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# Transportation Impact Analysis Hudson Ranch Mineral Recovery <br> County of Imperial, California <br> June 22, 2021 

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The following traffic impact analysis has been prepared to determine the potential impacts to the local circulation system due to the addition of truck and employee traffic related to construction and post construction Day-to-Day Operations of the proposed Hudson Ranch Mineral Recovery project in the County of Imperial, California. This report includes the following sections:

- Project Description
- Existing Conditions
- Analysis Approach and Methodology
- Significance Criteria
- Analysis of Existing Conditions
- Trip Generation / Distribution / Assignment
- During Construction Analysis
- Day-to-Day Operations Analysis
- Project Access Discussion
- Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) Assessment
- Conclusions and Recommendations


### 2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Energy-Source Minerals LLC (ES Minerals), is proposing to construct and operate a commercial lithium hydroxide production plant in the Salton Sea geothermal field known as Project ATLiS. The facility will process geothermal brine from the neighboring Hudson Ranch Power I Geothermal Plant (HR1) to produce lithium hydroxide, and zinc and manganese products which will be sold commercially.

The proposed Project consists of the following:

- Construction and operation of a facility to extract lithium, manganese, zinc and other commercially viable substances from geothermal brine and process the extracted substances to produce commercial quantities of lithium, and to the extent possible, manganese and zinc products and other products;
- Construction and operation of brine supply and return pipelines and other associated interconnection facilities with the HR1 powerplant;
- Construction of a primary access road from McDonald Road (approximately 500 ft . west of the HR 1 entrance) and an emergency access entrance only from Davis Road;
- Paving of McDonald Road from Highway 111 to English Road;
- Construction of a "laydown yard" that will also support temporary offices during construction as well as serving as a truck management yard during operations, and
- Construction of offices, repair facilities, shipping and receiving facilities and other infrastructure components.

The ATLiS plant \& facilities will be located about 3 miles west-southwest of the community of Niland near the southwest corner of the existing HR1 power plant site. The property is zoned for manufacturing (medium industrial) (M2G-PE), and is located entirely within the existing Salton Sea Geothermal Overlay Zone (see Figure 3). The proposed ATLiS plant site and associated plant facilities would be built within an existing approximately 37 -acre project area, with the addition of the 15 acres located at the southeast corner of Davis Road and McDonald Road, and approximately 40 acres on the south of the current HR 1 plant site.

Access is via McDonald Road.
Figure 2-1 depicts the project vicinity with Figure 2-2 depicts a more details project area map and Figure 2-3 shows the project's site plan.
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### 3.0 Existing Conditions

### 3.1 Existing Street Network

Following is a brief description of the street segments within the project area. Figure 3-1 illustrates the existing conditions, including the lane geometry, for the key intersections in the study area.

State Route 111 (SR-111) is classified as a State Highway/Expressway on the Imperial County General Plan Circulation Element. SR-111 is a north-south highway connecting the three largest cities in Imperial County and runs from I-10 in Riverside County to the international border. Outside the towns of Calipatria and Niland, SR-111 is constructed as a two-lane undivided north-south roadway, providing one lane of travel per direction and the posted speed limit is generally 65 mph .

Hazard Road is an east-west route through Imperial County. Hazard Road is currently an unpaved two-lane roadway within the Project vicinity.

Sinclair Road is an east-west route through Imperial County. Sinclair Road is currently a paved two-lane undivided roadway within the Project vicinity.

English Road is a north-south route through Imperial County. English Road is currently an unpaved two-lane roadway north of Sinclair Road and constructed as a two-lane paved roadway south of Sinclair Road.

McDonald Road is an east-west route though Imperial County. Currently, McDonald Road is an unpaved two-lane roadway west of SR-111 of Sinclair Road and constructed as a two-lane paved roadway east of SR-111. It is proposed to improve the intersection at SR-111 and pave McDonald Road between SR-111 and the site (west of SR-111) prior to construction of the project and thus the "Operations" analysis reflects these improvements.

### 3.2 Existing Traffic Volumes

Daily traffic (ADT) volumes on study area segments along SR-111 were obtained from the Caltrans Traffic Census Program for Year 2017, the latest available as of the date of this report. AM and PM peak hour intersection turning movement volume counts at study area intersections were commissioned by LLG Engineers in September 2019. Table 3-1 summarizes the segment ADT volumes on all the study area segments. It should be noted that all segment ADT volumes were applied a growth factor of $2 \%$ per year to represent Year 2021 conditions. In addition, it should be noted that for the unpaved segments along McDonald Road and Sinclair Road, the ADTs were estimated based on a relationship that the PM peak hour volumes comprise approximately $10 \%$ of the ADT.

Figure 3-2 depicts the existing traffic volumes on both an ADT and peak hour basis. Appendix $\boldsymbol{A}$ contains the manual intersection count sheets and latest Caltrans traffic volumes.

## Table 3-1 <br> Existing Traffic Volumes

| Street Segment | Source | ADT $^{\text {a }}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| SR-111 |  |  |
| North of Hazard Road | Caltrans | 3,800 |
| Hazard Road to McDonald Road | Caltrans | 3,800 |
| McDonald Road to Sinclair Road | Caltrans | 3,800 |
| South of Sinclair Road | Caltrans | 6,400 |
| McDonald Road | LLG | 270 E |
| Project Site to English Road | LLG | 220 E |
| English Road to SR-111 |  |  |
| Sinclair Road | LLG | 320 E |
| English Road to SR-111 |  |  |

## Footnotes:

a. Average Daily Traffic Volume.
b. A $2 \%$ growth factor per year ( $8 \%$ ) was applied to the 2017 Caltrans segment ADTs to reflect 2021 conditions.

E - Estimated volumes since road is unpaved.
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### 4.0 Analysis Approach and Methodology

### 4.1 Project Study Area

The following intersections and segments were analyzed in this study and were chosen since they will carry the majority of project truck traffic.

## Intersections:

1. SR 111 / Hazard Road
2. SR 111 / McDonald Road
3. SR 111 / Sinclair Road
4. English Road / McDonald Road
5. English Road / Sinclair Road

## Segments:

SR 111:

- North of Hazard Road
- Hazard Road to McDonald Road
- McDonald Road to Sinclair Road
- South of Sinclair Road


## McDonald Road:

- Project Site to English Road (currently unpaved)
- English Road to SR 111 (currently unpaved)


## Sinclair Road:

- English Road to SR 111


## Analysis Scenarios

The following scenarios are analyzed in this report:

- Existing
- Existing + Construction traffic;
- Existing + Operations traffic;
- Existing + Operations + Cumulative Growth traffic.


