additional travel lane for optional left turn, through movement, or right turns. This additional lane is designed to be 16 feet wide for its entire length allowing right turning vehicles enough space to pass-by and avoid waiting in the left-turn queue. This improvement will include a new roadway surface; new curb, gutter, sidewalk, and parkway on the south side of Via Valmonte; a new crosswalk across Via Valmonte at Hawthorne Boulevard; and new accessible ramps on the northwest and southwest corners of the intersection.

On Hawthorne Boulevard, street improvements include widening and traffic lane restriping to add a right southbound turn lane between Via Valmonte and the proposed Project driveway; a new sidewalk contiguous to the street curb; a landscaped parkway between the sidewalk and the Project property line wall; and modifications to the traffic signal at the Via Valmonte/Hawthorne Boulevard intersection.

Figure 31 illustrates the proposed street and traffic improvements along Via Valmonte and Hawthorne Boulevard, and at the intersection of Via Valmonte/Hawthorne Boulevard.

Currently, the Via Valmonte/Hawthorne Boulevard intersection operates in two phases - the northbound and southbound movements as one phase and the eastbound and westbound movements as another phase with left turn movements yielding to oncoming traffic in all directions. In the current operation, both the eastbound and westbound left turning vehicles must wait for opposing through vehicles to clear before proceeding, causing delays.

The proposed improvements to the intersection include "splitting" the eastbound and westbound movements (designating the eastbound movement as the lead) and adding a left turn arrow to the eastbound approach on Via Valmonte. This will allow all eastbound vehicles (far greater in volume than the westbound) to clear first, followed by the westbound movement from the shopping center driveway. It should be noted that, since many cycles will not include any westbound traffic, this movement will be skipped in the cycle increasing the time available for other movements. Additionally, the east-west crosswalk across Hawthorne Boulevard will be moved from the north leg to the south leg to lessen delays caused by conflicts between pedestrians and motor vehicles.

## Site Access \& Internal Circulation

A review of the site plan for the proposed Project reveals a simple, yet efficient, circulation system with convenient access to and from the Project via two driveways one ingress/egress driveway on Hawthorne Boulevard and one egress driveway on Via Valmonte.


Figure 31 - Via Valmonte \& Hawthorne Boulevard Improvements

Within the property, internal drive aisles lead directly into a subterranean parking structure. Within the parking structure, parking spaces and drive aisles are appropriately sized to accommodate resident and guest parking. Appropriately-sized fire lanes and maintenance roads are also provided on site. There are no gates or speed bumps to impede traffic entering the Project site. Gates that control entry into the parking garage are located over 150 feet from the Hawthorne Boulevard driveway entrance. Therefore, there should be no queuing of entering vehicles that back up onto Hawthorne Boulevard.

## Line of Sight Analysis

The City of Torrance requested that the TIS include an analysis of the "line of sight" from exiting vehicles on the proposed driveway on Hawthorne Boulevard looking north toward oncoming southbound traffic. The proposed driveway is designed for right-in/right-out movements only, with all exiting vehicles required to stop before entering the flow of traffic on Hawthorne Boulevard. With a vehicle stopped in the exit lane at the stop limit line, drivers will first look to see if there are any pedestrians crossing the driveway, and secondly, look north along Hawthorne Boulevard to see if any vehicles are approaching the driveway.

According to the Caltrans Highway Design Manual ${ }^{F}$, the line of sight for corner sight distance is to be determined from a 3 and $1 / 2$-foot height at the driver's location on the minor road (Project driveway) to a 4 and $1 / 4$-foot object height in the center of the approaching lane of the major road (Hawthorne Boulevard). As illustrated in Figure 32, assuming a design speed of 45 miles per hour (the posted speed limit) on Hawthorne Boulevard, the line of sight distance from the Project exit lane stop limit line (looking north toward southbound traffic on Hawthorne Boulevard) is 495 feet to the center of the lane closest to the center median (known as the Number 1 Lane).

The line of sight distance from the Project exit lane stop limit line is 290 feet to the center of the lane closest to the sidewalk curb (or Number 3 Lane). All traffic formed by these two lines of sight is within the cone of visibility by a driver exiting the Project driveway. Once the proposed street improvements along Hawthorne Boulevard are constructed (i.e., undergrounding power poles; widening the street to include a southbound right turn/deceleration lane onto the Project driveway; modifying the traffic signal at Hawthorne Boulevard and Via Valmonte; and moving the sidewalk to be contiguous to the curb in lieu of a landscaped parkway), there should be no visual impairments to any driver exiting the Project site on Hawthorne Boulevard. The closest object to creating visual impairment is the new power pole that will be installed near the Project driveway. However, as noted in Figure 32, the line of sight is approximately 3 foot clear of the power pole.
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Figure 32 - Line of Sight

## Parking

All vehicle parking for the proposed Project will be provided on-site. There will be feature multiple subterranean parking structures located under the residential buildings. Vehicular access to the parking structure will be controlled by signage. Designated guest parking will also be provided. In total, the 248 multi-family dwelling units will be served with 484 parking spaces. This includes one parking space for each one bedroom unit and two spaces for each two bedroom unit with an additional 50 spaces for guest parking.

## Intersection Queuing Analysis

The City of Torrance requested, as part of the TIS, that a queuing analysis be performed for the eastbound approach to the Via Valmonte/Hawthorne Boulevard intersection. The queuing analysis was intended to show the number of vehicles that typically wait (i.e., stopped at the traffic signal waiting for a green light) for the left turn movement onto northbound Hawthorne Boulevard during the A.M. peak hour. Between 7:00 A.M. and 8:00 A.M, on May 24, 2016 a field survey was taken to identify the number of vehicles stopped in the left turn lane at each traffic signal cycle. During that hour, a total of 112 vehicles were stopped in the left queueing lane at the eastbound approach and there were a total of 40 traffic signal cycles - 90 seconds each. This results in an hour-long average of 2.8 vehicles turning left per cycle. Broken down into 15 minute time intervals, the surveyed average vehicle queue is shown in Table XIV.

As shown in the table, the largest average queue of 3.2 vehicles occurred between 7:30 and 7:45 A.M. Note that the largest number observed at any given time during any cycle was five, which occurred twice during the hour long observation. It is important to emphasize that vehicles not having to stop and wait for the green light were not included in the survey and, that right turning vehicles did not wait within the left turn queue as there was enough space to pass-by.

## TABLE XIV - QUEUING SURVEY ${ }^{1}$

## Time Period

7:00-7:15 A.M. 2.25
7:15-7:30 A.M.
7:30-7:45 A.M.
7:45-8:00 A.M.
2.90
3.20
2.10
${ }^{1}$ Queuing Survey Taken May 24, 2016
As a follow-up, a second, two hour queuing survey was conducted on Thursday, September 27, 2018. The purpose of the second survey was to not only verify the findings from the previous survey, but to extend the survey period to include the 8:00
A.M. to 9:00 A.M. hour. Since the traffic volume counts taken in 2016 showed a significant increase in intersection traffic from the 7:00 to 8:00 A.M hour to the 8:00 A.M. to 9:00 A.M. hour, it was necessary to update the queuing analysis to reflect the higher volume time period. The results of the follow-up second survey are summarized in Table XV.

## TABLE XV - SECOND QUEUING SURVEY ${ }^{1}$

## Time Period

7:00-7:15 A.M. 2.31
7:15-7:30 A.M.
7:30-7:45 A.M.
7:45-8:00 A.M.
8:00-8:15 A.M.
8:15-8:30 A.M.
8:30-8:45 A.M.
8:45-9:00 A.M.
${ }^{1}$ Queuing Survey Taken September 27, 2018

As shown in the Table XV , the average queues between the two surveys are similar during the 7:00 to 8:00 A.M. hour. Also shown are higher averages occurring in the 8:00 to 9:00 A.M. hour with the largest average queue of 3.62 vehicles between 8:45 and 9:00 A.M. The largest number observed at any given time during any cycle was nine, which occurred once during the 8:45 to 9:00 A.M. time period. The highest hourly number of left turning vehicles occurred in the 8:00 to 9:00 hour with a total of 198 vehicles. Of these, 36 did not have to stop in the queue (i.e., they approached and went through the intersection during a green light. That left 162 vehicles that had to wait in the left turn lane during a red light sometime during that hour.

In order to estimate the impact of additional Project related trips to the left turn queue, the trip generation/distribution during the A.M. peak hour, as shown in Figure 25, was added to the surveyed vehicles. A total of 55 A.M. peak hour, left turning Project vehicles leaving the site from the Via Valmonte driveway, which divided by 40 traffic signal cycles, equals an average of 1.4 vehicles per cycle. The 55 Project vehicles added to the surveyed 162 vehicles brought the future hourly total to an estimated 217 vehicles turning left during the A.M. hour with Project buildout. Divided by 40 traffic signal cycles, the average queue for left turn movements is 5.4 vehicles during the A.M. peak hour.

To estimate a worst case scenario, the average Project vehicles per cycle (i.e., 1.4) added to the $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile of the maximum observed queue (i.e., nine $x .95=8.6$ ) brought the total worst-case queue to 10 vehicles.

As described above, the Project plan includes constructing a second optional left turn lane for the eastbound approach to the intersection. The anticipated vehicle capacity of both left turn options is 250 feet ( 125 feet for each lane), which should accommodate at least 10 vehicles (spaced at 25 foot intervals). With the development of the proposed intersection improvements, there should be adequate space within the left turn pockets to accommodate existing plus Project related vehicles during the highest use time periods.

The City of Torrance asked that the potential impacts on queuing on Via Valmonte be addressed using a 120 second cycle (or 30 cycles per hour), if the signal timing were to be adjusted in the future from the 90 second cycle (or 40 cycles per hour). Following the same methodology (i.e., 217 vehicles divided by 30 cycles), the average queue for left turn movements would be 7.2 vehicles during the A.M. peak hour. This anticipated average queue of left turning vehicles, with a longer traffic signal cycle length, should still be accommodated during the A.M. peak hour with the construction of Project related off-site improvements.

To estimate the potential worst-case (i.e., maximum) queue under the 120 second cycle scenario, the potential worst-case queue during the 90 second cycle (i.e., $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile of 10 vehicles) was multiplied by the number of 90 second cycles per hour ( 40 cycles) divided by the number of 120 second cycles per hour ( 30 cycles).

10 vehicles $\times 40$ cycles $/ 30$ cycles $=10 \times 1.33=13.33$ or 14 vehicles (rounded up) .
Thus, the estimated worst-case maximum queue under a 120 second signal cycle is 14 vehicles, or 4 more than the current 10 vehicles under a 90 second cycle.

Under extreme "worst-case" conditions, when there may be a significant number of vehicles attempting to exit the Project site onto Via Valmonte at the same time, the Project plan includes more than 120 feet of "on-site" queuing space within the driveway throat that could accommodate another six to seven vehicles.

## Intersection Queuing Analysis - Hawthorne Blvd./Pacific Coast Highway

For the Eighth Revision, a second queuing analysis was performed for the northbound left-turn movement at the Hawthorne Boulevard/Pacific Coast Highway intersection. Data used in the analysis was provided by the City of Torrance.

Currently, there are two northbound left-turn lanes at the Hawthorne Blvd./Pacific Coast Highway intersection. The length of each of these lanes is approximately 213 feet long up to the nearest intersection of Hawthorne Blvd. and $242^{\text {nd }}$ street. After existing "keep clear" zones at $242^{\text {nd }}$ street, queuing for the northbound left-turn lanes continues further south in one of the lanes for another 105 feet. Therefore, the total queuing distance for both lanes is approximately 531 feet. The total vehicle capacity of both left turn lanes is approximately 21 vehicles (assuming vehicle spacing at 25 feet per vehicle).

Using volume counts collected for this study in April 2016, the total number of vehicles traveling through the northbound left-turn movement was 278 in the A.M. and 311 in the P.M. peak hour.

During the A.M. peak hour, the traffic signal timing at this intersection operates at a range of 135 to 145 seconds per cycle - per data provided by the City. Using the higher value - representing longer delays (i.e., 145 seconds), there may be an average of 25 cycles in the A.M. peak hour. Therefore, 278 A.M. peak hour vehicles will be traveling through the northbound left-turn movement during 25 cycles for an average of 11 vehicles per cycle. Further, applying a design factor of $1.75 \times$ the average, per recommendations within the "Highway Design Manual", the worst-case queuing may reach 19 vehicles. As noted above, with a left-turn lane capacity of approximately 21 vehicles, there should be sufficient left-turn lane capacity to accommodate worst-case A.M. peak hour demands for this movement.

Applying the same methodology as above for the P.M. peak hour, 311 left-turning vehicles will travel through 25 cycles for an average of 12 vehicles per cycle. With the design factor of 1.75 , the worst-case queuing may reach 21 vehicles - equaling the 21 vehicle capacity.

The City has indicated that proposed improvements for this northbound left-turn movement include constructing an asphalt berm at the $242^{\text {nd }}$ street crossing and eliminating the existing "keep clear" zone. The estimated additional queuing space is 60 feet which would accommodate space for at least another 2 vehicles.

Project related traffic traveling through this northbound left-turn movement is anticipated to be the heaviest during the A.M. peak hour with 10 additional vehicles. These vehicles added to the A.M. analysis above results in 288 vehicles traveling through 25 cycles for an average of 11 vehicles per cycle and a worst-case condition of 19 vehicles - still below the current capacity of 21 vehicles and the future capacity of 23 vehicles.

## VIII. STUDY FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, \& RECOMMENDATIONS

The proposed Solana Torrance project will replace a closed surface mine operation with 248 new multi-family residences, utilizing only 5.71 acres of previously disturbed land within a 24.68 -acre property. The remaining 18.97 acres of land will be preserved as natural open space.

The potential traffic impacts associated with the proposed Project were documented and analyzed in this Traffic Impact Study by focusing on two key roadway segments and eighteen key intersections, as identified by the City of Torrance. The City also required that cumulative traffic impacts associated with the build-out of other projects in the vicinity of the site be analyzed. The study findings and recommendations are presented as follows:

## Study Findings

Based on the analyses presented herein, the following findings were made:

1) New traffic counts were taken in mid-April 2016. An annual growth factor of one percent was added to the 2016 volumes to estimate 2017 conditions and reflect baseline conditions at study roadway segments and intersections.
2) The Project is estimated to generate a total of 1,349 average weekday trip ends; and 89 A.M. and 109 P.M. peak hour trips ends, respectively.
3) The potential for "internal capture" of vehicle trips will be present, however, the percentage of such trip reduction is uncertain.
4) While the Project will generate some degree of regular transit use, thus potentially reducing private vehicle trips, the percentage of such trip reduction is uncertain.
5) Based on the current site plan for the Project, vehicular access to and from the site will be provided via one future driveway along Hawthorne Boulevard. One "exit-only" driveway with raised traffic movement barriers is proposed on Via Valmonte.
6) Both Project driveways will be restricted to right-turn-only movements for residents and visitors. Only emergency vehicles will be allowed to turn left into the site at the Via Valmonte entrance through the raised traffic movement barriers.
7) Capital Improvements are slated (planned for 2018) for the intersections of Hawthorne Boulevard/Pacific Coast Highway and Vista Montana/Pacific Coast Highway that will reduce traffic congestion for each location.
8) Each intersection was analyzed for "Levels of Service" (LOS) using four scenarios: existing plus one year of ambient growth 2017 volumes, two years of ambient growth volumes, plus Project volumes, and plus cumulative development volumes for both the A.M. and P.M. peak hours.
9) Each signalized intersection was analyzed using two methods - Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU), and Highway Capacity Manual (HCM). Calculation sheets for each intersection/condition are within the Appendix section of this report. Stop controlled intersections were only analyzed with the HCM method.
10) Using the Existing 2017 conditions the ICU LOS at each of the study intersections, during both the A.M. and P.M. peak hours of weekday commute, fall within acceptable limits (i.e., "D" or better) with the exception of:
a. the Crenshaw Boulevard/Pacific Coast Highway intersection during the P.M. peak hour;
b. the Crenshaw Boulevard/Palos Verdes Drive North intersection during the A.M. peak hour;
c. the Rolling Hills Road/Palos Verdes Drive North intersection during the A.M and P.M. peak hours; and
d. the Pacific Coast Highway/Calle Mayor intersection during the A.M. and P.M. peak hours.
11) The addition of Project traffic did not result in any changes in LOS from existing conditions.
12) The further addition of ambient growth (i.e., one percent per year for two years) traffic to the 2017 volumes resulted in incremental increases in volumes for all intersections and a decrease in ICU intersection LOS for the Crenshaw Boulevard/Palos Verdes Drive North intersection during the P.M. peak hour.
13) With the addition of cumulative development traffic, the utilization of each intersection increased, however, the ICU LOS at each intersection is projected to stay within acceptable limits during both the A.M. and P.M. peak hours, again with the exception of the four intersections noted above.
14) Using the HCM methodology to determine levels of service for the studied intersections revealed similar results in the existing and ambient conditions (i.e., to that of the ICU calculations) with the exception of the Hawthorne Boulevard/Pacific Coast Highway intersection resulting in LOS "E" in the P.M. peak hour, the Crenshaw Boulevard/Rolling Hills Road intersection resulting in LOS "E" in the A.M. peak hour, and the Hawthorne Boulevard/Palos Verdes Drive North intersection resulting in LOS "E" in the A.M. peak hour.
15) Intersection delays increased with each scenario, however, the LOS designations did not change from the 2017 existing levels with the addition of Project traffic.
16) Under the cumulative development conditions, many of the studied intersections showed increases in delays and further deterioration in LOS during both peak hours of traffic. However, the addition of Project traffic did not decrease the LOS any further.
17) The two roadway segments analyzed - Via Valmonte (LOS "A") and Hawthorne Boulevard (LOS "B"), adjacent to the Project site both currently operate at acceptable levels, and will continue to do so with the addition of ambient growth. The only anticipated change in LOS occurs on Via Valmonte, from LOS "A" to an acceptable LOS "B" with the addition of cumulative traffic.
18) In the queueing analysis, with the development of the proposed intersection improvements, and assuming a traffic signal cycle length of 90 seconds, there should be adequate space within the left turn lanes to accommodate existing
plus Project related vehicles. Using a 120 second cycle, or 30 cycles per hour, if the signal timing were to be adjusted in the future, the average queue for left turn movements would be 7.2 vehicles during the A.M. peak hour - under the anticipated capacity of 10 vehicles. For extreme conditions when more vehicles may try to exit the Project site at the same time onto Via Valmonte, there is planned to be more than 120 feet of on-site queuing space accommodating another six to eight vehicles.
19) Existing queuing capacity for the northbound left-turn movement at the Hawthorn Blvd./Pacific Coast Highway intersection is approximately 21 vehicles and is expected to expand to 23 vehicles with proposed improvements. This queuing capacity is anticipated to accommodate existing and future demands with Project development.
20) The line of sight distance from the Project exit lane stop limit line is 290 feet to the center of the lane closest to the sidewalk curb (or Number 3 Lane). All traffic formed by these two lines of sight is within the cone of visibility by a driver exiting the Project driveway. Once the proposed street improvements along Hawthorne Boulevard are constructed (i.e., relocation of power poles; widening the street to include a southbound right turn/deceleration lane onto the Project driveway; modifying the traffic signal at Hawthorne Boulevard and Via Valmonte; and moving the sidewalk to be contiguous to the curb in lieu of a landscaped parkway), there should be no visual impairments to drivers exiting the Project site onto Hawthorne Boulevard.

## Recommendations

Based on the study findings and conclusions, the proposed Project is not anticipated to result in any significant traffic impacts to any of the study street segments or intersections. Therefore, the following recommendations are made:

1) Construct Project driveways only allowing right-turn, "exit-only" movements to Via Valmonte, and right-turn, ingress/egress movements to Hawthorne Blvd.
2) Complete the off-site widening and improvements to Via Valmonte as shown on the Project plan.
3) Construct the intersection improvements, including an additional left/through lane to the eastbound approach leg of the Via Valmonte/Hawthorne Boulevard; a new crosswalk on the Via Valmonte leg; accessible ramps on the corners; and traffic signal improvements (e.g., modification of signal mast arms) on Via Valmonte.
4) Widen and restripe the west side of Hawthorne Boulevard for a right turn deceleration lane, adjacent to the site for Project related traffic ingress.
5) Provide various traffic controls, including signage, striping, and pavement
marking, to provide safe and efficient vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle movement through and within the Project site.
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## APPENDIX SECTION

## Appendix A - Existing Roadway ADT and

## A.M.IP.M. Peak Hour Intersection Counts

VOLUME

Day: Wednesday
Date: 4/13/2016

City: Torrance
Project \#: CA16_5230_002


Prepared by NDS/ATD
VOLUME
Via Valmonte W/O Hawthorne Blvd
Day: Wednesday
Date: 4/13/2016
City: Torrance
Project \#: CA16_5230_001

| DAILY TOTALS | NB | SB | WB | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 0 | 3,097 | 3,276 |



## ITM Peak Hour Summary



Natlonal Data \& Surveying Services


Total Ins \& Outs


Total Volume Per Leg


ITM Peak Hour Summary


National Data \& Surveying Services


## ITM Peak Hour Summary

| Prepared by: |
| :---: |
| N應 |

National Data \& Surveying Services


ITM Peak Hour Summary


National Data \& Surveying Services


Total Ins \& Outs


Total Volume Per Leg


## ITM Peak Hour Summary <br> Prepared by: <br> NDS
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Hawthorne Blvd \& Palos Verdes Dr North
Peak Hour Turning Movement Count


## Crenshaw Blvd \& Palos Verdes Dr North

Peak Hour Turning Movement Count


## Rolling Hills Rd/Portuguese Bend Rd \& Palos Verdes Dr North



Newton St \& Calle Mayor
Peak Hour Turning Movement Count

ID: 17-05764-006
City: Torrance

| Newton St |
| :---: |
| SOUTHBOUND |

Total Vehicles (NOON)


Total Vehicles (NOON)
Day: Wednesday
Date: 11/15/2017

| AM | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | AM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NOON | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NOON |
| PM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | PM |
|  | $\langle$ | $\checkmark$ |  | L | $\uparrow$ |  |
|  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | - |

## Vista Montana \& Newton St

Peak Hour Turning Movement Count

ID: 17-05764-005
City: Torrance


Total Vehicles (NOON)


Total Vehicles (PM)


| Vista Montana |
| :---: |
| SOUTHBOUND |

Day: Wednesday
Date: 11/15/2017


Total Vehicles (NOON)


Total Vehicles (PM)


## Madison St \& Newton St

Peak Hour Turning Movement Count


Pacific Coast Hwy \& Calls Mayor
Peak Hour Turning Movement Count


## Appendix B - ICU Worksheets

## Existing \& Existing Plus Project

## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

| Conditions: | Existing (2017) Plus Project |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location: | City of Torrance, California |
| North-South Street: | Hawthorne Boulevard |
| East-West Street:  <br> Annual Growth Rate: Pacific Coast Highway |  |


| Count Date: | Wed. April 13, 2016 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Horizon Date: | 2019 |
| Peak Hour:  <br> Data Source:  <br> Input By: $7: 30-8: 30$ AM <br>  C. B.. |  |

Comments: Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$
Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$

| Direction of Travel | Lane Movement | Number of Lanes | Capacity (Veh/Hr) On Green | Peak Hour Volume |  | Volume/Capacity Ratio |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Existing (2017) | Existing <br> +Project | Existing (2017) | Existing <br> +Project |
| Northbound | Left Turn | 2 | 3200 | 281 | 291 | 0.088 | 0.091 |
|  | Through | 3 | 4800 | 1378 | 1416 | 0.287 * | 0.295 |
|  | Right Turn** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |
| Southbound | Left Turn | 2 | 3200 | 181 | 181 | 0.057 | 0.057 |
|  | Through | 3 | 4800 | 726 | 733 | 0.151 | 0.153 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 302 | 302 | 0.189 | 0.189 |
| Eastbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 265 | 265 | 0.166 | 0.166 |
|  | Through | 3 | 4800 | 1282 | 1285 | 0.267 | 0.268 |
|  | Right Turn** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |
| Westbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 |  | 144 | 0.089 | 0.090 |
|  | Through | 3 | $4800$ | 1290 | 1290 | 0.269 | 0.269 |
|  | Right Turn** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ Existing 2017 Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  | 0.878 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | D |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of . 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.886 |
| Plus Project Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  | D |
| * Denotes Critical Movement <br> ** Right Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements |  |  |  |  |  |  | Study Intersection No. |

## KHR ASSOCIATES <br> INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

Conditions:
Location:
North-South Street:

| Existing (2017) Plus Project |
| :--- |
| City of Torrance, California |
| Hawthorne Boulevard |
| Pacific Coast Highway |

Annual Growth Rate:

Comments:
Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$ Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

| Direction of Travel | Lane Movement | Number of Lanes | Capacity (Veh/Hr) On Green | Peak Hour Volume |  | Volume/Capacity Ratio |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Existing (2017) | Existing <br> +Project | Existing (2017) | Existing <br> +Project |
| Northbound | Left Turn | 2 | 3200 | 314 | 320 | 0.098 | 0.100 |
|  | Through | 3 | 4800 | 949 | 970 | 0.198 | 0.202 |
|  | Right Turn** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |
| Southbound | Left Turn | 2 | 3200 | 376 | 376 | 0.118 | 0.118 |
|  | Through | 3 | 4800 | 1206 | 1222 | 0.251 | 0.255 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 375 | 384 | 0.234 | 0.240 |
| Eastbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 220 | 220 | 0.138 | 0.138 |
|  | Through | 3 | 4800 | 1460 | 1460 | 0.304 | 0.304 |
|  | Right Turn** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |
| Westbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 187 | 191 | 0.117 | 0.119 |
|  | Through | 3 | 4800 | 1199 | 1199 | 0.250 | 0.250 |
|  | Right Turn** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ Existing 2017 Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  | 0.870 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | D |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of . 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.878 |
| Plus Project Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  | D |
| * Denotes Critical Movement <br> ** Right Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements |  |  |  |  |  |  | Study Intersection No. |

## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

| Conditions: | Existing (2017) Plus Project |
| :---: | :---: |
| Location: | City of Torrance, California |
| North-South Street: | Hawthorne Boulevard |
| East-West Street: | 244th Street |
| Annual Growth Rate: | 1.00\% |

Count Date: $\quad$ Wed. April 13, 2016
Horizon Date:
Peak Hour: $\quad$ 7:30-8:30 AM
Data Source:
Input By:
C. B.

Comments: Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$
Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$

| Direction of Travel | Lane Movement | Number of Lanes | Capacity (Veh/Hr) On Green | Peak Hour Volume |  | Volume/Capacity Ratio |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Existing (2017) | Existing <br> +Project | Existing (2017) | Existing <br> +Project |
| Northbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 4 | 4 | 0.003 | 0.003 |
|  | Through | 3 | 4800 | 1581 | 1629 | 0.329 * | 0.339 |
|  | Right Turn** | 0 | 0 |  |  | - |  |
| Southbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 38 | 38 | 0.024 * | 0.024 |
|  | Through | 3 | 4800 | 1043 | 1055 | 0.217 | 0.220 |
|  | Right Turn** | 0 | 0 |  |  | - |  |
| Eastbound | Left Turn*** | 0 | 0 |  |  | - | - |
|  | Through | 1 | 1600 | 24 | 24 | 0.015 * | 0.015 |
|  | Right Turn | 0.5 | 800 | 4 | 4 | 0.005 | 0.005 |
| Westbound | Left Turn*** | 0 | 0 |  |  | - | - |
|  | Through | 1 | 1600 | 57 | 57 | 0.036 * | 0.036 |
|  | Right Turn | 0.5 | 800 | 51 | 51 |  | 0.064 |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ <br> Existing 2017 Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  | 0.504 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | A |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of . 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.514 |
| Plus Project Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  | A |
| * Denotes Critical Movement <br> ** Right Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements Left Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements |  |  |  |  |  |  | Study Intersection No. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |

## KHR ASSOCIATES <br> INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS



## KHR ASSOCIATES <br> INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

| Conditions: Existing (2017) Plus Project Count Date: Wed. April 13, 2016 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location: <br> North-South Street: <br> East-West Street: <br> Annual Growth Rate | City of | City of Torrance, California |  |  | Horizon Date: <br> Peak Hour: <br> Data Source: <br> Input By: | 2019 |  |
|  | Hawthorne Boulevard |  |  |  |  | 7:30-8:30 AM |  |
|  | Newton Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rate: $1.00 \%$ |  |  |  |  | C. B. |  |
| Comments: | Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Direction of Travel | Lane <br> Movement | Number of Lanes | Capacity <br> (Veh/Hr) <br> On Green | Peak Hour Volume |  | Volume/Capacity Ratio |  |
|  |  |  |  | Existing (2017) |  | Existing <br> +Project | Existing (2017) | Existing <br> +Project |
| Northbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 96 | 103 | 0.060 | 0.064 |
|  | Through | 3 | 4800 | 1584 | 1636 | 0.330 | 0.341 |
|  | Right Turn** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |
| Southbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 36 | 36 | 0.023 | 0.023 |
|  | Through | 2 | 3200 | 1009 | 1021 | 0.315 | 0.319 |
|  | Right Turn** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |
| Eastbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 22 | 22 | 0.014 | 0.014 |
|  | Through | 0.5 | 800 | 75 | 75 | 0.094 | 0.094 |
|  | Right Turn | 0.5 | 800 | 80 | 82 | 0.100 | 0.103 |
| Westbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 83 | 87 | 0.052 | 0.054 |
|  | Through | 1 | 1600 | 112 | 112 | 0.070 | 0.070 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 104 | 104 | 0.065 | 0.065 |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ Existing 2017 Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.627 \\ \text { B } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ <br> Plus Project Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.640 \\ \text { B } \end{gathered}$ |
| * Denotes Critical Movement <br> ** Right Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements |  |  |  |  |  |  | Study Intersection No. <br> 3 |

## KHR ASSOCIATES <br> INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS



## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

| Conditions: | Existing (2017) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location: | City of Torrance, California |
| North-South Street: Hawthorne Boulevard <br> East-West Street: Via Valmonte <br> Annual Growth Rate: $1.00 \%$ |  |

Count Date: Wed. April 13, 2016
Horizon Date: 2019
Peak Hour: 8:00-9:00 AM
Data Source:
Input By: C. B.

Comments: Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$
Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$

| Direction of Travel | Lane Movement | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Number } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Lanes }\end{array}$ | Capacity (Veh/Hr) On Green | Peak Hour Volume | Volume/Capacity Ratio |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Existing <br> (2017) | Existing (2017) |  |
| Northbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 45 | 0.028 |  |
|  | Through | 3 | 4800 | 1566 | 0.326 |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 36 | 0.023 |  |
| Southbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 3 | 0.002 |  |
|  | Through | 3 | 4800 | 1158 | 0.241 |  |
|  | Right Turn** | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |
| Eastbound | Left Turn*** | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |
|  | Through | 1 | 1600 | 236 | 0.148 |  |
|  | Right Turn | 0.5 | 800 | 67 | 0.084 |  |
| Westbound | Left Turn*** | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |
|  | Through | 1 | 1600 | 1 | 0.001 * |  |
|  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{1 0}$ <br> Existing 2017 Level of Service |  |  |  |  | 0.576 | WWWUWUW |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of. 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Plus Project Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |

* Denotes Critical Movement
** Right Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements
*** Left Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements

Study Intersection

No.
4

## KHR ASSOCIATES <br> INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

Conditions:
Location:
North-South Street:
East-West Street:
Annual Growth Rate:
Existing (2017) Plus Project
City of Torrance, California

Hawthorne Boulevard
Via Valmonte
1.00\%

Count Date:
Horizon Date:
Peak Hour:
Wed. April 13, 2016
2019

Data Source:
Input By: C. B.

Comments: Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$
Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$


* Denotes Critical Movement
** Right Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements
*** Left Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements

Study Intersection

No.
4

## KHR ASSOCIATES <br> INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS



[^6]Study
Intersection
No.
4

## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

Conditions:
Location:
North-South Street:
East-West Street:
Annual Growth Rate:

Count Date: Wed. April 13, 2016
Horizon Date: 2019
Peak Hour: 5:00-6:00 PM
Data Source:
Input By: C. B.

Comments: Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$
Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$


* Denotes Critical Movement
** Right Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements
*** Left Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements

Study
Intersection
No.


## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

| Conditions: | Existing (2017) Plus Project |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location: | City of Torrance, California |
| North-South Street: | Hawthorne Boulevard |
| East-West Street: | Rolling Hills Road |
| Annual Growth Rate: | $1.00 \%$ |
|  |  |


| Count Date: | Wed. April 13,2016 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Horizon Date: | 2019 |
| Peak Hour: | 7:30-8:30 AM |
| Data Source: <br> Input By: |  |
|  | C. B. |

Comments: $\frac{\text { Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane }=1600}{\text { Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes }=3200}$


[^7]Study Intersection

No.

## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS



## KHR ASSOCIATES <br> INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

Conditions:
Location:
Existing (2017) Plus Project
North-South Street:
City of Torrance, California
East-West Street:
Annual Growth Rate:

> Rolling Hills Road
1.00\%

Count Date: Wed. April 13, 2016
Horizon Date: 2019
Peak Hour: 7:30-8:30 AM
Data Source:
Input By: C. B.

Comments: Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$
Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$


## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

Conditions:
Location:
Existing (2017) Plus Project
City of Torrance, California
North-South Street:
Whiffletree Lane
East-West Street:
Rolling Hills Road
Annual Growth Rate: $\qquad$
1.00\%

Comments: Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$

Count Date: Wed. April 13, 2016
Horizon Date: 2019
Peak Hour: 5:00-6:00 PM
Data Source:
Input By : C. B.

Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$


* Denotes Critical Movement
** Right Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements
*** Left Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements

Study Intersection

No.
6

## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

| Conditions: | Existing (2017) Plus Project |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location: | City of Torrance, California |
| North-South Street: | Fallenleaf Drive |
| East-West Street: | Rolling Hills Road |
| Annual Growth Rate: | $1.00 \%$ |
|  |  |


| Count Date: | Wed. April 13,2016 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Horizon Date: | 2019 |
| Peak Hour: | 7:30-8:30 AM |
| Data Source: |  |
| Input By: | C. B. |

Comments: Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$
Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$

| Direction of Travel | Lane <br> Movement | Number of Lanes | Capacity (Veh/Hr) On Green | Peak Hour Volume |  | Volume/Capacity Ratio |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Existing (2017) | Existing <br> +Project | Existing (2017) | Existing <br> +Project |
| Northbound | Left Turn*** <br> Through <br> Right Turn** | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 1 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 1600 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 45 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 45 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{cc} - \\ 0.028 & * \\ - \end{array}$ | $0.028$ |
| Southbound | Left Turn*** <br> Through <br> Right Turn** | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 1 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 1600 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 59 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 59 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} - \\ 0.037 \\ - \end{gathered}$ | 0.037 |
| Eastbound | Left Turn <br> Through Right Turn** | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1600 \\ 3200 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 29 \\ 314 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 29 \\ 318 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{cc} \hline 0.018 & * \\ 0.098 & \\ & \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 0.018 0.099 * |
| Westbound | Left Turn <br> Through <br> Right Turn** | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1600 \\ 3200 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ 431 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ 433 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.007 \\ & 0.135 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.007 \\ & 0.135 \end{aligned}$ |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ Existing 2017 Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.318 \\ \text { A } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ Plus Project Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.318 \\ \text { A } \end{gathered}$ |
| * Denotes Critical Movement <br> ** Right Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements <br> *** Left Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements |  |  |  |  |  |  | Study Intersection No. 7 |


| KHR ASSOCIATES <br> INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Comments: | Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Direction of Travel | Lane <br> Movement | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Number } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Lanes }\end{array}$ | Capacity (Veh/Hr) On Green | Peak Hour Volume |  | Volume/Capacity Ratio |  |
|  |  |  |  | Existing (2017) | Existing +Project | Existing (2017) | Existing <br> +Project |
| Northbound | Left Turn*** <br> Through Right Turn** | $0$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 1600 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 24 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 24 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $0.015$ | $0.015$ |
| Southbound | Left Turn*** <br> Through Right Turn** | $0$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 1600 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 46 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 46 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $0.029$ | 0.029 |
| Eastbound | Left Turn <br> Through Right Turn** | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1600 \\ 3200 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ 437 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ 439 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.022 \\ & 0.137 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.022 \\ & 0.137 \end{aligned}$ |
| Westbound | Left Turn <br> Through Right Turn** | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1600 \\ 3200 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ 393 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ 399 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.013 \\ & 0.123 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.013 \\ & 0.125 \end{aligned}$ |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of 10 <br> Existing 2017 Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.288 \\ \mathrm{~A} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of 10 <br> Plus Project Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.290 \\ \text { A } \end{gathered}$ |
| * Denotes Critical Movement <br> ** Right Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements <br> *** Left Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements |  |  |  |  |  |  | Study Intersection No. 7 |

## KHR ASSOCIATES <br> INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS



## KHR ASSOCIATES <br> INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS



## KHR ASSOCIATES <br> INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

| Conditions: Location: | Existing (2017) Plus Project |  |  |  | Count Date: <br> Horizon Date: | Wed. April 13, 2016 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | City of Torrance, California |  |  |  |  | 2019 |  |
| North-South Street: Crenshaw Boulevard |  |  |  |  | Peak Hour: Data Source: Input By: | 8:00-9:00 AM |  |
| East-West Street: Pacific Coast Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Annual Grow | Rate: $1.00 \%$ |  |  |  |  | C. B. |  |
| Comments: | Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Peak Hour Volume |  | Volume/Capacity Ratio |  |
| Direction of Travel | Lane Movement | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Number } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Lanes }\end{array}$ | Capacity <br> (Veh/Hr) <br> On Green | Existing (2017) | Existing +Project | Existing <br> (2017) | Existing +Project |
|  | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 57 | 57 | 0.036 | 0.036 |
| Northbound | Through | 3 | 4800 | 985 | 986 | 0.205 | 0.205 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 478 | 479 | 0.299 | 0.299 |
|  | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 135 | 135 | 0.084 | 0.084 |
| Southbound | Through | 3 | 4800 | 619 | 624 | 0.129 | 0.130 |
|  | Right Turn** | 0 | 0 |  |  | - |  |
|  | Left Turn | 2 | 3200 | 163 | 167 | 0.051 | 0.052 |
| Eastbound | Through | 2 | 3200 | 938 | 945 | 0.293 | 0.295 |
|  | Right Turn** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |
|  | Left Turn | 2 | 3200 | 637 | 641 | 0.199 | 0.200 |
| Westbound | Through | 3 | 4800 | 1917 | 1924 | 0.399 | 0.401 |
|  | Right Turn** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ <br> Existing 2017 Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  | 0.882 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{1 0}$ <br> Plus Project Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  | : |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Denotes Critical Movement <br> ** Right Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements <br> *** Left Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements |  |  |  |  |  |  | Study Intersection No. 9 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS



## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

Conditions:
Location:
North-South Street:
East-West Street:
Annual Growth Rate:

Existing (2017) Plus Project
City of Torrance, California
Vista Montana
Pacific Coast Highway
$\qquad$

Count Date:
Horizon Date:
Peak Hour:
Wed. April 13, 2016

Data Source:
Input By:
2019
7:30-8:30 AM
C. B.