### 4.2 Analysis Methodology

The operations of the project area intersections and segments are characterized using the concept of "Level of Service" (LOS). LOS is the term used to denote the different operating conditions which occur on a given roadway segment under various traffic volume loads. It is a qualitative measure used to describe a quantitative analysis taking into account factors such as roadway geometries, signal phasing, speed, travel delay, freedom to maneuver, and safety. LOS provides an index to the operational qualities of a roadway segment or an intersection. LOS designations range from A
through F, with LOS A representing the best operating conditions and LOS F representing the worst operating conditions. LOS designation is reported differently for signalized and unsignalized intersections, as well as for roadway segments.

Table 4-1 summarizes the description for each level of service. Table 4-2 depicts the criteria, which are based on the average control delay for any particular minor movement (unsignalized intersections).

Table 4-1
Intersection Level of Service Descriptions

| Level of Service | Description |
| :---: | :--- |
| A | Occurs when progression is extremely favorable and most vehicles arrive during the green <br> phase. Most vehicles do not stop at all. Short cycle lengths may also contribute to low delay. |
| B | Generally occurs with good progression and/or short cycle lengths. More vehicles stop than <br> for LOS A, causing higher levels of average delay. |
| C | Generally results when there is fair progression and/or longer cycle lengths. Individual cycle <br> failures may begin to appear in this level. The number of vehicles stopping is significant at <br> this level, although many still pass through the intersection without stopping. |
| D | Generally results in noticeable congestion. Longer delays may result from some combination <br> of unfavorable progression, long cycle lengths, or high volume-to-capacity ratios. Many <br> vehicles stop, and the proportion of vehicles not stopping declines. Individual cycle failures <br> are noticeable. |
| E | Considered to be the limit of acceptable delay. These high delay values generally indicate <br> poor progression, long cycle lengths, and high volume-to-capacity ratios. Individual cycle <br> failures are frequent occurrences. |
| F | Considered to be unacceptable to most drivers. This condition often occurs with over <br> saturation i.e. when arrival flow rates exceed the capacity of the intersection. It may also <br> occur at high volume-to-capacity ratios below 1.00 with many individual cycle failures. Poor <br> progression and long cycle lengths may also be major contributing causes to such delay <br> levels. |

Table 4-2
Unsignalized Intersection LOS \& Delay Ranges

| LOS | Delay (seconds/vehicle) |
| :---: | :---: |
| A | $\leq 10.0$ |
| B | 10.1 to 15.0 |
| C | 15.1 to 25.0 |
| D | 25.1 to 35.0 |
| E | 35.1 to 50.0 |
| F | $\geq 50.1$ |

Source: 2000 Highway Capacity Manual

### 4.3 Street Segments

Street segments were analyzed based upon the comparison of ADT to the County of Imperial Roadway Classifications, Levels of Service (LOS) and Average Daily Traffic (ADT) table (see Table 4-3 below). Table 4-3 provides segment capacities for different street classifications, based on traffic volumes and roadway characteristics. Segment analysis is a comparison of ADT volumes and an approximate daily capacity on the subject roadway.

The County does not have a Two-Lane Expressway capacity. Therefore, for segments along SR-111, $40 \%$ capacity of a 6-lane Prime Arterial was utilized to calculate level of service.

Table 4-3
Imperial County Standard Street Classification Average Daily Vehicle Trips

| Road |  | Level of Service W/ADT* |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Class | X-Section | A | B | C | D | E |
| Expressway | $128 / 210$ | 30,000 | 42,000 | 60,000 | 70,000 | 80,000 |
| Prime Arterial | $106 / 136$ | 22,200 | 37,000 | 44,600 | 50,000 | 57,000 |
| Minor Arterial | $82 / 102$ | 14,800 | 24,700 | 29,600 | 33,400 | 37,000 |
| Major Collector (Collector) | $64 / 84$ | 13,700 | 22,800 | 27,400 | 30,800 | 34,200 |
| Minor Collector (Local Collector) | $40 / 70$ | 1,900 | 4,100 | 7,100 | 10,900 | 16,200 |
| Residential Street | $40 / 60$ | $*$ | $*$ | $<1,500$ | $*$ | $*$ |
| Residential Cul-de-Sac / Loop Street | $40 / 60$ | $76 / 96$ | 5,000 | 10,000 | 14,000 | 17,000 |
| Industrial Collector | $44 / 64$ | 2,500 | 5,000 | 7,000 | 8,500 | 20,000 |
| Industrial Local Street |  | $*$ | $*, 000$ |  |  |  |

* Levels of service are not applied to residential streets since their primary purpose is to serve abutting lots, not carry through traffic. Levels of service normally apply to roads carrying through traffic between major trip generators and attractors. It should be noted that for segments along SR111, the capacities of a 6-lane expressway were reduced by one-third and utilized to calculate level of service.


### 5.0 SigNificance Criteria

The County of Imperial does not have published significance criteria. However, the County General Plan does state that the level of service (LOS) goal for intersections and roadway segments is to operate at LOS C or better. Therefore, if an intersection or segment degrades from LOS C or better to LOS D or worse with the addition of project traffic, the impact is considered significant. If the location operates at LOS D or worse with and without project traffic, the impact is considered significant if the project causes the intersection delta to increase by more than two (2) seconds, or the V/C ratio to increase by more than 0.02 . These amounts are consistent with those used in the City of El Centro and the County of Imperial in numerous traffic studies.

Table 5-1
Traffic Impact Significant Thresholds

| Level of Service with <br> Project $^{\text {a }}$ | Allowable Increase Due to Project Impacts ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Freeways |  |  | Roadway Segments |  | Intersections |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | V/C | Speed (mph) | V/C | Speed (mph) | Delay (sec.) | Delay (min.) |
| D, E \& F <br> (or ramp meter delays <br> above 15 minutes) | 0.01 |  | 0.02 |  | 2 |  |

## Footnotes:

a. All level of service measurements are based upon HCM procedures for peak-hour conditions. However, V/C ratios for Roadway Segments may be estimated on an ADT/24-hour traffic volume. The acceptable LOS for freeways, roadways, and intersections is generally "D" ("C" for undeveloped or not densely developed locations per jurisdiction definitions). For metered freeway ramps, LOS does not apply. However, ramp meter delays above 15 minutes are considered excessive.
b. If a proposed project's traffic causes the values shown in the table to be exceeded, the impacts are deemed to be significant. These impact changes may be measured from appropriate computer programs or expanded manual spreadsheets. The project applicant shall then identify feasible mitigations (within the Traffic Impact Study [TIS] report) that will maintain the traffic facility at an acceptable LOS. If the LOS with the proposed project becomes unacceptable (see note a above), or if the project adds a significant amount of peak hour trips to cause any traffic queues to exceed on- or off-ramp storage capacities, the project applicant shall be responsible for mitigating significant impact changes.
c. The allowable increase in delay at a ramp meter with more than 15 minutes of delay and freeway LOS E is 2 minutes and at LOS F is 1 minute.

## General Notes:

1. V/C = Volume to Capacity Ratio
2. Speed $=$ Arterial speed measured in miles per hour
3. Delay = Average stopped delay per vehicle measured in seconds for intersections, or minutes for ramp meters.
4. LOS $=$ Level of Service

### 6.0 AnAlysis of Existing Conditions

### 6.1 Peak Hour Intersection Levels of Service

The project study area is located in a rural setting and all intersections are unsignalized. As seen in Table 6-1, all study area intersections are calculated to currently operate at LOS B or better during both the AM and PM peak hours.

## Table 6-1 <br> Existing Intersection Operations

| Intersection | Control Type | Peak <br> Hour | Existing |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Delay ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | LOS ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |
| 1. SR-111 / Hazard Road | TWSC ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | AM | 0.0 | A |
|  |  | PM | 0.0 | A |
| 2. SR-111 / McDonald Road | TWSC | AM | 8.9 | A |
|  |  | PM | 8.9 | A |
| 3. English Road / McDonald Road | TWSC | AM | 9.0 | A |
|  |  | PM | 0.0 | A |
| 4. English Road / Sinclair Road | TWSC | AM | 0.7 | A |
|  |  | PM | 1.0 | A |
| 5. SR-111 / Sinclair Road | TWSC | AM | 10.2 | B |
|  |  | PM | 9.6 | A |
|  |  |  | UNSIGNALIZED |  |
| Footnotes: |  |  | Delay LOS |  |
| a. Delay per vehicle in seconds |  |  | $0.0 \leq 10.0 \quad$ A |  |
| c. TWSC - Minor street STOP Controlled intersection. Minor street left-turn |  |  |  | в |
|  |  |  |  | C |
| TWSC - Two-Way STOP Controlled intersection. |  |  |  | D |
|  |  |  | 35.1 | E |
|  |  |  |  | F |

### 6.2 Daily Street Segment Levels of Service

As described above, the project study area is located in a rural setting and all segments are two-lane facilities. As seen in Table 6-2, all study area segments are calculated to currently operate at LOS A on a daily basis.

Table 6-2
Existing Street Segment Operations

| Street Segment | Functional Roadway <br> Classification $^{\text {a }}$ | Capacity <br> (LOS E) $^{\text {b }}$ | ADT $^{\text {c }}$ | LOS $^{\mathrm{d}}$ | V/C $^{\text {e }}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SR-111 |  |  |  |  |  |
| North of Hazard Road | 2-Ln Expressway | 22,700 | 3,800 | A | 0.167 |
| Hazard Road to McDonald Road | 2-Ln Expressway | 22,700 | 3,800 | A | 0.167 |
| McDonald Road to Sinclair Road | 2-Ln Expressway | 22,700 | 3,800 | A | 0.167 |
| South of Sinclair Road | 2-Ln Expressway | 22,700 | 6,400 | A | 0.282 |
| McDonald Road | 2-Ln Roadway | 1,500 | 270 | A | 0.180 |
| Project Site to English Road | 2-Ln Roadway | 1,500 | 220 | A | 0.147 |
| English Road to SR-111 | 2-Ln Roadway | 1,500 | 320 | A | 0.213 |
| Sinclair Road |  |  |  |  |  |
| English Road to SR-111 |  |  |  |  |  |

## Footnotes:

a. County of Imperial roadway classification
b. Roadway capacity corresponding to Level of Service E from Imperial County Standard Street Classification, Average Daily Vehicle Trips table.
c. Average Daily Traffic volumes
d. Level of Service
e. Volume / Capacity ratio.

### 7.0 TRIP Generation/Distribution/Assignment

### 7.1 Construction Trip Generation

Project traffic generation is based on site-specific trip generating characteristics provided by the applicant. The Project consists of two parts: During Construction, and Day-to-Day Operations.

In calculating daily trip generation for the construction portion of the project the total construction staff and truck activity was obtained from project description. Peak hour traffic volumes assume that half of workers will arrive/depart in the AM/PM peak hours. However, a meaningful number of worker trips may arrive/depart outside the peak hours due to earlier start times. While detailed construction schedules have yet to be established, these assumptions are based on experience with similar projects. To be conservative, it was assumed that no carpooling between workers was provided. These conservative assumptions are intended to represent a reasonably worst-case scenario for AM/PM peak hour traffic. In addition, 10 trips per day ( 20 ADT) was added to account for miscellaneous trips such as deliveries).

Based on these assumptions, the employee and miscellaneous portion of the construction phase would generate a maximum of 300 ADT, with 74 trips during the AM peak hour and 72 trips during the PM peak hour. Fifteen (15) trucks are estimated during construction. A passenger car equivalence factor (PCE) of 2.5 is applied to these trips for the purposes of the analysis to account for the reduced performance characteristics (stopping, starting, maneuvering, etc.) of heavy vehicles in the traffic flow. The trucks will generate an additional 75.

Table $7-1$ is a summary of the peak Project construction traffic. As shown on Table 7-1 the Construction portion of the Project would generate a total of 375 ADT with 84 total AM peak hour trips and 82 total PM peak hour trips.

### 7.2 Day-to-Day Operations Trip Generation

Trip generation for the Day-to-Day Operations portion of the project was also obtained from project description. Peak hour traffic volumes assume that half of workers would arrive/depart in the AM/PM peak hours. However, a meaningful number of worker trips may arrive/depart outside the peak hours due to earlier start times. While detailed schedules have yet to be established, these assumptions are based on experience with similar projects. To be conservative, it was assumed that no carpooling between workers was provided. These conservative assumptions are intended to represent a reasonably worst-case scenario for AM/PM peak hour traffic. In addition, 10 trips per day ( 20 ADT ) was added to account for miscellaneous trips such as deliveries) during the Day-toDay Operations portion of the project.

Based on these assumptions, the employee and miscellaneous portion of the operations would generate a maximum of 104 ADT, with 32 trips during the AM peak hour and 34 trips during the PM peak hour. Fifteen (15) trucks are estimated to generated during the Day-to-Day Operations. A passenger car equivalence factor (PCE) of 2.5 is applied to these trips for the purposes of the
analysis to account for the reduced performance characteristics (stopping, starting, maneuvering, etc.) of heavy vehicles in the traffic flow. The trucks will generate an additional 75.

Table 7-2 is a summary of the peak Day-to-Day Operations portion of the project. As shown on Table 7-2, a total of 179 ADT with 47 total AM peak hour trips and 55 total PM peak hour trips.