Comments: Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$
Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$

| Direction of Trave | Lane Movement | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Number } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Lanes }\end{array}$ | Capacity (Veh/Hr) On Green | Peak Hour Volume |  | Volume/Capacity Ratio |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Existing } \\ & \text { (2017) } \end{aligned}$ | Existing +Project | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Existing } \\ & \text { (2017) } \end{aligned}$ | Existing <br> +Project |
| Northbound | Left Turn | 1.5 | 2400 | 150 | 150 | 0.063 | 0.063 |
|  | Through | 1.5 | 2400 | 145 | 146 | 0.060 | 0.061 |
|  | Right Turn | 0.5 | 800 | 119 | 119 | 0.149 | 0.149 |
| Southbound | Left Turn | 1.5 | 2400 | 282 | 283 | 0.118 | 0.118 |
|  | Through | 1.5 | 2400 | 114 | 114 | 0.048 | 0.048 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 190 | 190 | 0.119 | 0.119 |
| Eastbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 47 | 47 | 0.029 | 0.029 |
|  | Through | 2 | 3200 | 1131 | 1133 | 0.353 | 0.354 |
|  | Right Turn** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |
| Westbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 65 | 65 | 0.041 | 0.041 |
|  | Through | 2 | 3200 | 1510 | 1520 | 0.472 | 0.475 |
|  | Right Turn** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of 10 <br> Existing 2017 Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  | 0.779 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of 10 |  |  |  |  |  | WWUWW | 0.783 |
| Plus Project Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  | C |

[^8]Study Intersection

No.

## KHR ASSOCIATES <br> INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS



## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS




## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS



## KHR ASSOCIATES <br> INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

| Conditions: | Existing (2017) Plus Project |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location: | City of Torrance, California |
| North-South Street: | Crenshaw Boulevard |
| East-West Street: | Palos Verdes Drive North |
| Annual Growth Rate: | $1.00 \%$ |

Count Date: Wed. November 15, 2017
Horizon Date:
Peak Hour: 5:00-6:00 PM
Data Source:
Input By: C. B.

Comments: Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$


* Denotes Critical Movement
** U-Turn Volumes Added to Left Turn Movements
*** Right Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements

Study
Intersection
No.
13

## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

| Conditions: | Existing (2017) Plus Project |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location: | City of Torrance, California |
| North-South Street: | Rolling Hills Road/Portuguese Road |
| East-West Street: Palos Verdes Drive North <br> Annual Growth Rate: $1.00 \%$ <br>  . |  |

Count Date: $\quad$ Wed. November 15, 2017
Horizon Date: 2019
Peak Hour: $\quad$ 7:15-8:15 AM
Data Source:
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Input By: } & \text { C. B. }\end{array}$

Comments: Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$
Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$

| Direction of Travel | Lane Movement | Number of Lanes | Capacity (Veh/Hr) On Green | Peak Hour Volume |  | Volume/Capacity Ratio |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Existing (2017) | Existing <br> +Project | Existing (2017) | Existing <br> +Project |
| Northbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 62 | 62 | 0.039 | 0.039 |
|  | Through | 1 | 1600 | 846 | 846 | 0.529 | 0.529 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 209 | 209 | 0.131 | 0.131 |
| Southbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 28 | 28 | 0.018 | 0.018 |
|  | Through | 0.5 | 800 | 887 | 887 | 1.109 | 1.109 |
|  | Right Turn | 0.5 | 800 | 13 | 13 | 0.016 | 0.016 |
| Eastbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 29 | 29 | 0.018 | 0.018 |
|  | Through | 1 | 1600 | 54 | 56 | 0.034 | 0.035 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 51 | 51 | 0.032 |  |
| Westbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 187 | 187 | 0.117 | 0.117 |
|  | Through | 1 | 1600 | 59 | 60 | 0.037 | 0.038 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 33 | 33 | 0.021 |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of . 10 Existing 2017 Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  | 1.398 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | F |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{1 0}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.399 |
| Plus Project Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  | F |

* Denotes Critical Movement
** U-Turn Volumes Added to Left Turn Movements
Study Intersection

No.

## KHR ASSOCIATES <br> INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

| Conditions: | Existing (2017) Plus Project | Count Date: | Wed. November 15, 2017 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location: | City of Torrance, California | Horizon Date: | 2019 |
| North-South Street: | Rolling Hills Road/Portuguese Road | Peak Hour: | 4:15-5:15 PM |
| East-West Street: | Palos Verdes Drive North | Data Source: |  |
| Annual Growth Rate: | 1.00\% | Input By: | C. B. |

Comments: Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$ Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$

| Direction of Travel | Lane Movement | Number of Lanes | Capacity <br> (Veh/Hr) <br> On Green | Peak Hour Volume |  | Volume/Capacity Ratio |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Existing (2017) | Existing +Project | Existing (2017) | Existing +Project |
| Northbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 33 | 33 | 0.021 | 0.021 * |
|  | Through | 1 | 1600 | 829 | 829 | 0.518 | 0.518 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 221 | 221 | 0.138 |  |
| Southbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 5 | 5 | 0.003 | 0.003 |
|  | Through | 0.5 | 800 | 679 | 679 | 0.849 * | 0.849 |
|  | Right Turn | 0.5 | 800 | 11 | 11 | 0.014 | 0.014 |
| Eastbound |  | 1 | 1600 | 22 | 22 | 0.014 | 0.014 |
|  | Through | 1 | $1600$ | 47 | 48 | 0.029 * | 0.030 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 78 | 78 |  |  |
| Westbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 644 | 644 | 0.403 | 0.403 * |
|  | Through | 1 | 1600 | 56 | 58 | 0.035 | 0.036 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 25 | 25 | 0.016 |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ <br> Existing 2017 Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  | 1.401 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $F$ |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{~} 10$ Plus Project Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.402 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | F |
| * Denotes Critical Movement <br> ** U-Turn Volumes Added to Left Turn Movements |  |  |  |  |  |  | Study Intersection No. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |

## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

| Conditions: | Existing (2017) Plus Project |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location: City of Torrance, California <br> North-South Street: Pacific Coast Highway <br> East-West Street: Calle Mayor <br> Annual Growth Rate: $1.00 \%$ <br>  . |  |


| Count Date: | Wed. November 15,2017 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Horizon Date: | 2019 |
| Peak Hour: | 7:30-8:30 AM |
| Data Source: |  |
| Input By: | C. B. |

Comments: Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$
Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$


## KHR ASSOCIATES <br> INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS



* Denotes Critical Movement
** U-Turn Volumes Added to Left Turn Movements
*** Right Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements


## Appendix C - ICU Worksheets

## Ambient \& Ambient Plus Project

## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS





## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

| Conditions: <br> Location: <br> North-South Street: <br> East-West Street: <br> Annual Growth Rate | Ambient (2019), Ambient+Proj |  |  |  | Count Date: <br> Horizon Date: <br> Peak Hour: <br> Data Source: <br> Input By : | Wed. April 13, 2016 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | City of Torrance, California |  |  |  |  | 2019 |  |
|  | : Hawthorne Boulevard |  |  |  |  | 5:00-6:00 PM |  |
|  | 244th Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rate: 1.00\% |  |  |  |  | C. B. |  |
| Comments | Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane = 1600 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Ambient Traffic Increase Factor per City of Torrance $=1 \%$ Per Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Direction of Travel | Lane Movement |  | Capacity <br> (Veh/Hr) <br> On Green | Peak Hour Volume |  | Volume/Capacity Ratio |  |
|  |  | Number of Lanes |  | Existing <br> +Ambient <br> (2019) | Existing +Project (2019) | Existing <br> +Ambient <br> (2019) | Ambient <br> +Project <br> (2019) |
| Northbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 31 | 31 | 0.019 | 0.019 |
|  | Through | 3 | 4800 | 1268 | 1295 | 0.264 | 0.270 |
|  | Right Turn** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |
| Southbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 75 | 75 | 0.047 | 0.047 |
|  | Through | 3 | 4800 | 1613 | 1646 | 0.336 | 0.343 |
|  | Right Turn** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |
| Eastbound | Left Turn*** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
|  | Through | 1 | 1600 | 60 | 60 | 0.038 | 0.038 |
|  | Right Turn | 0.5 | 800 | 22 | 22 | 0.028 | 0.028 |
| Westbound | Left Turn*** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
|  | Through | 1 | 1600 | 58 | 58 | 0.036 | 0.036 |
|  | Right Turn | 0.5 | 800 | 52 | 52 | 0.065 | 0.065 |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of .10 Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  | 0.529 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | A |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.536 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | A |
| * Denotes Critical Movement <br> ** Right Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements <br> ** Left Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements |  |  |  |  |  |  | Study Intersection No. 2 |



## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

| Conditions: | Ambient (2019), Ambient+Proj |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location: | City of Torrance, California |
| North-South Street: | Hawthorne Boulevard |
| East-West Street: | Newton Street |
| Annual Growth Rate: | $1.00 \%$ |
|  |  |


| Count Date: | Wed. April 13,2016 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Horizon Date:  <br> Peak Hour:  <br> Data Source: <br> Input By: 5:00-6:00 PM <br>   C. B. |  |

Comments: Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$
Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$
Ambient Traffic Increase Factor per City of Torrance $=1 \%$ Per Year


## KHR ASSOCIATES <br> INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS



## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

| Conditions: <br> Location: <br> North-South Street: | Ambient + Proj <br> Easty of Torrance, California <br> Eawthorne Boulevard <br> Annual Growth Rate: |
| :--- | :--- |
| Via Valmonte |  |
| $1.00 \%$ |  |


| Count Date: | Wed. April 13,2016 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Horizon Date: | 2019 |
| Peak Hour: | $8: 00-9: 00$ AM |
| Data Source: |  |
| Input By: | C. B. |

Comments: Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$
Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$
Ambient Traffic Increase Factor per City of Torrance $=1 \%$ Per Year


## KHR ASSOCIATES <br> INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

| Conditions: | Ambient (2019), |
| :---: | :---: |
| Location: | City of Torrance, California |
| North-South Street: | Hawthorne Boulevard |
| East-West Street: | Via Valmonte |
| Annual Growth Rate: | 1.00\% |


| Count Date: | Wed. April 13, 2016 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Horizon Date: | 2019 |
| Peak Hour: <br> Data Source: <br> Input By: | 5:00-6:00 PM |
|  |  |

Comments: Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$
Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$
Ambient Traffic Increase Factor per City of Torrance $=1 \%$ Per Year

| Direction of Travel | Lane <br> Movement | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Number } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Lanes } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Capacity (Veh/Hr) On Green | Peak Hour Volume | Volume/Capacity Ratio |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Existing +Ambient (2019) | Existing <br> +Ambient (2019) |  |
| Northbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 64 |  |  |
|  | Through | 3 | 4800 | 1203 | 0.251 |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 18 | $0.011$ |  |
| Southbound |  | 1 | 1600 | 16 | 0.010 |  |
|  | Through | 3 | 4800 | 1910 | 0.398 * |  |
|  | Right Turn** | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Eastbound | Left Turn*** | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |
|  | Through | 1 | 1600 | 152 | 0.095 |  |
|  | Right Turn | 0.5 | 800 | 61 |  |  |
| Westbound | Left Turn*** | 0 |  | 0 | - |  |
|  | Through | 1 | 1600 | 16 | 0.010 * |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1 |  | 20 | $0.013$ |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ Level of Service |  |  |  |  | 0.643 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | B |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of .10 <br> Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Denotes Critical Movement <br> ** Right Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements <br> *** Left Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements |  |  |  |  |  | Study Intersection No. |



| KHR ASSOCIATES <br> INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conditions Location: North-South East-West Annual Gro <br> Comments: <br> Direction of Travel | Ambient (2019), Ambient+Proj |  |  |  | Count Date: <br> Horizon Date: <br> Peak Hour: <br> Data Source: Input By: | Wed. April 13, 2016 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 2019 |
|  | eet: Hawthorne Boulevard |  |  |  |  | 7:30-8:30 AM |  |
|  | Rolling Hills Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rate: $1.00 \%$ |  |  |  |  | C. B. |  |
|  | Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes = 3200 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Ambient Traffic Increase Factor per City of Torrance $=1 \%$ Per Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Peak Hour Volume |  | Volume/Capacity Ratio |  |
|  | Lane Movement | ```Number of Lanes``` | Capacity <br> (Veh/Hr) <br> On Green | Existing <br> +Ambient (2019) |  | Ambient +Project (2019) | Existing <br> +Ambient <br> (2019) | Ambient <br> +Project <br> (2019) |
|  | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Northbound | Through | 2 | 3200 | 1360 | 1362 | 0.425 | 0.426 |
|  | Right Turn** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Left Turn | 2 | 3200 | 283 | 287 | 0.088 | 0.090 |
| Southbound | Through | 2 | 3200 | 825 | 835 | 0.258 | 0.261 |
|  | Right Turn** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |
|  | Left Turn*** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
| Eastbound | Through | 1 | 1600 | 2 | 2 | 0.001 | 0.001 |
|  | Right Turn | 0.5 | 800 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
|  | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 88 | 88 | 0.055 | 0.055 |
| Westbound | Through | 0.5 | 800 | 2 | 2 | 0.003 | 0.003 |
|  | Right Turn | 1.5 | 2400 | 433 | 435 | 0.180 | 0.181 |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of . 10 Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  | 0.670 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ <br> Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.672 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Denotes Critical Movement <br> ** Right Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements <br> *** Left Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements |  |  |  |  |  |  | Study Intersection No. |



## KHR ASSOCIATES <br> INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

| Conditions: | $\frac{\text { Ambient (2019), Ambient }+ \text { Proj }}{\text { Location: }}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |
| North-South Street: | City of Torrance, California |
| East-West Street: | Whiffletree Lane |
| Rolling Hills Road |  |
| Annual Growth Rate: | $1.00 \%$ |
|  |  |


| Count Date: | Wed. April 13,2016 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Horizon Date: | 2019 |
| Peak Hour: | $7: 30-8: 30$ AM |
| Data Source: |  |
| Input By: | C. B. |

Comments: Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$
Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$
Ambient Traffic Increase Factor per City of Torrance $=1 \%$ Per Year

| Direction of Travel | Lane Movement | Number of Lanes | Capacity (Veh/Hr) On Green | Peak Hour Volume |  | Volume/Capacity Ratio |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Existing <br> +Ambient (2019) | Ambient +Project (2019) | Existing <br> +Ambient (2019) | Ambient <br> +Project <br> (2019) |
| Northbound | Left Turn*** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
|  | Through | 1 | 1600 | 45 | 45 | 0.028 | 0.028 |
|  | Right Turn | 0.5 | 800 | 20 | 20 | 0.025 | 0.025 |
| Southbound | Left Turn*** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |
|  | Through | 1 | 1600 | 14 | 14 | 0.009 | 0.009 |
|  | Right Turn | 0.5 | 800 | 3 | 3 | 0.004 | 0.004 |
| Eastbound | Left Turn*** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
|  | Through | 2 | 3200 | 336 | 340 | 0.105 | 0.106 |
|  | Right Turn** | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | - |  |
| Westbound | Left Turn*** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
|  | Through | 2 | 3200 | 497 | 499 | 0.155 | 0.156 |
|  | Right Turn** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  | 0.397 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | A |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of . 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.399 |
| Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  | A |
| * Denotes Critical Movement <br> ** Right Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements *** Left Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements |  |  |  |  |  |  | Study Intersection No. |

## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

| Conditions: <br> Location: <br> North-South Street: <br> East-West Street: <br> Annual Growth Rate: | Ambie | 2019), Am | bient+Proj |  | Count Date: Horizon Date: Peak Hour: Data Source: Input By: | Wed. April 13, 2016 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | City of Torrance, California |  |  |  |  | 2019 |  |
|  | : Whiflletree Lane |  |  |  |  | 5:00-6:00 PM |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\frac{\text { Rolling Hills Road }}{1.00 \%}$ |  |  |  |  | C. B. |  |
| Comments: Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ambient Traffic Increase Factor per City of Torrance $=1 \%$ Per Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Direction of Travel | Lane <br> Movement |  | Capacity (Veh/Hr) On Green | Peak Hour Volume |  | Volume/Capacity Ratio |  |
|  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c} \begin{array}{c} \text { Number } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Lanes } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | Existing +Ambient (2019) |  | Ambient +Project (2019) | Existing +Ambient (2019) | Ambient +Project (2019) |
| Northbound | Left Turn*** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
|  | Through | 1 | 1600 | 15 | 15 | 0.009 | 0.009 |
|  | Right Turn | 0.5 | 800 | 15 | 15 | 0.019 | 0.019 |
| Southbound | Left Turn*** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |
|  | Through | 1 | 1600 | 16 | 16 | 0.010 | 0.010 |
|  | Right Turn | 0.5 | 800 | 6 | 6 | 0.008 | 0.008 |
| Eastbound | Left Turn*** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
|  | Through | 2 | 3200 | 518 | 520 | 0.162 | 0.163 |
|  | Right Turn** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |
| Westbound | Left Turn*** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
|  | Through | 2 | 3200 | 394 | 400 | 0.123 | 0.125 |
|  | Right Turn** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of .10 Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  | 0.404 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | A |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ <br> Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.407 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | A |
| * Denotes Critical Movement <br> ** Right Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements <br> ** Left Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements |  |  |  |  |  |  | Study Intersection No. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

| Conditions: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location: | Ambient (2019), Ambient+Proj  <br> North-South Street:  <br> East-West Street: City of Torrance, California <br> Annual Growth Rate: Rolling Hills Road <br>  . |

Count Date: Wed. April 13, 2016
Horizon Date:
Peak Hour:
7:30-8:30 AM
Data Source:
Input By : C. B.

Comments: Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$
Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$
Ambient Traffic Increase Factor per City of Torrance $=1 \%$ Per Year

| Direction of Travel | Lane Movement | $\begin{gathered} \text { Number } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Lanes } \end{gathered}$ | Capacity <br> (Veh/Hr) <br> On Green | Peak Hour Volume |  | Volume/Capacity Ratio |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Existing +Ambient (2019) | Ambient <br> +Project <br> (2019) | Existing +Ambient (2019) | Ambient <br> +Project <br> (2019) |
| Northbound | Left Turn*** <br> Through <br> Right Turn** | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 1 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 1600 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 47 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 47 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $0.029$ | $0.029$ |
| Southbound | Left Turn*** <br> Through <br> Right Turn** | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 1 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 1600 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 60 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 60 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $0.038$ | 0.038 |
| Eastbound | Left Turn Through Right Turn** | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1600 \\ 3200 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30 \\ 320 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30 \\ 324 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.019 \\ & 0.100 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.019 \\ & 0.101 \end{aligned}$ |
| Westbound | Left Turn <br> Through Right Turn** | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1600 \\ 3200 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ 440 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ 442 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.007 \\ & 0.138 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.007 \\ & 0.138 \end{aligned}$ |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of . 10 <br> Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.323 \\ \mathrm{~A} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 淢 |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of . 10 Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.324 \\ \text { A } \end{gathered}$ |
| * Denotes Critical Movement <br> ** Right Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements <br> *** Left Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements |  |  |  |  |  |  | Study Intersection No. 7 |

## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

| Conditions: | Ambient (2019), Ambient + Proj |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location: | City of Torrance, California |
| North-South Street: | Fallenleaf Drive |
| East-West Street: | Rolling Hills Road |
| Annual Growth Rate: | $1.00 \%$ |


| Count Date: | Wed. April 13,2016 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Horizon Date: | 2019 |
| Peak Hour: | $4: 30-5: 30$ PM |
| Data Source: |  |
| Input By: | C. B. |

Comments: Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$
Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$
Ambient Traffic Increase Factor per City of Torrance $=1 \%$ Per Year

| Direction of Travel | Lane <br> Movement |  | Capacity (Veh/Hr) On Green | Peak Hour Volume |  | Volume/Capacity Ratio |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Existing <br> +Ambient <br> (2019) | Ambient +Project (2019) | Existing <br> +Ambient <br> (2019) | Ambient <br> +Project <br> (2019) |
| Northbound | Left Turn**夫 <br> Through <br> Right Turn** | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 1 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 1600 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 25 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 25 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $0.016$ | $0.016$ |
| Southbound | Left Turn*** <br> Through <br> Right Turn** | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 1 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 1600 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 46 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 46 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $0.029$ | 0.029 |
| Eastbound | Left Turn <br> Through Right Turn** | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1600 \\ 3200 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 36 \\ 446 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 36 \\ 448 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.023 \\ & 0.139 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.023 \\ & 0.140 \end{aligned}$ |
| Westbound | Left Turn <br> Through Right Turn** | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1600 \\ 3200 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21 \\ 401 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21 \\ 407 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.013 \\ & 0.125 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.013 \\ & 0.127 \end{aligned}$ |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{~} 10$ Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.292 \\ \text { A } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ <br> Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.294 \\ \text { A } \end{gathered}$ |
| * Denotes Critical Movement <br> ${ }^{* *}$ Right Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements <br> *** Left Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements |  |  |  |  |  |  | Study Intersection No. $7$ |

## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

| Conditions: | Ambient (2019), Ambient+Proj |
| :---: | :---: |
| Location: | City of Torrance, California |
| North-South Street: | Crenshaw Boulevard |
| East-West Street: | Rolling Hills Road |
| Annual Growth Rate: | 1.00\% |

Count Date: Wed. April 13, 2016
Horizon Date: 2019
Peak Hour: 7:45-8:45 AM
Data Source:
Input By:
C. B.

Comments: Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$
Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$
Ambient Traffic Increase Factor per City of Torrance $=1 \%$ Per Year

| Direction <br> of Travel | Lane Movement |  | Capacity <br> (Veh/Hr) <br> On Green | Peak Hour Volume |  | Volume/Capacity Ratio |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Existing <br> +Ambient <br> (2019) | Ambient +Project (2019) | Existing <br> +Ambient <br> (2019) | Ambient <br> +Project <br> (2019) |
| Northbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 117 | 118 | 0.073 | 0.074 |
|  | Through | 3 | 4800 | 1340 | 1340 | 0.279 | 0.279 |
|  | Right Turn** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |
| Southbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 157 | 157 | 0.098 | 0.098 |
|  | Through | 3 | 4800 | 1024 | 1025 | 0.213 | 0.214 |
|  | Right Turn** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |
| Eastbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 146 | 148 | 0.091 | 0.093 |
|  | Through | 1 | 1600 | 147 | 147 | 0.092 | 0.092 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 60 | 62 | 0.038 | 0.039 |
| Westbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 22 | 22 | 0.014 | 0.014 |
|  | Through | 0.5 | 800 | 181 | 181 | 0.226 | 0.226 |
|  | Right Turn | 1.5 | 2400 | 200 | 200 | 0.083 | 0.083 |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ <br> Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  | 0.795 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | C |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ <br> Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.796 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | C |
| * Denotes Critical Movement <br> ** Right Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements <br> *** Left Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements |  |  |  |  |  |  | Study Intersection No. |

## KHR ASSOCIATES <br> INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

| Conditions: | Ambient (2019), Ambient + Proj |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location: | City of Torrance, California |
| North-South Street: | Crenshaw Boulevard |
| East-West Street: | Rolling Hills Road |
| Annual Growth Rate: | $1.00 \%$ |
|  |  |

Count Date: Wed. April 13, 2016
Horizon Date: 2019
Peak Hour: 4:45-5:45 PM
Data Source:
Input By:
C. B.

Comments: Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$
Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$
Ambient Traffic Increase Factor per City of Torrance = 1 \% Per Year

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Direction } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Travel } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Lane Movement | NumberofLanes | Capacity (Veh/Hr) On Green | Peak Hour Volume |  | Volume/Capacity Ratio |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Existing +Ambient (2019) | Ambient <br> +Project <br> (2019) | Existing <br> +Ambient (2019) | Ambient <br> +Project <br> (2019) |
| Northbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 101 | 104 | 0.063 | 0.065 |
|  | Through | 3 | 4800 | 1006 | 1006 | 0.210 | 0.210 |
|  | Right Turn** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |
| Southbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 274 | 274 | 0.171 | 0.171 |
|  | Through | 3 | 4800 | 1022 | 1025 | 0.213 | 0.214 |
|  | Right Turn** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |
| Eastbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 |  | 164 | 0.102 | 0.103 |
|  | Through | 1 | 1600 | 286 | 286 | 0.179 | 0.179 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 88 | 89 | 0.055 | 0.056 |
| Westbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 42 | 42 | 0.026 | 0.026 |
|  | Through | 0.5 | 800 | 217 | 217 | 0.271 | 0.271 |
|  | Right Turn | 1.5 |  | 164 | 164 | 0.068 | 0.068 |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  | 0.854 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | D |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.855 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | D |
| * Denotes Critical Movement <br> ** Right Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements *** Left Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements |  |  |  |  |  |  | Study Intersection No. |

## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

| Conditions: | Ambient (2019), Ambient+Proj |
| :---: | :---: |
| Location: | City of Torrance, California |
| North-South Street: | Crenshaw Boulevard |
| East-West Street: | Pacific Coast Highway |
| Annual Growth Rate: | 1.00\% |

Count Date: $\quad$ Wed. April 13, 2016
Horizon Date: 2019
Peak Hour: 8:00-9:00 AM
Data Source:
Input By: C. B.

Comments: Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$
Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$
Ambient Traffic Increase Factor per City of Torrance $=1 \%$ Per Year


## KHR ASSOCIATES <br> INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

Conditions:
Location:
North-South Street:
East-West Street:

| $\frac{\text { Ambient (2019), Ambient+Proj }}{\text { City of Torrance, California }}$ |
| :--- |
| Crenshaw Boulevard |
| Pacific Coast Highway |
| $1.00 \%$ |

Count Date:
Horizon Date:
Peak Hour:
Data Source:
Input By:
C. B.

Comments:
Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$
Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$
Ambient Traffic Increase Factor per City of Torrance $=1 \%$ Per Year





## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

| Conditions: <br> Location: <br> North-South Street: East-West Street: Annual Growth Rate: |  | 2019), Am | bient+Proj |  | Count Date: <br> Horizon Date: <br> Peak Hour: <br> Data Source: <br> Input By: | Wed. November 15, 2017 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | City of Torrance, California |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Hawthorne Boulevard |  |  |  | 5:00-6:00 PM |  |
|  |  | Palos Verdes Drive North |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | C. B. |  |
| Comments: | Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Ambient Traffic Increase Factor per City of Torrance $=1 \%$ Per Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Direction of Travel | Lane Movement |  | Capacity (Veh/Hr) On Green | Peak Hour Volume |  | Volume/Capacity Ratio |  |
|  |  | Number <br> of <br> Lanes |  | Existing <br> +Ambient (2019) | Ambient +Project (2019) | Existing +Ambient (2019) | Ambient +Project (2019) |
| Northbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 232 | 232 | 0.145 | 0.145 |
|  | Through | 2 | 3200 | 354 | 358 | 0.111 | 0.112 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 136 | 136 | 0.085 | 0.085 |
| Southbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 201 | 202 | 0.126 | 0.126 |
|  | Through | 2 | 3200 | 405 | 411 | 0.127 | 0.128 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 23 | 24 | 0.014 | 0.015 |
| Eastbound | Left Turn** | 1 | 1600 | 24 | 25 | 0.015 | 0.016 |
|  | Through | 2 | 3200 | 721 | 721 | 0.225 | 0.225 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 237 | 237 | 0.148 | 0.148 |
| Westbound | Left Turn** | 2 | 3200 | 141 | 141 | 0.044 | 0.044 |
|  | Through | 2 | 3200 | 1071 | 1071 | 0.335 | 0.335 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 319 | 321 | 0.199 | 0.201 |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of .10 Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  | 0.721 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | C |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{1 0}$ <br> Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.724 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | c |
| * Denotes Critical Movement <br> ** U-Turn Volumes Added to Left Turn Movements |  |  |  |  |  |  | Study Intersection No. 12 |

## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

| Conditions: | Ambient (2019), Ambient+Proj |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location: | City of Torrance, California |
| North-South Street: Crenshaw Boulevard <br> East-West Street: Palos Verdes Drive North <br> Annual Growth Rate: $1.00 \%$ |  |

Count Date: Wed. November 15, 2017
Horizon Date: 2019
Peak Hour: $\quad$ 7:45-8:45 AM
Data Source:
Input By:
C. B

Comments: Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$
Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$
Ambient Traffic Increase Factor per City of Torrance $=1 \%$ Per Year


## KHR ASSOCIATES <br> INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

| Conditions: | Ambient (2019), Ambient+Proj |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location:  <br> North-South Street: City of Torrance, California <br> Erenshaw Boulevard  <br> East-West Street: Palos Verdes Drive North <br> Annual Growth Rate: $1.00 \%$ <br>  . |  |


| Count Date: | Wed. November 15,2017 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Horizon Date: | 2019 |
| Peak Hour: | 5:00-6:00 PM |
| Data Source:  <br> Input By: C. B. |  |

Comments: Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$
Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$
Ambient Traffic Increase Factor per City of Torrance $=1 \%$ Per Year

| Direction of Travel | Lane Movement | Number of Lanes | Capacity (Veh/Hr) On Green | Peak Hour Volume |  | Volume/Capacity Ratio |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Existing +Ambient (2019) | Ambient <br> +Project <br> (2019) | Existing <br> +Ambient (2019) | Ambient <br> +Project (2019) |
| Northbound | Left Turn** | 1 | 1600 | 497 | 497 | 0.311 | 0.311 |
|  | Through | 2 | 3200 | 365 | 368 | 0.114 | 0.115 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 65 | 65 | 0.041 | 0.041 |
| Southbound | Left Turn** | 1 | 1600 | 361 | 361 | 0.226 | 0.226 |
|  | Through | 2 | 3200 | 369 | 370 | 0.115 | 0.116 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 54 | 54 | 0.034 | 0.034 |
| Eastbound | Left Turn** | 2 | 3200 | 48 | 48 | 0.015 | 0.015 |
|  | Through | 2 | 3200 | 1080 | 1081 | 0.338 * | 0.338 |
|  | Right Turn*** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
| Westbound | Left Turn** | 2 | 3200 | 116 | 116 | 0.036 * | 0.036 |
|  | Through | 2 | 3200 | 1009 | 1011 | 0.315 | 0.316 |
|  | Right Turn*** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ <br> Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  | 0.900 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | E |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of . 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.900 |
| Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  | E |
| * Denotes Critical Movement <br> ** U-Turn Volumes Added to Left Turn Movements <br> *** Right Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements |  |  |  |  |  |  | Study Intersection No. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $13$ |


| KHR ASSOCIATES <br> INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conditions: Location: North-South East-West Annual Grow Comments: <br> Direction of Travel | Ambient (2019), Ambient + Proj |  |  |  | Count Date: Horizon Date: Peak Hour: Data Source: Input By: | Wed. November 15, 2017 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 2019 |
|  | eet: Rolling Hills Road/Portuguese Road |  |  |  |  | 7:15-8:15 AM |  |
|  | Palos Verdes Drive North |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rate: 1.00\% |  |  |  |  | C. B. |  |
|  | Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane = 1600 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Ambient Traffic Increase Factor per City of Torrance $=1 \%$ Per Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Peak Hour Volume |  | Volume/Capacity Ratio |  |
|  | Lane <br> Movement | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Number } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Lanes } \end{array}$ | Capacity <br> (Veh/Hr) <br> On Green | Existing <br> +Ambient (2019) |  | Ambient <br> +Project (2019) | Existing <br> +Ambient (2019) | Ambient <br> +Project (2019) |
|  | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 63 | 63 | 0.039 | 0.039 |
| Northbound | Through | 1 | 1600 | 863 | 863 | 0.539 | 0.539 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 213 | 213 | 0.133 | 0.133 |
|  | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 29 | 29 | 0.018 | 0.018 |
| Southbound | Through | 0.5 | 800 | 905 | 905 | 1.131 | 1.131 |
|  | Right Turn | 0.5 | 800 |  |  |  | 0.016 |
|  | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 30 | 30 | 0.019 | 0.019 |
| Eastbound | Through | 1 | 1600 | 55 | 59 | 0.034 | 0.037 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 52 | 52 | 0.033 |  |
|  | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 191 | 191 | 0.119 | 0.119 |
| Westbound | Through | 1 | 1600 | 60 | 61 | 0.038 |  |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 34 | 34 | 0.021 |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  | 1.424 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ <br> Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.427 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F |
| * Denotes Critical Movement <br> ** U-Turn Volumes Added to Left Turn Movements |  |  |  |  |  |  | Study Intersection No. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $14$ |

## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

| Conditions: $\quad$ Ambient (2019), Ambient+Proj Count Date: Wed. November 15, 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location:  <br> $\begin{array}{ll}\text { North-South Street: } \\ \text { East-West Street: }\end{array}$ Rolling Hills Road/Portuguese Road <br> Eastorance, California  <br> Annual Growth Rate: Palos Verdes Drive North <br> $1.00 \%$  |  |  |  |  | Horizon Date: | $\frac{2019}{4: 15-5: 15 ~ P M}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Peak Hour: |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Data Source: |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Input By: | C. B. |  |
| Comments: Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ambient Traffic Increase Factor per City of Torrance $=1 \%$ Per Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Direction of Travel | Lane <br> Movement | Number of Lanes | Capacity <br> (Veh/Hr) <br> On Green | Peak Hour Volume |  | Volume/Capacity Ratio |  |
|  |  |  |  | Existing <br> +Ambient (2019) | Ambient +Project (2019) | Existing <br> +Ambient (2019) | Ambient <br> +Project (2019) |
| Northbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 35 | 35 | 0.022 | 0.022 |
|  | Through | 1 | 1600 | 863 | 863 | 0.539 | 0.539 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 230 | 230 | 0.144 |  |
| Southbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 5 | 5 | 0.003 | 0.003 |
|  | Through | 0.5 | 800 | 693 | 693 | 0.866 | 0.866 |
|  | Right Turn | 0.5 | 800 | 11 | 11 | 0.014 | 0.014 |
| Eastbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 22 | 22 | 0.014 | 0.014 |
|  | Through | 1 | 1600 | 48 | 49 | 0.030 | 0.031 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 80 |  | 0.050 |  |
| Westbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 657 | 657 | 0.411 | 0.411 |
|  | Through | 1 | 1600 | 57 | 59 | 0.036 | 0.037 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 26 | 26 | 0.016 |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of . 10 Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  | 1.429 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | F |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ <br> Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.429 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $3$ | F |
| * Denotes Critical Movement <br> ** U-Turn Volumes Added to Left Turn Movements |  |  |  |  |  |  | Study Intersection No. <br> 14 |


| KHR ASSOCIATES <br> INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conditions: Location: North-South East-West Annual Gro Comments: <br> Direction of Travel | $\begin{array}{ll}  & \begin{array}{l} \text { Ambien } \\ \text { reet: } \\ \text { et: } \end{array} \\ \text { Rate: } & \frac{\text { Pity of }}{\text { Pacific }} \\ & \begin{array}{l} \text { Calle M } \\ 1.00 \% \end{array} \end{array}$ | 2019), Am <br> rance, Ca <br> ast Highw <br> or | bient+Proj |  | Count Date: <br> Horizon Date: <br> Peak Hour: <br> Data Source: Input By: | Wed. Novemb <br> 2019 <br> 7:30-8:30 AM <br> C. B. | $15,2017$ |
|  | apacity Volume | Vehicles | Per Hour Per | ne $=1600$ ual Left-Turn rrance $=1$ | anes = 3200 Per Year |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Peak Hour Volume |  | Volume/Capacity Ratio |  |
|  | Lane <br> Movement | Number of Lanes | Capacity <br> (Veh/Hr) <br> On Green | Existing <br> +Ambient (2019) | Ambient <br> +Project <br> (2019) | Existing <br> +Ambient (2019) | Ambient <br> +Project <br> (2019) |
| Northbound | Left Turn <br> Through <br> Right Turn | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 1 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1600 \\ & 1600 \\ & 1600 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 148 \\ 804 \\ 33 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 148 \\ 804 \\ 33 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.093 \\ & 0.503 \\ & 0.021 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.093 \\ & 0.503 \\ & 0.021 \end{aligned}$ |
| Southbound | Left Turn Through Right Turn | 1 <br> 1 <br> 1 | $\begin{aligned} & 1600 \\ & 1600 \\ & 1600 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 180 \\ & 960 \\ & 305 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 180 \\ & 960 \\ & 305 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.113 \\ & 0.600 \\ & 0.191 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.113 \\ & 0.600 \\ & 0.191 \end{aligned}$ |
| Eastbound | Left Turn <br> Through Right Turn*** | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1600 \\ 3200 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 120 \\ 380 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 120 \\ 382 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.075 \\ & 0.119 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.075 \\ & 0.119 \end{aligned}$ |
| Westbound | Left Turn <br> Through Right Turn*** | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 2 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1600 \\ 3200 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 96 \\ 397 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 96 \\ 404 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.060 \\ & 0.124 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.060 \\ & 0.126 \end{aligned}$ |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ <br> Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.992 \\ E \end{gathered}$ |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ <br> Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.994 \\ E \end{gathered}$ |
| * Denotes Critical Movement <br> ** U-Turn Volumes Added to Left Turn Movements <br> *** Right Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements |  |  |  |  |  |  | Study Intersection No. 18 |

## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

| Conditions: <br> Location: <br> North-South Street: <br> East-West Street: <br> Annual Growth Rate: | Ambien | 2019), Amb | bient+Proj |  | Count Date: Horizon Date: Peak Hour: Data Source: Input By: | Wed. November 15, 2017 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | City of Torrance, California |  |  |  |  | 2019 |  |
|  | Pacific Coast Highway |  |  |  |  | 4:15-5:15 PM |  |
|  | Calle Mayor |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rate: $1.00 \%$ |  |  |  |  | C. B. |  |
| Comments | Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Ambient Traffic Increase Factor per City of Torrance $=1 \%$ Per Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Direction of Travel | Lane Movement | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Number } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Lanes }\end{array}$ | Capacity (Veh/Hr) On Green | Peak Hour Volume |  | Volume/Capacity Ratio |  |
|  |  |  |  | Existing <br> +Ambient (2019) | Ambient +Project (2019) | Existing <br> +Ambient (2019) | Ambient <br> +Project <br> (2019) |
| Northbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 194 | 194 | 0.121 | 0.121 |
|  | Through | 1 | 1600 | 1050 | 1050 | 0.656 | 0.656 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 50 | 50 | 0.031 | 0.031 |
| Southbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 175 | 175 | 0.109 | 0.109 |
|  | Through | 1 | 1600 | 959 | 959 | 0.599 | 0.599 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 86 | 86 | 0.054 | 0.054 |
| Eastbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 120 | 120 | 0.075 | 0.075 |
|  | Through | 2 | 3200 | 465 | 471 | 0.145 | 0.147 |
|  | Right Turn*** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
| Westbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 57 | 57 | 0.036 | 0.036 |
|  | Through | 2 | 3200 | 280 | 285 | 0.088 | 0.089 |
|  | Right Turn*** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  | 1.047 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | F |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.048 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F |
| * Denotes Critical Movement <br> ** U-Turn Volumes Added to Left Turn Movements <br> *** Right Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements |  |  |  |  |  |  | Study Intersection No. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Appendix D - ICU Worksheets

## Cumulative \& Cumulative Plus Project

## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

| Conditions: <br> Location: <br> North-South Street: <br> East-West Street: <br> Annual Growth Rate | Cumula | e w/ and w | w/o Project |  | Count Date: Horizon Date: Peak Hour: Data Source: Input By: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | City of Torrance, California |  |  |  |  | 2019 |  |
|  | Hawthorne Boulevard |  |  |  |  | 7:30-8:30 AM |  |
|  | Pacific Coast Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rate: 1.00\% |  |  |  |  | C. B. |  |
| Comments: | Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Direction <br> of Travel | Lane Movement | Number of Lanes | Capacity (Veh/Hr) On Green | Peak Hour Volume |  | Volume/Capacity Ratio |  |
|  |  |  |  | Cumulative w/o Project | Cumulative w/ Project | Cumulative w/o Project | Cumulative w/ Project |
| Northbound | Left Turn | 2 | 3200 | 293 | 303 | 0.092 | 0.095 |
|  | Through | 3 | 4800 | 1407 | 1438 | 0.293 | 0.300 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 61 | 68 | 0.038 | 0.043 |
| Southbound | Left Turn | 2 | 3200 | 202 | 202 | 0.063 | 0.063 |
|  | Through | 3 | 4800 | 765 | 772 | 0.159 | 0.161 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 325 | 325 | 0.203 | 0.203 |
| Eastbound | Left Turn | 2 | 3200 | 294 | 294 | 0.092 | 0.092 |
|  | Through | 3 | 4800 | 1045 | 1045 | 0.218 | 0.218 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 270 | 273 | 0.169 | 0.171 |
| Westbound | Left Turn | 2 | 3200 | 145 | 147 | 0.045 | 0.046 |
|  | Through | 3 | 4800 | 1075 | 1075 | 0.224 | 0.224 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 |  | 277 | 0.173 | 0.173 |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of . 10 Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  | 0.772 | T |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | C |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.779 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | C |
| * Denotes Critical Movement |  |  |  |  |  |  | Study Intersection No. |

## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

| Conditions: <br> Location: <br> North-South Street: <br> East-West Street: <br> Annual Growth Rate | Cumulative w/ and w/o Project |  |  |  | Count Date: <br> Horizon Date: <br> Peak Hour: <br> Data Source: Input By: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | 2019 |
|  | eet: Hawtho | e Boulevard |  |  |  | 5:00-6:00 PM |  |
|  | Pacific Coast Highway |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rate: 1.00\% |  |  |  |  | C. B. |  |
| Comments: | Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Direction of Travel | Lane Movement | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Number } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Lanes } \end{array}$ | Capacity <br> (Veh/Hr) <br> On Green | Peak Hour Volume |  | Volume/Capacity Ratio |  |
|  |  |  |  | Cumulative w/o Project |  | Cumulative <br> w/ Project | Cumulative w/o Project | Cumulative w/ Project |
| Northbound | Left Turn | 2 | 3200 | 324 | 330 | 0.101 | 0.103 |
|  | Through | 3 | 4800 | 943 | 961 | 0.196 | 0.200 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 74 | 77 | 0.046 | 0.048 |
| Southbound | Left Turn | 2 | 3200 | 423 | 423 | 0.132 | 0.132 |
|  | Through | 3 | 4800 | 1289 | 1305 | 0.269 | 0.272 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 430 | 430 | 0.269 | 0.269 |
| Eastbound | Left Turn | 2 | 3200 | 254 | 254 | 0.079 | 0.079 |
|  | Through | 3 | 4800 | 1147 | 1147 | 0.239 | 0.239 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 355 | 364 | 0.222 | 0.228 |
| Westbound | Left Turn | 2 | 3200 | 194 | 198 | 0.061 | 0.062 |
|  | Through | 3 | 4800 | 998 | 998 | 0.208 | 0.208 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 254 | 254 | 0.159 | 0.159 |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  | 0.769 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of . 10 <br> Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.776 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | C |
| * Denotes Critical Movement |  |  |  |  |  |  | Study Intersection No. |

## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

| Conditions: | Cumula | w/ and | w/o Project |  | Count Date: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location: | City of | rance, C | lifornia |  | Horizon Date: | 2019 |  |
| North-South | eet: Hawtho | e Bouleva |  |  | Peak Hour: | 7:30-8:30 AM |  |
| East-West S | : $\quad$ 244th S |  |  |  | Data Source: |  |  |
| Annual Grow | Rate: 1.00\% |  |  |  | Input By: | C. B. |  |
| Comments: | apacity Volume | Vehicles | Per Hour Pe | Lane $=1600$ |  |  |  |
|  | apacity Volume | Vehicles | Per Hour For | Dual Left-Turn | nes $=3200$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Peak H | r Volume | Volume/C | city Ratio |
| of Travel | Lane Movement | of Lanes | (Veh/Hr) <br> On Green | Cumulative w/o Project | Cumulative w/ Project | Cumulative w/o Project | Cumulative w/ Project |
|  | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 4 | 4 | 0.003 | 0.003 |
| Northbound | Through | 3 | 4800 | 1671 | 1719 | 0.348 | 0.358 |
|  | Right Turn** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |
|  | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 42 | 42 | 0.026 | 0.026 |
| Southbound | Through | 3 | 4800 | 1088 | 1100 | 0.227 | 0.229 |
|  | Right Turn** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |
|  | Left Turn*** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
| Eastbound | Through | 1 | 1600 | 29 | 29 | 0.018 | 0.018 |
|  | Right Turn | 0.5 | 800 | 8 | 8 | 0.010 | 0.010 |
|  | Left Turn*** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
| Westbound | Through | 1 | 1600 | 60 | 60 | 0.038 | 0.038 |
|  | Right Turn | 0.5 | 800 | 57 | 57 | 0.071 | 0.071 |
|  |  | ICU Plus | Lost Time F | ctor of .10 |  | 0.530 |  |
|  |  | Level of | Service |  |  | A |  |
|  |  | ICU Plus | Lost Time F | ctor of .10 |  |  | 0.540 |
|  |  | Level of | Service |  |  |  | A |
|  | notes Critical ight Turn Volum ft Turn Volume | vement <br> Added to <br> Added to T | Through Mo hrough Mov | ments ents |  |  | Study Intersection No. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |

## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

| Conditions: <br> Location: <br> North-South Street: <br> East-West Street: <br> Annual Growth Rate | Cumula | e $\mathrm{w} /$ and w | w/o Project |  | Count Date: <br> Horizon Date: Peak Hour: Data Source: Input By: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | City of Torrance, California |  |  |  |  | 2019 |  |
|  | Hawthorne Boulevard |  |  |  |  | 5:00-6:00 PM |  |
|  | treet: $\quad$ 244th S | 244th Street |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | wth Rate: $1.00 \%$ |  |  |  |  | C. B. |  |
| Comments: | Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\underline{\text { Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes }=3200}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Direction <br> of Travel | Lane Movement | $\begin{gathered} \text { Number } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Lanes } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Capacity <br> (Veh/Hr) <br> On Green | Peak Hour Volume |  | Volume/Capacity Ratio |  |
|  |  |  |  | Cumulative w/o Project | Cumulative w/ Project | Cumulative w/o Project | Cumulative w/ Project |
| Northbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 31 | 31 | 0.019 | 0.019 |
|  | Through | 3 | 4800 | 1314 | 1341 | 0.274 | 0.279 |
|  | Right Turn** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |
| Southbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 82 | 82 | 0.051 | 0.051 |
|  | Through | 3 | 4800 | 1681 | 1714 | 0.350 | 0.357 |
|  | Right Turn** |  |  | 0 |  | - |  |
| Eastbound | Left Turn*** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
|  | Through | 1 | 1600 | 65 | 65 | 0.041 | 0.041 |
|  | Right Turn | 0.5 |  | 27 | 27 | 0.034 |  |
| Westbound | Left Turn*** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
|  | Through | 1 | 1600 | 62 | 62 | 0.039 | 0.039 |
|  | Right Turn | 0.5 | 800 | 52 | 58 |  | 0.073 |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  | 0.549 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  | - | 0.556 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Denotes Critical Movement <br> ** Right Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements <br> *** Left Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements |  |  |  |  |  |  | Study Intersection No. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $2$ |

## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

| Conditions: <br> Location: <br> North-South Street: <br> East-West Street: <br> Annual Growth Rate: | Cumul | e w/ and $w$ | w/o Project |  | Count Date: <br> Horizon Date: <br> Peak Hour: <br> Data Source: <br> Input By: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | City of Torrance, California |  |  |  |  | 2019 |  |
|  | Hawthorne Boulevard |  |  |  |  | 7:30-8:30 AM |  |
|  | Newton Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rate: $1.00 \%$ |  |  |  |  | C. B. |  |
| Comments: | Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Direction <br> of <br> Travel | LaneMovement | $\begin{array}{\|c} \begin{array}{c} \text { Number } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Lanes } \end{array} \end{array}$ | Capacity <br> (Veh/Hr) <br> On Green | Peak Hour Volume |  | Volume/Capacity Ratio |  |
|  |  |  |  | Cumulative w/o Project | Cumulative w/ Project | Cumulative w/o Project | Cumulative w/ Project |
| Northbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 103 | 110 | 0.064 | 0.069 |
|  | Through | 3 | 4800 | 1666 | 1718 | 0.347 | 0.358 |
|  | Right Turn** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |
| Southbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 39 | 39 | 0.024 | 0.024 |
|  | Through | 2 | 3200 | 1049 | 1061 | 0.328 | 0.332 |
|  | Right Turn** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |
| Eastbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 27 | 27 | 0.017 | 0.017 |
|  | Through | 0.5 | 800 | 77 | 77 | 0.096 | 0.096 |
|  | Right Turn | 0.5 | 800 | 80 | 82 | 0.100 | 0.103 |
| Westbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 87 | 91 | 0.054 | 0.057 |
|  | Through | 1 | 1600 | 114 | 114 | 0.071 | 0.071 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 111 | 111 | 0.069 | 0.069 |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of . 10 Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  | 0.647 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | B |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of .10 Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.660 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B |
| * Denotes Critical Movement <br> ** Right Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements |  |  |  |  |  |  | Study Intersection No. 3 |

## KHR ASSOCIATES <br> INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

| Conditions: | Cumulative $\mathrm{w} /$ and w/o Project |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location: | City of Torrance, California |
| North-South Street: Hawthorne Boulevard <br> East-West Street: Newton Street <br>  . |  |

Count Date:
Horizon Date: 2019
Peak Hour: 5:00-6:00 PM
Data Source:
Input By:
C. B.

Comments: Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$
Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$


## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS



## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS



## KHR ASSOCIATES <br> INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

| Conditions: | Cumulative w/ and w/o Project |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location: | City of Torrance, California |
| North-South Street: | Hawthorne Boulevard |
| East-West Street: | Rolling Hills Road |
| Annual Growth Rate: | $1.00 \%$ |

Count Date:
Horizon Date: 2019
Peak Hour:
7:30-8:30 AM
Data Source:
Input By:
C. B.

Comments: Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$
Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$

| Direction of Travel | Lane <br> Movement | Number of Lanes | Capacity (Veh/Hr) On Green | Peak Hour Volume |  | Volume/Capacity Ratio |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Cumulative w/o Project | Cumulative w/ Project | Cumulative w/o Project | Cumulative w/ Project |
| Northbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
|  | Through | 2 | 3200 | 1403 | 1405 | 0.438 | 0.439 |
|  | Right Turn** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |
| Southbound | Left Turn | 2 | 3200 | 285 | 289 | 0.089 | 0.090 |
|  | Through | 2 | 3200 | 843 | 853 | 0.263 | 0.267 |
|  | Right Turn** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |
| Eastbound | Left Turn*** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
|  | Through | 1 | 1600 | 2 | 2 | 0.001 | 0.001 |
|  | Right Turn | 0.5 | 800 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Westbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 88 | 88 | 0.055 | 0.055 |
|  | Through | 0.5 | 800 | 2 | 2 | 0.003 | 0.003 |
|  | Right Turn | 1.5 |  | 438 | 440 |  | 0.183 |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  | 0.684 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | B |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.686 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | B |
| * Denotes Critical Movement <br> ** Right Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements <br> *** Left Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements |  |  |  |  |  |  | Study Intersection No. |

## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS



## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

| Conditions: | Cumulative w/ and w/o Project |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location: | City of Torrance, California |
| North-South Street: Whiffletree Lane <br> East-West Street: Rolling Hills Road <br> Annual Growth Rate: $1.00 \%$ |  |

Count Date:
Horizon Date: 2019
Peak Hour: 7:30-8:30 AM
Data Source:
Input By: C. B.

Comments: Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$
Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$

| Direction <br> of Travel | Lane <br> Movement | $\begin{gathered} \text { Number } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Lanes } \end{gathered}$ | Capacity (Veh/Hr) On Green | Peak Hour Volume |  | Volume/Capacity Ratio |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Cumulative w/o Project | Cumulative w/ Project | Cumulative w/o Project | Cumulative w/ Project |
| Northbound | Left Turn*** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
|  | Through | 1 | 1600 | 45 | 45 | 0.028 | 0.028 |
|  | Right Turn | 0.5 | 800 | 21 | 21 | 0.026 | 0.026 |
| Southbound | Left Turn*** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |
|  | Through | 1 | 1600 | 15 | 15 | 0.009 | 0.009 |
|  | Right Turn | 0.5 | 800 | 4 | 4 | 0.005 | 0.005 |
| Eastbound | Left Turn*** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
|  | Through | 2 | 3200 | 338 | 342 | 0.106 | 0.107 |
|  | Right Turn** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |
| Westbound | Left Turn*** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
|  | Through | 2 | 3200 | 498 | 500 | 0.156 | 0.156 |
|  | Right Turn** |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  | 0.399 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | A |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.401 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Denotes Critical Movement <br> ** Right Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements *** Left Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements |  |  |  |  |  |  | Study Intersection No. |

## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

| Conditions: | Cumulative w/ and w/o Project |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location: | City of Torrance, California |
| North-South Street: | Whiffletree Lane |
| East-West Street: | Rolling Hills Road |
| Annual Growth Rate: | $1.00 \%$ |
|  |  |

Count Date:
Horizon Date:
Peak Hour:

$$
2019
$$

Data Source:
Input By: $\qquad$

Comments: Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$
Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$

| Direction of Travel | Lane Movement | Number of Lanes | Capacity (Veh/Hr) On Green | Peak Hour Volume |  | Volume/Capacity Ratio |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Cumulative w/o Project | Cumulative w/ Project | Cumulative w/o Project | Cumulative w/ Project |
| Northbound | Left Turn*** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
|  | Through | 1 | 1600 | 15 | 15 | 0.009 | 0.009 |
|  | Right Turn | 0.5 | 800 | 16 | 16 | 0.020 | 0.020 |
| Southbound | Left Turn*** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |
|  | Through | 1 | 1600 | 16 | 16 | 0.010 | 0.010 |
|  | Right Turn | 0.5 | 800 | 7 | 7 | 0.009 | 0.009 |
| Eastbound | Left Turn*** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
|  | Through | 2 | 3200 | 525 | 527 | 0.164 | 0.165 |
|  | Right Turn** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |
| Westbound | Left Turn*** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
|  | Through | 2 | 3200 | 396 | 402 | 0.124 | 0.126 |
|  | Right Turn** | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  | 0.407 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | A |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.410 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | A |
| * Denotes Critical Movement <br> ** Right Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements <br> *** Left Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements |  |  |  |  |  |  | Study Intersection No. |




## KHR ASSOCIATES <br> INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

| Conditions: | Cumulative w/ and w/o Project |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location: | City of Torrance, California |
| North-South Street: Crenshaw Boulevard <br> East-West Street: Rolling Hills Road <br> Annual Growth Rate: $1.00 \%$ |  |

Count Date:
Horizon Date: 2019
Peak Hour: 7:45-8:45 AM
Data Source:
Input By: C. B.

| Comments: | Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Peak Ho | Volume | Volume/ | pacity Ratio |
| of Travel | Lane Movement | of Lanes | (Veh/Hr) On Green | Cumulative w/o Project | Cumulative w Project | Cumulative w/o Project | Cumulative w/ Project |
| Northbound | Left Turn <br> Through Right Turn** | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 3 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1600 \\ 4800 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 117 \\ 1392 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 118 \\ 1392 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.073 \\ & 0.290 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.074 \\ & 0.290 \end{aligned}$ |
| Southbound | Left Turn <br> Through Right Turn** | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 3 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1600 \\ 4800 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 159 \\ 1045 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 159 \\ 1046 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.099 \\ & 0.218 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.099 \\ & 0.218 \end{aligned}$ |
| Eastbound | Left Turn Through Right Turn | 1 <br> 1 <br> 1 | $\begin{aligned} & 1600 \\ & 1600 \\ & 1600 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 153 \\ 147 \\ 60 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 155 \\ 147 \\ 62 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.096 \\ & 0.092 \\ & 0.038 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.097 \\ & 0.092 \\ & 0.039 \end{aligned}$ |
| Westbound | Left Turn Through Right Turn | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ 0.5 \\ 1.5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1600 \\ 800 \\ 2400 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 24 \\ 181 \\ 206 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 24 \\ 181 \\ 206 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.015 \\ & 0.226 \\ & 0.086 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.015 \\ & 0.226 \\ & 0.086 \end{aligned}$ |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.811 \\ \mathrm{D} \end{gathered}$ |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.813 \\ \mathrm{D} \end{gathered}$ |
| * Denotes Critical Movement <br> ** Right Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements <br> *** Left Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements |  |  |  |  |  |  | Study Intersection No. |

KHR ASSOCIATES

## INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

|  | Cumula | e w/ and | w/o Project |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location: | City of | rrance, Ca | alifornia |  | Horizon Date: | 2019 |  |
| North-South | reet: Crensh | Boulevar |  |  | Peak Hour: | 4:45-5:45 PM |  |
| East-West S | : Rolling | ills Road |  |  | Data Source: |  |  |
| Annual Grow | Rate: $1.00 \%$ |  |  |  | Input By: | C. B. |  |
| Comments: | apacity Volume | Vehicles | Per Hour Per | Lane $=1600$ |  |  |  |
|  | apacity Volume | Vehicles | Per Hour For | Dual Left-Turn | nes $=3200$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Peak H | Volume | Volume/C | pacity Ratio |
| of Travel | Lane Movement | of Lanes | (Veh/Hr) <br> On Green | Cumulative w/o Project | Cumulative <br> w/ Project | Cumulative w/o Project | Cumulative w/ Project |
|  | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 101 | 104 | 0.063 | 0.065 |
| Northbound | Through | 3 | 4800 | 1039 | 1039 | 0.216 | 0.216 |
|  | Right Turn** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |
|  | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 279 | 279 | 0.174 | 0.174 |
| Southbound | Through | 3 | 4800 | 1088 | 1091 | 0.227 | 0.227 |
|  | Right Turn** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |  |
|  | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 168 | 169 | 0.105 | 0.106 |
| Eastbound | Through | 1 | 1600 | 286 | 286 | 0.179 | 0.179 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 88 | 89 | 0.055 | 0.056 |
|  | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 46 | 46 | 0.029 | 0.029 |
| Westbound | Through | 0.5 | 800 | 217 | 217 | 0.271 | 0.271 |
|  | Right Turn | 1.5 | 2400 |  | 167 | 0.070 | 0.070 |
|  |  | ICU Plus | Lost Time F | ctor of .10 |  | 0.867 |  |
|  |  | Level of | Service |  |  | D |  |
|  |  | ICU Plus | Lost Time F | ctor of .10 |  |  | 0.868 |
|  |  | Level of | Service |  |  |  |  |
|  | notes Critical ight Turn Volum ft Turn Volume | vement <br> Added to <br> dded to T | Through Mo hrough Mov | ments ents |  |  | Study Intersection No. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $8$ |

## KHR ASSOCIATES <br> INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS




## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

| Conditions: | Cumulative w/ and w/o Project |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location: | City of Torrance, California |
| North-South Street: | Vista Montana |
| East-West Street: | Pacific Coast Highway |
| Annual Growth Rate: | $1.00 \%$ |

## Count Date:

Horizon Date: 2019
Peak Hour: $\quad$ 7:30-8:30 AM
Data Source:
Input By:
C. B.

Comments: Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$
Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$

| Direction of Travel | Lane Movement | Number of Lanes | Capacity (Veh/Hr) On Green | Peak Hour Volume |  | Volume/Capacity Ratio |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Cumulative w/o Project | Cumulative w/ Project | Cumulative w/o Project | Cumulative w/ Project |
| Northbound | Left Turn | 2 | 3200 | 153 | 153 | 0.048 | 0.048 |
|  | Through | 1.5 | 2400 | 150 | 151 | 0.063 | 0.063 |
|  | Right Turn | 0.5 | 800 | 130 | 130 | 0.163 | 0.163 |
| Southbound | Left Turn | 2 | 3200 | 289 | 290 | 0.090 | 0.091 |
|  | Through | 2 | 3200 | 116 | 116 | 0.036 | 0.036 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 |  | 194 | 194 | 0.121 | 0.121 |
| Eastbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 48 | 48 | 0.030 | 0.030 |
|  | Through | 2 | 3200 | 1175 | 1177 | 0.367 | 0.368 |
|  | Right Turn** |  |  |  |  | - |  |
| Westbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 72 | 72 | 0.045 | 0.045 |
|  | Through | 2 | 3200 | 1565 | 1575 | 0.489 | 0.492 |
|  | Right Turn** |  |  |  |  | - |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  | 0.772 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.776 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | C |
| * Denotes Critical Movement <br> ** Right Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements |  |  |  |  |  |  | Study Intersection No. |

## KHR ASSOCIATES <br> INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS



## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

| Conditions: | Cumulative w/ and w/o Project |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location: | City of Torrance, California |
| North-South Street: | Hawthorne Boulevard |
| East-West Street: | Palos Verdes Drive North |
| Annual Growth Rate: | $1.00 \%$ |

Count Date:
Horizon Date:
Peak Hour: $\qquad$

Comments: Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$
Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$

| Direction of Travel | Lane <br> Movement | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Number } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Lanes } \end{array}$ | Capacity <br> (Veh/Hr) <br> On Green | Peak Hour Volume |  | Volume/Capacity Ratio |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Cumulative w/o Project | Cumulative w/ Project | Cumulative w/o Project | Cumulative w/ Project |
| Northbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 187 | 187 | 0.117 | 0.117 |
|  | Through | 2 | 3200 | 460 | 461 | 0.144 | 0.144 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 168 | 168 | 0.105 | 0.105 |
| Southbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 345 | 347 | 0.216 | 0.217 |
|  | Through | 2 | 3200 | 424 | 430 | 0.133 | 0.134 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 16 | 18 | 0.010 | 0.011 |
| Eastbound | Left Turn** | 1 | 1600 | 35 | 35 | 0.022 | 0.022 |
|  | Through | 2 | 3200 | 935 | 935 | 0.292 | 0.292 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 291 | 291 | 0.182 | 0.182 |
| Westbound | Left Turn** | 2 | 3200 | 129 | 129 | 0.040 | 0.040 |
|  | Through | 2 | 3200 | 564 | 564 | 0.176 | 0.176 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 262 | 263 | 0.164 | 0.164 |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  | 0.792 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | C |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of . 10 Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.793 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | C |
| * Denotes Critical Movement <br> ** U-Turn Volumes Added to Left Turn Movements |  |  |  |  |  |  | Study Intersection No. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $12$ |

## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS




## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS



## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

| Conditions: <br> Location: <br> North-South Street: <br> East-West Street: <br> Annual Growth Rate | Cumulative w/ and w/o Project |  |  |  | Count Date: <br> Horizon Date: <br> Peak Hour: <br> Data Source: Input By: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | City of Torrance, California |  |  |  |  | 2019 |  |
|  | Rolling Hills Road/Portuguese Road |  |  |  |  | 7:15-8:15 AM |  |
|  | Palos Verdes Drive North |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rate: 1.00\% |  |  |  |  | C. B. |  |
| Comments: | Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Direction of Travel | Lane Movement |  | Capacity (Veh/Hr) On Green | Peak Hour Volume |  | Volume/Capacity Ratio |  |
|  |  |  |  | Cumulative w/o Project | Cumulative w/ Project | Cumulative w/o Project | Cumulative w/Project |
| Northbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 63 | 63 | 0.039 | 0.039 |
|  | Through | 1 | 1600 | 863 | 863 | 0.539 | 0.539 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 213 | 213 | 0.133 | 0.133 |
| Southbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 31 | 31 | 0.019 | 0.019 |
|  | Through | 0.5 | 800 | 905 | 905 | 1.131 | 1.131 |
|  | Right Turn |  | 800 | 13 | 13 |  | 0.016 |
| Eastbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 30 | 30 | 0.019 | 0.019 |
|  | Through | 1 | 1600 | 63 | 65 | 0.039 | 0.041 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 |  |  |  | 0.033 |  |
| Westbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 191 | 191 | 0.119 | 0.119 |
|  | Through | 1 | 1600 | 77 | 78 | 0.048 | 0.049 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 42 | 42 | 0.026 |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  | 1.429 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of $\mathbf{. 1 0}$ Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.431 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | F |
| * Denotes Critical Movement <br> ** U-Turn Volumes Added to Left Turn Movements |  |  |  |  |  |  | Study Intersection No. <br> 14 |

## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS



## KHR ASSOCIATES INTERSECTION CAPACITY UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

| Conditions: | Cumulative w/ and w/o Project |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location: | City of Torrance, California |
| North-South Street: Pacific Coast Highway <br> East-West Street: Calle Mayor <br> Annual Growth Rate: $1.00 \%$ |  |

Count Date:
Horizon Date: 2019
Peak Hour: 7:30-8:30 AM
Data Source:
Input By : C. B.

Comments: Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour Per Lane $=1600$
Capacity Volume of Vehicles Per Hour For Dual Left-Turn Lanes $=3200$

| Direction of Travel | Lane Movement | NumberofLanes | Capacity (Veh/Hr) On Green | Peak Hour Volume |  | Volume/Capacity Ratio |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Cumulative w/o Project | Cumulative w/ Project | Cumulative w/o Project | Cumulative w/ Project |
| Northbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 148 | 148 | 0.093 | 0.093 |
|  | Through | 1 | 1600 | 805 | 805 | 0.503 | 0.503 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 33 | 33 | 0.021 | 0.021 |
| Southbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 180 | 180 | 0.113 | 0.113 |
|  | Through | 1 | 1600 | 960 | 960 | 0.600 | 0.600 |
|  | Right Turn | 1 | 1600 | 305 | 305 | 0.191 | 0.191 |
| Eastbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 120 | 120 | 0.075 | 0.075 |
|  | Through | 2 | 3200 | 403 | 405 | 0.126 | 0.127 |
|  | Right Turn*** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
| Westbound | Left Turn | 1 | 1600 | 96 | 96 | 0.060 | 0.060 |
|  | Through | 2 | 3200 | 417 | 424 | 0.130 | 0.133 |
|  | Right Turn*** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of . 10 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.998 |  |
| Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  | E | $\underline{\square}$ |
| ICU Plus Lost Time Factor of . 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 |
| Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  | F |
| * Denotes Critical Movement <br> ** U-Turn Volumes Added to Left Turn Movements <br> *** Right Turn Volumes Added to Through Movements |  |  |  |  |  |  | Study Intersection No. |
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| Timer Results | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assigned Phase | 5 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 8 | 7 | 4 |
| Case Number | 2.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 |
| Phase Duration, s | 20.0 | 50.2 | 19.8 | 50.0 | 18.0 | 30.0 | 20.0 | 32.0 |
| Change Period, ( $Y+R_{c}$ ), s | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Max Allow Headway ( MAH ), s | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Queue Clearance Time ( $g_{s}$ ), s | 18.0 |  | 15.8 |  | 13.8 | 24.0 | 16.2 | 30.0 |
| Green Extension Time ( $g_{e}$ ), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Probability | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Max Out Probability | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |


| Movement Group Results | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Assigned Movement | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Adjusted Flow Rate ( $v$ ), veh/h | 244 | 1127 | 496 | 208 | 917 | 415 | 349 | 712 | 343 | 418 | 1340 | 417 |
| Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate ( $s$ ), veh/h/ln | 1781 | 1870 | 1643 | 1781 | 1841 | 1665 | 1743 | 1885 | 1811 | 1743 | 1712 | 1581 |
| Queue Service Time ( $g_{s}$ ), s | 16.0 | 31.8 | 31.9 | 13.8 | 24.6 | 24.6 | 11.8 | 21.9 | 22.0 | 14.2 | 28.0 | 28.0 |
| Cycle Queue Clearance Time ( $g_{c}$ ), s | 16.0 | 31.8 | 31.9 | 13.8 | 24.6 | 24.6 | 11.8 | 21.9 | 22.0 | 14.2 | 28.0 | 28.0 |
| Green Ratio ( $g / C$ ) | 0.13 | 0.39 | 0.39 | 0.13 | 0.38 | 0.38 | 0.12 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.13 | 0.23 | 0.23 |
| Capacity ( c), veh/h | 238 | 1441 | 633 | 234 | 1411 | 638 | 407 | 817 | 392 | 465 | 1198 | 369 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ( $X$ ) | 1.029 | 0.782 | 0.783 | 0.888 | 0.650 | 0.650 | 0.858 | 0.871 | 0.874 | 0.899 | 1.118 | 1.129 |
| Back of Queue ( $Q$ ), ft/ln ( 50 th percentile) | 286.9 | 367.9 | 341.6 | 200.5 | 279.7 | 257.7 | 143.8 | 277.4 | 288.7 | 183.2 | 470.1 | 494.7 |
| Back of Queue ( Q), veh/ln ( 50 th percentile) | 11.3 | 14.5 | 13.7 | 7.9 | 10.8 | 10.3 | 5.7 | 11.0 | 11.5 | 7.3 | 18.7 | 19.5 |
| Queue Storage Ratio ( $R Q$ ) ( 50 th percentile) | 0.96 | 1.23 | 1.16 | 0.67 | 0.93 | 0.89 | 0.72 | 1.39 | 1.46 | 0.61 | 1.57 | 1.65 |
| Uniform Delay ( $d_{1}$ ), s/veh | 52.0 | 32.4 | 32.5 | 51.3 | 30.4 | 30.4 | 52.0 | 45.4 | 45.4 | 51.2 | 46.0 | 46.0 |
| Incremental Delay ( $d_{2}$ ), s/veh | 66.0 | 4.3 | 9.3 | 29.6 | 2.3 | 5.1 | 12.2 | 9.7 | 18.4 | 19.6 | 64.8 | 86.7 |
| Initial Queue Delay ( $d_{3}$ ), 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 |
| Control Delay ( $d$ ), s/veh | 118.0 | 36.7 | 41.8 | 80.9 | 32.7 | 35.5 | 64.2 | 55.1 | 63.8 | 70.8 | 110.8 | 132.7 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | F | D | D | F | C | D | E | E | E | E | F | F |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | 48.7 |  | D | 40.0 |  |  | 59.5 |  |  | 107.3 |  | F |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | 67.2 |  |  |  |  |  | E |  |  |  |  |  |


| Multimodal Results | EB |  | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS | 3.4 | C | 3.5 | C | 3.3 | C | 3.3 | C |
| Bicycle LOS Score / LOS | 1.5 | B | 1.3 | A | 1.3 | A | 1.7 | B |
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Phone: Fax:
EMail:
ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL(AWSC) ANALYSIS $\qquad$

Analyst:
Agency/Co.: KHR Associates
Date Performed: 8/4/2016
Analysis Time Period: 8:00-9:00 A.M.
Intersection: Palos Verdes North
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Existing AM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Via Valmonte
North/South Street: Palos Verdes North
Volume Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics $\qquad$
\% Thrus Left Lane

$\qquad$ Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Li Li | Li | LD | Li | Li | Li | LD |



| hRT-adj | -0.6 | -0.6 | -0.7 | -0.6 |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |  |
| hadj, computed | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.5 |

Worksheet 4 - Departure Headway and Service Time $\qquad$
$\qquad$
Workshet 4 - Departure Headway

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Elow rate | 207 |  | 202 |  | 13 | 489 | 266 |  |
| hd, initial value | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 |
| x , initial | 0.18 |  | 0.18 |  | 0.01 | 0.43 | 0.24 |  |
| hd, final value | 6.97 |  | 6.98 |  | 7.01 | 6.50 | 6.61 |  |
| $x$, final value | 0.40 |  | 0.392 |  | 0.025 | 0.883 | 0.48 |  |
| Move-up time, m | 2.0 |  | 2.0 |  | 2.3 |  | 2.0 |  |
| Service Time | 5.0 |  | 5.0 |  | 4.7 | 4.2 | 4.6 |  |



Phone: Fax:
EMail:
ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL (AWSC) ANALYSIS $\qquad$

Analyst:
Agency/Co.: KHR Associates
Date Performed: 8/4/2016
Analysis Time Period: 5:00 - 6:00 P.M.
Intersection: Palos Verdes North
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Existing PM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Via Valmonte
North/South Street: Palos Verdes North
Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics
Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics___ _ _ _

\% Thrus Left Lane

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Li 12 | L 1 | L 2 | L 1 | L 2 | L 1 | Lh |


| Configuration | LIR | CTR | L | T | CTR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PH | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Flow Rate | 23 | 185 | 6 | 382 | 577 |
| \% Heavy Ven | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. Lanes | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 |  |
| Opposing-Lanes | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| Conflicting-lanes | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |  |
| Geometry group | 2 | 2 | 5 | 1 |  |
| Da |  |  | 4 a |  |  |

Duration, T 1.00 hrs.
$\qquad$ Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Li | LD | Li | LD | LI | LD | Li |

Flow Rates:

| Total in Lane | 23 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Left-Turn | 0 |


| 185 | 6 | 382 | 577 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

2
5
$4 a$
Geometry Group 2
Adjustments Exhibit 17-33:

| hLT-adj | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| hRT-adj | -0.6 | -0.6 | -0.7 | -0.6 |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |  |
| hadj, computed | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.5 |
| 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |

Worksheet 4 - Departure Headway and Service Time $\qquad$

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Elow rate | 23 |  | 185 |  | 6 | 382 | 577 |  |
| hd, initial value | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 |
| x , initial | 0.02 |  | 0.16 |  | 0.01 | 0.34 | 0.51 |  |
| hd, final value | 7.06 |  | 6.48 |  | 6.43 | 5.93 | 5.35 |  |
| $x$, final value | 0.045 |  | 0.333 |  | 0.011 | 0.629 | 0.858 |  |
| Move-up time, m | 2.0 |  | 2.0 |  | 2.3 |  | 2.0 |  |
| Service Time | 5.1 |  | 4.5 |  | 4.1 | 3.6 | 3.4 |  |

$\qquad$ Worksheet 5 - Capacity and Level of Service $\qquad$

|  | Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound |  | Southbound |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 L2 | L1 L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 L2 |
| Elow Rate | 23 | 185 | 6 | 382 | 577 |
| Service Time | 5.1 | 4.5 | 4.1 | 3.6 | 3.4 |
| Utilization, $x$ | 0.045 | 0.333 | 0.011 | 0.629 | 0.858 |
| Dep. headway, hd | 7.06 | 6.48 | 6.43 | 5.93 | 5.35 |
| Capacity | 460 | 561 | 600 | 606 | 671 |
| 95\% Queue Length | 0.1 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 4.9 | 14.0 |
| Delay | 10.4 | 12.7 | 9.2 | 18.5 | 37.4 |
| LOS | B | B | A | C | E |
| Approach: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 10.4 | 12.7 |  | . 4 | 37.4 |
| LOS | B | B | C |  | E |
| Intersection Delay | 26.7 | Intersection | LOS D |  |  |

HCS7 Signalized Intersection Results Summary
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| Timer Results | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assigned Phase | 5 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 8 | 7 | 4 |
| Case Number | 1.1 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 |
| Phase Duration, s | 7.5 | 67.9 | 10.0 | 70.3 | 20.0 | 22.2 | 20.0 | 22.2 |
| Change Period, ( $Y+R \mathrm{c}$ ), s | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Max Allow Headway ( MAH ), s | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Queue Clearance Time ( $g_{s}$ ), s | 2.8 |  | 4.3 |  | 16.2 | 14.4 | 16.6 | 16.4 |
| Green Extension Time ( $g_{e}$ ), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 1.8 |
| Phase Call Probability | 0.59 |  | 0.99 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Max Out Probability | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.03 | 1.00 | 0.06 |


| Movement Group Results | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Assigned Movement | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Adjusted Flow Rate ( $v$ ), veh/h | 27 | 786 | 258 | 153 | 1167 | 348 | 252 | 386 | 148 | 219 | 441 | 26 |
| Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate ( $s$ ), veh/h/ln | 1753 | 1752 | 1608 | 1702 | 1752 | 1608 | 1781 | 1781 | 1607 | 1781 | 1781 | 1579 |
| Queue Service Time ( $g_{s}$ ), s | 0.8 | 16.2 | 10.7 | 2.3 | 26.8 | 14.8 | 14.2 | 12.4 | 10.3 | 14.6 | 14.4 | 1.7 |
| Cycle Queue Clearance Time ( $g_{c}$ ), s | 0.8 | 16.2 | 10.7 | 2.3 | 26.8 | 14.8 | 14.2 | 12.4 | 10.3 | 14.6 | 14.4 | 1.7 |
| Green Ratio ( $g / C$ ) | 0.56 | 0.53 | 0.53 | 0.59 | 0.55 | 0.55 | 0.28 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.13 | 0.15 | 0.15 |
| Capacity ( $c$ ), veh/h | 260 | 1865 | 856 | 827 | 1936 | 888 | 312 | 539 | 243 | 238 | 539 | 239 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ( $X$ ) | 0.103 | 0.421 | 0.301 | 0.185 | 0.603 | 0.391 | 0.809 | 0.715 | 0.607 | 0.922 | 0.818 | 0.107 |
| Back of Queue ( $Q$ ), ft/ln ( 50 th percentile) | 7.8 | 162 | 97.6 | 21.3 | 266 | 133.9 | 181.5 | 137 | 102.1 | 222.6 | 163.8 | 16.4 |
| Back of Queue ( Q ), veh/ln ( 50 th percentile) | 0.3 | 6.3 | 3.9 | 0.8 | 10.3 | 5.4 | 7.1 | 5.4 | 4.1 | 8.8 | 6.4 | 0.6 |
| Queue Storage Ratio ( $R Q$ ) ( 50 th percentile) | 0.03 | 0.54 | 0.34 | 0.07 | 0.89 | 0.46 | 0.91 | 0.69 | 0.52 | 0.74 | 0.55 | 0.05 |
| Uniform Delay ( $d_{1}$ ), s/veh | 14.8 | 16.9 | 15.6 | 12.1 | 18.0 | 15.3 | 37.1 | 48.4 | 47.6 | 51.4 | 49.3 | 43.9 |
| Incremental Delay ( $d_{2}$ ), s/veh | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 1.3 | 13.7 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 37.1 | 3.1 | 0.1 |
| Initial Queue Delay ( $d_{3}$ ), 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 |
| Control Delay ( $d$ ), s/veh | 14.8 | 17.6 | 16.5 | 12.1 | 19.4 | 16.6 | 50.8 | 49.1 | 48.5 | 88.5 | 52.4 | 44.0 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | B | B | B | B | B | B | D | D | D | F | D | D |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | 17.3 |  | B | 18.2 |  | B | 49.5 |  | D | 63.6 |  | E |

Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS
31.2

C
Multimodal Results
Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS
Bicycle LOS Score / LOS

| EB |  | WB |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2.9 | C | 2.9 | C |
| 1.4 | A | 1.9 | B |


| NB |  | SB |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3.1 | C | 3.0 | C |
| 1.1 | A | 1.1 | A |
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Phone:
Fax:
EMail:
ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL (AWS) ANALYSIS $\qquad$

Analyst:
Agency/Co.: KHR Associates
Date Performed: 11/15/17
Analysis Time Period: 7:30-8:30 A.M.
Intersection:
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Existing AM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Newton Street
North/South Street: Calle Mayor
$\qquad$ Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics $\qquad$
 \% Thrus Left Lane

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Li | L2 | Li | LD | LI | LD | LI |

Configuration
PH
Flow Rate
\% Heavy Veh
No. Lanes
Opposing-Lanes
Conflicting-lanes
Geometry group
Duration, T 1.00 hrs.
$\qquad$ Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Li | LD | Li | LD | LI | LD | Li |

Flow Rates:
Total in Lane
Left-Turn
Right-Turn
Prop. Left-Turns
Prop. Right-Turns

| L | R | TR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 73 | 137 | 444 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |

2
1
LT
$1.00 \quad 1.00$
131277
0
0
2
$0 \quad 2 \quad 1$

2 2
3 b
2
13 b

5

Prop. Heavy Vehicle
Geometry Group
Adjustments Exhibit 17-33: hLT-adj

| 73 | 137 | 444 |  | 131 | 277 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 73 | 0 | 0 |  | 131 | 0 |
| 0 | 137 | 94 |  | 0 | 0 |
| 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 1.0 | 0.0 |
| 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.2 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | 1 |  | $3 b$ |  | 5 |

hRT-adj
hHV-adj
hadj, computed
$-0.6$
$1.7 \quad 1.7$
1.7
-0.7
1.7
$\begin{array}{lllll}0.2 & -0.6 & -0.1 & 0.5 & 0.0\end{array}$

Worksheet 4 - Departure Headway and Service Time $\qquad$
$\qquad$

| Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 L2 | L1 | L2 |
|  |  | 73 | 137 | 444 | 131 | 277 |
| 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | $3.20 \quad 3.20$ | 3.20 | 3.20 |
|  |  | 0.06 | 0.12 | 0.39 | 0.12 | 0.25 |
|  |  | 6.16 | 5.35 | 5.28 | 6.10 | 5.59 |
|  |  | 0.125 | 0.204 | 0.651 | 0.222 | 0.430 |
|  |  | 2.0 |  | 2.0 |  | 3 |
|  |  | 4.2 | 3.4 | 3.3 | 3.8 | 3.3 |

Worksheet 5 - Capacity and Level of Service $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |

Flow Rate
Service Time
Utilization, x
Dep. headway, hd
Capacity
95\% Queue Length
Delay
LOS
Approach:
Delay
LOS

| 73 | 137 | 444 | 131 | 277 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 4.2 | 3.4 | 3.3 | 3.8 | 3.3 |
| 0.125 | 0.204 | 0.651 | 0.222 | 0.430 |
| 6.16 | 5.35 | 5.28 | 6.10 | 5.59 |
| 608 | 685 | 683 | 595 | 644 |
| 0.4 | 0.8 | 5.4 | 0.9 | 2.2 |
| $10.0+$ | 9.7 | 18.0 | 10.5 | 12.5 |
| B | A | C | B | B |

9.8
18.0
C
A
11.9

B
Intersection Delay 14.0
Intersection LOS B

Phone:
Fax:
EMail:

ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL (AWSC) ANALYSIS $\qquad$

Analyst:
Agency/Co.:
KHR Associates
Date Performed:
11/15/17
Analysis Time Period: 4:00-5:00 P.M.
Intersection:
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Existing PM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Newton Street
North/South Street: Calle Mayor
$\qquad$ Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics $\qquad$

\% Thrus Left Lane

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Li | L2 | Li | L2 | LI | L2 | LI | L2 |


| Configuration | L | R | TR | L | T |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PH | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Flow Rate | 60 | 60 | 350 | 88 | 330 |
| $\%$ Heavy Ven | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| No. Lanes |  | 2 | 1 | 0 |  |
| Opposing-Lanes | 0 | 2 | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting-lanes | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |  |
| Geometry group | 1 | $3 b$ | 5 |  |  |

Duration, T 1.00 hrs.
Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Li LD | Li | LD | LI | LD | LD | LD |

Flow Rates:

| Total in Lane | 60 | 60 | 350 | 88 | 330 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Left-Turn | 60 | 0 | 0 | 88 | 0 |
| Right-Turn | 0 | 60 | 46 | 0 | 0 |
| op. Left-Turns | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
| op. Right-Turns | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| op. Heavy Vehicle | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| ometry Group | 1 |  | $3 b$ | 0.0 |  |
| justments Exhibit 17-33: |  | 0.2 |  | 0.2 | 0.5 |


| hRT-adj | -0.6 | -0.6 | -0.7 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |  |
| hadj, computed | 0.2 | -0.6 | -0.1 | 0.5 |

Worksheet 4 - Departure Headway and Service Time $\qquad$
$\qquad$

| Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
|  |  | 60 | 60 | 350 |  | 88 | 330 |
| 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 |
|  |  | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.31 |  | 0.08 | 0.29 |
|  |  | 5.89 | 5.09 | 5.04 |  | 5.67 | 5.17 |
|  |  | 0.098 | 0.085 | 0.490 |  | 0.139 | 0.474 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
|  |  | 3.9 | 3.1 | 3.0 |  | 3.4 | 2.9 |

Worksheet 5 - Capacity and Level of Service $\qquad$
Eastbound
L1 L2

Flow Rate
Service Time
Utilization, x
Dep. headway, hd
Capacity
95\% Queue Length
Delay
LOS
Approach:
Delay
LOS

| Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
|  |  |  |  | 88 | 330 |
| 60 | 60 | 350 |  | 3.4 | 2.9 |
| 3.9 | 3.1 | 3.0 |  | 0.139 | 0.474 |
| 0.098 | 0.085 | 0.490 |  | 5.67 | 5.17 |
| 5.89 | 5.09 | 5.04 | 629 | 702 |  |
| 600 | 750 | 714 | 0.5 | 2.7 |  |
| 0.3 | 0.3 | 2.8 | 9.3 | 12.5 |  |
| 9.5 | 8.6 | 12.9 | A | B |  |
| A | A | B |  |  |  |

LOS
9.0

A
12.9

B
11.8

B

Intersection Delay 11.8
Intersection LOS B

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:

ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL(AWSC) ANALYSIS $\qquad$

Analyst:
Agency/Co.: KHR Associates
Date Performed: 11/15/2017
Analysis Time Period: 7:30-8:30 A.M.
Intersection:
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Existing AM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Newton Street
North/South Street: Vista Montana
$\qquad$ Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics $\qquad$

\% Thrus Left Lane

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Configuration | LTR |  | LTR |  | LTR |  | L | TR |
| PHF | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Flow Rate | 291 |  | 364 |  | 265 |  | 60 | 125 |
| \% Heavy Veh | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| No. Lanes |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 2 |
| Opposing-Lanes |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 2 |  | 1 |
| Conflicting-lanes |  | 2 |  | 2 |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| Geometry group |  | 2 |  | 2 |  | 4 a |  | 5 |
| Duration, T 1.00 | hrs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

$\qquad$ Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |

Flow Rates:

| Total in Lane | 291 | 364 | 265 | 60 | 125 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Left-Turn | 77 | 41 | 71 | 60 | 0 |
| Right-Turn | 75 | 141 | 19 | 0 | 33 |
| op. Left-Turns | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
| op. Right-Turns | 0.3 | 0.0 |  | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| op. Heavy Vehicle0.0 | 2 | 2 | 0.0 | 0.3 |  |
| ometry Group |  |  |  | $4 a$ | 0.0 |
| justments Exhibit $17-33:$ | 0.2 |  | 0.2 |  | 0.2 |

hLT-adj
0.2
0.2
0.2
0.5

| hRT-adj | -0.6 | -0.6 |  | -0.6 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | -0.7 |
| hadj, computed | -0.1 | -0.2 | 0.0 |  |

Worksheet 4 - Departure Headway and Service Time

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Flow rate | 291 |  | 364 |  | 265 |  | 60 | 125 |
| hd, initial value | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 |
| x , initial | 0.26 |  | 0.32 |  | 0.24 |  | 0.05 | 0.11 |
| hd, final value | 6.01 |  | 5.77 |  | 6.44 |  | 7.56 | 6.86 |
| $x$, final value | 0.486 |  | 0.583 |  | 0.474 |  | 0.126 | 0.238 |
| Move-up time, m |  | 0 |  | . 0 |  |  |  | 3 |
| Service Time | 4.0 |  | 3.8 |  | 4.4 |  | 5.3 | 4.6 |
| _Wo | ksheet | - Ca | city an | Leve | of Servi | ce |  |  |
|  | East | und | Westb | und | Northb | und | South | und |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Flow Rate | 291 |  | 364 |  | 265 |  | 60 | 125 |
| Service Time | 4.0 |  | 3.8 |  | 4.4 |  | 5.3 | 4.6 |
| Utilization, x | 0.486 |  | 0.583 |  | 0.474 |  | 0.126 | 0.238 |
| Dep. headway, hd | 6.01 |  | 5.77 |  | 6.44 |  | 7.56 | 6.86 |
| Capacity | 594 |  | 628 |  | 564 |  | 462 | 521 |
| 95\% Queue Length | 2.8 |  | 4.1 |  | 2.7 |  | 0.4 | 0.9 |
| Delay | 14.7 |  | 16.8 |  | 15.2 |  | 11.4 | 11.7 |
| LOS | B |  | C |  | C |  | B | B |
| Approach: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay |  | . 7 |  | . 8 |  | . 2 |  | . 6 |
| LOS |  |  | C |  | C |  |  |  |
| Intersection Delay | $15.0-$ |  | Inte | secti | LOS B |  |  |  |

Phone:
Fax:
EMail:

ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL(AWSC) ANALYSIS $\qquad$
Analyst:
Agency/Co.: KHR Associates
Date Performed: $\quad 11 / 15 / 2017$
Analysis Time Period: 4:00-5:00 P.M.
Intersection:
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Existing PM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Newton Street
North/South Street: Vista Montana
$\qquad$ Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics $\qquad$

\% Thrus Left Lane


Duration, T 1.00 hrs.
$\qquad$ Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Li | LD | LI | L2 | Li | L2 | LI |

Flow Rates:

| Total in Lane | 121 | 312 | 170 | 63 | 214 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Left-Turn | 39 | 36 | 10 | 63 | 0 |  |
| Right-Turn | 10 | 207 |  | 15 | 0 | 52 |
| op. Left-Turns | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 1.0 | 0.0 |  |
| op. Right-Turns | 0.1 | 0.0 |  | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| op. Heavy Vehicle 0.0 | 2 | 2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| merry Group |  |  |  | $4 a$ | 5 |  |
| justments Exhibit $17-33:$ | 0.2 |  | 0.2 |  | 0.2 | 0.5 |


| hRT-adj | -0.6 | -0.6 | -0.6 | -0.7 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |
| hadj, computed | 0.0 |  | -0.4 | -0.0 |

Worksheet 4 - Departure Headway and Service Time $\qquad$

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Flow rate | 121 |  | 312 |  | 170 |  | 63 | 214 |
| hd, initial value | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 |
| x , initial | 0.11 |  | 0.28 |  | 0.15 |  | 0.06 | 0.19 |
| hd, final value | 5.67 |  | 4.97 |  | 5.61 |  | 6.43 | 5.75 |
| x , final value | 0.191 |  | 0.431 |  | 0.265 |  | 0.113 | 0.342 |
| Move-up time, m |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| Service Time | 3.7 |  | 3.0 |  | 3.6 |  | 4.1 | 3.5 |

$\qquad$ Worksheet 5 - Capacity and Level of Service $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| L1 12 | L1 |


| Northbound | Southbound |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| L1 L2 | L1 |


| Flow Rate | 121 | 312 | 170 | 63 | 214 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Service Time | 3.7 | 3.0 | 3.6 | 4.1 | 3.5 |
| Utilization, x | 0.191 | 0.431 | 0.265 | 0.113 | 0.342 |
| Dep. headway, hd | 5.67 | 637 | 4.97 | 5.61 | 6.43 |
| Capacity | 726 | 654 | 5.75 |  |  |
| $95 \%$ Queue Length | 0.7 | 2.2 | 1.1 | 573 | 629 |
| Delay | $10.0+$ | 11.7 | 10.6 | 0.4 | 1.5 |
| LOS | B | B | B | 9.9 | 11.4 |

Approach:

Delay
LOS
$10.0+$
B

## 11.7

B
Intersection LOS B
Intersection Delay 11.1

$$
11.1
$$

B
10.6

B

Fax:
Phone:
EMail:

ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL (AWSC) ANALYSIS $\qquad$

Analyst:
Agency/Co.:
KHR Associates
Date Performed:
11/15/2017
Analysis Time Period: 7:45-8:45 A.M.
Intersection:
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Existing AM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Newton Street
North/South Street: Madison Street
Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics $\qquad$

\% Thrus Left Lane

| Configuration | LT | R | LT | R | LT | R | LT | R |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PH | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Flow Rate | 181 | 5 | 116 | 103 | 23 | 14 | 15 | 40 |
| \% Heavy Ven | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. Lanes |  | 2 |  | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |  |
| Opposing-Lanes | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  |
| Conflicting-lanes | 2 |  | 2 | 2 | 5 |  |  |  |
| Geometry group |  | 5 |  | 5 | 5 | 5 |  |  |

Duration, T 1.00 hrs.
Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Li | Li | LI | Lh | Li | Le | Li | Lh |

Flow Rates:


| hRT-adj | -0.7 |  | -0.7 | -0.7 | -0.7 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |  |  |
| hadj, computed | 0.3 | -0.7 | 0.0 | -0.7 | 0.3 | -0.7 |

Worksheet 4 - Departure Headway and Service Time $\qquad$

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Flow rate | 181 | 5 | 116 | 103 | 23 | 14 | 15 | 40 |
| hd, initial value | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 |
| x , initial | 0.16 | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.09 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.04 |
| hd, final value | 5.20 | 4.21 | 4.91 | 4.19 | 5.80 | 4.79 | 5.87 | 4.77 |
| $x$, final value | 0.261 | 0.006 | 0.158 | 0.120 | 0.037 | 0.019 | 0.024 | 0.053 |
| Move-up time, m |  | 3 |  | 3 |  |  |  | 3 |
| Service Time | 2.9 | 1.9 | 2.6 | 1.9 | 3.5 | 2.5 | 3.6 | 2.5 |

Worksheet 5 - Capacity and Level of Service $\qquad$

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Flow Rate | 181 | 5 | 116 | 103 | 23 | 14 | 15 | 40 |
| Service Time | 2.9 | 1.9 | 2.6 | 1.9 | 3.5 | 2.5 | 3.6 | 2.5 |
| Utilization, x | 0.261 | 0.006 | 0.158 | 0.120 | 0.037 | 0.019 | 0.024 | 0.053 |
| Dep. headway, hd | 5.20 | 4.21 | 4.91 | 4.19 | 5.80 | 4.79 | 5.87 | 4.77 |
| Capacity | 696 | 500 | 725 | 858 | 575 | 700 | 750 | 800 |
| 95\% Queue Length | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Delay | 9.7 | 6.9 | 8.5 | 7.5 | 8.7 | 7.6 | 8.7 | 7.7 |
| Los | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| Approach: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 9.7 |  | 8.0 |  | 8.3 |  | 8.0 |  |
| LOS | A |  | A |  | A |  | A |  |
| Intersection Delay | 8.7 |  | Intersection LOS A |  |  |  |  |  |

Phone:
Fax:
EMail:
$\qquad$
Analyst:
Agency/Co.: KHR Associates
Date Performed: 11/15/2017
Analysis Time Period: 7:45 - 8:45 A.M.
Intersection:
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Existing PM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Newton Street
North/South Street: Madison Street
$\qquad$ Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics $\qquad$

\% Thrus Left Lane



| hRT-adj | -0.7 |  | -0.7 | -0.7 | -0.7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |  |
| hadj, computed | 0.2 | -0.7 | 0.0 | -0.7 | 0.2 |

Worksheet 4 - Departure Headway and Service Time $\qquad$

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Flow rate | 169 | 12 | 147 | 15 | 34 | 2 | 53 | 150 |
| hd, initial value | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 |
| x , initial | 0.15 | 0.01 | 0.13 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.13 |
| hd, final value | 5.41 | 4.56 | 5.30 | 4.58 | 5.83 | 4.90 | 5.77 | 4.72 |
| $x$, final value | 0.254 | 0.015 | 0.216 | 0.019 | 0.055 | 0.003 | 0.085 | 0.197 |
| Move-up time, m |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |
| Service Time | 3.1 | 2.3 | 3.0 | 2.3 | 3.5 | 2.6 | 3.5 | . 4 |

Worksheet 5 - Capacity and Level of Service $\qquad$

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Flow Rate | 169 | 12 | 147 | 15 | 34 | 2 | 53 | 150 |
| Service Time | 3.1 | 2.3 | 3.0 | 2.3 | 3.5 | 2.6 | 3.5 | 2.4 |
| Utilization, $x$ | 0.254 | 0.015 | 0.216 | 0.019 | 0.055 | 0.003 | 0.085 | 0.197 |
| Dep. headway, hd | 5.41 | 4.56 | 5.30 | 4.58 | 5.83 | 4.90 | 5.77 | 4.72 |
| Capacity | 676 | 600 | 668 | 750 | 567 | 0 | 663 | 750 |
| 95\% Queue Length | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.7 |
| Delay | 10.0- | 7.3 | 9.5 | 7.4 | 8.9 | 7.6 | 9.0 | 8.6 |
| LOS | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| Approach: | 9.8 |  | 9.3 |  | 8.8 |  | 8.7 |  |
| Delay |  |  | A |  | A |  |  |  |
| LOS | A |  |  |  | Intersection LOS A |  | A |  |

HCS7 Signalized Intersection Results Summary

| General Information |  | KHR Associates |  |  |  |  |  | Intersection Information |  |  |  |  | $\downarrow+6$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agency |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Duration, h |  |  | 0.25 |  |  | $\frac{1+b}{1+b}$ |  |
| Analyst |  | - |  | Analysis Date |  | 8/1/2016 |  | Area Type |  |  | Other |  |  |  |  |
| Jurisdiction |  | Torrance California |  | Time Period |  |  |  | PHF |  |  | 0.90 |  |  | $w \frac{v}{w}$ |  |
| Urban Street |  | Pacific Coast Highway |  | Analysis Year |  | 2016 |  | Analysis Period |  |  | 1> 7:30 |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection |  | Calle Mayor |  | File Name |  | 18-PCH-Calle Mayor Exist AM.xus |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\dagger \uparrow$ |  |  |
| Project Description |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $1+14$ |  |
| Demand Information |  |  |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | SB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Movement |  |  |  |  |  |  | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Demand ( $v$ ), veh/h |  |  |  | 118 | 206 | 167 | 94 | 229 | 160 | 145 | 788 | 32 | 176 | 941 | 299 |
| Signal Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Us |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle, s | 90.0 | Reference Phase | 2 |  |  |  | $\ddot{\Rightarrow}$ | $\uparrow$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End | Green | 5.6 | 1.0 | 25.5 | 6.9 | 1.1 | 33.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 4.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 |  |  |  |  | † |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |  |



HCS7 Signalized Intersection Results Summary


## Existing Plus Project

## Highway Capacity Method

HCS 2010 Signalized Intersection Results Summary


HCS 2010 Signalized Intersection Results Summary
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[^21]Phone:
EMail:

Fax:

ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL(AWSC) ANALYSIS $\qquad$
Analyst:
Agency/Co.: KHR Associates
Date Performed: 8/4/2016
Analysis Time Period: 8:00 - 9:00 A.M.
Intersection: Palos Verdes North
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Existing AM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Via Valmonte
North/South Street: Palos Verdes North
$\qquad$ Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics $\qquad$


Volume
$t$ Lane
\% Thrus Left Lane

$\qquad$ Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Li | LD | LI | LD | LI | LT | Li | L2 |



| hRT-adj | -0.6 |  | -0.6 | -0.7 | -0.6 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |  |
| hadj, computed | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.5 |

Worksheet 4 - Departure Headway and Service Time

|  | Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound |  | Southbound |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 L2 | L1 L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 L2 |
| Flow rate | 207 | 202 | 13 | 489 | 267 |
| hd, initial value | $3.20 \quad 3.20$ | $3.20 \quad 3.20$ | 3.20 | 3.20 | $3.20 \quad 3.20$ |
| x , initial | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.01 | 0.43 | 0.24 |
| hd, final value | 6.97 | 6.99 | 7.02 | 6.51 | 6.62 |
| $x$, final value | 0.401 | 0.392 | 0.025 | 0.884 | 0.491 |
| Move-up time, m | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 3 | 2.0 |
| Service Time | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.7 | 4.2 | 4.6 |
| Worksheet 5 - Capacity and Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound |  | Southbound |
|  | L1 L2 | L1 L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 L2 |
| Elow Rate | 207 | 202 | 13 | 489 | 267 |
| Service Time | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.7 | 4.2 | 4.6 |
| Utilization, x | 0.401 | 0.392 | 0.025 | 0.884 | 0.491 |
| Dep. headway, hd | 6.97 | 6.99 | 7.02 | 6.51 | 6.62 |
| Capacity | 518 | 518 | 433 | 556 | 545 |
| 95\% Queue Length | 2.0 | 1.9 | 0.1 | 15.4 | 2.8 |
| Delay | 14.6 | 14.5 | 9.9 | 50.5 | 15.9 |
| LOS | B | B | A | F | C |
| Approach: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 14.6 | 14.5 |  | . 5 | 15.9 |
| LOS | B | B | E |  | C |
| Intersection Delay | 29.8 | Intersecti | LOS D |  |  |

```
Phone: Fax:
```

EMail:
ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL(AWSC) ANALYSIS
$\qquad$

Analyst:
Agency/Co.: KHR Associates
Date Performed: 8/4/2016
Analysis Time Period: 5:00 - 6:00 P.M.
Intersection: Palos Verdes North
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Existing PM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Via Valmonte
North/South Street: Palos Verdes North
Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics

\% Thrus Left Lane

$\qquad$ Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Li | Le | Li | L2 | LI | L2 | Li | LD |

Flow Rates:
Total in Lane 23

| 185 | 6 | 383 | 577 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Left-Turn 0
Right-Turn 0
Prop. Left-Turns 0.00 .0
$0.0 \quad 0.0 \quad 0.0$
Prop. Right-Turns 0.00 .0
$\begin{array}{lll}0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0\end{array}$
Prop. Heavy Vehicle 0.0
Geometry Group 2
Adjustments Exhibit 17-33:
hLT-adj 0.2
0.2
0.5
0.2

| hRT-adj | -0.6 | -0.6 |  | -0.7 | -0.6 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |  |
| hadj, computed | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.5 |


|  | Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound |  | Southbound |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 L2 | L1 L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 L2 |
| Flow rate | 23 | 185 | 6 | 383 | 577 |
| hd, initial value | $3.20 \quad 3.20$ | $3.20 \quad 3.20$ | 3.20 | 3.20 | $3.20 \quad 3.20$ |
| x , initial | 0.02 | 0.16 | 0.01 | 0.34 | 0.51 |
| hd, final value | 7.07 | 6.48 | 6.44 | 5.93 | 5.36 |
| $x$, final value | 0.045 | 0.333 | 0.011 | 0.631 | 0.858 |
| Move-up time, m | 2.0 | 2.0 |  | 3 | 2.0 |
| Service Time | 5.1 | 4.5 | 4.1 | 3.6 | 3.4 |
| Wo | ksheet $5-\mathrm{C}$ | city and Leve | of Serv | ce |  |
|  | Eastbound | Westbound | Northb | und | Southbound |
|  | L1 L2 | L1 L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 L2 |
| Elow Rate | 23 | 185 | 6 | 383 | 577 |
| Service Time | 5.1 | 4.5 | 4.1 | 3.6 | 3.4 |
| Utilization, x | 0.045 | 0.333 | 0.011 | 0.631 | 0.858 |
| Dep. headway, hd | 7.07 | 6.48 | 6.44 | 5.93 | 5.36 |
| Capacity | 460 | 561 | 600 | 608 | 671 |
| 95\% Queue Length | 0.1 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 4.9 | 14.0 |
| Delay | 10.4 | 12.7 | 9.2 | 18.6 | 37.5 |
| LOS | B | B | A | C | E |
| Approach: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 10.4 | 12.7 |  | . 5 | 37.5 |
| LOS | B | B | C |  | E |
| Intersection Delay | 26.8 | Intersecti | LOS D |  |  |

HCS 2010 Signalized Intersection Results Summary
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HCS 2010 Signalized Intersection Results Summary


Phone:
E-Mail:

Fax:

ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL (AWSC) ANALYSIS $\qquad$
Analyst:
Agency/Co.: KHR Associates
Date Performed: 11/15/17
Analysis Time Period: 7:30-8:30 A.M.
Intersection:
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Existing AM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Newton Street
North/South Street: Calle Mayor
$\qquad$ Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics $\qquad$

\% Thrus Left Lane

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 |


| Configuration | L | R | TR | L | T |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PHF | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Flow Rate | 73 | 137 | 444 | 131 | 277 |
| $\%$ Heavy Veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. Lanes |  | 2 | 1 | 2 |  |
| Opposing-Lanes | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 |  |
| Conflicting-lanes | 2 | 2 | $3 b$ | 5 |  |

Duration, T 1.00 hrs.
$\qquad$ Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| L1 L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 |

Flow Rates:
Total in Lane
Left-Turn
Right-Turn
Prop. Left-Turns
Prop. Right-Turns
Prop. Heavy Vehicle
Geometry Group
Adjustments Exhibit 17-33:
hLT-adj

| 73 | 137 | 444 |  | 131 | 277 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 73 | 0 | 0 |  | 131 | 0 |
| 0 | 137 | 94 |  | 0 | 0 |
| 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 1.0 | 0.0 |
| 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.2 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | 1 |  |  | $3 b$ |  |
|  | 0.2 |  | 0.2 |  | 5 |


| hRT-adj | -0.6 | -0.6 | -0.7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |
| hadj, computed | 0.2 | -0.6 | -0.1 |

Worksheet 4 - Departure Headway and Service Time $\qquad$
$\qquad$

| Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 L2 | L1 | L2 |
|  |  | 73 | 137 | 444 | 131 | 277 |
| 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | $3.20 \quad 3.20$ | 3.20 | 3.20 |
|  |  | 0.06 | 0.12 | 0.39 | 0.12 | 0.25 |
|  |  | 6.16 | 5.35 | 5.28 | 6.10 | 5.59 |
|  |  | 0.125 | 0.204 | 0.651 | 0.222 | 0.430 |
|  |  | 2.0 |  | 2.0 |  | 3 |
|  |  | 4.2 | 3.4 | 3.3 | 3.8 | 3.3 |

Worksheet 5 - Capacity and Level of Service $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 |


| Elow Rate | 73 | 137 | 444 | 131 | 277 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Service Time | 4.2 | 3.4 | 3.3 | 3.8 | 3.3 |
| Utilization, x | 0.125 | 0.204 | 0.651 | 0.222 | 0.430 |
| Dep. headway, hd | 6.16 | 5.35 | 5.28 | 6.10 | 5.59 |
| Capacity | 608 | 685 | 683 | 595 | 644 |
| $95 \%$ Queue Length | 0.4 | 0.8 | 5.4 | 0.9 | 2.2 |
| Delay | $10.0+$ | 9.7 | 18.0 | 10.5 | 12.5 |
| Los | B | A | C | B | B |

Approach:
Delay
LOS
$9.8 \quad 18.0 \quad 11.9$
A C B
Intersection Delay 14.0
Intersection LOS B

```
HCS+: Unsignalized Intersections Release 5.6
```

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:

ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL (AWSC) ANALYSIS $\qquad$
Analyst:

| Agency/Co.: | KHR Associates |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Performed: | $11 / 15 / 17$ |
| Analysis Time Period: | $4: 00-5: 00$ P.M. |
| Intersection: |  |
| Jurisdiction: |  |
| Units: U. S. Customary |  |
| Analysis Year: |  |
| Project ID: Existing | PM Peak Hour |
| East/West Street: | Newton Street |
| North/South Street: | Calle Mayor |

$\qquad$ Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics $\qquad$


Volume
\% Thrus Left Lane


Duration, T 1.00 hrs .
$\qquad$ Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Li | LD | Li | LD | Li | LD | Li |

Flow Rates:

|  | 60 | 60 | 350 | 88 | 330 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total in Lane | 60 | 0 | 0 | 88 | 0 |
| Left-Turn | 0 | 60 | 46 | 0 | 0 |
| Right-Turn | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
| op. Left-Turns | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| op. Right-Turns | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| op. Heavy Vehicle | 1 |  | $3 b$ | 5 |  |


| hRT-adj | -0.6 | -0.6 | -0.7 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |  |
| hadj, computed | 0.2 | -0.6 | -0.1 | 0.5 |

Worksheet 4 - Departure Headway and Service Time $\qquad$
$\qquad$

| Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
|  |  | 60 | 60 | 350 |  | 88 | 330 |
| 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 |
|  |  | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.31 |  | 0.08 | 0.29 |
|  |  | 5.89 | 5.09 | 5.04 |  | 5.67 | 5.17 |
|  |  | 0.098 | 0.085 | 0.490 |  | 0.139 | 0.474 |
|  |  | 2.0 |  | 2.0 |  | 2.3 |  |
|  |  | 3.9 | 3.1 | 3.0 |  | 3.4 | 2.9 |

Worksheet 5 - Capacity and Level of Service $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 |


| Flow Rate | 60 | 60 | 350 | 88 | 330 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Service Time | 3.9 | 3.1 | 3.0 | 3.4 | 2.9 |
| Utilization, $x$ | 0.098 | 0.085 | 0.490 | 0.139 | 0.474 |
| Dep. headway, hd | 5.89 | 5.09 | 5.04 | 5.67 | 5.17 |
| Capacity | 600 | 750 | 714 | 629 | 702 |
| 95 Queue Length | 0.3 | 0.3 | 2.8 | 0.5 | 2.7 |
| Delay | 9.5 | 8.6 | 12.9 | 9.3 | 12.5 |
| LOS | A | A | B | A | B |
| Approach: |  | 9.0 |  | 12.9 | 11.8 |
| $\quad$ Delay |  | A | B | B |  |

Phone: E-Mail:

Fax:
$\qquad$
Analyst:
Agency/Co.: KHR Associates
Date Performed: 11/15/2017
Analysis Time Period: 7:30-8:30 A.M.
Intersection:
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Existing AM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Newton Street
North/South Street: Vista Montana
___ Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics $\qquad$

\% Thrus Left Lane

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Configuration | LTR |  | LTR |  | LTR |  | L | TR |
| PHF | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Flow Rate | 291 |  | 367 |  | 265 |  | 60 | 125 |
| \% Heavy Veh | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| No. Lanes |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 2 |
| Opposing-Lanes |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 2 |  | 1 |
| Conflicting-lanes |  | 2 |  | 2 |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| Geometry group |  | 2 |  | 2 |  | 4 a |  | 5 |
| Duration, T 1.00 | hrs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

$\qquad$ Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet $\qquad$
Eastbound
L1 L2
Westbound

Northbound
Southbound
L1 L2
L1 L2
Elow Rates:


| hRT-adj | -0.6 | -0.6 |  | -0.6 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | -0.7 |
| hadj, computed | -0.1 | -0.2 | 0.0 | 0.5 |