Table 7-1
Construction Trip Generation

| Trip Type | Daily Total (ADT) ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |
| Employees (140) ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 280 | 70 | 0 | 70 | 0 | 70 | 70 |
| Trucks (w/ PCE) ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 75 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| Misc. Trips | 20 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Total | 375 | 77 | 7 | 84 | 6 | 76 | 82 |

Footnotes:
a. ADT = Average Daily Traffic (24-hour total bi-directional traffic on a roadway segment).
b. Assumes half of total employees begin or leave shift during peak hour.
c. $\mathrm{PCE}=$ Passenger Car Equivalent (2.5), used to reflect the additional impacts of heavy vehicles in the technical analyses (15 Inbound Trucks *2 $($ In + Out $) * 2.5(\mathrm{PCE})=75$ total trips.

Table 7-2 shows the Day-to-Day Operations traffic after construction is complete. As compared to Table 7-1, the Operations traffic is substantially less than the construction traffic, which validates the assertion that analysis of the construction impacts would represent the worst-case potential traffic impacts of the project.

Table 7-2
Day-to-Day Operations Trip Generation

| Trip Type | Daily Total <br> (ADT) $^{\mathbf{a}}$ | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |
| Employees (42) | 84 | 30 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 30 | 30 |
| Trucks (w/ PCE) | 75 | 10 | 5 | 15 | 13 | 8 | 21 |
| Misc. Trips/Deliveries | 20 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 9}$ | $\mathbf{4 1}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{4 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{4 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 5}$ |

Footnotes:
a. ADT = Average Daily Traffic (24-hour total bi-directional traffic on a roadway segment).
b. Assumes half of total employees begin or leave shift during peak hour.
c. $\mathrm{PCE}=$ Passenger Car Equivalent (2.5), used to reflect the additional impacts of heavy vehicles in the technical analyses (15 Inbound Trucks * 2 $($ In + Out $) * 2.5($ PCE $)=75$ total trips.

### 7.3 Trip Distribution

It should be noted that separate distributions were derived for the Construction and Operations phases of the project. It is also noted that during the construction phase of the project, McDonald Road will not be a viable option for construction traffic since it will be unpaved. Construction traffic from the south will utilize the paved Sinclair Road as opposed to the unpaved McDonald Road as east / west access to reach the site during construction. It should be noted that for the Operations distribution, McDonald Road will be paved and would serve as the primary road utilized by project traffic.

### 7.3.1 During Construction - Employee and Truck Construction Traffic Distribution

It is initially anticipated that the majority of construction workers and trucks will be from the proximate local population centers of Calipatria, Brawley, and El Centro. The majority of employee traffic ( $85 \%$ ) is anticipated to be to/from south of the site, from the local labor pool utilizing SR-111 as the primary route to work. This traffic will use Sinclair Road as the east/west road to reach the construction site/

Figure 7-1a shows the distribution of construction employee passenger car as well as any miscellaneous trips that would occur during the day. Figure 7-1b shows the distribution of construction truck traffic.

### 7.3.2 Day-to-Day Operations - Employee and Truck Traffic Distribution

It is initially anticipated that the majority of construction workers will be from the proximate local population centers of Calipatria, Brawley, and El Centro. The majority of employee traffic (85\%) is anticipated to be to/from south of the site, from the local labor pool utilizing SR-111 as the primary route to work. It should be detailed that the majority of operations traffic are utilizing the intersection of SR-111 and McDonald Road as the primary access from SR-111.

Figure 7-2a shows the distribution of employee passenger car operations traffic as well as any miscellaneous trips that would occur during the day. Figure 7-1b shows the distribution of construction truck traffic.

### 7.4 Trip Assignment

Separate trip assignments were prepared for each trip type and project phase based on the distribution percentages detailed above.

The Project construction employee vehicle traffic assignment is shown on Figure 7-3. Figure 7-4 shows the Project construction truck traffic assignment. Figure $7-5$ depicts the total Project construction traffic assignment. The Project operations employee vehicle traffic assignment is shown on Figure 7-6. Figure 7-7 shows the Project operations truck traffic assignment. Figure 7-8 depicts the total Project operations traffic assignment.
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### 8.0 ANALYSIS

### 8.1 Existing + Construction Project Analysis

### 8.1.1 Intersection Operations

Table $8-\mathbf{1}$ summarizes the intersection operations throughout the project study area during the construction phase of the project. This table shows that all of the intersections in the study area are calculated to operate at LOS B or better during the AM and PM peak hours.

### 8.1.2 Segment Analysis

Table 8-2 summarizes the street segment operations throughout the project study area during the construction phase of the project. This table shows that all of the street segments in the study area are forecasted to operate at LOS A on a daily basis.

Table 8-1
Existing + Construction Intersection Operations


Table 8-2
Existing + Construction Traffic Street Segment Operations

| Street Segment | Functional Roadway <br> Classification $^{\text {a }}$ | LOS E <br> Capacity $^{\mathrm{b}}$ | ADT $^{\text {c }}$ | LOS $^{\mathrm{d}}$ | V/C $^{\mathrm{e}}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SR-111 |  |  |  |  |  |
| North of Hazard Road | 2-Ln Expressway | 22.700 | 3,853 | A | 0.170 |
| Hazard Road to McDonald Road | 2-Ln Expressway | 22,700 | 3,845 | A | 0.169 |
| McDonald Road to Sinclair Road | 2-Ln Expressway | 22,700 | 3,800 | A | 0.167 |
| South of Sinclair Road | 2-Ln Expressway | 22,700 | 6,720 | A | 0.230 |
| McDonald Road |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Site to English Road | 2-Ln Roadway | 1,500 | 645 | A | 0.430 |
| English Road to SR-111 | 2-Ln Roadway | 1,500 | 220 | A | 0.147 |
| Sinclair Road |  |  |  |  |  |
| English Road to SR-111 | 2-Ln Roadway | 1,500 | 642 | A | 0.427 |

## Footnotes:

a. County of Imperial roadway classification
b. Roadway capacity corresponding to Level of Service E from Imperial County Standard Street Classification, Average Daily Vehicle Trips table. Forty percent ( $40 \%$ ) of capacity utilized for SR-111 segments.
c. Average Daily Traffic volumes
d. Level of Service
e. Volume / Capacity ratio.


### 9.0 Project Operations Analysis

### 9.1 Existing + Project Operations Analysis

### 9.1.1 Intersection Operations

Table 8-1 summarizes the intersection operations throughout the project study area during the operations phase of the project. This table shows that all of the intersections in the study area are calculated to continue to operate at LOS B or better during the AM and PM peak hours.

### 9.1.2 Segment Analysis

Table 8-2 summarizes the street segment operations throughout the project study area during the operations phase of the project. This table shows that all of the street segments in the study area are calculated to continue to operate at LOS A on a daily basis.

### 9.2 Cumulative Growth

To account for potential cumulative project traffic increases that may be unforeseen, a $10 \%$ growth factor was applied to the existing traffic volumes at the study area intersections and segments. This $10 \%$ growth would conservatively represent the amount of traffic that may utilize the street system in the project vicinity proposed from future development projects planned in Imperial County.

### 9.3 Existing + Project Operations + Cumulative Analysis

### 9.3.1 Intersection Operations

Table 8-1 summarizes the intersection operations throughout the project study area during the operations phase of the project and the addition of cumulative growth. This table shows that all of the intersections in the study area are calculated to continue to operate at LOS B or better during the AM and PM peak hours.

### 9.3.2 Segment Analysis

Table 8-2 summarizes the street segment operations throughout the project study area during the operations phase of the project and the addition of cumulative growth. This table shows that all of the street segments in the study area are calculated to continue to operate at LOS A on a daily basis.

Table 9-1
Intersection Operations

| Intersection | Control Type | Peak <br> Hour | Existing + Project Operations |  | Existing + Project + Cumulative Projects Operations |  | $\Delta^{\text {c }}$ Delay | Impact <br> Type |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Delay | LOS | Delay | LOS |  |  |
| 1. SR-111 / Hazard Rd | TWSC ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | AM | 0.0 | A | 0.0 | A | 0.0 | None |
|  |  | PM | 0.0 | A | 0.0 | A | 0.0 | None |
| 2. SR-111/ McDonald Rd | TWSC | AM | 9.1 | A | 9.2 | A | 0.1 | None |
|  |  | PM | 9.2 | A | 9.3 | A | 0.1 | None |
| 3. English Road / McDonald Rd | TWSC | AM | 9.3 | A | 9.3 | A | 0.0 | None |
|  |  | PM | 0.0 | A | 0.0 | A | 0.0 | None |
| 4. English Road / Sinclair Rd | TWSC | AM | 0.7 | A | 0.7 | A | 0.0 | None |
|  |  | PM | 1.0 | A | 1.0 | A | 0.0 | None |
| 5. SR-111 / Sinclair Rd | TWSC | AM | 10.6 | B | 10.7 | B | 0.1 | None |
|  |  | PM | 9.9 | A | 10.1 | B | 0.2 | None |

Average delay expressed in seconds per vehicle.
b. Level of Service.
c. $\Delta$ denotes an increase in delay due to project.
d. TWSC - Minor Street Stop Controlled intersection. Minor street left turn delay is reported.

| UNSIGNALIZED |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Delay | LOS |
| $0.0 \leq 10.0$ | A |
| 10.1 to 15.0 | B |
| 15.1 to 25.0 | C |
| 25.1 to 35.0 | D |
| 35.1 to 50.0 | E |
| $\geq 50.1$ | F |

Table 9-2
Street Segment Operations

| Street Segment | Capacity$(\operatorname{LOS} E)^{a}$ | Existing + Project Operations |  |  | Existing + Project + Cumulative Projects Operations |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \Delta \\ \mathrm{V} / \mathrm{C} \end{gathered}$ | Impact <br> Type |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ADT | LOS | V/C | ADT | LOS | V/C |  |  |
| SR-111 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| North of Hazard Rd | 22,700 | 3,824 | A | 0.168 | 4,204 | A | 0.185 | 0.017 | None |
| Hazard Rd to McDonald Rd | 22,700 | 3,824 | A | 0.168 | 4,204 | A | 0.185 | 0.017 | None |
| McDonald Rd to Sinclair Rd | 22,700 | 3,950 | A | 0.174 | 4,330 | A | 0.191 | 0.017 | None |
| South of Sinclair Road | 22,700 | 6,555 | A | 0.288 | 7,195 | A | 0.317 | 0.028 | None |
| McDonald Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Site to English Rd | 1,500 | 449 | A | 0.300 | 476 | A | 0.317 | 0.018 | None |
| English Rd to SR-111 | 1,500 | 394 | A | 0.263 | 416 | A | 0.277 | 0.015 | None |
| Sinclair Road |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| English Rd to SR-111 | 1,500 | 325 | A | 0.217 | 357 | A | 0.238 | 0.021 | None |

Footnotes:
a. Capacities based on County of Imperial Roadway Classification Table.
b. Average Daily Traffic Volumes.
c. Level of Service.
d. Volume to Capacity.



### 10.0 Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE)

An Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) is being competed under separate cover. Table 10-1 summarizes the operations of four alternatives that could be implemented at the SR-111/McDonald Road intersection.

Table 10-1
SR-111 / McDonald Road intersection ICE Analysis


### 11.0 Vehicle Mles Traveled (VMT)

### 11.1 VMT Background

In September 2013, the Governor's Office signed SB 743 into law, starting a process that fundamentally changes the way transportation impact analysis is conducted under CEQA. These changes include the elimination of auto delay, level of service (LOS), and similar measurements of vehicular roadway capacity and traffic congestion as the basis for determining significant impacts. The justification for this paradigm shift is that Auto Delay/LOS impacts lead to improvements that increase roadway capacity and therefore induce more traffic and greenhouse gas emissions. The VMT standard for evaluating transportation impacts under CEQA became mandatory statewide on July 1, 2020.

VMT is defined as a measurement of miles traveled by vehicles within a specified region and for a specified time period. VMT is a measure of the use and efficiency of the transportation network. VMT's are calculated based on individual vehicle trips generated and their associated trip lengths. VMT accounts for two-way (round trip) travel and is typically estimated on a weekday for the purpose of measuring potential transportation impacts.

### 11.2 Significance Threshold

Since the County has not yet adopted its own VMT threshold, the County is relying on the guidance provided in the Technical Advisory published by the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) in December 2018 (the "OPR Guidance") for purposes of evaluating the potential VMT impacts of development projects. The OPR Guidance for VMT states that depending on the type of project, different thresholds of significance are applicable. The "Recommended Numeric Thresholds for Residential, Office, and Retail Project" section of the OPR Guidance includes a section on "Other Project Types" which applies to the Project:
"Of land use projects, residential, office, and retail projects tend to have the greatest influence on VMT. For that reason, OPR recommends the quantified thresholds described [in the Residential, Office, and Retail Project section] for purposes of analysis and mitigation. Lead agencies, using more location-specific information, may develop their own more specific thresholds, which may include other land use types...".