Worksheet 4 - Departure Headway and Service Time $\qquad$

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Flow rate | 291 |  | 367 |  | 265 |  | 60 | 125 |
| hd, initial value | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 |
| x , initial | 0.26 |  | 0.33 |  | 0.24 |  | 0.05 | 0.11 |
| hd, final value | 6.02 |  | 5.78 |  | 6.45 |  | 7.58 | 6.87 |
| $x$, final value | 0.487 |  | 0.589 |  | 0.475 |  | 0.126 | 0.239 |
| Move-up time, m | 2.0 |  | 2.0 |  | 2.0 |  | 2.3 |  |
| Service Time | 4.0 |  | 3.8 |  | 4.5 |  | 5.3 | 4.6 |


|  | Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 L2 | L1 L2 | L1 L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Elow Rate | 291 | 367 | 265 | 60 | 125 |
| Service Time | 4.0 | 3.8 | 4.5 | 5.3 | 4.6 |
| Utilization, x | 0.487 | 0.589 | 0.475 | 0.126 | 0.239 |
| Dep. headway, hd | 6.02 | 5.78 | 6.45 | 7.58 | 6.87 |
| Capacity | 594 | 622 | 564 | 462 | 521 |
| 95\% Queue Length | 2.8 | 4.2 | 2.7 | 0.4 | 0.9 |
| Delay | 14.7 | 17.0 | 15.2 | 11.4 | 11.7 |
| LOS | B | C | C | B | B |
| Approach: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 14.7 | 17.0 | 15.2 |  | 11.6 |
| LOS | B | C | C |  | B |
| Intersection Delay | 15.1 | Intersect | LOS C |  |  |

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:

ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL(AWSC) ANALYSIS $\qquad$
Analyst:
Agency/Co.: KHR Associates
Date Performed: 11/15/2017
Analysis Time Period: 4:00-5:00 P.M.
Intersection:
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Existing PM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Newton Street
North/South Street: Vista Montana
Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments

Volume
\% Thrus Left Lane


Duration, T 1.00 hrs.
$\qquad$ Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Li Le | Li | LD | Li | LD | Li |

Flow Rates:

| Total in Lane | 121 | 316 | 170 | 63 | 214 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Left-Turn | 39 | 38 | 10 | 63 | 0 |
| Right-Turn | 10 | 209 | 15 | 0 | 52 |
| op. Left-Turns | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
| op. Right-Turns | 0.1 | 0.7 |  | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| op. Heavy Vehicle 0.0 |  | 2 | 0.0 | 0.2 |  |
| merry Group | 2 |  |  | $4 a$ | 0.0 |
| justments Exhibit $17-33:$ | 0.2 |  | 0.2 |  | 0.2 |


| hRT-adj | -0.6 | -0.6 | -0.6 | -0.7 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |
| hadj, computed | 0.0 |  | -0.4 | -0.0 |


|  | Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 L2 | L1 L2 | L1 L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Elow rate | 121 | 316 | 170 | 63 | 214 |
| hd, initial value | $3.20 \quad 3.20$ | $3.20 \quad 3.20$ | $3.20 \quad 3.20$ | 3.20 | 3.20 |
| x , initial | 0.11 | 0.28 | 0.15 | 0.06 | 0.19 |
| hd, final value | 5.68 | 4.98 | 5.62 | 6.44 | 5.76 |
| x , final value | 0.191 | 0.437 | 0.265 | 0.113 | 0.343 |
| Move-up time, m | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |  |  |
| Service Time | 3.7 | 3.0 | 3.6 | 4.1 | 3.5 |
| Worksheet 5 - Capacity and Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |
|  | L1 L2 | L1 L2 | L1 L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Elow Rate | 121 | 316 | 170 | 63 | 214 |
| Service Time | 3.7 | 3.0 | 3.6 | 4.1 | 3.5 |
| Utilization, x | 0.191 | 0.437 | 0.265 | 0.113 | 0.343 |
| Dep. headway, hd | 5.68 | 4.98 | 5.62 | 6.44 | 5.76 |
| Capacity | 637 | 718 | 630 | 573 | 629 |
| 95\% Queue Length | 0.7 | 2.3 | 1.1 | 0.4 | 1.6 |
| Delay | $10.0+$ | 11.8 | 10.6 | 10.0- | 11.5 |
| LOS | B | B | B | A | B |
| Approach: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | $10.0+$ | 11.8 | 10.6 | $11.1$ |  |
| LOS | B | B | B |  |  |
| Intersection Delay | 11.1 | Intersection LOS B |  |  |  |

Fax:
E-Mail:

ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL (AWSC) ANALYSIS $\qquad$
Analyst:

| Agency/Co.: | KHR Associates |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Performed: | $11 / 15 \% 2017$ |
| Analysis Time Period: | $7: 45-8: 45$ A.M. |
| Intersection: |  |
| Jurisdiction: |  |
| Units: U. S. Customary |  |
| Analysis Year: |  |
| Project ID: Existing | AM Peak Hour |
| East/West Street: | Newton Street |
| North/South Street: | Madison Street |

$\qquad$ Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics $\qquad$

\% Thrus Left Lane


Duration, T 1.00 hrs.
$\qquad$ Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet $\qquad$


| hRT-adj | -0.7 |  | -0.7 | -0.7 | -0.7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |  |
| hadj, computed | 0.3 | -0.7 | 0.0 | -0.7 | 0.3 |
| -0.7 | 0.4 | -0.7 |  |  |  |

Worksheet 4 - Departure Headway and Service Time $\qquad$

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Elow rate | 185 | 5 | 120 | 103 | 23 | 14 | 15 | 40 |
| hd, initial value | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 |
| x , initial | 0.16 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.09 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.04 |
| hd, final value | 5.19 | 4.21 | 4.91 | 4.20 | 5.81 | 4.81 | 5.89 | 4.79 |
| $x$, final value | 0.267 | 0.006 | 0.164 | 0.120 | 0.037 | 0.019 | 0.025 | 0.053 |
| Move-up time, m |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| Service Time | 2.9 | 1.9 | 2.6 | 1.9 | 3.5 | 2.5 | 3.6 | 2.5 |

$\qquad$ Worksheet 5 - Capacity and Level of Service $\qquad$

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Elow Rate | 185 | 5 | 120 | 103 | 23 | 14 | 15 | 40 |
| Service Time | 2.9 | 1.9 | 2.6 | 1.9 | 3.5 | 2.5 | 3.6 | 2.5 |
| Utilization, x | 0.267 | 0.006 | 0.164 | 0.120 | 0.037 | 0.019 | 0.025 | 0.053 |
| Dep. headway, hd | 5.19 | 4.21 | 4.91 | 4.20 | 5.81 | 4.81 | 5.89 | 4.79 |
| Capacity | 685 | 500 | 750 | 858 | 575 | 700 | 750 | 800 |
| 95\% Queue Length | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Delay | 9.8 | 6.9 | 8.6 | 7.5 | 8.7 | 7.6 | 8.7 | 7.8 |
| LOS | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| Approach: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 9.7 |  | 8.1 |  | 8.3 |  | 8.0 |  |
| LOS | A |  | A |  | A |  | A |  |
| Intersection Dela | 8.7 |  | Intersection LOS A |  |  |  |  |  |

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL(AWSC) ANALYSIS $\qquad$
Analyst:
Agency/Co.: KHR Associates
Date Performed: 11/15/2017
Analysis Time Period: 7:45-8:45 A.M.
Intersection:
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Existing PM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Newton Street
North/South Street: Madison Street
Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics $\qquad$
$\qquad$

| Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 153 | 118 | 12 |  | 142 | 15 | 16 | 18 | 2 | 37 | 16 | 150 |

Volume
153
$t$ Lane
\% Thrus Left Lane

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Configuration | LT | R | LT | R | LT | R | LT | R |
| PHF | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Elow Rate | 171 | 12 | 147 | 15 | 34 | 2 | 53 | 150 |
| \% Heavy Veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. Lanes |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |
| Opposing-Lanes |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |
| Conflicting-lanes |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |
| Geometry group |  |  |  | 5 |  |  |  | 5 |

Duration, T 1.00 hrs.

Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet $\qquad$
$\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| L1 L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |

Elow Rates:

| Total in Lane | 171 | 12 | 147 | 15 | 34 | 2 | 53 | 150 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Left-Turn | 53 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 37 | 0 |
| Right-Turn | 0 | 12 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 150 |
| rop. Left-Turns | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.0 |
| rop. Right-Turns | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
| rop. Heavy Vehicle 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| ametry Group | 5 |  | 5 |  | 5 | 5 |  |  |


| hRT-adj | -0.7 |  | -0.7 | -0.7 | -0.7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |  |
| hadj, computed | 0.2 | -0.7 | 0.0 | -0.7 | 0.2 |

Worksheet 4 - Departure Headway and Service Time $\qquad$

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Elow rate | 171 | 12 | 147 | 15 | 34 | 2 | 53 | 150 |
| hd, initial value | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 |
| x , initial | 0.15 | 0.01 | 0.13 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.13 |
| hd, final value | 5.41 | 4.56 | 5.30 | 4.58 | 5.84 | 4.90 | 5.77 | 4.73 |
| $x$, final value | 0.257 | 0.015 | 0.216 | 0.019 | 0.055 | 0.003 | 0.085 | 0.197 |
| Move-up time, m |  |  |  | 3 |  | 3 |  | 3 |
| Service Time | 3.1 | 2.3 | 3.0 | 2.3 | 3.5 | 2.6 | 3.5 | 2.4 |

$\qquad$ Worksheet 5 - Capacity and Level of Service $\qquad$

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Elow Rate | 171 | 12 | 147 | 15 | 34 | 2 | 53 | 150 |
| Service Time | 3.1 | 2.3 | 3.0 | 2.3 | 3.5 | 2.6 | 3.5 | 2.4 |
| Utilization, x | 0.257 | 0.015 | 0.216 | 0.019 | 0.055 | 0.003 | 0.085 | 0.197 |
| Dep. headway, hd | 5.41 | 4.56 | 5.30 | 4.58 | 5.84 | 4.90 | 5.77 | 4.73 |
| Capacity | 658 | 600 | 668 | 750 | 567 | 0 | 589 | 750 |
| 95\% Queve Length | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.7 |
| Delay | 10.0- | 7.3 | 9.5 | 7.4 | 8.9 | 7.6 | 9.0 | 8.6 |
| LOS | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| Approach: | 9.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay |  |  | 9.3 |  | 8.8 |  | 8.7 |  |
| LOS | A |  | A |  | A |  | A |  |
| Intersection Delay | 9.2 |  | Intersection LOS A |  |  |  |  |  |
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Timer Results
Assigned Phase
Case Number
Phase Duration, s
Change Period, $(Y+R c)$, $s$
Max Allow Headway (MAH), s
Queue Clearance Time ( $g s$ ), s
Green Extension Time ( $g_{e}$ ), s
Phase Call Probability
Max Out Probability

## Movement Group Results

Approach Movement
Assigned Movement
Adjusted Flow Rate ( $v$ ), veh/h
Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate ( $s$ ), veh/h/ln
Queue Service Time ( $g s$ ), $s$
Cycle Queue Clearance Time ( $g c$ ), s
Green Ratio ( $g / C$ )
Capacity ( $c$ ), veh/h
Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ( $X$ )
Back of Queue ( $Q$ ), ft/ln ( 50 th percentile)
Back of Queue ( $Q$ ), veh/In ( 50 th percentile)
Queue Storage Ratio ( $R Q$ ) ( 50 th percentile)
Uniform Delay $\left(d_{1}\right), s /$ veh
Incremental Delay $\left(d_{2}\right)$, s/veh
Initial Queue Delay ( $d_{3}$ ), s/veh
Control Delay ( $d$ ), s/veh
Level of Service (LOS)
Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS
Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS

| EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2 |  | 6 | 3 | 8 | 7 | 4 |
|  | 8.0 |  | 5.0 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 4.0 |
|  | 18.5 |  | 18.5 | 0.0 | 27.6 | 13.9 | 41.5 |
|  | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
|  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 3.0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 17.1 | 9.2 | 15.6 |
|  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.5 | 0.7 | 8.0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 0.25 | 0.07 | 0.04 |

## Multimodal Results

Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS
Bicycle LOS Score / LOS
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| Timer Results | EBL |  | EBT | WBL |  | WBT | NBL |  | NBT | SBL |  | SBT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assigned Phase |  |  | 2 |  |  | 6 |  |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |
| Case Number |  |  | 8.0 |  |  | 8.0 |  |  | 12.0 |  |  | 12.0 |
| Phase Duration, s |  |  | 32.0 |  |  | 32.0 |  |  | 7.7 |  |  | 5.3 |
| Change Period, $\left(Y+R_{c}\right)$, $s$ |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |  |  | 4.0 |
| Max Allow Headway ( MAH), s |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 3.1 |  |  | 3.1 |
| Queue Clearance Time ( $g_{s}$ ), $s$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.9 |  |  | 2.5 |
| Green Extension Time ( $g_{e}$ ), s |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.1 |  |  | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Probability |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.61 |  |  | 0.21 |
| Max Out Probability |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |
| Movement Group Results |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Assigned Movement | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Adjusted Flow Rate ( $v$ ), veh/h | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate ( $s$ ), veh/h/ln | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Queue Service Time ( $g s$ ), s | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Cycle Queue Clearance Time ( $g_{c}$ ), s | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Green Ratio ( $g / C$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity ( $c$ ), veh/h |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ( $X$ ) | 0.000 |  | 0.000 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |  | 0.000 |  |
| Back of Queue ( Q ), ft/ln ( 50 th percentile) | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Back of Queue ( Q ), veh/ln ( 50 th percentile) | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Queue Storage Ratio ( $R Q$ ) ( 50 th percentile) | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |
| Uniform Delay ( $d_{1}$ ), s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Incremental Delay ( $d_{2}$ ), s/veh | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Initial Queue Delay ( $d_{3}$ ), s/veh | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Control Delay ( $d$ ), s/veh |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level of Service (LOS) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | 3.7 |  | A | 4.0 |  | A | 20.9 |  | C | 23.1 |  | C |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | 5.5 |  |  |  |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |  |
| Multimodal Results | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS | 2.0 |  | B | 2.0 |  | B | 2.7 |  | C | 2.7 |  | C |
| Bicycle LOS Score / LOS | 0.8 |  | A | 1.0 |  | A | 0.6 |  | A | 0.5 |  | A |
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| Timer Results | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assigned Phase |  | 2 |  | 6 |  | 8 |  | 4 |
| Case Number |  | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |  | 12.0 |  | 12.0 |
| Phase Duration, $s$ |  | 32.6 |  | 32.6 |  | 5.7 |  | 6.7 |
| Change Period, $(Y+R c), s$ |  | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |
| Max Allow Headway $(M A H), s$ |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 3.0 |  | 3.0 |
| Queue Clearance Time $(g s), s$ |  |  |  |  |  | 2.6 |  | 3.1 |
| Green Extension Time $\left(g_{e}\right), s$ |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.1 |
| Phase Call Probability |  |  |  |  |  | 0.28 |  | 0.46 |
| Max Out Probability |  |  |  |  |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |


| Movement Group Results | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Assigned Movement | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Adjusted Flow Rate ( $v$ ), veh/h | 38 | 465 | 0 | 22 | 418 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate ( $s$ ), veh/h/ln | 984 | 1900 | 0 | 943 | 1900 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Queue Service Time ( $g s$ ), s | 0.7 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 2.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Cycle Queue Clearance Time ( $g_{c}$ ), s | 2.8 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 2.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Green Ratio ( $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{C}$ ) | 0.64 | 0.64 |  | 0.64 | 0.64 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity ( c ), veh/h | 740 | 2414 |  | 711 | 2414 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ( $X$ ) | 0.051 | 0.192 | 0.000 | 0.031 | 0.173 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |  | 0.000 |  |
| Back of Queue ( Q ), ftlln ( 50 th percentile) | 2.6 | 11.2 | 0 | 1.6 | 9.9 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| Back of Queue ( Q ), veh/ln ( 50 th percentile) | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Queue Storage Ratio ( $R Q$ ) ( 50 th percentile) | 0.03 | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.05 | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |
| Uniform Delay ( $d_{1}$ ), s/veh | 3.9 | 3.4 |  | 4.0 | 3.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Incremental Delay ( $d_{2}$ ), s/veh | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Initial Queue Delay ( $d_{3}$ ), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| Control Delay ( $d$ ), s/veh | 4.1 | 3.6 |  | 4.1 | 3.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level of Service (LOS) | A | A |  | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | 3.6 |  | A | 3.5 |  | A | 22.4 |  | C | 21.3 |  | C |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | 4.9 |  |  |  |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Multimodal Results | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS | 2.0 |  | B | 2.0 |  | B | 2.8 |  | C | 2.8 |  | C |
| Bicycle LOS Score / LOS | 0.9 |  | A | 0.9 |  | A | 0.5 |  | A | 0.6 |  | A |
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| Timer Results | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assigned Phase | 5 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 8 | 7 | 4 |
| Case Number | 1.1 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration, $s$ | 10.0 | 50.0 | 20.0 | 60.0 | 9.3 | 37.1 | 12.8 | 40.7 |
| Change Period, $(Y+R c), s$ | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Max Allow Headway $(M A H), s$ | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Queue Clearance Time $(g s), s$ | 5.7 |  | 17.5 |  | 6.1 | 35.1 | 8.8 | 14.5 |
| Green Extension Time $(g e), s$ | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 6.2 |
| Phase Call Probability | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  | 0.87 | 1.00 | 0.99 | 1.00 |
| Max Out Probability | 0.00 |  | 1.00 |  | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.01 | 0.07 |


| Movement Group Results | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Assigned Movement | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 |  |
| Adjusted Flow Rate ( $v$ ), veh/h | 175 | 1007 |  | 684 | 2059 |  | 61 | 1057 | 513 | 145 | 665 |  |
| Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate ( $s$ ), veh/h/ln | 1689 | 1738 |  | 1689 | 1658 |  | 1781 | 1698 | 1608 | 1781 | 1698 |  |
| Queue Service Time ( $g s$ ), s | 3.7 | 32.1 |  | 15.5 | 47.3 |  | 4.1 | 22.7 | 33.1 | 6.8 | 12.5 |  |
| Cycle Queue Clearance Time ( $g_{c}$ ), s | 3.7 | 32.1 |  | 15.5 | 47.3 |  | 4.1 | 22.7 | 33.1 | 6.8 | 12.5 |  |
| Green Ratio ( g/C ) | 0.43 | 0.38 |  | 0.53 | 0.47 |  | 0.04 | 0.28 | 0.28 | 0.36 | 0.31 |  |
| Capacity ( $c$ ), veh/h | 311 | 1331 |  | 698 | 2323 |  | 79 | 1407 | 444 | 237 | 1557 |  |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ( $X$ ) | 0.562 | 0.757 |  | 0.980 | 0.886 |  | 0.774 | 0.751 | 1.154 | 0.612 | 0.427 |  |
| Back of Queue ( Q ), ft/ln ( 50 th percentile) | 38 | 384 |  | 237.9 | 537.8 |  | 48.7 | 238.9 | 599.9 | 72.5 | 127.3 |  |
| Back of Queue ( Q ), veh/ln ( 50 th percentile) | 1.5 | 14.8 |  | 9.2 | 20.7 |  | 1.9 | 9.4 | 24.0 | 2.9 | 5.0 |  |
| Queue Storage Ratio ( $R Q$ ) ( 50 th percentile) | 0.13 | 1.28 |  | 0.79 | 1.79 |  | 0.24 | 1.19 | 3.05 | 0.24 | 0.42 |  |
| Uniform Delay ( $d_{1}$ ), s/veh | 29.2 | 39.5 |  | 30.2 | 38.3 |  | 56.7 | 39.7 | 43.4 | 29.9 | 33.3 |  |
| Incremental Delay ( $d_{2}$ ), s/veh | 0.6 | 4.1 |  | 29.0 | 5.5 |  | 5.9 | 2.1 | 92.2 | 1.0 | 0.1 |  |
| Initial Queue Delay ( $d_{3}$ ), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Control Delay ( $\alpha$ ), s/veh | 29.8 | 43.6 |  | 59.2 | 43.8 |  | 62.7 | 41.7 | 135.7 | 30.9 | 33.3 |  |
| Level of Service (LOS) | C | D |  | E | D |  | E | D | F | C | C |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | 41.5 |  |  | 47.6 |  |  | 72.0 |  | E | 32.9 |  | C |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | 50.9 |  |  |  |  |  | D |  |  |  |  |  |


| Multimodal Results | EB |  | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrian LOS Score /LOS | 3.4 | C | 3.3 | C | 3.1 | C | 3.3 | C |
| Bicycle LOS Score / LOS | 1.5 | A | 2.0 | B | 1.4 | A | 0.9 | A |
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| Timer Results | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assigned Phase | 5 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 8 | 7 | 4 |
| Case Number | 1.1 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration, $s$ | 10.1 | 50.5 | 19.5 | 59.9 | 10.8 | 30.0 | 20.0 | 39.2 |
| Change Period, $(Y+R c), s$ | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Max Allow Headway $(M A H), s$ | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Queue Clearance Time $(g s), s$ | 5.9 |  | 15.4 |  | 7.2 | 28.0 | 18.0 | 27.2 |
| Green Extension Time $\left(g_{e}\right), s$ | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.3 |
| Phase Call Probability | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  | 0.93 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Max Out Probability | 0.00 |  | 1.00 |  | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.54 |


| Movement Group Results | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Assigned Movement | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 |  |
| Adjusted Flow Rate ( v ), veh/h | 183 | 1353 |  | 502 | 1546 |  | 79 | 748 | 483 | 350 | 1166 |  |
| Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate ( $s$ ), veh/h/ln | 1689 | 1738 |  | 1689 | 1658 |  | 1781 | 1698 | 1608 | 1781 | 1698 |  |
| Queue Service Time ( $g s$ ), s | 3.9 | 46.5 |  | 13.4 | 32.4 |  | 5.2 | 16.2 | 26.0 | 16.0 | 25.2 |  |
| Cycle Queue Clearance Time ( $g_{c}$ ), s | 3.9 | 46.5 |  | 13.4 | 32.4 |  | 5.2 | 16.2 | 26.0 | 16.0 | 25.2 |  |
| Green Ratio ( g/C ) | 0.44 | 0.39 |  | 0.53 | 0.47 |  | 0.06 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.37 | 0.29 |  |
| Capacity ( $c$ ), veh/h | 409 | 1348 |  | 556 | 2317 |  | 100 | 1104 | 348 | 356 | 1496 |  |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ( $X$ ) | 0.448 | 1.004 |  | 0.904 | 0.667 |  | 0.784 | 0.677 | 1.386 | 0.983 | 0.779 |  |
| Back of Queue ( Q ), ft/ln ( 50 th percentile) | 39.1 | 651.9 |  | 231.5 | 357.2 |  | 61.8 | 170.7 | 712.1 | 301.7 | 264.2 |  |
| Back of Queue ( Q ), veh/ln ( 50 th percentile) | 1.5 | 25.1 |  | 8.9 | 13.7 |  | 2.4 | 6.7 | 28.5 | 11.9 | 10.4 |  |
| Queue Storage Ratio ( $R Q$ ) ( 50 th percentile) | 0.13 | 2.17 |  | 0.77 | 1.19 |  | 0.31 | 0.85 | 3.62 | 1.01 | 0.88 |  |
| Uniform Delay ( $d_{1}$ ), s/veh | 24.1 | 44.5 |  | 38.9 | 33.3 |  | 55.9 | 43.2 | 47.0 | 34.8 | 38.8 |  |
| Incremental Delay ( $d_{2}$ ), s/veh | 0.3 | 25.5 |  | 17.0 | 1.5 |  | 5.0 | 1.4 | 190.7 | 43.0 | 2.5 |  |
| Initial Queue Delay ( $d_{3}$ ), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Control Delay ( $d$ ), s/veh | 24.4 | 70.0 |  | 55.9 | 34.8 |  | 60.9 | 44.5 | 237.7 | 77.7 | 41.3 |  |
| Level of Service (LOS) | C | F |  | E | C |  | E | D | F | E | D |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | 64.5 |  | E | 40.0 |  | D | 116.8 |  | F | 49.7 |  | D |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | 63.9 |  |  |  |  |  | E |  |  |  |  |  |


| Multimodal Results | EB |  | WB |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS | 3.4 | C | 3.3 | C | 3.1 | C | 3.3 | C |  |
| Bicycle LOS Score / LOS | 1.8 | B | 1.6 | B | 1.2 | A | 1.3 | A |  |



| Timer Results | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assigned Phase | 5 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 8 | 7 | 4 |
| Case Number | 1.1 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 |
| Phase Duration, $s$ | 9.2 | 71.7 | 9.6 | 72.1 | 12.9 | 20.0 | 18.7 | 25.7 |
| Change Period, $(Y+R c), s$ | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Max Allow Headway $(M A H), s$ | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 3.0 | 3.1 |
| Queue Clearance Time $\left(g_{s}\right), s$ | 3.7 |  | 4.4 |  | 8.7 | 14.0 | 14.5 | 20.4 |
| Green Extension Time $\left(g_{e}\right), s$ | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 1.3 | 0.2 | 1.3 |
| Phase Call Probability | 0.87 |  | 0.94 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Max Out Probability | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.01 | 0.01 | 1.00 | 0.01 |


| Movement Group Results | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Assigned Movement | 5 | 2 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Adjusted Flow Rate ( $v$ ), veh/h | 62 | 1479 |  | 85 | 1978 |  | 197 | 181 | 165 | 368 | 149 | 249 |
| Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate ( $s$ ), veh/h/ln | 1739 | 1738 |  | 1739 | 1738 |  | 1730 | 1870 | 1594 | 1730 | 1781 | 1577 |
| Queue Service Time ( $g s$ ), s | 1.7 | 44.5 |  | 2.4 | 68.1 |  | 6.7 | 11.2 | 12.0 | 12.5 | 4.3 | 18.4 |
| Cycle Queue Clearance Time ( $g c$ ), s | 1.7 | 44.5 |  | 2.4 | 68.1 |  | 6.7 | 11.2 | 12.0 | 12.5 | 4.3 | 18.4 |
| Green Ratio ( $g / C$ ) | 0.61 | 0.56 |  | 0.61 | 0.57 |  | 0.07 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 0.12 | 0.18 | 0.18 |
| Capacity ( $c$ ), veh/h | 136 | 1961 |  | 209 | 1973 |  | 258 | 249 | 212 | 423 | 645 | 286 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ( $X$ ) | 0.453 | 0.754 |  | 0.405 | 1.003 |  | 0.766 | 0.729 | 0.776 | 0.869 | 0.231 | 0.871 |
| Back of Queue ( $Q$ ), ft/ln ( 50 th percentile) | 25.6 | 514.9 |  | 26.8 | 906 |  | 74.2 | 132 | 119.8 | 155.8 | 46.9 | 194.2 |
| Back of Queue ( Q ), veh/ln ( 50 th percentile) | 1.0 | 19.8 |  | 1.0 | 34.8 |  | 2.9 | 5.2 | 4.8 | 6.1 | 1.8 | 7.6 |
| Queue Storage Ratio ( $R Q$ ) ( 50 th percentile) | 0.17 | 1.72 |  | 0.22 | 3.62 |  | 0.49 | 0.66 | 0.61 | 1.04 | 0.26 | 0.97 |
| Uniform Delay ( $d_{1}$ ), s/veh | 29.1 | 30.2 |  | 20.8 | 37.3 |  | 54.5 | 49.9 | 50.3 | 51.7 | 42.0 | 47.8 |
| Incremental Delay ( $d_{2}$ ), s/veh | 0.9 | 2.8 |  | 0.5 | 20.9 |  | 1.8 | 1.5 | 2.3 | 14.3 | 0.1 | 8.0 |
| Initial Queue Delay ( $d_{3}$ ), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay ( $d$ ), s/veh | 30.0 | 32.9 |  | 21.3 | 58.2 |  | 56.3 | 51.5 | 52.6 | 66.0 | 42.1 | 55.8 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | C | C |  | C | F |  | E | D | D | E | D | E |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | 32.8 |  | C | 56.7 |  | E | 53.6 |  | D | 58.0 |  | E |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | 49.1 |  |  |  |  |  | D |  |  |  |  |  |

## Multimodal Results

Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS
Bicycle LOS Score / LOS

| EB |  | WB |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2.9 | C | 3.0 | C |
| 1.8 | B | 2.2 | B |


| NB |  | SB |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2.9 | C | 2.9 | C |
| 0.9 | A | 1.1 | A |

HCS7 Signalized Intersection Results Summary


[^25]Fax:
Phone:

ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL(AWSC) ANALYSIS $\qquad$
Analyst:
Agency/Co.: KHR Associates
Date Performed: 8/4/2016
Analysis Time Period: 8:00 - 9:00 A.M.
Intersection: Palos Verdes North
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Ambient AM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Via Valmonte
North/South Street: Palos Verdes North

\% Thrus Left Lane

$\qquad$ Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Li | LT | Li | LD | Li | LD | Li | L2 |

Flow Rates:

| Total in Lane | 211 | 206 | 13 | 499 | 271 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Left-Turn | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 |
| Right-Turn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| op. Left-Turns | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| op. Right-Turns | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| op. Heavy Vehicle 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| ometry Group | 2 | 2 |  | 5 |  |

Adjustments Exhibit 17-33:
hLT-adj
0.2
0.2
0.5
0.2

| hRT-adj | -0.6 |  | -0.6 | -0.7 | -0.6 |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |  |  |
| hadj, computed | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.5 | 0.0 |

$\qquad$ Worksheet 4 - Departure Headway and Service Time $\qquad$

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Elow rate | 211 |  | 206 |  | 13 | 499 | 271 |  |
| hd, initial value | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 |
| x , initial | 0.19 |  | 0.18 |  | 0.01 | 0.44 | 0.24 |  |
| hd, final value | 7.08 |  | 7.10 |  | 7.09 | 6.58 | 6.72 |  |
| $x$, final value | 0.415 |  | 0.406 |  | 0.026 | 0.913 | 0.50 |  |
| Move-up time, m |  |  |  | 0 |  | 3 |  |  |
| Service Time | 5.1 |  | 5.1 |  | 4.8 | 4.3 | 4.7 |  |

$\qquad$ Worksheet 5 - Capacity and Level of Service $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 |


| Elow Rate | 211 | 206 | 13 | 499 | 271 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Service Time | 5.1 | 5.1 | 4.8 | 4.3 | 4.7 |
| Utilization, $x$ | 0.415 | 0.406 | 0.026 | 0.913 | 0.506 |
| Dep. headway, hd | 7.08 | 7.10 | 7.09 | 6.58 | 6.72 |
| Capacity | 502 | 502 | 433 | 548 | 531 |
| $95 \%$ Queue Length | 2.1 | 2.0 | 0.1 | 17.9 | 3.0 |
| Delay | 15.1 | 14.9 | $10.0-$ | 61.0 | 16.6 |
| LOS | C | B | A | F | C |

Approach:


Phone:
Fax:
EMail:

ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL(AWSC) ANALYSIS $\qquad$
Analyst:
Agency/Co.: KHR Associates
Date Performed: 8/4/2016
Analysis Time Period: 5:00 - 6:00 P.M.
Intersection: Palos Verdes North
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Ambient PM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Via Valmonte
North/South Street: Palos Verdes North
___ Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics $\qquad$

\% Thrus Left Lane


Duration, T 1.00 hrs.
Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet $\qquad$
Eastbound
LI LD

Westbound
Northbound
Southbound
L1 L2
LI L2
LI Le
LI LL
Flow Rates:

| Total in Lane | 23 | 189 | 6 | 389 | 588 |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Left-Turn | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Right-Turn | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Prop. Left-Turns | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Prop. Right-Turns | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop. Heavy Vehicle 0.0 | 2 | 0.0 | 2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Geometry Group | $2:$ |  |  | 5 | 4 a |  |
| Adjustments Exhibit $17-33:$ | 0.2 |  | 0.2 |  | 0.5 | 0.2 |


| hRT-adj | -0.6 |  | -0.6 | -0.7 | -0.6 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |  |
| hadj, computed | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.5 |

$\qquad$ Worksheet 4 - Departure Headway and Service Time

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Elow rate | 23 |  | 189 |  | 6 | 389 | 588 |  |
| hd, initial value | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 |
| x , initial | 0.02 |  | 0.17 |  | 0.01 | 0.35 | 0.52 |  |
| hd, final value | 7.16 |  | 6.54 |  | 6.48 | 5.98 | 5.40 |  |
| $x, f i n a l ~ v a l u e ~$ | 0.046 |  | 0.34 |  | 0.011 | 0.646 | 0.881 |  |
| Move-up time, m |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Service Time | 5.2 |  | 4.5 |  | 4.2 | 3.7 | 3.4 |  |




HCS7 Signalized Intersection Results Summary


| Timer Results | EBL |  | EBT | WBL |  | WBT | NBL |  | NBT | SBL |  | SBT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assigned Phase | 5 |  | 2 | 1 |  | 6 | 3 |  | 8 | 7 |  | 4 |
| Case Number | 1.1 |  | 3.0 | 1.1 |  | 3.0 | 1.1 |  | 3.0 | 2.0 |  | 3.0 |
| Phase Duration, s | 7.5 |  | 67.5 | 10.0 |  | 70.0 | 20.0 |  | 22.5 | 20.0 |  | 22.5 |
| Change Period, ( $Y+R_{c}$ ), s | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |
| Max Allow Headway ( MAH), s | 3.0 |  | 0.0 | 3.0 |  | 0.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 |
| Queue Clearance Time ( $g s$ ), s | 2.8 |  |  | 4.4 |  |  | 16.5 |  | 14.6 | 16.9 |  | 16.7 |
| Green Extension Time ( $g_{e}$ ), s | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.3 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 1.9 | 0.0 |  | 1.8 |
| Phase Call Probability | 0.59 |  |  | 0.99 |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Max Out Probability | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 1.00 |  | 0.03 | 1.00 |  | 0.08 |
| Movement Group Results | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Assigned Movement | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Adjusted Flow Rate ( $v$ ), veh/h | 27 | 801 | 263 | 157 | 1190 | 354 | 258 | 393 | 151 | 223 | 450 | 26 |
| Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate ( $s$ ), veh/h/ln | 1753 | 1752 | 1608 | 1702 | 1752 | 1608 | 1781 | 1781 | 1607 | 1781 | 1781 | 1579 |
| Queue Service Time ( $g s$ ), s | 0.8 | 16.7 | 11.1 | 2.4 | 27.8 | 15.3 | 14.5 | 12.6 | 10.5 | 14.9 | 14.7 | 1.7 |
| Cycle Queue Clearance Time ( $g_{c}$ ), s | 0.8 | 16.7 | 11.1 | 2.4 | 27.8 | 15.3 | 14.5 | 12.6 | 10.5 | 14.9 | 14.7 | 1.7 |
| Green Ratio ( $g / C$ ) | 0.56 | 0.53 | 0.53 | 0.58 | 0.55 | 0.55 | 0.29 | 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.13 | 0.15 | 0.15 |
| Capacity ( c ), veh/h | 251 | 1856 | 852 | 811 | 1927 | 884 | 312 | 549 | 248 | 238 | 549 | 243 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ( $X$ ) | 0.106 | 0.432 | 0.309 | 0.193 | 0.618 | 0.401 | 0.827 | 0.717 | 0.610 | 0.940 | 0.820 | 0.105 |
| Back of Queue (Q ), ft/ln ( 50 th percentile) | 7.9 | 167.1 | 100.9 | 22 | 276.8 | 138.3 | 189.1 | 140.1 | 104.3 | 233.9 | 167.6 | 16.4 |
| Back of Queue (Q), veh/ln ( 50 th percentile) | 0.3 | 6.5 | 4.0 | 0.9 | 10.7 | 5.5 | 7.4 | 5.5 | 4.2 | 9.2 | 6.6 | 0.6 |
| Queue Storage Ratio ( $R Q$ ) ( 50 th percentile) | 0.03 | 0.56 | 0.35 | 0.07 | 0.92 | 0.48 | 0.95 | 0.70 | 0.53 | 0.78 | 0.56 | 0.05 |
| Uniform Delay ( $d_{1}$ ), s/veh | 15.2 | 17.2 | 15.9 | 12.3 | 18.4 | 15.6 | 37.0 | 48.3 | 47.4 | 51.5 | 49.1 | 43.6 |
| Incremental Delay ( $d_{2}$ ), s/veh | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 15.7 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 41.7 | 3.4 | 0.1 |
| Initial Queue Delay ( $d_{3}$ ), 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 |
| Control Delay (d), s/veh | 15.2 | 17.9 | 16.8 | 12.4 | 19.9 | 16.9 | 52.7 | 49.1 | 48.3 | 93.2 | 52.5 | 43.7 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | B | B | B | B | B | B | D | D | D | F | D | D |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | 17.6 |  | B | 18.6 |  | B | 50.1 |  | D | 65.2 |  | E |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | 31.8 |  |  |  |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |


| Multimodal Results | EB |  | WB |  |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS | 2.9 | C | 2.9 | C | 3.1 | C | 3.0 | C |  |
| Bicycle LOS Score /LOS | 1.4 | A | 1.9 | B | 1.1 | A | 1.1 | A |  |

HCS7 Signalized Intersection Results Summary


HCS7 Signalized Intersection Results Summary


| Timer Results | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assigned Phase | 5 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 8 | 7 | 4 |
| Case Number | 1.1 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 |
| Phase Duration, $s$ | 9.0 | 69.0 | 9.9 | 69.9 | 20.0 | 21.1 | 20.0 | 21.1 |
| Change Period, $(Y+R c), s$ | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Max Allow Headway $(M A H), s$ | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Queue Clearance Time $\left(g_{s}\right), s$ | 2.8 |  | 3.9 |  | 18.0 | 15.2 | 18.0 | 15.4 |
| Green Extension Time $\left(g_{e}\right), s$ | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 1.7 |
| Phase Call Probability | 0.83 |  | 0.99 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Max Out Probability | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.03 | 1.00 | 0.03 |


| Movement Group Results |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |
| Assigned Movement | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Adjusted Flow Rate ( $v$ ), veh/h | 53 | 629 | 571 | 129 | 585 | 536 | 552 | 806 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate ( $s$ ), veh/h/ln | 1702 | 1841 | 1665 | 1702 | 1841 | 1683 | 1781 | 析 | 72 | 401 | 410 | 60 |
| Queue Service Time ( $\mathrm{g} s$ ), s | 0.8 | 28.5 | 28.8 | 19 | 25. | 253 | 1781 | 1781 | 1607 | 1781 | 781 | 1578 |
| Cycle Queue Clearance Time ( $g_{c}$ ), s | 0.8 | 28.5 | 28.8 | 19 | 25. |  |  | 13.2 | 4.8 | 16.0 | 13.4 | 4.1 |
| Green Ratio ( $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{C}$ ) | 0.58 | 0.54 | 0.54 | 0.59 | 0.55 | 2.35 | 16.0 | 13.2 | 4.8 | 6.0 | 13.4 | 4.1 |
| Capacity ( $c$ ), veh/h | 579 | 996 | 901 | 564 | 1011 | 924 | 312 | 0.14 | 0.14 | 0.13 | 0.14 | 0.14 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ( $X$ ) | 0.092 | 0.631 | 0.634 | 0.228 | 0.579 | 0.580 | 1.772 | 508 | 229 | 238 | 508 | 225 |
| Back of Queue ( $Q$ ), fflln ( 50 th percentile) | 7.3 | 310.9 | 276.8 | 17.5 | 271.2 | 243 |  | 0.798 | 0.315 | 1.689 | 0.807 | 0.266 |
| Back of Queue ( $Q$ ), veh/ln ( 50 th percentile) | 0.3 | 12.0 | 11.1 | 0.7 | 10.5 | 97 |  | 148 | 47.7 | 725.2 | 150.7 | 40 |
| Queue Storage Ratio ( $R Q$ ) ( 50 th percentile) | 0.02 | 1.04 | 0.95 | 0.06 | 0.90 | 0.84 | 38.9 | 5.8 | 1.9 | 28.6 | 5.9 | 1.6 |
| Uniform Delay ( $d_{1}$ ), s/veh | 13.7 | 19.2 | 19.2 | 14.5 | 17.9 | 179 | 40.8 | 0.74 | 0.24 | 2.42 | 0.50 | 0.13 |
| Incremental Delay ( $d_{2}$ ), s/veh | 0.0 | 3.0 | 3.4 | 0.1 | 2.4 | 27 | 0 | 17 |  | 52.0 | 49.8 | 45.8 |
| Initial Queue Delay ( $\left.d_{3}\right)^{\text {, }}$, /veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 360.0 | 1.7 | 0.3 | 327.6 | 2.0 | 0.2 |
| Control Delay ( $d$ ), s/veh | 13.7 | 22.2 | 22.6 | 14.5 | 20.3 | 20.6 | 400 |  |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | B | C | C | B | C |  |  | 51.5 | 46.5 | 379.6 | 51.8 | 46.1 |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | 22. |  | C | 19.8 |  | C | 238.5 | D | D |  | \| F |  |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | 22.0 ${ }_{\text {c }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | F |  | 202.3 |  |  |

## Multimodal Results

Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS
Bicycle LOS Score / LOS

HCS7 Signalized Intersection Results Summary


HCS7 Signalized Intersection Results Summary


HCS+: Unsignalized Intersections Release 5.6

Phone:
Fax:
EMail:

ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL (AWSC) ANALYSIS $\qquad$
Analyst:
Agency/Co.: KHR Associates
Date Performed: $\quad 11 / 15 / 17$
Analysis Time Period: 7:30-8:30 A.M.
Intersection:
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Ambient AM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Newton Street
North/South Street: Calle Mayor

\% Thrus Left Lane

Configuration
SHF
Eastbound
LI LD


Northbound
Southbound
LI L2
LI
Li L2
LI LL

Flow Rate


TR
LT
$1.00 \quad 1.00$
134283
0
2
0
2
1

1
1.00

453
0

2
2
$3 b$

0
2
1
\% Heavy Veh
No. Lanes
Opposing-Lanes
Conflicting-lanes
Geometry group
Duration, T 1.00 hrs.

Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Li LD | Li | LD | LI | LT | L1 | LD |

Flow Rates:
Total in Lane
Left-Turn

| 75 | 140 | 45 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 75 | 0 | 0 |

Right-Turn
Prop. Left-Turns
$0 \quad 140 \quad 96$
$1.0 \quad 0.0 \quad 0.0$
$0.0 \quad 1.0 \quad 0.2$
0.0

1
$3 b$
134
1340
00
$1.0 \quad 0.0$
$0.0 \quad 0.0$
$0.0 \quad 0.0$
5
0.2
0.2
0.5
hRT-adj
hHV-adj
hadj, computed


Worksheet 4 - Departure Headway and Service Time
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Flow rate |  |  | 75 | 140 | 453 |  | 134 | 283 |
| hd, initial value | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 |
| x , initial |  |  | 0.07 | 0.12 | 0.40 |  | 0.12 | 0.25 |
| hd, final value |  |  | 6.21 | 5.40 | 5.31 |  | 6.13 | 5.63 |
| $x$, final value |  |  | 0.129 | 0.210 | 0.669 |  | 0.228 | 0.442 |
| Move-up time, m |  |  | 2.0 |  | 2.0 |  | 2.3 |  |
| Service Time |  |  | 4.2 | 3.4 | 3.3 |  | 3.8 | 3.3 |



Phone:
EMail:

Fax:

ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL(AWSC) ANALYSIS $\qquad$
Analyst:
Agency/Co.: KHR Associates
Date Performed: $\quad 11 / 15 / 17$
Analysis Time Period: 4:00-5:00 P.M.
Intersection:
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Ambient PM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Newton Street
North/South Street: Calle Mayor

\% Thrus Left Lane

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Li | Li | Li | L2 | Li | LD | Li |


| Configuration | L | R | TR | L | T |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PH | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Flow Rate | 61 | 61 | 357 | 90 | 337 |
| \% Heavy Ven | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. Lanes |  | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |
| Opposing-Lanes | 0 | 2 | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting-lanes | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |  |
| Geometry group |  | 1 | $3 b$ | 5 |  |

Duration, T 1.00 hrs.

Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Li Li | Li | LD | Li | LD | Li | L2 |

Flow Rates:
Total in Lane
Left-Turn
Right-Turn
Prop. Left-Turns
Prop. Right-Turns
Prop. Heavy Vehicle
Geometry Group
Adjustments Exhibit 17-33:
hLT-adj
61
$61 \quad 0 \quad 0$
$0 \quad 61 \quad 47$
$1.0 \quad 0.0$
$1.0 \quad 0.0$
$-1.0 \quad 0.1$
$0.0 \quad 0.0 \quad 0.0$
1
0.2

Sb
0.2
0.5

| hRT-adj | -0.6 | -0.6 | -0.7 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |  |
| hadj, computed | 0.2 | -0.6 | -0.1 | 0.5 |

Worksheet 4 - Departure Headway and Service Time

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Flow rate |  |  | 61 | 61 | 357 |  | 90 | 337 |
| hd, initial value | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 |
| x , initial |  |  | 0.05 | 0.05 | 0.32 |  | 0.08 | 0.30 |
| hd, final value |  |  | 5.93 | 5.12 | 5.06 |  | 5.69 | 5.18 |
| $x$, final value |  |  | 0.100 | 0.087 | 0.502 |  | 0.142 | 0.485 |
| Move-up time, m |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 3 |
| Service Time |  |  | 3.9 | 3.1 | 3.1 |  | 3.4 | 2.9 |

Worksheet 5 - Capacity and Level of Service $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 |

Flow Rate
Service Time
Utilization, $x$
Dep. headway, hd
Capacity
95\% Queue Length
Delay
LOS
$\begin{array}{lllll}3.9 & 3.1 & 3.1 & 3.4 & 2.9\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}0.100 & 0.087 & 0.502 & 0.142 & 0.485\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}5.93 & 5.12 & 5.06 & 5.69 & 5.18\end{array}$

| 610 | 678 | 714 | 643 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

$\begin{array}{lllll}0.3 & 0.3 & 3.0 & 0.5 & 2.8\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}9.6 & 8.6 & 13.1 & 9.3 & 12.7\end{array}$
A A B A B
Approach:
Delay
LOS
$\begin{array}{ll}9.1 & 13.1 \\ \text { A } & \text { B }\end{array}$
12.0

B
Intersection Delay 12.1 Intersection LOS B

Phone: Fax:
EMail:
ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL (AWSC) ANALYSIS $\qquad$
Analyst:
Agency/Co.: KHR Associates
Date Performed: 11/15/2017
Analysis Time Period: 7:30-8:30 A.M.
Intersection:
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Ambient AM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Newton Street
North/South Street: Vista Montana

\% Thrus Left Lane


Duration, T 1.00 hrs.
$\qquad$ Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Li | LD | Li | LD | LT | L2 | LT | LD |

Flow Rates:

| Total in Lane | 298 | 372 | 270 | 61 | 128 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Left-Turn | 79 | 42 | 72 | 61 | 0 |
| Right-Turn | 77 | 144 | 19 | 0 | 34 |
| op. Left-Turns | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
| op. Right-Turns | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
| op. Heavy Vehicle 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| ometry Group | 2 |  | 2 | $4 a$ | 5 |


| hLT-adj | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| hRT-adj | -0.6 | -0.6 | -0.6 | -0.7 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |
| hadj, computed | -0.1 | -0.2 | 0.0 |  |

Worksheet 4 - Departure Headway and Service Time $\qquad$

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound | Southbound |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2



```
HCS+: Unsignalized Intersections Release 5.6
```

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:

ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL (AWSC) ANALYSIS $\qquad$
Analyst:
Agency/Co.: KHR Associates
Date Performed: 11/15/2017
Analysis Time Period: 4:00-5:00 P.M.
Intersection:
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Ambient PM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Newton Street
North/South Street: Vista Montana
$\qquad$ Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics $\qquad$

\% Thrus Left Lane

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Configuration | LTR |  | LTR |  | LTR |  | L | TR |
| PHF | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Flow Rate | 123 |  | 318 |  | 173 |  | 64 | 218 |
| \% Heavy Veh | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| No. Lanes |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |
| Opposing-Lanes |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting-lanes |  | 2 |  | 2 |  | 1 |  |  |
| Geometry group |  | 2 |  | 2 |  | 4 a |  |  |

Duration, T 1.00 hrs.


| hRT-adj | -0.6 | -0.6 | -0.6 | -0.7 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |
| hadj, computed | 0.0 |  | -0.4 | -0.0 |

$\qquad$ Worksheet 4 - Departure Headway and Service Time $\qquad$

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Flow rate | 123 |  | 318 |  | 173 |  | 64 | 218 |
| hd, initial value | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 |
| x , initial | 0.11 |  | 0.28 |  | 0.15 |  | 0.06 | 0.19 |
| hd, final value | 5.72 |  | 5.01 |  | 5.65 |  | 6.47 | 5.79 |
| x , final value | 0.195 |  | 0.443 |  | 0.272 |  | 0.115 | 0.351 |
| Move-up time, m |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| Service Time | 3.7 |  | 3.0 |  | 3.7 |  | 4.2 | 3.5 |

$\qquad$ Worksheet 5 - Capacity and Level of Service $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound |  | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 |


| Flow Rate | 123 | 318 | 173 | 64 | 218 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Service Time | 3.7 | 3.0 | 3.7 | 4.2 | 3.5 |
| Utilization, x ha | 0.195 | 5.72 | 0.443 | 0.272 | 0.115 |
| Dep. headway, hd | 5.01 | 5.65 | 6.47 | 5.79 |  |
| Capacity | 615 | 723 | 641 | 582 | 623 |
| $95 \%$ Queue Length | 0.7 | 2.4 | 1.1 | 0.4 | 1.6 |
| Delay | 10.1 | $B$ | 12.0 | 10.8 | $10.0+$ |
| LOS | B | $B$ | $B$ | $B$ |  |

Approach:

Delay $\quad 10.1$
LOS B
Intersection Delay 11.3
12.0
10.8

B
11.2

B

HCS+: Unsignalized Intersections Release 5.6

Phone:
EMail:

Fax:

ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL(AWSC) ANALYSIS
Analyst:
Agency/Co.: KHR Associates
Date Performed: 11/15/2017
Analysis Time Period: 7:45-8:45 A.M.
Intersection:
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Ambient AM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Newton Street
North/South Street: Madison Street
$\qquad$ Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics

\% Thrus Left Lane


Duration, T 1.00 hrs.

Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet $\qquad$

$\left.\begin{array}{ccccccc}\text { hRT-adj } & -0.7 & & -0.7 & -0.7 & -0.7 \\ \text { hHV-adj } & 1.7 & 1.7 & 1.7 & 1.7 \\ \text { hadj, computed } & 0.3 & -0.7 & 0.0 & -0.7 & 0.3 & -0.7\end{array}\right] 0.4$
$\qquad$ Worksheet 4 - Departure Headway and Service Time $\qquad$

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Flow rate | 185 | 5 | 118 | 103 | 23 | 14 | 15 | 41 |
| hd, initial value | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 |
| x , initial | 0.16 | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.09 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.04 |
| hd, final value | 5.20 | 4.21 | 4.91 | 4.20 | 5.81 | 4.81 | 5.89 | 4.79 |
| x , final value | 0.267 | 0.006 | 0.161 | 0.120 | 0.037 | 0.019 | 0.025 | 0.055 |
| Move-up time, m |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  | 3 |
| Service Time | 2.9 | 1.9 | 2.6 | 1.9 | 3.5 | 2.5 | 3.6 | 2.5 |

$\qquad$ Worksheet 5 - Capacity and Level of Service $\qquad$
Eastbound
L1 12
Westbound
L1 L2

| Northbound | Southbound |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| L1 | L2 | L1 |


| Flow Rate | 185 | 5 | 118 | 103 | 23 | 14 | 15 | 41 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Service Time | 2.9 | 1.9 | 2.6 | 1.9 | 3.5 | 2.5 | 3.6 | 2.5 |
| Utilization, x | 0.267 | 0.006 | 0.161 | 0.120 | 0.037 | 0.019 | 0.025 | 0.055 |
| Dep. headway, hd | 5.20 | 4.21 | 4.91 | 4.20 | 5.81 | 4.81 | 5.89 | 4.79 |
| Capacity | 685 | 500 | 738 | 858 | 575 | 700 | 750 | 820 |
| $95 \%$ Queue Length | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Delay | 9.8 | 6.9 | 8.6 | 7.5 | 8.7 | 7.6 | 8.7 | 7.8 |
| LOS | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A |

Approach:

Delay LOS
9.7

A
8.1

A
8.3

A
8.0

A

Intersection Delay 8.7 Intersection LOS A

Phone:
Fax:
EMail:

ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL (AWS) ANALYSIS $\qquad$
Analyst:
Agency/Co.:
KHR Associates
Date Performed:
11/15/2017
Analysis Time Period: 7:45-8:45 A.M.
Intersection:
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Ambient PM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Newton Street
North/South Street: Madison Street

\% Thrus Left Lane


Duration, T 1.00 hrs.
$\qquad$ Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Li Li | Li | LD | LI | L2 | LI | LD |

Flow Rates:

| Total in Lane | 172 | 12 | 150 | 15 | 34 | 2 | 54 | 153 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Left-Turn | 54 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 38 | 0 |
| Right-Turn | 0 | 12 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 153 |
| Pop. Left-Turns | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.0 |
| crop. Right-Turns | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
| crop. Heavy Vehicle 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| geometry Group | 5 |  | 5 |  | 5 | 5 |  |  |

hLT-adj 0.5
0.5
0.5
0.5

```
    hRT-adj
    -0.7
    -0.7
        -0.7
        -0.7
    hHV-adj
    1.7 1.7
        1.7
hadj, computed 
```

$\qquad$ Worksheet 4 - Departure Headway and Service Time $\qquad$

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Flow rate | 172 | 12 | 150 | 15 | 34 | 2 | 54 | 153 |
| hd, initial value | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 |
| x , initial | 0.15 | 0.01 | 0.13 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.14 |
| hd, final value | 5.43 | 4.57 | 5.31 | 4.60 | 5.86 | 4.92 | 5.79 | 4.74 |
| x , final value | 0.259 | 0.015 | 0.221 | 0.019 | 0.055 | 0.003 | 0.087 | 0.201 |
| Move-up time, m | 2.3 |  | 2.3 |  | 2.3 |  | 2.3 |  |
| Service Time | 3.1 | 2.3 | 3.0 | 2.3 | 3.6 | 2.6 | 3.5 | 2.4 |

$\qquad$ Worksheet 5 - Capacity and Level of Service $\qquad$

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Flow Rate | 172 | 12 | 150 | 15 | 34 | 2 | 54 | 153 |
| Service Time | 3.1 | 2.3 | 3.0 | 2.3 | 3.6 | 2.6 | 3.5 | 2.4 |
| Utilization, x | 0.259 | 0.015 | 0.221 | 0.019 | 0.055 | 0.003 | 0.087 | 0.201 |
| Dep. headway, hd | 5.43 | 4.57 | 5.31 | 4.60 | 5.86 | 4.92 | 5.79 | 4.74 |
| Capacity | 662 | 600 | 682 | 750 | 567 | 0 | 600 | 765 |
| 95\% Queue Length | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.8 |
| Delay | $10.0+$ | 7.3 | 9.5 | 7.4 | 8.9 | 7.6 | 9.0 | 8.6 |
| LOS | B | A | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| Approach: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 9.9 |  | 9.3 |  | 8.8 |  | 8.7 |  |
| LOS | A |  | A |  | A |  | A |  |
| Intersection Delay | 9.3 |  | Intersection LOS A |  |  |  |  |  |

HCS7 Signalized Intersection Results Summary


| Timer Results | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assigned Phase | 5 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 8 | 7 | 4 |
| Case Number | 1.1 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 3.0 |
| Phase Duration, s | 10.7 | 30.4 | 9.6 | 29.4 | 11.1 | 37.8 | 12.2 | 38.9 |
| Change Period, ( $Y+R_{c}$ ), s | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Max Allow Headway ( MAH ), s | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Queue Clearance Time ( $g_{s}$ ), s | 6.8 |  | 5.8 |  | 7.0 | 35.7 | 8.1 | 36.9 |
| Green Extension Time ( $g_{e}$ ), s | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Probability | 0.96 |  | 0.93 |  | 0.98 | 1.00 | 0.99 | 1.00 |
| Max Out Probability | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.01 | 1.00 |


| Movement Group Results | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Assigned Movement | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Adjusted Flow Rate ( $v$ ), veh/h | 133 | 223 | 199 | 107 | 232 | 209 | 164 | 893 | 37 | 200 | 1067 | 339 |
| Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate ( $s$ ), veh/h/ln | 1753 | 1841 | 1567 | 1753 | 1841 | 1587 | 1781 | 1870 | 1609 | 1781 | 1870 | 1583 |
| Queue Service Time ( $g$ s ), s | 4.8 | 8.8 | 9.3 | 3.8 | 9.3 | 9.8 | 5.0 | 33.7 | 1.3 | 6.1 | 34.9 | 15.0 |
| Cycle Queue Clearance Time ( $g_{c}$ ), s | 4.8 | 8.8 | 9.3 | 3.8 | 9.3 | 9.8 | 5.0 | 33.7 | 1.3 | 6.1 | 34.9 | 15.0 |
| Green Ratio ( g/C ) | 0.36 | 0.29 | 0.29 | 0.34 | 0.28 | 0.28 | 0.45 | 0.38 | 0.38 | 0.47 | 0.39 | 0.39 |
| Capacity ( $c$ ), veh/h | 372 | 541 | 460 | 349 | 519 | 448 | 220 | 701 | 603 | 243 | 726 | 614 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ( $X$ ) | 0.359 | 0.412 | 0.433 | 0.305 | 0.448 | 0.467 | 0.748 | 1.274 | 0.061 | 0.822 | 1.470 | 0.552 |
| Back of Queue ( Q ), ft/ln ( 50 th percentile) | 47.2 | 101.3 | 90 | 38 | 109 | 97.4 | 49.3 | $\begin{gathered} 1007 . \\ 8 \end{gathered}$ | 11.4 | 60.7 | 1474.5 | 131.3 |
| Back of Queue ( $Q$ ), veh/ln ( 50 th percentile) | 1.8 | 3.9 | 3.6 | 1.5 | 4.2 | 3.9 | 1.9 | 39.7 | 0.5 | 2.4 | 58.0 | 5.2 |
| Queue Storage Ratio ( $R Q$ ) ( 50 th percentile) | 0.16 | 0.34 | 0.31 | 0.13 | 0.36 | 0.33 | 0.25 | 5.04 | 0.06 | 0.20 | 4.91 | 0.44 |
| Uniform Delay ( $d_{1}$ ), s/veh | 20.8 | 25.5 | 25.7 | 21.3 | 26.6 | 26.7 | 21.1 | 28.1 | 18.0 | 20.8 | 27.5 | 21.5 |
| Incremental Delay ( $d_{2}$ ), s/veh | 0.2 | 2.3 | 2.9 | 0.2 | 2.8 | 3.5 | 1.9 | 134.2 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 219.0 | 0.6 |
| Initial Queue Delay ( $d_{3}$ ), 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 |
| Control Delay ( $d$ ), s/veh | 21.0 | 27.8 | 28.7 | 21.4 | 29.3 | 30.2 | 23.1 | 162.3 | 18.0 | 23.6 | 246.5 | 22.1 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | F | B | C | F | C |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | 26.5 |  | C | 28.1 | C |  | 136.5 |  | F | 171.4 |  | F |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | 119.6 |  |  |  |  |  | $F$ |  |  |  |  |  |


| Multimodal Results | EB |  | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS | 2.4 | B | 2.4 | B | 2.8 | C | 2.8 | C |  |
| Bicycle LOS Score / LOS | 0.9 |  | A | 0.9 | A | 2.3 | B | 3.1 | C |

HCS7 Signalized Intersection Results Summary


| Timer Results | EBL |  | EBT | WBL |  | WBT | NBL |  | NBT | SBL |  | SBT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assigned Phase | 5 |  | 2 | 1 |  | 6 | 3 |  | 8 | 7 |  | 4 |
| Case Number | 1.1 |  | 4.0 | 1.1 |  | 4.0 | 1.1 |  | 3.0 | 1.1 |  | 3.0 |
| Phase Duration, s | 10.7 |  | 31.2 | 8.8 |  | 29.4 | 12.8 |  | 37.9 | 12.1 |  | 37.2 |
| Change Period, ( $Y+R_{c}$ ), s | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |
| Max Allow Headway ( MAH ), s | 3.0 |  | 0.0 | 3.0 |  | 0.0 | 3.0 |  | 2.9 | 3.0 |  | 2.9 |
| Queue Clearance Time ( $g_{s}$ ), s | 6.8 |  |  | 4.2 |  |  | 8.6 |  | 35.9 | 8.0 |  | 35.2 |
| Green Extension Time ( $g_{e}$ ), s | 0.1 |  | 0.0 | 0.1 |  | 0.0 | 0.2 |  | 0.0 | 0.2 |  | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Probability | 0.96 |  |  | 0.79 |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.99 |  | 1.00 |
| Max Out Probability | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.01 |  | 1.00 | 0.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Movement Group Results | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Assigned Movement | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Adjusted Flow Rate ( $v$ ), veh/h | 133 | 262 | 256 | 63 | 160 | 151 | 216 | 1167 | 56 | 194 | 1066 | 96 |
| Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate ( $s$ ), veh/h/ln | 1753 | 1841 | 1555 | 1753 | 1841 | 1554 | 1781 | 1870 | 1609 | 1781 | 1870 | 1582 |
| Queue Service Time ( $g$ s), s | 4.8 | 10.4 | 12.3 | 2.2 | 6.2 | 7.0 | 6.6 | 33.9 | 2.0 | 6.0 | 33.2 | 3.7 |
| Cycle Queue Clearance Time ( $g_{c}$ ), s | 4.8 | 10.4 | 12.3 | 2.2 | 6.2 | 7.0 | 6.6 | 33.9 | 2.0 | 6.0 | 33.2 | 3.7 |
| Green Ratio ( $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{C}$ ) | 0.36 | 0.30 | 0.30 | 0.33 | 0.28 | 0.28 | 0.47 | 0.38 | 0.38 | 0.46 | 0.37 | 0.37 |
| Capacity ( $c$ ), veh/h | 425 | 557 | 471 | 298 | 519 | 438 | 254 | 704 | 605 | 241 | 690 | 583 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ( $X$ ) | 0.314 | 0.470 | 0.543 | 0.213 | 0.308 | 0.345 | 0.848 | 1.658 | 0.092 | 0.808 | 1.545 | 0.164 |
| Back of Queue ( $Q$ ), ft/ln ( 50 th percentile) | 47.1 | 120.7 | 120.6 | 22.4 | 70.7 | 66.8 | 71.2 | $\begin{gathered} 1846 . \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | 17.4 | 59.2 | 1568.4 | 31.8 |
| Back of Queue ( Q ), veh/ln ( 50 th percentile) | 1.8 | 4.7 | 4.8 | 0.9 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 72.7 | 0.7 | 2.3 | 61.7 | 1.3 |
| Queue Storage Ratio ( $R Q$ ) ( 50 th percentile) | 0.16 | 0.40 | 0.42 | 0.07 | 0.24 | 0.23 | 0.36 | 9.23 | 0.09 | 0.20 | 5.23 | 0.11 |
| Uniform Delay ( $d_{1}$ ), s/veh | 20.5 | 25.5 | 26.2 | 21.6 | 25.4 | 25.7 | 20.7 | 28.1 | 18.1 | 20.9 | 28.4 | 19.1 |
| Incremental Delay ( $d_{2}$ ), s/veh | 0.2 | 2.8 | 4.4 | 0.1 | 1.5 | 2.1 | 5.8 | 302.3 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 252.6 | 0.0 |
| Initial Queue Delay ( $d_{3}$ ), 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 |
| Control Delay (d), s/veh | 20.7 | 28.3 | 30.6 | 21.7 | 26.9 | 27.8 | 26.5 | 330.3 | 18.2 | 23.4 | 281.0 | 19.1 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | F | B | C | F | B |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | 27.7 |  | C | 26.4 |  | C | 272.7 | F |  | 225.6 | F |  |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | 190.1 |  |  |  |  |  | F |  |  |  |  |  |
| Multimodal Results | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS | 2.4 |  | B | 2.4 |  | B | 2.8 |  | C | 2.8 | C |  |
| Bicycle LOS Score / LOS | 1.0 |  | A |  |  | A |  |  | C | 2.7 | C |  |
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| Multimodal Results | EB |  | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS | 2.9 | C | 3.2 | C | 2.4 | B | 2.2 | B |
| Bicycle LOS Score / LOS | 0.8 | A | 1.0 | A | 1.5 | A | 1.4 | A |
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```
HCS+: Unsignalized Intersections Release 5.6
```

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$
Analyst:
Agency/Co.: KHR Associates
Date Performed: 8/4/2016
Analysis Time Period: 8:00-9:00 A.M.
Intersection: Palos Verdes North
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Project AM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Via Valmonte
North/South Street: Palos Verdes North
Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics $\qquad$


Volume
\% Thrus Left Lane

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Configuration | LTR |  | LTR |  | L | T | LTR |  |
| PHF | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Elow Rate | 211 |  | 206 |  | 13 | 499 | 271 |  |
| \% Heavy Veh | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| No. Lanes |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 2 |  | 1 |
| Opposing-Lanes |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 2 |
| Conflicting-lanes |  | 2 |  | 2 |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| Geometry group |  | 2 |  | 2 |  | 5 |  | 4 a |
| Duration, T 1.00 | hrs. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

$\qquad$ Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| L1 L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 |

Flow Rates:

| Total in Lane 211 | 206 |  | 13 | 499 | 271 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Left-Turn 0 | 0 |  | 13 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Right-Turn 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| rop. Left-Turns 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| rop. Right-Turns 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| rop. Heavy Vehicle0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| ometry Group 2 |  | 2 | 5 |  | 4 a |  |
| justments Exhibit 17-33: |  |  | 0.5 |  | 0.2 |  |
| hLT-adj 0.2 |  | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |


| hRT-adj | -0.6 |  | -0.6 | -0.7 | -0.6 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |  |
| hadj, computed | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.5 |

$\qquad$ Worksheet 4 - Departure Headway and Service Time $\qquad$



```
HCS+: Unsignalized Intersections Release 5.6
```

Phone:
Eax:
E-Mail:

ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL(AWSC) ANALYSIS $\qquad$
Analyst:
Agency/Co.: KHR Associates
Date Performed: 8/4/2016
Analysis Time Period: 5:00 - 6:00 P.M.
Intersection: Palos Verdes North
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Project PM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Via Valmonte
North/South Street: Palos Verdes North
$\qquad$ Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics $\qquad$
 \% Thrus Left Lane

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Configuration | LTR |  | LTR |  | L | T | LTR |  |
| PHF | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Flow Rate | 23 |  | 189 |  | 6 | 389 | 590 |  |
| \% Heavy Veh | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| No. Lanes |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  | 1 |
| Opposing-Lanes |  |  |  |  |  | , |  | 2 |
| Conflicting-lanes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Geometry group |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |  | 4 a |

Duration, T 1.00 hrs.
$\qquad$ Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 |

Elow Rates:

| Total in Lane | 23 | 189 | 6 | 389 | 590 |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Left-Turn | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| Right-Turn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Prop. Left-Turns | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop. Right-Turns | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop. Heavy Vehicle0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |

Geometry Group 2
2
5
4a
Adjustments Exhibit 17-33: hLT-adj 0.2
0.2
0.5
0.2

| hRT-adj | -0.6 | -0.6 | -0.7 | -0.6 |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |  |
| hadj, computed | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.5 |

Worksheet 4 - Departure Headway and Service Time $\qquad$
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## HCS+: Unsignalized Intersections Release 5.6

Phone:
E-Mail:

Fax:

ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL(AWSC) ANALYSIS $\qquad$
Analyst:
Agency/Co.: KHR Associates
Date Performed: 11/15/17
Analysis Time Period: 7:30-8:30 A.M.
Intersection:
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Project AM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Newton Street
North/South Street: Calle Mayor
Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics $\qquad$

Volume
\% Thrus Left Lane

|  | Eastbound | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Configuration |  | L | R | TR |  | L | T |
| PHE |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Elow Rate |  | 75 | 140 | 453 |  | 134 | 283 |
| \% Heavy Veh |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| No. Lanes |  | 2 |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |
| Opposing-Lanes |  | 0 |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |
| Conflicting-lanes |  | 2 |  | 2 |  |  | 2 |
| Geometry group |  | 1 |  | 3 b |  |  | 5 |

Duration, T 1.00 hrs.
$\qquad$ Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| L1 L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 |


| Flow Rates: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total in Lane | 75 | 140 | 453 | 134 | 283 |
| Left-Turn | 75 | 0 | 0 | 134 | 0 |
| Right-Turn | 0 | 140 | 96 | 0 | 0 |
| Prop. Left-Turns | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop. Right-Turns | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop. Heavy Vehicle | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Geometry Group | 1 |  | $3 b$ | 5 |  |
| Adjustments Exhibit 17-33: |  | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.5 |  |


| hRT-adj | -0.6 | -0.6 | -0.7 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |  |
| hadj, computed | 0.2 | -0.6 | -0.1 | 0.5 |

$\qquad$ Worksheet 4 - Departure Headway and Service Time $\qquad$

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Flow rate |  |  | 75 | 140 | 453 |  | 134 | 283 |
| hd, initial value | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 |
| x , initial |  |  | 0.07 | 0.12 | 0.40 |  | 0.12 | 0.25 |
| hd, final value |  |  | 6.21 | 5.40 | 5.31 |  | 6.13 | 5.63 |
| $x$, final value |  |  | 0.129 | 0.210 | 0.669 |  | 0.228 | 0.442 |
| Move-up time, m |  |  | 2.0 |  | 2.0 |  |  | 3 |
| Service Time |  |  | 4.2 | 3.4 | 3.3 |  | 3.8 | 3.3 |

$\qquad$ Worksheet 5 - Capacity and Level of Service $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2


| Flow Rate | 75 | 140 | 453 | 134 | 283 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Service Time | 4.2 | 3.4 | 3.3 | 3.8 | 3.3 |
| Utilization, x | 0.129 | 0.210 | 0.669 | 0.228 | 0.442 |
| Dep. headway, hd | 6.21 | 5.40 | 5.31 | 6.13 | 5.63 |
| Capacity | 577 | 667 | 676 | 583 | 643 |
| $95 \%$ Queue Length | 0.4 | 0.8 | 5.8 | 0.9 | 2.3 |
| Delay | 10.1 | 9.8 | 18.9 | 10.6 | 12.8 |
| LOS | B | A | C | B | B |

Approach:
Delay
LOS

| 9.9 | 18.9 |
| :--- | :--- |
| A | C |

12.1

LOS
Intersection LOS B

```
HCS+: Unsignalized Intersections Release 5.6
```

Phone:
E-Mail:

Fax:
$\qquad$ ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL(AWSC) ANALYSIS $\qquad$
Analyst:
Agency/Co.: KHR Associates
Date Performed: 11/15/17
Analysis Time Period: 4:00-5:00 P.M.
Intersection:
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Project PM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Newton Street
North/South Street: Calle Mayor
$\qquad$ Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics $\qquad$

|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | I |  | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
|  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 337 | 61 |  | 310 | 47 | 90 | 337 | 0 |

\% Thrus Left Lane

|  | Eastbound <br> L1 L2 | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Configuration |  | L | R | TR |  | L | T |
| PHF |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Elow Rate |  | 61 | 61 | 357 |  | 90 | 337 |
| \% Heavy Veh |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| No. Lanes |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Opposing-Lanes |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Conflicting-lanes |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Geometry group |  |  |  |  | 3 b |  |  |

Duration, T 1.00 hrs.
Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 |

Flow Rates:

| Total in Lane | 61 | 61 | 357 | 90 | 337 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Left-Turn | 61 | 0 | 0 | 90 | 0 |
| Right-Turn | 0 | 61 | 47 | 0 | 0 |
| op. Left-Turns | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
| op. Right-Turns | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| op. Heavy Vehicle | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |
| ometry Group | 1 |  | $3 b$ | 5 |  |
| justments Exhibit 17-33: |  | 0.2 |  | 0.2 | 0.0 |


| hRT-adj | -0.6 | -0.6 | -0.7 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |  |
| hadj, computed | 0.2 | -0.6 | -0.1 | 0.5 |

$\qquad$ Worksheet 4 - Departure Headway and Service Time $\qquad$

$\qquad$ Worksheet 5 - Capacity and Level of Service $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| L1 L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |

Flow Rate
Service Time
Utilization, x
Dep. headway, hd
Capacity
95\% Queue Length
Delay
LOS
Approach:
Delay
LOS
Intersection Delay 12.1

| 61 | 61 | 357 | 90 | 337 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3.9 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.4 | 2.9 |
| 0.100 | 0.087 | 0.502 | 0.142 | 0.485 |
| 5.93 | 5.12 | 5.06 | 5.69 | 5.18 |
| 610 | 678 | 714 | 643 | 688 |
| 0.3 | 0.3 | 3.0 | 0.5 | 2.8 |
| 9.6 | 8.6 | 13.1 | 9.3 | 12.7 |
| A | A | B | A | B |

A B
9.1
13.1
12.0

A
B
B
Intersection LOS B

```
Phone: Fax:
```

E-Mail:
ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL(AWSC) ANALYSIS
$\qquad$
Analyst:
Agency/Co.: KHR Associates
Date Performed: 11/15/2017
Analysis Time Period: 7:30-8:30 A.M.
Intersection:
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Project AM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Newton Street
North/South Street: Vista Montana
$\qquad$ Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics $\qquad$

| Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 79 | 142 |  | 44 | $18 \overline{6}$ | 145 | 72 | 179 | 21 | 61 | 94 |  |

Volume
179 Lane

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 |
| L2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Duration, T 1.00 hrs.
$\qquad$ Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet $\qquad$
Eastbound
L1 L2
Westbound
L1 L2

| Northbound | Southbound |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| L1 | L1 | L2 |

Elow Rates:
Total in Lane 298

| 375 | 272 | 61 | 128 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 44 | 72 | 61 | 0 |
| 145 | 21 | 0 | 34 |
| 0.1 | 0.3 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
| 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
| 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Prop. Heavy Vehicle0.0
Geometry Group
Adjustments Exhibit 17-33:
hLT-adj 0.2
0.2
0.2
0.5

| hRT-adj | -0.6 | -0.6 | -0.6 | -0.7 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |
| hadj, computed | -0.1 | -0.2 | 0.0 | 0.5 |

$\qquad$ Worksheet 4 - Departure Headway and Service Time $\qquad$