Guidance from OPR's Technical Advisory is used to establish a significance threshold of a minimum $15 \%$ reduction or more from the Regional average VMT per employee for this project evaluation. That means that if the Project's VMT per employee is more than $15 \%$ below the regional average, no significant transportation impact would result. It should be noted that OPR has no guidelines for truck trips.

### 11.3 VMT Methodology

The VMT assessment conducted using California Statewide Travel Demand Model (CSTDM) data provided by Caltrans. The following is a summary of steps involved in calculating the trip length and Region-wide VMT:

- Step 1. Determine the project analysis zone
- Step 2. Determine the VMT per Employee for the zone where proposed Project is located.
- Step 3. Determine the average VMT per Employee within the County of Imperial representing the Regional VMT.
- Step 4. Using the average VMT from Step 2, compare the zone VMT against the Regional VMT. It should be noted that this step differs from the typical approach of comparing VMT per Capita because there is no associated population for the Project.

Using the CSTDM, the VMT per Employee can be utilized at both the regional and census tract level.


Project TAZ


Regional Map

### 11.4 Assessment:

Caltrans provides Transportation Analysis Zone (TAZs) map which provide information for each zone. The Project site is located in the County of Imperial which includes total 17 zones representing Imperial Region. Table 11-1 tabulates average regional VMT per employee and the threshold. Attachment $\boldsymbol{D}$ contains the calculation of average regional VMT data.

Caltrans guidelines suggest that the VMT analysis is recommended based on the project location and zoning. The Project site is located in the Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ) 5600. The VMT per employee for TAZ 5600 is 20.84 .

Table 11-1
Regional VMT per Employee and Threshold

| Region $^{1}$ | Significance Threshold $^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 24.51 | 20.83 |

Footnotes:

1. Regional VMT per Employee is calculated by Averaging VMT per Employee for 17 TAZs located in the Imperial County.
2. Based on $15 \%$ below the Regional VMT Average.

### 11.5 Result

As shown in Table 11-2, the VMT per employee for TAZ 5600, where the project is located, is 0.01 mile more than the significance threshold shown in Table 11-1. Therefore, the Project has a significant transportation impact and mitigation measures are needed. Only a $0.048 \%$ decrease I VMT is required to mitigate the impact.

TABLE 11-2
VMT per Employee Comparison

| Significance Threshold $^{\mathbf{1}}$ | TAZ (Project) $^{\mathbf{2}}$ | Significant Transportation Impact? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20.83 | 20.84 | Yes |

Footnotes:

1. See Table 11-1.
2. SOURCE: Project VMT per Employee

### 11.6 Mitigation

It is recommended that the project implement a Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) program to discourage single-occupancy vehicle trips and encourage alternative modes of transportation such as carpooling, taking transit, walking, and biking. The CTR program could include features such as Carpooling encouragement, Ride-matching assistance, Preferential carpool parking, Half time transportation coordinator, Vanpool assistance and Bicycle end-trip facilities (parking, showers and lockers) and provide employees with assistance in using alternative modes of travel.

### 12.0 CONCLUSIONS \& RECOMMENDATIONS

The capacity analyses performed for the key roadway segments and unsignalized and signalized intersections indicate that no significant impacts would occur during the construction or Day-toDay Operations of the project.

### 12.1 Operational Deficiencies

However, a significant impact could potentially occur if improvements are not implemented at the SR-111 / McDonald Road intersection. Therefore, the SR-111/McDonald Road intersection should be improved to Caltrans satisfaction including the installation of a Northbound Left-Turn pocket prior to the opening of the project. This improvement will be implemented prior to the Project's certificate of occupation.

Providing a southbound right-turn lane was considered but rejected due to the low volumes. The maximum peak hour volume in this movement is 12 during construction and 7 during operations.

An ICE analysis has been prepared under separate cover that address and analyzes the following four alternatives:

1. Minor Street Stop Control (MSSC) - Existing traffic control
2. All-Way Stop Control (AWSC)
3. Traffic Signal
4. Roundabout

Construction traffic should be instructed to use the paved Sinclair Road and not the unpaved McDonald Road as east / west access to the site during construction.

### 12.2 VMT Analysis

The Project has a significant transportation impact. However, only a $0.048 \%$ decrease in VMT is required to mitigate the impact. It is recommended that the project implement a Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) program to discourage single-occupancy vehicle trips and encourage alternative modes of transportation such as carpooling, taking transit, walking, and biking. The CTR program could include features such as Carpooling encouragement, Ride-matching assistance, Preferential carpool parking, Half-time transportation coordinator, Vanpool assistance and Bicycle end-trip facilities (parking, showers and lockers) and provide employees with assistance in using alternative modes of travel.
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## APPENDIX A

## Intersection Count Sheets \& Caltrans Traffic Volumes

## Hwy 111 \& Hazard Rd

Peak Hour Turning Movement Count

ID: 19-04371-001
City: Calipatria


Total Vehicles (Noon)


Total Vehicles (PM)


| Hwy 111 |
| :---: |
| SOUTHBOUND |


| AM | 0 | 107 | 0 | 0 | 101 | AM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NOON | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NOON |
|  | PM | 0 | 106 | 0 | 0 | 106 | PM

Day: Wednesday
Date: 09/25/2019


Bikes (NOON)


Bikes (PM)


## Hwy 111 \& McDonald Rd

## Peak Hour Turning Movement Count



Total Vehicles (Noon)


Total Vehicles (PM)



Day: Wednesday
Date: 09/25/2019

| AM | 1 | 107 | 2 | 0 | 103 | AM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NOON | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NOON |
|  | PM | 0 | 92 | 1 | 0 | 112 |





Bikes (NOON)


Bikes (PM)


## English Rd \& McDonald Rd

## Peak Hour Turning Movement Count



## English Rd \& W Sinclair Rd

## Peak Hour Turning Movement Count



## Hwy 111 \& Sinclair Rd

Peak Hour Turning Movement Count


Total Vehicles (Noon)


Total Vehicles (PM)


| Hwy 111 |
| :---: |
| SOUTHBOUND |

Day: Wednesday
Date: 09/25/2019

| AM | 6 | 84 | 21 | 0 | 90 | AM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | NOON |



Bikes (NOON)


Bikes (PM)