```
HCS+: Unsignalized Intersections Release 5.6
```

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$
Analyst:
Agency/Co.: KHR Associates
Date Performed: 11/15/2017
Analysis Time Period: 4:00-5:00 P.M.
Intersection:
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Project PM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Newton Street
North/South Street: Vista Montana
Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics $\qquad$

|  | , | b |  |  | tb |  |  | thb |  |  | thb |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
|  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume | $1 \overline{40}$ | 73 | 10 | 9 | 70 | 213 | 10 | 148 | 17 | 64 | 165 | 53 |

\% Thrus Left Lane


Duration, T 1.00 hrs.
$\qquad$ Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| L1 L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |


| Elow Rates: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total in Lane | 123 | 322 | 175 | 64 | 218 |
| Left-Turn | 40 | 39 | 10 | 64 | 0 |
| Right-Turn | 10 | 213 | 17 | 0 | 53 |
| Prop. Left-Turns | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop. Right-Turns | 0.1 | 0.7 |  | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Prop. Heavy Vehicle0.0 |  | 0.0 | 2 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Geometry Group | 2 |  |  | 4 a | 0.0 |
| Adjustments Exhibit $17-33:$ | 0.2 |  | 0.2 |  | 0.2 |

hRT-adj

$$
-0.6
$$

1.7
$-0.6$
$-0.6$
$-0.7$
hHV-adj

$$
1.7
$$

$$
1.7
$$

0.0
$-0.4 \quad-0.0$
hadj, computed

W

|  | Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 L2 | L1 L2 | L1 L2 | L1 L2 |
| Elow rate | 123 | 322 | 175 | 64218 |
| hd, initial value | $3.20 \quad 3.20$ | $3.20 \quad 3.20$ | $3.20 \quad 3.20$ | $3.20 \quad 3.20$ |
| x , initial | 0.11 | 0.29 | 0.16 | $0.06 \quad 0.19$ |
| hd, final value | 5.73 | 5.02 | 5.66 | $6.49 \quad 5.81$ |
| $x$, final value | 0.196 | 0.449 | 0.275 | 0.1150 .352 |
| Move-up time, m | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.3 |
| Service Time | 3.7 | 3.0 | 3.7 | 4.23 .5 |


|  | Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 L2 | L1 L2 | L1 L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Flow Rate | 123 | 322 | 175 | 64 | 218 |
| Service Time | 3.7 | 3.0 | 3.7 | 4.2 | 3.5 |
| Utilization, x | 0.196 | 0.449 | 0.275 | 0.115 | 0.352 |
| Dep. headway, hd | 5.73 | 5.02 | 5.66 | 6.49 | 5.81 |
| Capacity | 615 | 716 | 625 | 533 | 623 |
| 95\% Queue Length | 0.7 | 2.4 | 1.1 | 0.4 | 1.6 |
| Delay | 10.1 | 12.1 | 10.8 | 10.0+ | 11.7 |
| LOS | B | B | B | B | B |
| Approach: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 10.1 | 12.1 | 10.8 |  | . 3 |
| LOS | B | B | B | B |  |
| Intersection Delay | 11.3 | Intersect | LOS B |  |  |

Phone: Eax:
E-Mail:
ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL(AWSC) ANALYSIS $\qquad$
Analyst:
Agency/Co.: KHR Associates
Date Performed: 11/15/2017
Analysis Time Period: 7:45-8:45 A.M.
Intersection:
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Project AM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Newton Street
North/South Street: Madison Street
$\qquad$ Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics $\qquad$

Volume
\% Thrus Left Lane

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Configuration | LT | R | LT | R | LT | R | LT | R |
| PHF | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Elow Rate | 189 | 5 | 122 | 103 | 23 | 14 | 15 | 41 |
| \% Heavy Veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. Lanes |  | 2 |  | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |
| Opposing-Lanes |  | 2 |  | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |
| Conflicting-lanes |  | 2 |  | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |
| Geometry group |  | 5 |  | 5 |  |  |  | 5 |
| Duration, T 1.00 | hrs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

$\qquad$ Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet $\qquad$
Eastbound
L1 L2

| Westbound |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| L1 | L2 |
|  |  |
| 122 | 103 |
| 3 | 0 |
| 0 | 103 |
| 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0.0 | 1.0 |
| 0.0 | 0.0 |

5
0.5
0.5
0.5

| hRT-adj | -0.7 |  | -0.7 | -0.7 | -0.7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |  |
| hadj, computed | 0.3 | -0.7 | 0.0 | -0.7 | 0.3 |

Worksheet 4 - Departure Headway and Service Time $\qquad$

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Flow rate | 189 | 5 | 122 | 103 | 23 | 14 | 15 | 41 |
| hd, initial value | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 |
| x , initial | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.09 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.04 |
| hd, final value | 5.20 | 4.22 | 4.92 | 4.20 | 5.83 | 4.83 | 5.91 | 4.81 |
| $x$, final value | 0.273 | 0.006 | 0.167 | 0.120 | 0.037 | 0.019 | 0.025 | 0.055 |
| Move-up time, m |  | 3 |  |  |  | 3 |  | 3 |
| Service Time | 2.9 | 1.9 | 2.6 | 1.9 | 3.5 | 2.5 | 3.6 | 2.5 |
| Worksheet 5 - Capacity and Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Flow Rate | 189 | 5 | 122 | 103 | 23 | 14 | 15 | 41 |
| Service Time | 2.9 | 1.9 | 2.6 | 1.9 | 3.5 | 2.5 | 3.6 | 2.5 |
| Utilization, x | 0.273 | 0.006 | 0.167 | 0.120 | 0.037 | 0.019 | 0.025 | 0.055 |
| Dep. headway, hd | 5.20 | 4.22 | 4.92 | 4.20 | 5.83 | 4.83 | 5.91 | 4.81 |
| Capacity | 700 | 500 | 718 | 858 | 575 | 700 | 750 | 820 |
| 95\% Queue Length | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Delay | 9.8 | 6.9 | 8.6 | 7.5 | 8.8 | 7.6 | 8.8 | 7.8 |
| LOS | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| Approach: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 9.8 |  | 8.1 |  | 8.3 |  | 8.0 |  |
| LOS | A |  | A |  | A |  | A |  |
| Intersection Delay | 8.7 |  | Intersection LOS A |  |  |  |  |  |

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$
Analyst:
Agency/Co.: KHR Associates
Date Performed: 11/15/2017
Analysis Time Period: 7:45-8:45 A.M.
Intersection:
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Project PM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Newton Street
North/South Street: Madison Street
$\qquad$ Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics $\qquad$

|  |  | bo |  |  | bo |  |  | thb |  |  | thb |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume | 154 | 120 | 12 |  | 160 | 5 |  | 18 |  | 38 | 16 | 153 | \% Thrus Left Lane


|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Configuration | LT | R | LT | R | LT | R | LT | R |
| PHE | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Elow Rate | 174 | 12 | 165 | 15 | 34 | 2 | 54 | 153 |
| \% Heavy Veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. Lanes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Opposing-Lanes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Conflicting-lanes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Geometry group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

$\qquad$ Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 |

Flow Rates:

| Total in Lane | 174 | 12 | 165 | 15 | 34 | 2 | 54 | 153 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Left-Turn | 54 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 38 | 0 |
| Right-Turn | 0 | 12 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 153 |
| op. Left-Turns | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.0 |
| op. Right-Turns | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
| op. Heavy Vehicle0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| ometry Group | 5 |  |  | 5 |  | 5 | 5 |  |

## Adjustments Exhibit 17-33:

hLT-adj 0.5
0.5
0.5
0.5

| hRT-adj | -0.7 |  | -0.7 | -0.7 | -0.7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |  |
| hadj, computed | 0.2 | -0.7 | 0.0 | -0.7 | 0.2 |

Worksheet 4 - Departure Headway and Service Time $\qquad$

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Flow rate | 174 | 12 | 165 | 15 | 34 | 2 | 54 | 153 |
| hd, initial value | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 |
| x , initial | 0.15 | 0.01 | 0.15 | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.14 |
| hd, final value | 5.45 | 4.59 | 5.32 | 4.60 | 5.91 | 4.97 | 5.83 | 4.78 |
| x , final value | 0.263 | 0.015 | 0.244 | 0.019 | 0.056 | 0.003 | 0.088 | 0.203 |
| Move-up time, m |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Service Time | 3.1 | 2.3 | 3.0 | 2.3 | 3.6 | 2.7 | 3.5 | 2.5 |

$\qquad$ Worksheet 5 - Capacity and Level of Service $\qquad$
Eastbound
L1 12
Westbound
L1 L2

| Northbound | Southbound |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| L1 L2 | L1 |


| Elow Rate | 174 | 12 | 165 | 15 | 34 | 2 | 54 | 153 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Service Time | 3.1 | 2.3 | 3.0 | 2.3 | 3.6 | 2.7 | 3.5 | 2.5 |
| Utilization, x | 0.263 | 0.015 | 0.244 | 0.019 | 0.056 | 0.003 | 0.088 | 0.203 |
| Dep. headway, hd | 5.45 | 4.59 | 5.32 | 4.60 | 5.91 | 4.97 | 5.83 | 4.78 |
| Capacity | 669 | 600 | 688 | 750 | 567 | 0 | 600 | 765 |
| $95 \%$ Queue Length | 1.1 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.8 |
| Delay | 10.1 | 7.4 | 9.7 | 7.4 | 9.0 | 7.7 | 9.1 | 8.7 |
| LOS | B | A | A | A | A | A | A | A |

Approach:
Delay 9.9

LOS A

```
9.5
A
```

8.9
A
8.8

A
Intersection Delay 9.4 Intersection LOS A


HCS 2010 Signalized Intersection Results Summary


[^26]
## Cumulative without Project

## Highway Capacity Method

HCS 2010 Signalized Intersection Results Summary


| Timer Results | EBL |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { EBT } \\ \hline 2 \end{gathered}$ | WBL |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { WBT } \\ \hline 6 \end{gathered}$ | NBL |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { NBT } \\ \hline 8 \end{gathered}$ | SBL |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { SBT } \\ \hline 4 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assigned Phase | 5 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 7 |  |  |
| Case Number | 2.0 |  | 3.0 | 2.0 |  | 3.0 | 2.0 |  | 3.0 | 2.0 |  | 3.0 |
| Phase Duration, s | 17.3 |  | 58.4 | 11.6 |  | 52.7 | 16.9 |  | 36.4 | 13.6 |  | 33.1 |
| Change Period, ( $\left.Y+R_{c}\right)$, $s$ | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |
| Max Allow Headway ( MAH ), s | 3.0 |  | 0.0 | 3.0 |  | 0.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 | 3.0 |  | 3.0 |
| Queue Clearance Time ( $g s$ ), s | 13.1 |  |  | 7.5 |  |  | 12.7 |  | 34.4 | 9.3 |  | 27.6 |
| Green Extension Time ( $g_{e}$ ), s | 0.2 |  | 0.0 | 0.2 |  | 0.0 | 0.2 |  | 0.0 | 0.2 |  | 1.2 |
| Phase Call Probability | 1.00 |  |  | 0.99 |  |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |
| Max Out Probability | 1.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.73 |  | 1.00 | 0.01 |  | 1.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement Group Results |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Assigned Movement | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Adjusted Flow Rate ( $v$ ), veh/h | 313 | 1112 | 287 | 154 | 1144 | 295 | 312 | 1497 | 65 | 215 | 814 | 346 |
| Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate ( $s$ ), veh/h/ln | 1673 | 1643 | 1531 | 1673 | 1643 | 1530 | 1723 | 1691 | 1577 | 1723 | 1691 | 1573 |
| Queue Service Time ( $g s$ ), s | 11.1 | 22.2 | 17.9 | 5.5 | 24.0 | 19.3 | 10.7 | 32.4 | 3.8 | 7.3 | 17.4 | 25.6 |
| Cycle Queue Clearance Time ( $g_{c}$ ), s | 11.1 | 22.2 | 17.9 | 5.5 | 24.0 | 19.3 | 10.7 | 32.4 | 3.8 | 7.3 | 17.4 | 25.6 |
| Green Ratio ( $\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{C}$ ) | 0.11 | 0.45 | 0.45 | 0.06 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.11 | 0.27 | 0.27 | 0.08 | 0.24 | 0.24 |
| Capacity ( 6 ), veh/h | 371 | 2234 | 694 | 212 | 2001 | 621 | 370 | 1371 | 426 | 275 | 1230 | 381 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ( $X$ ) | 0.843 | 0.498 | 0.414 | 0.727 | 0.572 | 0.475 | 0.842 | 1.092 | 0.152 | 0.781 | 0.662 | 0.907 |
| Back of Queue ( $Q$ ), ft/ln ( 50 th percentile) | 136.1 | 241.2 | 187.4 | 60.9 | 262.9 | 204.4 | 129 | 514.1 | 36.7 | 82.5 | 185.6 | 316.4 |
| Back of Queue ( Q ), veh/ln ( 50 th percentile) | 5.2 | 9.3 | 7.2 | 2.3 | 10.1 | 7.9 | 5.0 | 19.8 | 1.4 | 3.2 | 7.1 | 12.2 |
| Queue Storage Ratio ( $R Q$ ) ( 50 th percentile) | 0.45 | 0.80 | 0.62 | 0.20 | 0.88 | 0.68 | 0.63 | 2.51 | 0.18 | 0.27 | 0.60 | 1.03 |
| Uniform Delay ( $d_{1}$ ), s/veh | 54.5 | 30.6 | 29.2 | 56.4 | 34.8 | 33.1 | 52.5 | 43.8 | 33.3 | 54.2 | 41.0 | 44.1 |
| Incremental Delay ( $d_{2}$ ), s/veh | 10.2 | 0.8 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.2 | 2.6 | 9.3 | 53.5 | 0.1 | 1.8 | 1.1 | 24.1 |
| Initial Queue Delay $\left(d_{3}\right)$, 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 |
| Control Delay ( $d$ ), s/veh | 64.8 | 31.4 | 31.0 | 58.2 | 36.0 | 35.6 | 61.9 | 97.3 | 33.4 | 56.0 | 42.1 | 68.3 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | E | C | C | E | D | D | E | F | C | E | D | E |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | 37.4 |  | D | 38.1 |  | D | 89.2 |  | F | 50.8 |  | D |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Multimodal Results |  | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |
| Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS | 3.5 |  | C | 3.5 |  | C | 3.5 |  | C | 3.5 |  | C |
| Bicycle LOS Score / LOS | 1.4 |  | A | 1.4 |  | A | 1.5 |  | A | 1.2 |  | A |

HCS 2010 Signalized Intersection Results Summary
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HCS 2010 Signalized Intersection Results Summary



E-Mail:

Fax:

ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL (AWSC) ANALYSIS $\qquad$
Analyst:
Agency/Co.: KHR Associates
Date Performed: 8/4/2016
Analysis Time Period: 8:00 - 9:00 A.M.
Intersection: Palos Verdes North
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Cumulative AM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Via Valmonte
North/South Street: Palos Verdes North


## \% Thrus Left Lane

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Configuration | LTR |  | LTR |  | L | T | LTR |  |
| PHE | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Flow Rate | 211 |  | 206 |  | 13 | 499 | 270 |  |
| \% Heavy Veh | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| No. Lanes |  | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |  | 1 |
| Opposing-Lanes |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 2 |
| Conflicting-lanes |  | 2 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| Geometry group |  | 2 |  |  |  | 5 |  | 4 a |

Duration, T 1.00 hrs.


| hRT-adj | -0.6 |  | -0.6 |  | -0.7 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | -0.6 |  |
| hadj, computed | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.5 |

Worksheet 4 - Departure Headway and Service Time $\qquad$


$\qquad$
Analyst:

| Agency/Co.: | KHR Associates |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Performed: | $8 / 4 / 2016$ |
| Analysis Time Period: | $5: 00-6: 00$ P.M. |
| Intersection: | Palos Verdes North |
| Jurisdiction: |  |
| Units: U. S. Customary |  |
| Analysis Year: |  |
| Project ID: Cumulative PM Peak Hour |  |
| East/West Street: | Via Valmonte |
| North/South Street: | Palos Verdes North |



```
% Thrus Left Lane
```

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Configuration | LTR |  | LTR |  | L | T | LTR |  |
| PHE | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Elow Rate | 23 |  | 189 |  | 6 | 389 | 588 |  |
| \% Heavy Veh | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| No. Lanes |  | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |  | 1 |
| Opposing-Lanes |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 2 |
| Conflicting-lanes |  | 2 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| Geometry group |  | 2 |  |  |  | 5 |  | 4 a |

Duration, T 1.00 hrs.
$\qquad$ Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| L1 L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |

Elow Rates:
Total in Lane 23
Left-Turn 0
Right-Turn 0
Prop. Left-Turns 0.0
189

| 6 | 389 | 588 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 6 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Prop. Heavy Vehicle0.0
Geometry Group 2
3 :
$\begin{array}{cr}\text { Adjustments Exhibit } & 17-33: \\ \text { hLT-adj } & 0.2\end{array}$
5
4 a
0.2
0.5
0.2

| hRT-adj | -0.6 |  | -0.6 | -0.7 | -0.6 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |  |
| hadj, computed | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.5 |


|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Elow rate | 23 |  | 189 |  | 6 | 389 | 588 |  |
| hd, initial value | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 |
| x , initial | 0.02 |  | 0.17 |  | 0.01 | 0.35 | 0.52 |  |
| hd, final value | 7.16 |  | 6.54 |  | 6.48 | 5.98 | 5.40 |  |
| $x$, final value | 0.046 |  | 0.34 |  | 0.011 | 0.646 | 0.88 |  |
| Move-up time, m |  |  |  | 0 |  | 3 |  |  |
| Service Time | 5.2 |  | 4.5 |  | 4.2 | 3.7 | 3.4 |  |


|  | Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound |  | Southbound |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 L2 | L1 L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 L2 |
| Flow Rate | 23 | 189 | 6 | 389 | 588 |
| Service Time | 5.2 | 4.5 | 4.2 | 3.7 | 3.4 |
| Utilization, x | 0.046 | 0.343 | 0.011 | 0.646 | 0.881 |
| Dep. headway, hd | 7.16 | 6.54 | 6.48 | 5.98 | 5.40 |
| Capacity | 460 | 556 | 600 | 598 | 668 |
| 95\% Queue Length | 0.1 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 5.2 | 15.9 |
| Delay | 10.5 | 12.9 | 9.3 | 19.4 | 42.9 |
| LOS | B | B | A | C | E |
| Approach: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 10.5 | 12.9 |  | 9.2 | 42.9 |
| LOS | B | B | C |  | E |
| Intersection Delay | 29.7 | Intersect | LOS D |  |  |
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HCS+: Unsignalized Intersections Release 5.6
```

```
Phone:
Fax:
```

E-Mail:

ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL(AWSC) ANALYSIS $\qquad$
Analyst:
Agency/Co.: KHR Associates
Date Performed: 11/15/17
Analysis Time Period: 7:30-8:30 A.M.
Intersection:
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Cumulative AM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Newton Street
North/South Street: Calle Mayor
___ Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics $\qquad$

\% Thrus Left Lane

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| L1 L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |


| Configuration | L | R | TR | L | T |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PHF | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Elow Rate | 77 | 141 | 455 | 135 | 283 |
| $\%$ Heavy Veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. Lanes |  | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |
| Opposing-Lanes | 0 | 2 | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting-lanes | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |  |
| Geometry group | 1 | $3 b$ | 5 |  |  |

Duration, T 1.00 hrs.
$\qquad$ Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| L1 L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |

Flow Rates:
Total in Lane

| 77 | 141 | 455 | 135 | 283 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 77 | 0 | 0 | 135 | 0 |
| 0 | 141 | 98 | 0 | 0 |
| 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
| 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

1
$3 b$
5
Geometry Group
Adjustments Exhibit 17-33:
hLT-adj
0.2
0.2
0.5

| hRT-adj | -0.6 | -0.6 | -0.7 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |  |
| hadj, computed | 0.2 | -0.6 | -0.1 | 0.5 |

Worksheet 4 - Departure Headway and Service Time $\qquad$
$\qquad$

| Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
|  |  | 77 | 141 | 455 |  | 135 | 283 |
| 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 |
|  |  | 0.07 | 0.13 | 0.40 |  | 0.12 | 0.25 |
|  |  | 6.22 | 5.41 | 5.32 |  | 6.15 | 5.64 |
|  |  | 0.133 | 0.212 | 0.673 |  | 0.231 | 0.444 |
|  |  | 2.0 |  | 2.0 |  |  | 3 |
|  |  | 4.2 | 3.4 | 3.3 |  | 3.8 | 3.3 |

$\qquad$ Worksheet 5 - Capacity and Level of Service $\qquad$
Eastbound
L1 L2

Flow Rate
Service Time
Utilization, x
Dep. headway, hd Capacity
95\% Queue Length
Delay
LOS
Approach:
Delay
LOS
Westbound
L1 L2
Northbound
L1

Southbound
L1 L2
L1 L2
$\begin{array}{llll}77 & 141 & 455 & 135\end{array}$

| 4.2 | 3.4 | 3.3 | 3.8 | 3.3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

$\begin{array}{lllll}0.133 & 0.212 & 0.673 & 0.231 & 0.444\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}6.22 & 5.41 & 5.32 & 6.15 & 5.64\end{array}$

| 592 | 671 | 679 | 587 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

$\begin{array}{lllll}0.5 & 0.8 & 5.9 & 0.9 & 2.4\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}10.2 & 9.9 & 19.1 & 10.7 & 12.8\end{array}$
B A C B B

Intersection Delay 14.6
$10.0-19.1$
A C
12.1

B
Intersection LOS B

Phone: E-Mail:

ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL(AWSC) ANALYSIS $\qquad$
Analyst:
Agency/Co.: KHR Associates
Date Performed: 11/15/17
Analysis Time Period: 4:00 - 5:00 P.M.
Intersection:
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Cumulative PM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Newton Street
North/South Street: Calle Mayor
$\qquad$ Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics $\qquad$

|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 L | T | R | L | T | R | I | T | R | L | T | R |
|  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume | 10 | 0 | 0 | 63 | 337 | 62 |  | 310 | 51 | 92 | 337 | 0 |

\% Thrus Left Lane

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 |


| Configuration | L | R | TR | L | T |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PHF | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Flow Rate | 63 | 62 | 361 | 92 | 337 |
| \% Heavy Veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. Lanes |  | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |
| Opposing-Lanes |  | 0 | 2 | 1 |  |
| Conflicting-lanes | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |  |
| Geometry group |  |  | $3 b$ | 5 |  |

Duration, T 1.00 hrs.
$\qquad$ Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| L1 L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 |

Elow Rates:
Total in Lane
$63 \quad 62$
Left-Turn
Right-Turn
Prop. Left-Turns
630
$0 \quad 62 \quad 51$
$\begin{array}{lll}1.0 & 0.0 & 0.0\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lll}0.0 & 1.0 & 0.1\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lll}0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0\end{array}$
1
$3 b$
0.2
0.2
0.5

| hRT-adj | -0.6 | -0.6 | -0.7 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |  |
| hadj, computed | 0.2 | -0.6 | -0.1 | 0.5 |

Worksheet 4 - Departure Headway and Service Time $\qquad$
Eastbound
L1 L2

Flow rate
hd, initial value $3.20 \quad 3.20$
x , initial
hd, final value
$x$, final value
Move-up time, m
Service Time

| Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| 63 | 62 | 361 |  | 92 | 337 |
| 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 |
| 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.32 |  | 0.08 | 0.30 |
| 5.95 | 5.14 | 5.06 |  | 5.70 | 5.20 |
| 0.104 | 0.088 | 0.508 |  | 0.146 | 0.487 |
|  |  | 2.0 |  | 2.3 |  |
| 3.9 | 3.1 | 3.1 |  | 3.4 | 2.9 |

$\qquad$ Worksheet 5 - Capacity and Level of Service $\qquad$

Eastbound
Westbound
L1

Northbound
Southbound
L1 L2

| Elow Rate | 63 | 62 | 361 | 92 | 337 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Service Time | 3.9 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.4 | 2.9 |
| Utilization, x | 0.104 | 0.088 | 0.508 | 0.146 | 0.4 |
| Dep. headway, hd | 5.95 | 5.14 | 5.06 | 5.70 | 5.2 |
| Capacity | 630 | 689 | 708 | 613 | 688 |
| 95\% Queue Length | 0.3 | 0.3 | 3.0 | 0.5 | 2.8 |
| Delay | 9.6 | 8.6 | 13.3 | 9.4 | 12. |
| LOS | A | A | B | A | B |
| Approach: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 9.1 |  | 13.3 | 12.1 |  |
| LOS | A |  | B | B |  |
| Intersection Delay 12.1 | Inte | sectio | LOS B |  |  |


$\qquad$ Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 |

Elow Rates:
Total in Lane $301 \quad 379 \quad 270 \quad 65$
Left-Turn 7
Right-Turn 7
$42 \quad 72$
$72 \quad 65 \quad 0$
Prop. Left-Turns 0.3
$148 \quad 19$
$19 \quad 0 \quad 34$
Prop. Right-Turns 0.
$0.3 \quad 1.0 \quad 0.0$
$0.1 \quad 0.3$
$\begin{array}{ll}0.4 & 0.1 \\ 0.0 & 0.0\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{ll}1.0 & 0.3 \\ 0.0 & 0.0\end{array}$
Prop. Heavy Vehicle0.
Geometry Group 2
Adjustments Exhibit 17-33:
hLT-adj 0.2
2
$\begin{array}{ll}0.4 & 0.1 \\ 0.0 & 0.0\end{array}$
0.2
4 a
5
0.5

| hRT-adj | -0.6 | -0.6 | -0.6 | -0.7 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |
| hadj, computed | -0.1 | -0.2 | 0.0 | 0.5 |

$\qquad$ Worksheet 4 - Departure Headway and Service Time $\qquad$

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Flow rate | 301 |  | 379 |  | 270 |  | 65 | 128 |
| hd, initial value | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 |
| x , initial | 0.27 |  | 0.34 |  | 0.24 |  | 0.06 | 0.11 |
| hd, final value | 6.15 |  | 5.89 |  | 6.59 |  | 7.72 | 7.02 |
| $x$, final value | 0.514 |  | 0.620 |  | 0.49 |  | 0.139 | 0.249 |
| Move-up time, m | 2.0 |  | 2.0 |  | 2.0 |  |  |  |
| Service Time | 4.1 |  | 3.9 |  | 4.6 |  | 5.4 | 4.7 |



HCS+: Unsignalized Intersections Release 5.6

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:

ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL(AWSC) ANALYSIS $\qquad$
Analyst:
Agency/Co.: KHR Associates
Date Performed: 11/15/2017
Analysis Time Period: 4:00-5:00 P.M.
Intersection:
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Cumulative PM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Newton Street
North/South Street: Vista Montana
$\qquad$ Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics $\qquad$

\% Thrus Left Lane

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Configuration | LTR |  | LTR |  | LTR |  | L | TR |
| PHF | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Elow Rate | 129 |  | 323 |  | 173 |  | 69 | 218 |
| \% Heavy Veh | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| No. Lanes |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 2 |
| Opposing-Lanes |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 2 |  | 1 |
| Conflicting-lanes |  | 2 |  | 2 |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| Geometry group |  | 2 |  | 2 |  | 4 a |  | 5 |

Duration, T 1.00 hrs.

Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet $\qquad$
Eastbound
L1 L2
Westbound
L1 L2

| Northbound | Southbound |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| L1 L2 | L1 |

Flow Rates:


| hRT-adj | -0.6 | -0.6 | -0.6 | -0.7 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |
| hadj, computed | 0.0 |  | -0.4 | -0.0 |

$\qquad$ Worksheet 4 - Departure Headway and Service Time $\qquad$

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Flow rate | 129 |  | 323 |  | 173 |  | 69 | 218 |
| hd, initial value | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 |
| $x$, initial | 0.11 |  | 0.29 |  | 0.15 |  | 0.06 | 0.19 |
| hd, final value | 5.75 |  | 5.04 |  | 5.71 |  | 6.51 | 5.83 |
| $x$, final value | 0.206 |  | 0.453 |  | 0.274 |  | 0.125 | 0.353 |
| Move-up time, m | 2.0 |  | 2.0 |  | 2.0 |  |  |  |
| Service Time | 3.8 |  | 3.0 |  | 3.7 |  | 4.2 | 3.5 |



Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:

ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL (AWSC) ANALYSIS $\qquad$
Analyst:
Agency/Co.: KHR Associates
Date Performed: 11/15/2017
Analysis Time Period: 7:45-8:45 A.M.
Intersection:
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Cumulative AM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Newton Street
North/South Street: Madison Street
___ Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics___


Volume

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Louthbound |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| L1 L2 | L1 L2 | L1 |  |


| Configuration | LT | R | LT | R | LT | R | LT | R |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PHF | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Elow Rate | 190 | 5 | 129 | 107 | 23 | 14 | 15 | 41 |
| s Heavy Veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. Lanes |  | 2 |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |
| Opposing-Lanes | 2 | 2 |  | 2 | 2 |  |  |  |
| Conflicting-lanes | 2 |  | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  |
| Geometry group |  | 5 |  | 5 | 5 | 5 |  |  |

Duration, T 1.00 hrs.
$\qquad$ Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet $\qquad$
Eastbound
L1 L2
Westbound


Southbound
L1 L2 L1 L2 L1 L2

## Flow Rates:

Total in Lane 190

## Left-Turn

Right-Turn
Prop. Left-Turns 0.60 .0
Prop. Right-Turns $0.0 \quad 1.0$
Prop. Heavy Vehicle0.0 0.0
Geometry Group 5 5
$33:$

## Adjustments Exhibit 17-33:

hLT-adj
0.5
0.5
0.5
0.5

| hRT-adj | -0.7 | -0.7 |  | -0.7 | -0.7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |  |
| hadj, computed | 0.3 | -0.7 | 0.0 | -0.7 | 0.3 |


|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Flow rate | 190 | 5 | 129 | 107 | 23 | 14 | 15 | 41 |
| hd, initial value | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 |
| $x$, initial | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.10 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.04 |
| hd, final value | 5.21 | 4.23 | 4.93 | 4.21 | 5.86 | 4.85 | 5.93 | 4.83 |
| $x$, final value | 0.275 | 0.006 | 0.177 | 0.125 | 0.037 | 0.019 | 0.025 | 0.055 |
| Move-up time, m |  | 3 |  |  |  | 3 |  | 3. |
| Service Time | 2.9 | 1.9 | 2.6 | 1.9 | 3.6 | 2.6 | 3.6 | 2.5 |


|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Flow Rate | 190 | 5 | 129 | 107 | 23 | 14 | 15 | 41 |
| Service Time | 2.9 | 1.9 | 2.6 | 1.9 | 3.6 | 2.6 | 3.6 | 2.5 |
| Utilization, x | 0.275 | 0.006 | 0.177 | 0.125 | 0.037 | 0.019 | 0.025 | 0.055 |
| Dep. headway, hd | 5.21 | 4.23 | 4.93 | 4.21 | 5.86 | 4.85 | 5.93 | 4.83 |
| Capacity | 679 | 500 | 717 | 823 | 575 | 700 | 750 | 683 |
| 95\% Queue Length | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Delay | 9.9 | 7.0 | 8.7 | 7.5 | 8.8 | 7.6 | 8.8 | 7.8 |
| LOS | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| Approach: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 9.8 |  | 8.2 |  | 8.4 |  | 8.1 |  |
| LOS | A |  | A |  | A |  | A |  |
| Intersection Delay | 8.8 |  | Intersection LOS A |  |  |  |  |  |

HCS+: Unsignalized Intersections Release 5.6

Phone:
E-Mail:

Fax:

ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL(AWSC) ANALYSIS $\qquad$
Analyst:
Agency/Co.: KHR Associates
Date Performed: 11/15/2017
Analysis Time Period: 7:45 - 8:45 A.M.
Intersection:
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Cumulative PM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Newton Street
North/South Street: Madison Street
Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments

Volume
\% Thrus Left Lane

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Configuration | LT | R | LT | R | LT | R | LT | R |
| PHE | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Flow Rate | 178 | 12 | 74 | 28 | 34 | 2 | 54 | 153 |
| \% Heavy Veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. Lanes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Opposing-Lanes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Conflicting-lanes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Geometry group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Duration, T 1.00 hrs .
$\qquad$ Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| L1 L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 |

Elow Rates:

hLT-adj
0.5
0.5
0.5
0.5

| hRT-adj | -0.7 |  | -0.7 |  | -0.7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | -0.7 |  |
| hadj, computed | 0.2 | -0.7 | 0.1 | -0.7 | 0.2 |

$\qquad$ Worksheet 4 - Departure Headway and Service Time $\qquad$

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Elow rate | 178 | 12 | 74 | 28 | 34 | 2 | 54 | 153 |
| hd, initial value | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 |
| x , initial | 0.16 | 0.01 | 0.07 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.14 |
| hd, final value | 5.35 | 4.49 | 5.40 | 4.58 | 5.69 | 4.76 | 5.64 | 4.59 |
| $x$, final value | 0.265 | 0.015 | 0.111 | 0.036 | 0.054 | 0.003 | 0.085 | 0.195 |
| Move-up time, m |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  | 3 |
| Service Time | 3.0 | 2.2 | 3.1 | 2.3 | 3.4 | 2.5 | 3.3 | 2.3 |


|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Flow Rate | 178 | 12 | 74 | 28 | 34 | 2 | 54 | 153 |
| Service Time | 3.0 | 2.2 | 3.1 | 2.3 | 3.4 | 2.5 | 3.3 | 2.3 |
| Utilization, x | 0.265 | 0.015 | 0.111 | 0.036 | 0.054 | 0.003 | 0.085 | 0.195 |
| Dep. headway, hd | 5.35 | 4.49 | 5.40 | 4.58 | 5.69 | 4.76 | 5.64 | 4.59 |
| Capacity | 685 | 1200 | 673 | 700 | 680 | 0 | 675 | 765 |
| 95\% Queue Length | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.7 |
| Delay | 10.0- | 7.3 | 8.8 | 7.4 | 8.7 | 7.5 | 8.9 | 8.4 |
| LOS | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| Approach: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 9.8 |  | 8.4 |  | 8.6 |  | 8.5 |  |
| LOS | A |  | A |  | A |  | A |  |
| Intersection Delay | 9.0 |  | Intersection LOS A |  |  |  |  |  |
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## 2019 Project Plus Cumulative Development Conditions Highway Capacity Method
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General Information
Agency

| Analyst |  | An |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Jurisdiction | Torrance California | Tin |
| Urban Street | Pacific Coast Highway | An |
| Intersection | Hawthorne Boulevard | Fil |
| Project Description |  |  |

Project Description

Intersection Information
Duration, h Area Type PHF Analysis Period
File Name $\quad$ 1-PCH-Hawthorne Cumu PM.xus

| Demand Information | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Demand ( $v$ ), veh/h | 254 | 1147 | 364 | 198 | 998 | 254 | 330 | 961 | 77 | 423 | 1305 | 430 |


| Signal Information |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\pi}{=}$ |  |  | $1.3$ |  |  | $\vec{\nabla}$ |  | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cycle, s | 120.0 | Reference Phase | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | End |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 4.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 14.7 | 1.3 0 | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |


| Timer Results | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assigned Phase | 5 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 8 | 7 | 4 |
| Case Number | 2.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 |
| Phase Duration, $s$ | 16.2 | 56.0 | 14.0 | 53.8 | 18.7 | 30.0 | 20.0 | 31.3 |
| Change Period, $(Y+R c), s$ | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Max Allow Headway $(M A H), s$ | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Queue Clearance Time $\left(g_{s}\right), s$ | 12.0 |  | 9.8 |  | 14.5 | 27.1 | 18.0 | 29.3 |
| Green Extension Time $\left(g_{e}\right), s$ | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Probability | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Max Out Probability | 0.37 |  | 0.03 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |


| Movement Group Results | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Assigned Movement | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Adjusted Flow Rate ( $v$ ), veh/h | 282 | 1274 | 404 | 220 | 1109 | 282 | 367 | 1068 | 86 | 470 | 1450 | 478 |
| Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate ( $s$ ), veh/h/ln | 1673 | 1643 | 1531 | 1673 | 1643 | 1530 | 1723 | 1691 | 1576 | 1723 | 1691 | 1572 |
| Queue Service Time ( $g s$ ), s | 10.0 | 26.7 | 27.4 | 7.8 | 23.0 | 18.3 | 12.5 | 25.1 | 5.4 | 16.0 | 27.3 | 27.3 |
| Cycle Queue Clearance Time ( $g_{c}$ ), s | 10.0 | 26.7 | 27.4 | 7.8 | 23.0 | 18.3 | 12.5 | 25.1 | 5.4 | 16.0 | 27.3 | 27.3 |
| Green Ratio ( $g / C$ ) | 0.10 | 0.43 | 0.43 | 0.08 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.12 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.13 | 0.23 | 0.23 |
| Capacity ( $c$ ), veh/h | 341 | 2135 | 663 | 280 | 2044 | 634 | 422 | 1099 | 342 | 459 | 1155 | 358 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ( $X$ ) | 0.827 | 0.597 | 0.610 | 0.787 | 0.543 | 0.445 | 0.869 | 0.971 | 0.250 | 1.023 | 1.256 | 1.335 |
| Back of Queue ( $Q$ ), ftlln ( 50 th percentile) | 119.3 | 291.3 | 292.1 | 87.2 | 251.1 | 192.2 | 158.9 | 317.9 | 53.4 | 254 | 627.2 | 703.5 |
| Back of Queue ( Q ), veh/ln ( 50 th percentile) | 4.6 | 11.2 | 11.2 | 3.4 | 9.7 | 7.4 | 6.1 | 12.2 | 2.1 | 9.8 | 24.1 | 27.1 |
| Queue Storage Ratio ( $R Q$ ) ( 50 th percentile) | 0.40 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.29 | 0.84 | 0.64 | 0.78 | 1.55 | 0.26 | 0.83 | 2.04 | 2.29 |
| Uniform Delay ( $d_{1}$ ), s/veh | 54.9 | 33.7 | 33.9 | 55.6 | 33.7 | 32.0 | 51.7 | 46.6 | 38.9 | 52.0 | 46.3 | 46.3 |
| Incremental Delay ( $d_{2}$ ), s/veh | 7.4 | 1.2 | 4.1 | 1.9 | 1.0 | 2.3 | 14.3 | 20.4 | 0.1 | 48.0 | 122.4 | 168.8 |
| Initial Queue Delay ( $d_{3}$ ), 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 |
| Control Delay ( $d$ ), s/veh | 62.3 | 34.9 | 38.1 | 57.5 | 34.8 | 34.3 | 66.0 | 67.0 | 39.1 | 100.0 | 168.7 | 215.2 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | E | C | D | E | C | C | E | E | D | F | F | F |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | 39.5 |  | D | 37.8 |  | D | 65.2 |  | E | 164.5 |  | F |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | 84.4 |  |  |  |  |  | F |  |  |  |  |  |


| Multimodal Results | EB |  | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS | 3.5 | C | 3.5 | C | 3.5 | C | 3.5 | C |
| Bicycle LOS Score /LOS | 1.6 | A | 1.4 | A | 1.3 | A | 1.8 | A |
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| Timer Results | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assigned Phase |  | 2 |  | 6 |  | 8 |  | 4 |
| Case Number |  | 6.0 |  | 6.0 |  | 12.0 |  | 12.0 |
| Phase Duration, s |  | 32.5 |  | 32.5 |  | 5.7 |  | 6.7 |
| Change Period, ( $Y+R_{c}$ ), s |  | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |  | 4.0 |
| Max Allow Headway ( MAH ), s |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 3.0 |  | 3.0 |
| Queue Clearance Time ( $g s$ ), $s$ |  |  |  |  |  | 2.6 |  | 3.1 |
| Green Extension Time ( $g_{e}$ ), s |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.1 |
| Phase Call Probability |  |  |  |  |  | 0.29 |  | 0.46 |
| Max Out Probability |  |  |  |  |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |