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dist | Route | County |  | Postmile | Description | Back <br> Peak <br> Hour | Back <br> Peak <br> Month | Back <br> AADT | Ahead Peak Hour | Ahead Peak AADT | Ahead AADT |
| 7 | 110 | LA |  | 29.028 | LOS ANGELES, AVENUE 64 | 8700 | 103000 | 98000 | 7100 | 82000 | 80000 |
| 7 | 110 | LA |  | 29.5 | LOS ANGELES, YORK BOULEVARD | 7100 | 82000 | 80000 | 6900 | 82000 | 78000 |
| 7 | 110 | LA |  | 29.95 | SOUTH PASADENA, BRIDEWELL STREET | 6900 | 82000 | 78000 | 6800 | 81000 | 77000 |
| 7 | 110 | LA |  | 30.587 | SOUTH PASADENA, ORANGE GROVE AVENUE | 6800 | 81000 | 77000 | 4950 | 59000 | 56000 |
| 7 | 110 | LA |  | 31.17 | SOUTH PASADENA, FAIR OAKS AVENUE | 4950 | 59000 | 56000 | 3550 | 42000 | 40000 |
| 7 | 110 | LA |  | 31.912 | PASADENA, GLENARM STREET | 3550 | 42000 | 40000 | 3550 | 42000 | 40000 |
| 7 | 110 | LA |  | 31.913 | PASADENA, END FREEWAY | 3550 | 42000 | 40000 |  |  |  |
| 11 | 111 | IMP | R | 0 | CALEXICO, SO CITY LIMITS, AT MEXICAN BNDRY |  |  |  | 1950 | 26000 | 24600 |
| 11 | 111 | IMP | R | 0.2 | CALEXICO, SECOND STREET | 1950 | 26000 | 24600 | 1950 | 26000 | 24600 |
| 11 | 111 | IMP |  | 0.408 | THIRD ST | 1950 | 26000 | 24600 | 2150 | 29500 | 28500 |
| 11 | 111 | IMP |  | 0.836 | CALEXICO, GRANT STREET (EIGHTH STREET) | 2150 | 29500 | 28500 | 2150 | 30000 | 28500 |
| 11 | 111 | IMP | R | 1.183 | JCT. RTE. 98 | 2150 | 30000 | 28500 | 2600 | 32500 | 31500 |
| 11 | 111 | IMP | R | 2.211 | COLE ROAD | 2600 | 32500 | 31500 | 2800 | 38000 | 35000 |
| 11 | 111 | IMP | R | 4.741 | JCT. RTE. 86 WEST | 2800 | 38000 | 35000 | 2750 | 34000 | 30500 |
| 11 | 111 | IMP | R | 6.242 | MC CABE ROAD (LAKE ROAD) | 2750 | 34000 | 30500 | 2400 | 32000 | 30000 |
| 11 | 111 | IMP | R | 7.714 | JCT. RTE. 8 | 2400 | 32000 | 30000 | 1800 | 20600 | 19300 |
| 11 | 111 | IMP | R | 9.503 | EVAN HEWES HWY | 1700 | 20200 | 18200 | 1600 | 18900 | 16800 |
| 11 | 111 | IMP | R | 11.299 | ATEN RD | 1600 | 18900 | 16800 | 1050 | 14000 | 13500 |
| 11 | 111 | IMP | R | 12.874 | WORTHINGTON ROAD | 1050 | 14000 | 13500 | 1100 | 12100 | 11000 |
| 11 | 111 | IMP | R | 17.385 | KEYSTONE ROAD | 1100 | 12100 | 11000 | 1050 | 12300 | 11000 |
| 11 | 111 | IMP | R | 22.015 | JCT. RTE. 78 | 950 | 11500 | 10000 | 630 | 5800 | 5500 |
| 11 | 111 | IMP |  | 23.538 | SHANK ROAD | 630 | 5800 | 5500 | 560 | 5700 | 5300 |
| 11 | 111 | IMP |  | 23.787 | DEL RIO RD RT. | 560 | 5700 | 5300 | 560 | 5700 | 5300 |
| 11 | 111 | IMP |  | 24.682 | ANDRE RD | 560 | 5700 | 5300 | 620 | 6000 | 4650 |
| 11 | 111 | IMP |  | 26.67 | RUTHERFORD ROAD | 620 | 6000 | 4650 | 700 | 6600 | 5300 |
| 11 | 111 | IMP |  | 32.01 | CALIPATRIA, SOUTH CITY LIMITS | 700 | 6600 | 5300 | 690 | 6500 | 5200 |
| 11 | 111 | IMP |  | 32.513 | JCT. RTE. 115 EAST | 690 | 6500 | 5200 | 600 | 5700 | 4550 |
| 11 | 111 | IMP |  | 32.74 | CALIFORNIA STREET | 600 | 5700 | 4550 | 730 | 6500 | 5000 |
| 11 | 111 | IMP |  | 36.09 | SINCLAIR ROAD | 730 | 6500 | 5000 | 650 | 6000 | 3750 |
| 11 | 111 | IMP |  | 39.82 | NILAND AVENUE | 650 | 6000 | 3750 | 420 | 3700 | 2900 |
| 11 | 111 | IMP |  | 40.4 | THIRD STREET | 420 | 3700 | 2900 | 480 | 4200 | 3200 |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dist | Route | County |  | Postmile | Description | Back <br> Peak <br> Hour |  | Back <br> AADT | Ahead Peak Hour | Ahead <br> Peak <br> AADT | Ahead AADT |
| 11 | 111 | IMP |  | 40.71 | BEAL ROAD | 480 | 4200 | 3200 | 330 | 3200 | 2450 |
| 11 | 111 | IMP |  | 42.47 | ENGLISH ROAD | 330 | 3200 | 2450 | 340 | 3200 | 2500 |
| 11 | 111 | IMP |  | 57.625 | BOMBAY BEACH ROAD | 200 | 1900 | 1500 | 190 | 1700 | 1400 |
| 11 | 111 | IMP |  | 65.394 | IMPERIAL/RIVERSIDE COUNTY LINE | 190 | 2150 | 1500 | 190 | 1750 | 1400 |
| 8 | 111 | RIV |  | 7.67 | SALTON SEA STATE PARK ROAD | 190 | 2050 | 1700 | 300 | 3200 | 2700 |
| 8 | 111 | RIV |  | 18.428 | MECCA, JCT. RTE. 195 WEST | 490 | 5200 | 4400 | 860 | 9200 | 7700 |
| 8 | 111 | RIV |  | 47.252 | PALM SPRINGS, GOLF CLUB DRIVE | 860 | 9200 | 7700 | 3150 | 35000 | 32000 |
| 8 | 111 | RIV | T | 47.795 | EAST PALM CANYON/GENE AUTRY TRAIL | 2800 | 31000 | 28500 | 1300 | 13300 | 12500 |
| 8 | 111 | RIV | T | 48.318 | GENE AUTRY TR N/O PALM CYN | 1300 | 13300 | 12500 | 1150 | 12500 | 11700 |
| 8 | 111 | RIV | T | 49.37 | PALM SPRINGS, RAMON ROAD | 1150 | 12500 | 11700 | 1850 | 19200 | 18000 |
| 8 | 111 | RIV | T | 51.588 | VISTA CHINO | 2000 | 20600 | 19300 | 2650 | 31000 | 29000 |
| 8 | 111 | RIV | T | 52.371 | PALM SPRINGS, FARRELL DRIVE | 2650 | 31000 | 29000 | 2100 | 24500 | 23000 |
| 8 | 111 | RIV | T | 52.876 | PALM SPRINGS, SUNRISE WAY | 2100 | 24500 | 23000 | 1950 | 22300 | 21000 |
| 8 | 111 | RIV | T | 53.376 | PALM SPRINGS, AVENIDA CABALLEROS | 1950 | 22300 | 21000 | 1250 | 14700 | 13800 |
| 8 | 111 | RIV | T | 53.627 | PALM SPRINGS, VIA MIRALESTE | 1250 | 14700 | 13800 | 1250 | 14700 | 13800 |
| 8 | 111 | RIV | T | 53.877 | PALM SPRINGS, INDIAN CANYON | 1250 | 14700 | 13800 | 970 | 11200 | 10500 |
| 8 | 111 | RIV |  | 53.821 | VISTA CHINO @ PALM CNYN | 970 | 11200 | 10500 | 2100 | 19700 | 17500 |
| 8 | 111 | RIV |  | 54.955 | PALM SPRINGS, TRAMWAY DRIVE | 1900 | 18000 | 16000 | 1900 | 18000 | 16000 |
| 8 | 111 | RIV | R | 63.378 | JCT. RTE. 10 | 1550 | 14800 | 13200 |  |  |  |
| 4 | 112 | ALA | R | 0 | SAN LEANDRO, JCT. RTE. 61 |  |  |  | 2200 | 29500 | 29000 |
| 4 | 112 | ALA |  | 0.602 | JCT. RTE. 880 | 4100 | 55000 | 54000 | 3000 | 41000 | 40000 |
| 4 | 112 | ALA |  | 1.507 | SAN LEANDRO, SAN LEANDRO BOULEVARD | 2650 | 36000 | 35000 | 2200 | 31000 | 30000 |
| 4 | 112 | ALA |  | 1.782 | SAN LEANDRO, JCT. RTE. 185 | 1750 | 23500 | 22900 |  |  |  |
| 4 | 113 | SOL |  | 0 | JCT. RTE. 12 |  |  |  | 390 | 4050 | 3750 |
| 4 | 113 | SOL |  | 11.61 | ELMIRA/FRY ROADS | 370 | 3850 | 3550 | 320 | 3350 | 3100 |
| 4 | 113 | SOL |  | 18.95 | DIXON, CHERRY STREET | 970 | 7500 | 6900 | 1150 | 8500 | 8200 |
| 4 | 113 | SOL |  | 19.29 | DIXON, A STREET | 1650 | 12100 | 11700 | 990 | 9300 | 9000 |
| 4 | 113 | SOL |  | 19.96 | DIXON, NORTH ADAMS STREET | 1050 | 10000 | 9600 | 1250 | 11200 | 10900 |
| 4 | 113 | SOL | R | 21.24 | R DIXON, WEST JCT. RTE. 80 | 2400 | 21500 | 20000 | 4750 | 43000 | 40000 |
| 4 | 113 | SOL | R | 21.653 | EAST JCT RTE 80 SB | 2400 | 21500 | 20000 | 4750 | 43000 | 40000 |
| 4 | 113 | SOL | R | 22.45 | SOLANO YOLO COUNTY LINE (PUTAH CREEK BRIDGE) | 4750 | 43000 | 40000 |  |  |  |