Movement Group Results
Approach Movement
Assigned Movement
Adjusted Flow Rate ( $v$ ), veh/h
Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate ( $s$ ), veh/h/ln
Queue Service Time ( $g s$ ), s
Cycle Queue Clearance Time ( $g c$ ), s
Green Ratio ( $g / C$ )
Capacity ( $c$ ), veh/h
Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ( $X$ )
Back of Queue ( Q ), ft/ln ( 50 th percentile)
Back of Queue ( Q), veh/ln ( 50 th percentile)
Queue Storage Ratio ( $R Q$ ) ( 50 th percentile)
Uniform Delay ( $d_{1}$ ), s/veh
Incremental Delay ( $d_{2}$ ), s/veh
Initial Queue Delay ( $d_{3}$ ), s/veh
Control Delay ( $d$ ), s/veh
Level of Service (LOS)
Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS
Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS

| EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| 38 | 469 | 0 | 23 | 426 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 977 | 1900 | 0 | 939 | 1900 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 0.7 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 2.1 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| 2.8 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 2.1 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| 0.63 | 0.63 |  | 0.63 | 0.63 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 734 | 2409 |  | 707 | 2409 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.051 | 0.195 | 0.000 | 0.032 | 0.177 | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |  | 0.000 |  |
| 2.7 | 11.3 | 0 | 1.7 | 10.1 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |
| 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| 0.03 | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.05 | 0.00 |  | 0.00 |  |  | 0.00 |  |
| 4.0 | 3.4 |  | 4.0 | 3.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |
| 4.1 | 3.6 |  | 4.1 | 3.6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A | A |  | A | A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.7 |  | A | 3.6 |  | A | 22.3 |  | C | 21.3 |  | C |
| 5.0 |  |  |  |  |  | A |  |  |  |  |  |


| Multimodal Results | EB |  | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS | 2.0 | B | 2.0 | B | 2.8 | C | 2.8 | C |
| Bicycle LOS Score / LOS | 0.9 | A | 0.9 | A | 0.5 | A | 0.6 | A |
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| Timer Results | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assigned Phase | 5 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 8 | 7 | 4 |
| Case Number | 2.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 |
| Phase Duration, s | 18.0 | 61.2 | 8.8 | 52.0 | 11.4 | 30.0 | 20.0 | 38.6 |
| Change Period, ( $Y+R_{c}$ ), s | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Max Allow Headway ( MAH ), s | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 2.9 |
| Queue Clearance Time ( $g s$ ), s | 14.0 |  | 5.3 |  | 7.6 | 27.2 | 17.0 | 26.3 |
| Green Extension Time ( $g_{\mathrm{e}}$ ), s | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.1 |
| Phase Call Probability | 1.00 |  | 0.79 |  | 0.97 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Max Out Probability | 1.00 |  | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.44 |


| Movement Group Results | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Assigned Movement | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 3 | 8 |  | 7 | 4 |  |
| Adjusted Flow Rate ( $v$ ), veh/h | 174 | 295 | 92 | 47 | 224 | 172 | 107 | 1071 |  | 288 | 1125 |  |
| Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate ( $s$ ), veh/h/ln | 1723 | 1810 | 1608 | 1723 | 1810 | 1607 | 1774 | 1691 |  | 1774 | 1691 |  |
| Queue Service Time ( $g s$ ), s | 12.0 | 15.0 | 4.9 | 3.3 | 11.9 | 10.2 | 5.6 | 25.2 |  | 15.0 | 24.3 |  |
| Cycle Queue Clearance Time ( $g c$ ), s | 12.0 | 15.0 | 4.9 | 3.3 | 11.9 | 10.2 | 5.6 | 25.2 |  | 15.0 | 24.3 |  |
| Green Ratio ( $g / C$ ) | 0.12 | 0.48 | 0.48 | 0.04 | 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.28 | 0.22 |  | 0.37 | 0.29 |  |
| Capacity ( $c$ ), veh/h | 201 | 863 | 767 | 68 | 724 | 642 | 204 | 1099 |  | 300 | 1461 |  |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ( $X$ ) | 0.866 | 0.342 | 0.120 | 0.693 | 0.309 | 0.268 | 0.525 | 0.974 |  | 0.958 | 0.770 |  |
| Back of Queue ( Q ), ft/ln ( 50 th percentile) | 170.4 | 181.9 | 46.5 | 38.9 | 143.5 | 104.1 | 61.9 | 320.7 |  | 247.7 | 260.8 |  |
| Back of Queue ( $Q$ ), veh/ln ( 50 th percentile) | 6.6 | 7.0 | 1.9 | 1.5 | 5.5 | 4.2 | 2.4 | 12.3 |  | 9.5 | 10.0 |  |
| Queue Storage Ratio ( $R Q$ ) ( 50 th percentile) | 0.57 | 0.61 | 0.16 | 0.13 | 0.48 | 0.36 | 0.30 | 1.57 |  | 0.81 | 0.85 |  |
| Uniform Delay ( $d_{1}$ ), s/veh | 54.4 | 26.5 | 23.1 | 57.7 | 30.8 | 30.1 | 34.9 | 46.7 |  | 33.1 | 39.1 |  |
| Incremental Delay ( $d_{2}$ ), s/veh | 23.2 | 1.1 | 0.3 | 4.6 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 21.0 |  | 40.3 | 2.3 |  |
| Initial Queue Delay ( $d_{3}$ ), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Control Delay ( $d$ ), s/veh | 77.6 | 27.6 | 23.4 | 62.3 | 31.9 | 31.2 | 35.7 | 67.7 |  | 73.3 | 41.4 |  |
| Level of Service (LOS) | E | C | C | E | C | C | D | E |  | E | D |  |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | 42.4 |  | D | 34.8 |  | C | 64.8 |  |  | 47.9 |  | D |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | 51.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Multimodal Results | EB |  | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS | 3.3 | C | 3.3 | C | 2.5 | B | 2.4 | B |
| Bicycle LOS Score / LOS | 1.4 | A | 1.2 | A | 1.1 | A | 1.3 | A |
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```
HCS+: Unsignalized Intersections Release 5.6
```

Phone: Fax:
E-Mail:

ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL(AWSC) ANALYSIS $\qquad$
Analyst:
Agency/Co.: KHR Associates
Date Performed: 8/4/2016
Analysis Time Period: 8:00 - 9:00 A.M.
Intersection: Palos Verdes North
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Cumulative AM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Via Valmonte
North/South Street: Palos Verdes North
$\qquad$ Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics $\qquad$

|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
|  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume | 10 | 211 | 0 |  | 206 | 0 | 13 | 499 | 42 | 0 | 271 | 0 |

\% Thrus Left Lane

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Configuration | LTR |  | LTR |  | L | T | LTR |  |
| PHF | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Elow Rate | 211 |  | 206 |  | 13 | 499 | 271 |  |
| \% Heavy Veh | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| No. Lanes |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  | 1 |
| Opposing-Lanes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Conflicting-lanes |  |  |  |  |  | , |  | 1 |
| Geometry group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 a |

Duration, T 1.00 hrs.

Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| L1 L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 |

Flow Rates:

| Total in Lane | 211 | 206 | 13 | 499 | 271 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Left-Turn | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 |
| Right-Turn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| op. Left-Turns | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| op. Right-Turns | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| op. Heavy Vehicle0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |

$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { Prop. Heavy Vehicle0.0 } 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0\end{array}$
Geometry Group 2
Adjustments Exhibit 17-33:
hLT-adj
0.2
0.2
0.5
0.2

| hRT-adj | -0.6 | -0.6 | -0.7 | -0.6 |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |  |
| hadj, computed | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.5 |


|  | Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 L2 | L1 L2 | L1 L2 | L1 L2 |
| Elow rate | 211 | 206 | 13499 | 271 |
| hd, initial value | $3.20 \quad 3.20$ | $3.20 \quad 3.20$ | $3.20 \quad 3.20$ | $3.20 \quad 3.20$ |
| x , initial | 0.19 | 0.18 | $0.01 \quad 0.44$ | 0.24 |
| hd, final value | 7.08 | 7.10 | 7.096 .58 | 6.72 |
| $x$, final value | 0.415 | 0.406 | $0.026 \quad 0.913$ | 0.506 |
| Move-up time, m | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.3 | 2.0 |
| Service Time | 5.1 | 5.1 | 4.8 4.3 | 4.7 |

$\qquad$ Worksheet 5 - Capacity and Level of Service $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound |  | Southbound |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L1 L2 | L1 L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 L2 |
| 211 | 206 | 13 | 499 | 271 |
| 5.1 | 5.1 | 4.8 | 4.3 | 4.7 |
| 0.415 | 0.406 | 0.026 | 0.913 | 0.506 |
| 7.08 | 7.10 | 7.09 | 6.58 | 6.72 |
| 502 | 502 | 433 | 548 | 531 |
| 2.1 | 2.0 | 0.1 | 17.9 | 3.0 |
| 15.1 | 14.9 | 10.0- | 61.0 | 16.6 |
| C | B | A | F | C |


| Flow Rate | 211 | 206 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Service Time | 5.1 | 5.1 |
| Utilization, x | 0.415 | 0.406 |
| Dep. headway, hd | 7.08 | 7.10 |
| Capacity | 502 | 502 |
| 95\% Queue Length | 2.1 | 2.0 |
| Delay | 15.1 | 14.9 |
| LoS | C | B |

Approach:
Delay 15.1
LOS C
Intersection Delay 34.4
14.9
B
59.7
F
Intersection LOS D
16.6

C

```
HCS+: Unsignalized Intersections Release 5.6
```

Phone:
E-Mail:

Fax:
$\qquad$
Analyst:
Agency/Co.: KHR Associates
Date Performed: 8/4/2016
Analysis Time Period: 5:00 - 6:00 P.M.
Intersection: Palos Verdes North
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Cumulative PM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Via Valmonte
North/South Street: Palos Verdes North
$\qquad$ Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics $\qquad$


Volume
\% Thrus Left Lane

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Configuration | LTR |  | LTR |  | L | T | LTR |  |
| PHF | 1.00 |  | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  |
| Elow Rate | 23 |  | 189 |  | 6 | 390 | 590 |  |
| \% Heavy Veh | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| No. Lanes |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 2 |  | 1 |
| Opposing-Lanes |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 2 |
| Conflicting-lanes |  | 2 |  | 2 |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| Geometry group |  | 2 |  | 2 |  | 5 |  | 4 a |
| Duration, T 1.00 | hrs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 |

Elow Rates:

| Total in Lane | 23 | 189 | 6 | 390 | 590 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Left-Turn | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| Right-Turn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| op. Left-Turns | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| op. Right-Turns | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| op. Heavy Vehicle0.0 | 2 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| ometry Group | 2 |  |  | 5 | 0.0 |

Adjustments Exhibit 17-33:
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { hLT-adj } & 0.2 & 0.2 & 0.5 & 0.2\end{array}$

| hRT-adj | -0.6 | -0.6 | -0.7 | -0.6 |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |  |
| hadj, computed | 0.0 |  | 0.0 |  | 0.5 |

$\qquad$ Worksheet 4 - Departure Headway and Service Time $\qquad$

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Elow rate | 23 |  | 189 |  | 6 | 390 | 590 |  |
| hd, initial value | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 |
| x , initial | 0.02 |  | 0.17 |  | 0.01 | 0.35 | 0.52 |  |
| hd, final value | 7.17 |  | 6.55 |  | 6.49 | 5.98 | 5.40 |  |
| $x$, final value | 0.046 |  | 0.344 |  | 0.011 | 0.648 | 0.88 |  |
| Move-up time, m |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  | 0 |
| Service Time | 5.2 |  | 4.5 |  | 4.2 | 3.7 | 3.4 |  |

$\qquad$ Worksheet 5 - Capacity and Level of Service $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 |


| Flow Rate | 23 | 189 | 6 | 390 | 590 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Service Time | 5.2 | 4.5 | 4.2 | 3.7 | 3.4 |
| Utilization, x | 0.046 | 0.344 | 0.011 | 0.648 | 0.885 |
| Dep. headway, hd | 7.17 | 6.55 | 6.49 | 5.98 | 5.40 |
| Capacity | 460 | 556 | 600 | 600 | 670 |
| $95 \%$ Queue Length | 0.1 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 5.3 | 16.2 |
| Delay | 10.5 | 13.0 | 9.3 | 19.5 | 43.9 |
| LOS | B | B | A | C | E |

Approach:

Delay 10.5
LOS B
B
Intersection Delay 30.2
$13.0 \quad 19.3$
B C
Intersection LOS D

HCS 2010 Signalized Intersection Results Summary


HCS 2010 Signalized Intersection Results Summary


| Timer Results | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assigned Phase | 5 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 8 | 7 | 4 |
| Case Number | 1.1 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 |
| Phase Duration, $s$ | 8.0 | 65.9 | 10.0 | 67.8 | 20.0 | 24.1 | 20.0 | 24.1 |
| Change Period, $(Y+R c), s$ | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Max Allow Headway $(M A H), s$ | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Queue Clearance Time $(g), s$ | 3.1 |  | 4.5 |  | 16.3 | 15.3 | 17.8 | 18.3 |
| Green Extension Time $(g e), s$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 1.8 |
| Phase Call Probability | 0.67 |  | 0.99 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Max Out Probability | 0.0 |  | 0.00 |  | 1.00 | 0.05 | 1.00 | 0.17 |


| Movement Group Results | EB |  |  | WB |  |  | NB |  |  | SB |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Assigned Movement | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Adjusted Flow Rate ( $v$ ), veh/h | 33 | 801 | 263 | 157 | 1190 | 367 | 258 | 416 | 151 | 234 | 499 | 32 |
| Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate ( $s$ ), veh/h/ln | 1740 | 1739 | 1608 | 1689 | 1739 | 1608 | 1774 | 1773 | 1607 | 1774 | 1773 | 1573 |
| Queue Service Time ( $g s$ ), s | 1.1 | 17.4 | 11.4 | 2.5 | 29.2 | 16.6 | 14.3 | 13.3 | 10.4 | 15.8 | 16.3 | 2.1 |
| Cycle Queue Clearance Time ( $g_{c}$ ), s | 1.1 | 17.4 | 11.4 | 2.5 | 29.2 | 16.6 | 14.3 | 13.3 | 10.4 | 15.8 | 16.3 | 2.1 |
| Green Ratio ( g/C ) | 0.55 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.57 | 0.53 | 0.53 | 0.30 | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.13 | 0.17 | 0.17 |
| Capacity ( c), veh/h | 243 | 1794 | 830 | 780 | 1850 | 856 | 310 | 595 | 270 | 237 | 595 | 264 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio ( $X$ ) | 0.137 | 0.447 | 0.317 | 0.201 | 0.643 | 0.429 | 0.832 | 0.698 | 0.560 | 0.991 | 0.838 | 0.122 |
| Back of Queue ( Q ), ftlln ( 50 th percentile) | 10.2 | 174 | 104.7 | 23.3 | 292.5 | 152.3 | 189.6 | 149 | 102.1 | 271.1 | 192 | 20 |
| Back of Queue ( Q ), veh/ln ( 50 th percentile) | 0.4 | 6.7 | 4.2 | 0.9 | 11.3 | 6.1 | 7.3 | 5.8 | 4.1 | 10.5 | 7.4 | 0.8 |
| Queue Storage Ratio ( $R Q$ ) ( 50 th percentile) | 0.03 | 0.58 | 0.36 | 0.08 | 0.98 | 0.52 | 0.93 | 0.73 | 0.52 | 0.89 | 0.63 | 0.07 |
| Uniform Delay ( $d_{1}$ ), s/veh | 16.3 | 18.3 | 16.8 | 13.3 | 20.0 | 17.0 | 35.9 | 47.1 | 45.9 | 51.9 | 48.4 | 42.4 |
| Incremental Delay ( $d_{2}$ ), s/veh | 0.1 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 1.6 | 16.3 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 55.8 | 5.2 | 0.1 |
| Initial Queue Delay ( $d_{3}$ ), 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 |
| Control Delay ( $d$ ), s/veh | 16.4 | 19.1 | 17.8 | 13.4 | 21.7 | 18.6 | 52.2 | 48.1 | 46.5 | 107.8 | 53.5 | 42.5 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | B | B | B | B | C | B | D | D | D | F | D | D |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | 18.7 |  | B | 20.3 |  | C | 49.1 |  | D | 69.7 |  | E |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | 33.9 |  |  |  |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |


| Multimodal Results | EB |  | WB |  | NB |  | SB |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS | 2.9 | C | 2.9 | C | 3.1 | C | 3.0 | C |
| Bicycle LOS Score / LOS | 1.4 | A | 1.9 | A | 1.2 | A | 1.1 | A |

HCS 2010 Signalized Intersection Results Summary
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Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:

ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL(AWSC) ANALYSIS $\qquad$
Analyst:
Agency/Co.: KHR Associates
Date Performed: 11/15/17
Analysis Time Period: 7:30-8:30 A.M.
Intersection:
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Cumulative AM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Newton Street
North/South Street: Calle Mayor
$\qquad$ Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics $\qquad$

Volume
10 Lane

```
% Thrus Left Lane
```

Eastbound
Westbound Northbound

Southbound
L1 L2 L1 L2
L1 L2

| Configuration | L | R | TR | L | T |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PHE | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Flow Rate | 77 | 141 | 455 | 135 | 283 |
| $\%$ Heavy Veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. Lanes |  | 2 |  | 1 | 2 |
| Opposing-Lanes | 0 | 2 | 1 |  |  |
| Conflicting-lanes | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |  |
| Geometry group |  | 1 | $3 b$ | 5 |  |

Geometry group
Duration, T 1.00 hrs.
$\qquad$ Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 |

Flow Rates:

hRT-adj
hHV-adj
hadj, computed
$-0.6$
$1.7 \quad-0.6$
$1.7 \quad 1.7$
$\begin{array}{lllll}0.2 & -0.6 & -0.1 & 0.5 & 0.0\end{array}$

Worksheet 4 - Departure Headway and Service Time $\qquad$
$\qquad$

| Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| 77 | 141 | 455 |  | 135 | 283 |
| 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 |
| 0.07 | 0.13 | 0.40 |  | 0.12 | 0.25 |
| 6.22 | 5.41 | 5.32 |  | 6.15 | 5.64 |
| 0.133 | 0.212 | 0.673 |  | 0.231 | 0.444 |
| 2.0 |  | 2.0 |  | 2.3 |  |
| 4.2 | 3.4 | 3.3 |  | 3.8 | 3.3 | Worksheet 5 - Capacity and Level of Service $\qquad$


| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |

Elow Rate
Service Time Utilization, $x$
Dep. headway, hd
Capacity
95\% Queue Length
Delay
LOS
Approach:
Delay
LOS

| 77 | 141 | 455 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 4.2 | 3.4 | 3.3 |
| 0.133 | 0.212 | 0.673 |
| 6.22 | 5.41 | 5.32 |
| 592 | 671 | 679 |
| 0.5 | 0.8 | 5.9 |
| 10.2 | 9.9 | 19.1 |
| B | A | C |

$\begin{array}{lllll}4.2 & 3.4 & 3.3 & 3.8 & 3.3\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}0.133 & 0.212 & 0.673 & 0.231 & 0.444\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}6.22 & 5.41 & 5.32 & 6.15 & 5.64\end{array}$

| 592 | 671 | 679 | 587 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

$\begin{array}{lllll}0.5 & 0.8 & 5.9 & 0.9 & 2.4\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}10.2 & 9.9 & 19.1 & 10.7 & 12.8\end{array}$
B A C
135283

| Southbound <br> L1 |  |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | L2 |
| 135 | 283 |
| 3.8 | 3.3 |
| 0.231 | 0.444 |
| 6.15 | 5.64 |
| 587 | 643 |
| 0.9 | 2.4 |
| 10.7 | 12.8 |
| B | B |

    \(10.0-\quad 19.1\)
    12.1
    A
    C
        B
    Intersection Delay 14.6
Intersection LOS B

```
HCS+: Unsignalized Intersections Release 5.6
```

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL(AWSC) ANALYSIS $\qquad$
Analyst:
Agency/Co.: KHR Associates
Date Performed: 11/15/17
Analysis Time Period: 4:00-5:00 P.M.
Intersection:
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Cumulative PM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Newton Street
North/South Street: Calle Mayor
$\qquad$ Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics $\qquad$
 \% Thrus Left Lane

|  | Eastbound L1 L2 | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Configuration |  | L | R | TR |  | L | T |
| PHF |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |  | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Flow Rate |  | 63 | 62 | 361 |  | 92 | 337 |
| \% Heavy Veh |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| No. Lanes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Opposing-Lanes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Conflicting-lanes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Geometry group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Duration, T 1.00 hrs.
Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 |

Elow Rates:
Total in Lane $\begin{array}{llll}63 & 62 & 361 & 92\end{array}$
Left-Turn

| 63 | 0 | 0 | 92 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Right-Turn
Prop. Left-Turns
Prop. Right-Turns
$0 \quad 62 \quad 51$
920
00
$\begin{array}{lllll}1.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 1.0 & 0.0\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}0.0 & 1.0 & 0.1 & 0.0 & 0.0\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0\end{array}$ 1

3b
5
Geometry Group
Adjustments Exhibit 17-33:
hLT-adj
0.2
0.2
0.5
hRT-adj
hHV-adj
hadj, computed
$-0.6$
$1.7-0.6$
1.7
$-0.7$
1.7
$\begin{array}{lllll}0.2 & -0.6 & -0.1 & 0.5 & 0.0\end{array}$

Worksheet 4 - Departure Headway and Service Time $\qquad$

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Elow rate |  |  | 63 | 62 | 361 | L2 | 92 | 12 337 |
| hd, initial value | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 |
| x , initial |  |  | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.32 |  | 0.08 | 0.30 |
| hd, final value |  |  | 5.95 | 5.14 | 5.06 |  | 5.70 | 5.20 |
| $x$, final value |  |  | 0.104 | 0.088 | 0.508 |  | 0.146 | 0.487 |
| Move-up time, m |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 3 |
| Service Time |  |  | 3.9 | 3.1 | 3.1 |  | 3.4 | 2.9 |
| Worksheet 5 - Capacity and Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Flow Rate |  |  | 63 | 62 | 361 |  | 92 | 337 |
| Service Time |  |  | 3.9 | 3.1 | 3.1 |  | 3.4 | 2.9 |
| Utilization, x |  |  | 0.104 | 0.088 | 0.508 |  | 0.146 | 0.487 |
| Dep. headway, hd |  |  | 5.95 | 5.14 | 5.06 |  | 5.70 | 5.20 |
| Capacity |  |  | 630 | 689 | 708 |  | 613 | 688 |
| 95\% Queue Length |  |  | 0.3 | 0.3 | 3.0 |  | 0.5 | 2.8 |
| Delay |  |  | 9.6 | 8.6 | 13.3 |  | 9.4 | 12.8 |
| LOS |  |  | A | A | B |  | A | B |
| Approach: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay |  |  | 9.1 |  | 13.3 |  | 12.1 |  |
| LOS |  |  | A |  | B |  | B |  |
| Intersection Delay | 12.1 |  | Intersection LOS B |  |  |  |  |  |

```
HCS+: Unsignalized Intersections Release 5.6
```

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$ ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL(AWSC) ANALYSIS $\qquad$
Analyst:
Agency/Co.: KHR Associates
Date Performed: 11/15/2017
Analysis Time Period: 7:30-8:30 A.M.
Intersection:
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Cumulative AM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Newton Street
North/South Street: Vista Montana
$\qquad$ Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics $\qquad$

|  | 1 | bo |  |  | bo |  |  | thb |  |  | h |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
|  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume | $1 \overline{79}$ | 145 | 7 | 4 | 189 | 149 | 72 | 179 | 21 | 65 | 94 |  |

```
% Thrus Left Lane
```

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound <br>  <br>  <br> L1 |  | L2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Duration, T 1.00 hrs.
$\qquad$ Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 |


| Flow Rates: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total in Lane | 301 | 382 | 272 | 65 | 128 |
| Left-Turn | 79 | 44 | 72 | 65 | 0 |
| Right-Turn | 77 | 149 | 21 | 0 | 34 |
| Prop. Left-Turns | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop. Right-Turns | 0.3 | 0.4 |  | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Prop. Heavy Vehicle0.0 |  | 0.0 | 2 | 0.0 | 0.3 |
| Geometry Group | 2 |  |  | $4 a$ | 0.0 |
| Adjustments Exhibit $17-33:$ | 0.2 |  | 0.2 |  | 0.2 |


| hRT-adj | -0.6 | -0.6 |  | -0.6 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | -0.7 |
| hadj, computed | -0.1 | -0.2 | 0.0 | 0.5 |

$\qquad$ Worksheet 4 - Departure Headway and Service Time

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Elow rate | 301 |  | 382 |  | 272 |  | 65 | 128 |
| hd, initial value | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 |
| x , initial | 0.27 |  | 0.34 |  | 0.24 |  | 0.06 | 0.11 |
| hd, final value | 6.17 |  | 5.91 |  | 6.61 |  | 7.75 | 7.04 |
| $x$, final value | 0.516 |  | 0.627 |  | 0.500 |  | 0.140 | 0.250 |
| Move-up time, m |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| Service Time | 4.2 |  | 3.9 |  | 4.6 |  | 5.4 | 4.7 |

$\qquad$ Worksheet 5 - Capacity and Level of Service $\qquad$

|  | Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 L2 | L1 L2 | L1 L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Flow Rate | 301 | 382 | 272 | 65 | 128 |
| Service Time | 4.2 | 3.9 | 4.6 | 5.4 | 4.7 |
| Utilization, x | 0.516 | 0.627 | 0.500 | 0.140 | 0.250 |
| Dep. headway, hd | 6.17 | 5.91 | 6.61 | 7.75 | 7.04 |
| Capacity | 579 | 606 | 544 | 464 | 512 |
| 95\% Queue Length | 3.1 | 4.8 | 2.9 | 0.5 | 1.0 |
| Delay | 15.7 | 18.7 | 16.2 | 11.7 | 12.1 |
| LOS | C | C | C | B | B |

Approach:

| Delay | 15.7 |
| :--- | :--- |
| LOS | C |

$18.7 \quad 16.2$
C C
12.0

B
Intersection Delay 16.2
Intersection LOS C

```
HCS+: Unsignalized Intersections Release 5.6
```

Phone:
Eax:
E-Mail:
ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL(AWSC) ANALYSIS $\qquad$
Analyst:
Agency/Co.: KHR Associates
Date Performed: 11/15/2017
Analysis Time Period: 4:00 - 5:00 P.M.
Intersection:
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Cumulative PM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Newton Street
North/South Street: Vista Montana
$\qquad$ Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics $\qquad$

\% Thrus Left Lane

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2

Duration, T 1.00 hrs.
$\qquad$ Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |


| Elow Rates: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Total in Lane | 129 | 327 | 175 | 69 | 218 |
| Left-Turn | 40 | 38 | 10 | 69 | 0 |
| Right-Turn | 10 | 216 | 17 | 0 | 53 |
| Prop. Left-Turns | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
| Prop. Right-Turns | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Prop. Heavy Vehicle 0.0 | 2 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Geometry Group | 2 |  |  | $4 a$ | 0.0 |
| Adjustments Exhibit $17-33:$ | 0.2 |  | 0.2 |  | 0.2 |


| hRT-adj | -0.6 | -0.6 | -0.6 | -0.7 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |
| hadj, computed | 0.0 |  | -0.4 | -0.0 |

Worksheet 4 - Departure Headway and Service Time $\qquad$
$\qquad$

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Flow rate | 129 |  | 327 |  | 175 |  | 69 | 218 |
| hd, initial value | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 |
| x , initial | 0.11 |  | 0.29 |  | 0.16 |  | 0.06 | 0.19 |
| hd, final value | 5.77 |  | 5.06 |  | 5.72 |  | 6.53 | 5.85 |
| $x$, final value | 0.20 |  | 0.459 |  | 0.278 |  | 0.125 | 0.354 |
| Move-up time, m | 2.0 |  | 2.0 |  | 2.0 |  |  |  |
| Service Time | 3.8 |  | 3.1 |  | 3.7 |  | 4.2 | 3.6 |


|  | Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 L2 | L1 L2 | L1 L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Flow Rate | 129 | 327 | 175 | 69 | 218 |
| Service Time | 3.8 | 3.1 | 3.7 | 4.2 | 3.6 |
| Utilization, x | 0.207 | 0.459 | 0.278 | 0.125 | 0.354 |
| Dep. headway, hd | 5.77 | 5.06 | 5.72 | 6.53 | 5.85 |
| Capacity | 614 | 711 | 625 | 531 | 623 |
| 95\% Queue Length | 0.8 | 2.5 | 1.1 | 0.4 | 1.6 |
| Delay | 10.3 | 12.3 | 10.9 | 10.2 | 11.8 |
| LOS | B | B | B | B | B |
| Approach: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 10.3 | 12.3 | 10.9 |  | . 4 |
| LOS | B | B | B | B |  |
| Intersection Delay | 11.5 | Intersect | LOS B |  |  |

```
HCS+: Unsignalized Intersections Release 5.6
```

Phone:
Eax:
E-Mail:
ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL(AWSC) ANALYSIS $\qquad$
Analyst:
Agency/Co.: KHR Associates
Date Performed: 11/15/2017
Analysis Time Period: 7:45-8:45 A.M.
Intersection:
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Cumulative AM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Newton Street
North/South Street: Madison Street
___ Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics $\qquad$

\% Thrus Left Lane

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 |



Duration, T 1.00 hrs.


| hRT-adj | -0.7 |  | -0.7 | -0.7 | -0.7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |  |
| hadj, computed | 0.3 | -0.7 | 0.0 | -0.7 | 0.3 |
| -0.7 | 0.4 | -0.7 |  |  |  |

$\qquad$ Worksheet 4 - Departure Headway and Service Time $\qquad$

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Flow rate | 194 | 5 | 133 | 107 | 23 | 14 | 15 | 41 |
| hd, initial value | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 |
| X, initial | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.12 | 0.10 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.04 |
| hd, final value | 5.21 | 4.23 | 4.94 | 4.21 | 5.88 | 4.87 | 5.95 | 4.85 |
| x, final value | 0.281 | 0.006 | 0.182 | 0.125 | 0.038 | 0.019 | 0.025 | 0.055 |
| Move-up time, m |  | 2.3 |  | 2.3 |  | 2.3 | 2.3 |  |
| Service Time | 2.9 | 1.9 | 2.6 | 1.9 | 3.6 | 2.6 | 3.7 | 2.6 |

$\qquad$ Worksheet 5 - Capacity and Level of Service $\qquad$

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Elow Rate | 194 | 5 | 133 | 107 | 23 | 14 | 15 | 41 |
| Service Time | 2.9 | 1.9 | 2.6 | 1.9 | 3.6 | 2.6 | 3.7 | 2.6 |
| Utilization, x | 0.281 | 0.006 | 0.182 | 0.125 | 0.038 | 0.019 | 0.025 | 0.055 |
| Dep. headway, hd | 5.21 | 4.23 | 4.94 | 4.21 | 5.88 | 4.87 | 5.95 | 4.85 |
| Capacity | 693 | 500 | 739 | 823 | 575 | 700 | 750 | 683 |
| 95\% Queue Length | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Delay | 9.9 | 7.0 | 8.7 | 7.5 | 8.8 | 7.7 | 8.8 | 7.8 |
| LOS | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| Approach: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 9.9 |  | 8.2 |  | 8.4 |  | 8.1 |  |
| LOS | A |  | A |  | A |  | A |  |
| Intersection Delay | 8.8 |  | Intersection LOS A |  |  |  |  |  |

```
HCS+: Unsignalized Intersections Release 5.6
```

Phone:
Fax:
E-Mail:
$\qquad$
Analyst:
Agency/Co.: KHR Associates
Date Performed: 11/15/2017
Analysis Time Period: 7:45-8:45 A.M.
Intersection:
Jurisdiction:
Units: U. S. Customary
Analysis Year:
Project ID: Cumulative PM Peak Hour
East/West Street: Newton Street
North/South Street: Madison Street
$\qquad$ Worksheet 2 - Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics $\qquad$

|  | Eastbound |  |  | Westbound |  |  | Northbound |  |  | Southbound |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
|  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume | 157 | 123 | 12 | 8 | 171 | 28 |  | 18 | 2 | 38 | 16 | 153 |

\% Thrus Left Lane

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Configuration | LT | R | LT | R | LT | R | LT | R |
| PHF | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Elow Rate | 180 | 12 | 189 | 28 | 34 | 2 | 54 | 153 |
| \% Heavy Veh | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| No. Lanes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Opposing-Lanes |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  | 2 |
| Conflicting-lanes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Geometry group |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |  | 5 |
| Duration, T 1.00 | hrs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

$\qquad$ Worksheet 3 - Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet $\qquad$

| Eastbound | Westbound | Northbound | Southbound |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |

Elow Rates:

| Total in Lane 180 | 12 | 189 | 28 | 34 | 2 | 54 | 153 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Left-Turn 57 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 38 | 0 |
| Right-Turn 0 | 12 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 153 |
| op. Left-Turns 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.0 |
| op. Right-Turns 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 |
| op. Heavy Vehicle0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| ometry Group | 5 |  |  |  | 5 |  | 5 |
| justments Exhibit 17-33: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| hLT-adj | 0.5 |  |  |  | 0.5 |  | 0.5 |


| hRT-adj | -0.7 |  | -0.7 | -0.7 | -0.7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| hHV-adj | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.7 |  |
| hadj, computed | 0.2 | -0.7 | 0.0 | -0.7 | 0.2 |

Worksheet 4 - Departure Headway and Service Time $\qquad$
$\qquad$ -

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Flow rate | 180 | 12 | 189 | 28 | 34 | 2 | 54 | 153 |
| hd, initial value | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.20 |
| x, initial | 0.16 | 0.01 | 0.17 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.14 |
| hd, final value | 5.50 | 4.65 | 5.37 | 4.63 | 6.02 | 5.09 | 5.94 | 4.89 |
| x, final value | 0.275 | 0.015 | 0.282 | 0.036 | 0.057 | 0.003 | 0.089 | 0.208 |
| Move-up time, m |  | 2.3 |  | 2.3 |  | 2.3 | 2.3 |  |
| Service Time | 3.2 | 2.3 | 3.1 | 2.3 | 3.7 | 2.8 | 3.6 | 2.6 |

$\qquad$ Worksheet 5 - Capacity and Level of Service $\qquad$

|  | Eastbound |  | Westbound |  | Northbound |  | Southbound |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 | L1 | L2 |
| Elow Rate | 180 | 12 | 189 | 28 | 34 | 2 | 54 | 153 |
| Service Time | 3.2 | 2.3 | 3.1 | 2.3 | 3.7 | 2.8 | 3.6 | 2.6 |
| Utilization, x | 0.275 | 0.015 | 0.282 | 0.036 | 0.057 | 0.003 | 0.089 | 0.208 |
| Dep. headway, hd | 5.50 | 4.65 | 5.37 | 4.63 | 6.02 | 5.09 | 5.94 | 4.89 |
| Capacity | 643 | 600 | 675 | 700 | 567 | 0 | 600 | 729 |
| 95\% Queue Length | 1.1 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.8 |
| Delay | 10.3 | 7.4 | 10.2 | 7.5 | 9.1 | 7.8 | 9.2 | 8.9 |
| LOS | B | A | B | A | A | A | A | A |
| Approach: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Delay | 10.1 |  | 9.8 |  | 9.0 |  | 9.0 |  |
| LOS | B |  | A |  | A |  | A |  |
| Intersection Delay | 9.6 |  | Intersection LOS A |  |  |  |  |  |

HCS 2010 Signalized Intersection Results Summary


HCS 2010 Signalized Intersection Results Summary
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