## Appendix B

Peak Hour Intersection Analysis Worksheets

Existing





















## Existing + Project Operations




| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations |  | \$ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | \$ |  |  | \$ |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 102 | 2 | 2 | 107 | 12 |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 102 | 2 | 2 | 107 | 12 |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 111 | 2 | 2 | 116 | 13 |











| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 1.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations |  | ${ }_{*}$ |  |  | ${ }_{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{4}$ |  |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 11 | 0 | 20 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 2 | 100 | 2 | 1 | 92 | 0 |  |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 11 | 0 | 20 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 2 | 100 | 2 | 1 | 92 | 0 |  |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | , | 0 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |  |
| RT Channelized | - |  | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |  |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |
| Mvmt Flow | 12 | 0 | 22 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 2 | 109 | 2 | 1 | 100 | 0 |  |





| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 6.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 1 | 15 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 67 | 2 | 0 |  |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 1 | 15 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 67 | 2 | 0 |  |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Sign Control | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |  |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - |  | None |  |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |
| Mvmt Flow | 1 | 16 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 73 | 2 | 0 |  |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations |  | \$ |  |  | ¢ |  | \% | F |  | \% | F |  |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 8 | 2 | 76 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 8 | 89 | 1 | 1 | 116 | 3 |  |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 8 | 2 | 76 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 8 | 89 | 1 | 1 | 116 | 3 |  |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Sign Control S | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |  |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |  |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |
| Mumt Flow | 9 | 2 | 83 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 9 | 97 | 1 | 1 | 126 | 3 |  |



## Existing + Project Operations + Cumulative Analysis






HCMLOS A B










| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 2.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations |  | ${ }_{*}$ |  |  | ${ }_{4}$ |  | \% | $\stackrel{1}{1}$ |  |  | $\uparrow$ | 7 |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 6 | 0 | 55 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 16 | 110 | 2 | 1 | 101 | 1 |  |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 6 | 0 | 55 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 16 | 110 | 2 | 1 | 101 | 1 |  |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Sign Control Stor | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |  |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |  |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | 0 |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |
| Mvmt Flow | 7 | 0 | 60 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 17 | 120 | 2 | 1 | 110 | 1 |  |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations |  | ¢ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 0 | 61 | 5 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 0 | 61 | 5 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Sign Control | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free |  |
| RT Channelized | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - |  | None |  |
| Storage Length | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# | \# | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Grade, \% | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |
| Mvmt Flow | 0 | 66 | 5 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |



| Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Int Delay, s/veh | 3.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Movement EBL | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |  |
| Lane Configurations |  | \$ |  |  | $\dagger$ |  |  | ¢ |  |  | ¢ |  |  |
| Traffic Vol, veh/h | 1 | 17 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 0 |  |
| Future Vol, veh/h | 1 | 17 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 0 |  |
| Conflicting Peds, \#/hr | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Sign Control F | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Free | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop | Stop |  |
| RT Channelized |  | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None | - | - | None |  |
| Storage Length |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Veh in Median Storage, \# |  | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Grade, \% |  | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | - |  |
| Peak Hour Factor | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 |  |
| Heavy Vehicles, \% |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |
| Mvmt Flow |  | 18 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 0 |  |





